

Y MEDICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV OF MICH

FEB 24 1936

RESEARCH BULLETIN

OF THE NATIONAL
EDUCATION
ASSOCIATION

VOL. XIV · No. 1
JANUARY · 1936

The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures

Published by the RESEARCH DIVISION of the
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

RESEARCH BULLETIN OF THE

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Published five times each year
in January, March, May,
September, and November

President, AGNES SAMUELSON

Executive Secretary, WILLARD E. GIVENS

The payment of the \$5 membership fee of the National Education Association entitles one to receive for one year the Research Bulletin, the Journal, the Annual Volume of Addresses and Proceedings, and certain other publications of the Association. One dollar of each \$5 membership fee is for a year's subscription to

the Research Bulletin. The Research Bulletin may be subscribed for separately at \$1 per year. Copies may be purchased at nominal cost, and in quantities at a reduced rate. Those entitled to receive the Research Bulletin regularly are asked to report at once any change of residence, giving old as well as new address.

Entered as second-class matter February 10, 1923, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 10, 1923.

Copyright, 1936 by the National Education Association

Director of Research: William G. Carr; Associate Director: Frank W. Hubbard

Assistant Directors: Richard R. Foster, Ivan A. Booker

Executive and Editorial Offices . . . 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Purchasing Copies

Additional copies of this issue of the Research Bulletin may be obtained at the following prices, postpaid if remittance accompanies order:

Single copies, 25c.

2 to 9 copies—10% reduction.

10 to 99 copies—25% reduction.

100 or more copies—33⅓% reduction.

Orders for Research Bulletins not accompanied by remittance are subject to transportation charges. Make checks payable to National Education Association.

Subscriptions

The Research Bulletin may be received regularly thru a special subscription at \$1 per year. Many of the early issues of the Research Bulletin are already out

of print. The special subscription at \$1 per year offers an opportunity to maintain a complete file of future Research Bulletins.

Reproduction of Material in Research Bulletins

Material appearing in the Research Bulletin is copyrighted. However, Departments and regularly affiliated organizations of the National Education Association may reproduce parts of these bulletins for the advancement of education. These departments and organizations need no authority other than this notice previous to such reproduction. In other cases application for the release of materials is required. Address communications to the Research Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	4
INTRODUCTION	5
Scope and Basic Assumptions of the Study.....	5
Sources of Information.....	6
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES IN PREPARING AND ADOPTING THE NEW SALARY SCHEDULE	9
Extent to Which New Schedules Are Replacements of Older Ones.....	9
Preliminary Steps	9
Personnel Participating in Preparing the Salary Schedule.....	10
Financing the New Schedule.....	16
Format and Organization of Schedule.....	18
Time Required for Salary Schedule Preparation.....	18
Transition from Old to New Schedule.....	19
Summary	20
GATHERING AND PRESENTING THE FACTS ON SALARIES.....	21
Form of Report of Salary Studies.....	21
Factors Studied in the Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules.....	21
The Salary Schedule Already in Effect.....	25
Salaries Paid in Other School Systems.....	25
Salaries in Occupations Other Than Teaching.....	27
The Present Teaching Personnel.....	29
Cost of Living and Standard of Living in Relation to Teachers' Salaries.....	31
Administrative Practises Affecting Personnel and Salaries.....	34
Financing the Salary Schedule.....	35
Suggested Sources of Information on Salaries.....	38
REFERENCES TO LOCAL STUDIES OF TEACHERS' SALARY SCHEDULES	41
COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND LIST OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPLYING.....	43
LIST OF TABLES	45
LIST OF FIGURES	46

FOREWORD

THE EVIDENCE clearly indicates that during the present school year of 1935-36 progress has been made toward restoration and readjustment of salaries. Local groups are studying salary problems; new salary schedules are being proposed and adopted. The past few years have been a period of arrested progress and even retrogression for teachers' salaries, after a decade during which the tangible rewards of teaching, at least in the larger cities, were gradually being raised toward a professional standard. It is important that the present period of salary adjustment be used to think thru the whole problem of teachers' salaries. A mere return to 1929 conditions may not be adequate or equitable in 1936.

Few public questions are more fundamental than the framing of policies on teachers' salaries. The payment of a fair remuneration to teachers is part of the larger national problem of a fair wage for all workers. Teachers constitute an important section of the gainfully employed in the United States; their salaries have an especially significant influence on the national welfare because of the strategic place occupied by education in the further improvement of our American democracy. The economic position of teachers is also important in the recruitment of future members of the profession. It is too much to expect that a sufficient number of young men and women of the highest intellectual and personal qualities will be attracted to a profession which cannot offer them the security, comfort, and independence promised by other lines of work.

The question of an adequate standard of living for teachers must be carefully restudied in all parts of the country. We need to consider the minimum salary to be fixed for beginning teachers in various classifications; the factors to be considered in fixing the increments in the salary schedule; and the amounts of the maximum salaries. We need to collect and study all the facts which will throw any light whatever upon these difficult questions. We need to draft our new salary schedules in recognition of these facts and to use the most effective administrative procedures in studying the entire question of equitable salaries. It is with these and similar problems that the January and March 1936 issues of the *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association are concerned.

It is hoped that these two bulletins will be of great value to teachers, principals, superintendents of schools, and boards of education in their efforts to develop satisfactory plans for the payment of teachers.

WILLARD E. GIVENS, *Executive Secretary,*
National Education Association.

Introduction

Scope and Basic Assumptions of the Study

This bulletin deals with administrative and statistical procedures in the preparation of teachers' salary schedules in city school systems, basing its discussion largely on practises reported by 222 superintendents of schools and on the published reports of 22 local salary studies. It is Part I of a study which is being issued in two separate numbers of the *Research Bulletin*, for January and for March 1936. Part II, to be issued in March, will call attention to questions which arise in making decisions on the detailed provisions of salary schedules, and will present a list of items for consideration at successive stages of the schedule-making process.

The essential elements in the scheduling of teachers' salaries may be grouped under three headings: first, purposes; second, conditions and standards which must be recognized; and third, possible bases for variation within the schedule itself. Figure I lists these elements. Assuming that the general purpose of the salary schedule is to obtain the best teaching service possible, the first column of Figure I states three specific purposes: to secure, to improve, and to retain good teachers. In drafting a schedule designed to achieve these aims, certain conditions and standards must be recognized, which are mentioned in the second column of Figure I. For example, local customs and policies have their influence; the new schedule must be applied to many of the teachers already in service; the cost of maintaining an individual at an economic standard suitable for the teaching profession requires consideration; the salaries must be financed from public funds. Such facts as these must be faced and considered in relation to each other and to the purposes of the salary schedule, in fixing the amounts to be paid and in deciding upon the detailed provisions of the schedule. The third column of Figure I names the bases for variation in salaries which have been noted in existing salary schedules and which have been

proposed in discussions of the salary problem. Few schedules include all of them; this bulletin does not suggest that all should be included.

The statement of essential elements given in Figure I is related to the entire treatment of salary scheduling given thruout this study. The list of conditions and standards is paralleled by the second major section in this bulletin which deals with gathering and presenting the facts on salaries; the third column, on bases for variation within the schedule, will be developed in Part II, on decisions in drafting the salary schedule. Underlying the consideration of these elements in any school system is the professional skill and wisdom needed to determine salary policies and to fix rates of pay which will promote the educational welfare of the community being served. The organization for utilizing this professional skill is recognized in the first section of this bulletin, which deals with administrative procedures in preparing the salary schedule.

Basic assumptions—In addition to the elements recognized in Figure I, certain other assumptions are made, as follows:

1. The term "salary schedule" is used in accordance with the definition given in a previous issue of the *Research Bulletin*:

By a salary schedule is meant a plan for the payment of school employees formally adopted by the board of education or school committee, which to a large degree automatically determines the beginning salary, the amount and number of yearly increases, and the maximum salary received by various groups of teachers, principals, and other employees with specified qualifications.¹

2. The advantages of paying teachers on the basis of a formally adopted schedule rather than on the basis of individual bargaining are generally conceded,² and will be accepted as basic to the discussion in this bulletin.

3. It is assumed that the present system of occupational distribution in the United States will continue, which makes it necessary for boards of education to compete with occupa-

* ¹ National Education Association, Research Division. "The Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries." *Research Bulletin* 5: 159; May, 1927.

² See especially: Cooke, Dennis H. *Problems of the Teaching Personnel*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. p. 269-70. ¶ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 5-6. ¶ Lewis, Ervin Eugene. *Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff*. New York: Century Co., 1925. p. 279-82.

On the need for a salary schedule even in the very small school system, see: Huggett, A. J. "Salary Schedules in Small Towns." *American School Board Journal* 77: 43-44, 133; August, 1928. ¶ Schwall, H. E. "Teachers' Salary Schedule for a Small Town." *American School Board Journal* 81: 47; December, 1930.

tions other than teaching in order to attract able men and women to the teaching profession. It is recognized that young people who choose teaching as a life work do so both for the opportunity which teaching gives to help in the progress of humanity and also for the opportunity which teaching offers to establish economic security for themselves.

4. Another form of competition which must be recognized for some time to come is the rivalry among boards of education for the services of the most competent teachers. Thru state minimum salary laws,³ consolidation of indefensibly small school districts, granting of state aid, and improvement in state teacher-preparation programs, progress is being made toward enabling every school system to provide competent teachers for its pupils. But this progress is still too slow. Literally thousands of school districts are entering the market for teachers' services with the offer of less than a living wage.⁴ So long as the schools are manned by those who must accept such wages, so long

will the occupation of teaching fall short of having a completely professional personnel. It is not assumed that conditions will continue to exist in the United States, whereby some school systems are unable to compete for adequately prepared teachers. But it seems reasonable to suppose that, beyond a minimum which should be met by all, there will be local variations among school systems which will represent a competition for the best teaching ability.

Sources of Information

The principal sources of information used for the study are: (1) replies to a questionnaire sent to city school systems; (2) published reports of 22 local studies of teachers' salaries; and (3) the provisions of 150 salary schedules adopted subsequent to 1927. In addition, the publications of the National Education Association and the published studies and opinions of individual students of salary scheduling have been drawn upon freely.

³ Spencer, Paul R. *A State Minimum Teachers' Salary Schedule*. Contributions to Education, No. 519. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. 150 p.

For outline of certain features in eight state minimum schedules, see: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division. *Organization and Content, Teachers' Salary Schedules*. Educational Research Service Circular No. 6, 1935. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. p. 24-27.

⁴ For further comment on the problem of the small school system in salary scheduling, see: Carpenter, W. W., and Capps, A. G. "Wasting Human Power." *American School Board Journal* 91: 32, 58; August, 1935. ¶ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 228-29.

Purposes	Conditions and Standards To Be Recognized	Possible Bases for Variation Within the Schedule Itself
To secure new teachers who are personally competent and professionally well prepared	Community attitudes and traditions	Position or special assignment
To encourage the professional growth of teachers while in service	Local standards for appointment and administration of personnel	Professional preparation (either before or after appointment) or equivalent professional activity
To retain the most competent teachers in the school system	Teaching staff already in service	Years of teaching experience
	Supply of desirable applicants	Directive responsibility
	Salaries and policies in other school systems	Teaching efficiency
	Salaries and opportunities in other occupations	Non-professional factors — sex, race, marriage, dependents.
	Costs of an appropriate standard of living for teachers	
	Legislative standards	
	Financial resources	

FIGURE I.
ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS IN THE SCHEDULING OF TEACHERS' SALARIES

The questionnaire—A questionnaire⁵ on practises followed in the preparation of salary schedules was sent in October 1935 to school systems which had previously reported the adoption of a new salary schedule in 1928 or any later year. The mailing list for the questionnaire was based primarily on information collected by the Research Division late in 1934 in its biennial salary study for 1934-35.⁶ A few other cities, known to have adopted salary schedules in 1935, were included. The years 1928 to 1934, in which most of the schedules in the questionnaire study were adopted, cover a period which is about equally divided between pre-depression and depression years, so far as teachers' salaries are concerned. Relatively few school systems were affected by failing revenues before 1931 and the full effect of depression cuts came later in most places. Table 1 shows the total number of questionnaires and replies, and indicates that 222 usable replies were received.

The five population groups as defined in columns 1 and 2 of Table 1 are followed consistently thruout this bulletin and are referred to by number, both in text and in tables. The questionnaire findings, however, are for the most part presented under three headings: Groups I and II combined, representing the large cities; Group III, which includes cities

of 10,000 to 30,000; and Groups IV and V, which include the smaller cities of 2500 to 10,000.

The date of adoption of the 222 schedules reported on by the questionnaire is given in Table 2. Approximately half of them, or 49.6 percent, were adopted in 1928, 1929, and 1930. Several items in the questionnaire on practises which might show a tendency to increase or decrease in the course of seven or eight years were studied on that basis, but as no significant trends were noted the tabulations of replies are not organized on the basis of years.

The 22 local studies—The published reports of salary studies made in a number of school systems were examined, in order to bring together the suggestions which they offer for the drafting of a salary schedule. An effort was made to secure for this analysis reports of all salary studies published during the past ten years which present a proposed salary schedule accompanied by an interpretation and presentation of supporting statistical data; 22 such studies were located.⁷ Other reports, which deal with status but do not recommend a schedule,⁸ have been studied and used in the preparation of the bulletin, but are not included in the tabular analysis.

The 150 salary schedules—An analysis was made of the content of all the salary schedules

⁵ The questionnaire is reproduced in the closing pages of this bulletin. It is followed by a list of the 222 school systems submitting usable replies.

⁶ The study is summarized in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries of School Employees, 1934-35." *Research Bulletin* 13: 1-30; March, 1935.

⁷ See items marked with asterisk in "References to Local Studies of Teachers' Salary Schedules," at close of second major section of this bulletin.

The studies mentioned in this list are referred to by name of city only, both in text and tables.

⁸ See items not marked with asterisk in "References to Local Studies of Teachers' Salary Schedules."

TABLE 1.—QUESTIONNAIRES ON PREPARATION OF TEACHERS' SALARY SCHEDULES, NUMBER ISSUED AND PERCENT OF RETURN

Size of school systems to which questionnaire was sent		Number sent	Number of replies *	Percent of return	Number of usable replies *	Percent of usable replies
Group number	Population ranges					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I	Over 100,000	40	25	62.5	18	45.0
II	30,000-100,000	59	47	79.7	27	45.8
III	10,000-30,000	133	107	80.5	74	55.6
IV	5,000-10,000	118	83	70.3	50	42.4
V	2,500-5,000	146	85	58.2	53	36.3
Total.....		496	347	70.0	222	44.8

* A number of replies were not usable because (1) the reply indicated that the date of adoption formerly reported was not the date of the basic schedule but of temporary adjustments due to depression conditions, or (2) the respondents did not answer the questions but merely stated that the salary schedule referred to by the questionnaire was still in effect.

submitted to the Research Division in connection with the 1934-35 biennial study of school salaries which were (1) either printed or mimeographed, and (2) dated not earlier than 1928. There were 150 schedules which met these two tests of availability and recency.⁹ Table 3 indicates the distribution by city size of the school systems represented by these schedules.

Presentation of findings—The questionnaire

⁹ For a list of the 150 schedules, and a more detailed report of the analysis, see: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division, *Organization and Content, Teachers' Salary Schedules*, op. cit.

TABLE 2.—DATE OF ADOPTION OF 222 SCHEDULES IN QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY

Year	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total	
				Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6
1928	6	13	14	33	14.9
1929	15	14	14	43	19.4
1930	10	11	13	34	15.3
1931	1	5	11	17	7.6
1932	1	8	10	19	8.5
1933	3	10	10	23	10.4
1934	7	9	25	41	18.5
1935	2	4	6	12	5.4
Total					
Number	45	74	103	222	100.0
Percent	20.3	33.3	46.4	100.0	

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

replies are emphasized in the first section of this bulletin, on administrative procedures in preparing and adopting the new salary schedule. The second section, which deals with gathering and presenting the facts on salaries, is based largely on the 22 local salary studies. The March 1936 *Research Bulletin* will present the material from the 150 schedules and also will draw upon all other sources used in the study.

TABLE 3.—SIZE OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPRESENTED BY 150 SALARY SCHEDULES ANALYZED, AND YEAR OF ADOPTION

Year	Group I*	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Total	
						Num-ber	Per-cent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1928	6	4	7	3	3	23	15.3
1929	7	7	9	7	3	33	22.0
1930	3	15	6	4	5	33	22.0
1931	...	3	5	2	5	15	10.0
1932	2	1	7	3	1	14	9.3
1933	3	1	5	3	1	13	8.7
1934	4	1	4	6	4	19	12.7
Total							
Number....	25	32	43	28	22	150	100.0
Percent....	16.7	21.3	28.6	18.7	14.7	100.0	

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

THE ADVENT of the definite salary schedule was a long step toward the professionalization of teaching. The elimination of the personal element permits the school authorities to consider the problem in all its ramifications, impersonally and dispassionately, with an eye to the present and future welfare of all concerned. . . . It is no longer a question of whether or not a school system shall have a salary schedule; the problem today is how to formulate the most effective schedule.—Willard S. Elsbree, *Teachers' Salaries*, 1931, p. 5-6.

Administrative Procedures in Preparing and Adopting the New Salary Schedule

What administrative machinery is set in motion before a new salary schedule is adopted? What groups participate in its preparation? To what extent are systematic studies made as a basis for the recommendations in the schedule? How long does it take to prepare the schedule? This chapter deals with these and related questions in the light of the 222 replies to the questionnaire which was sent to school systems where new salary schedules were adopted during the years from 1928 to 1935.

Extent to Which New Schedules Are Replacements of Older Ones

Very few large school systems are operated now without a definite salary schedule, formally adopted by the board of education. Much progress has been made toward acceptance of the salary-schedule plan since 1914, when Boykin and King found definite salary schedules in effect in only 13.1 percent of the 820 cities above 5000 in size which they studied.¹ In 1932-33 there were 1283 cities above 5000 in population which reported on teachers' salaries to the Research Division of the National Education Association; 950 of these systems, or 74 percent, reported the provisions of a definite salary schedule.²

The 222 schedules reported on by the present questionnaire inquiry were for the most part replacements or revisions of older schedules. As may be seen in Table 4, a salary schedule had been adopted earlier in 79 percent of the cities reporting. Even in the cities in Groups IV and V, two-thirds of the schedules were replacements of older ones. The existence of an older schedule, however, need not prevent a full consideration of the whole salary problem when a new schedule is being prepared.

Preliminary Steps

"By what official or group was the first formal proposal for the new salary schedule made?" Replies to this question from 215 school systems are summarized in Table 5.

In the majority of cities the superintendent of schools took the lead in suggesting that a new schedule be prepared. Next in frequency is the board of education, and third, the teachers associations. A number of replies refer to a proposal made jointly by superintendent and board, or superintendent and members of the

TABLE 4.—NUMBER OF CITIES WHERE NEW SALARY SCHEDULE REPLACED A PREVIOUS SCHEDULE

Question and replies	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Had a schedule been adopted previously?				
Yes.....	44	62	67	173
No.....	1	12	33	46
Total replies....	45	74	100	219
Percent replying Yes.	97.8	83.8	67.0	79.0

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

staff. As shown by Table 6, nearly two-thirds of the schedules were prepared after formal action had been taken by the board of education, authorizing the preliminary work on the schedule. Several other replies indicate that informal approval was granted. One superintendent stated:

The superintendent made a report to the board pointing out the difficulties arising from working under the then present schedule, indicating that he was working with a committee of teachers and would have a report later on, and asking for suggestions from the board.

Complete understanding between board of education and school staff from the very beginning of a study of the salary question seems to be desirable. Altho the actual preparation of the schedule would best be left in the hands of a professional staff, the board of education must take final responsibility for adopting the schedule. There may be much motion lost if the board is not informed of work going forward on the problem of salaries.

¹ Boykin, James C., and King, Roberta, *Tangible Rewards of Teaching*. Compiled for the Committee on Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living of the National Education Association (Joseph Swain, chairman). U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1914, No. 16. Whole Number 589. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1914. p. 10-12, 216-39.

² National Education Association, Research Division. *Special Salary Tabulations, 1932-33*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1933.

TABLE 5.—OFFICIAL OR GROUP MAKING FIRST PROPOSAL FOR PREPARATION OF NEW SALARY SCHEDULE

Official or group	Groups I and II*		Group III		Groups IV and V		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Superintendent and staff.....	17	40.5	51	70.8	74	73.2	142	66.1
Superintendent of schools.....	13		45		66		124	57.7
Superintendent and committee representing teachers and administrative staff.....	..		1		..		1	0.5
Superintendent and committee of teachers.....	2		1		2		5	2.3
Superintendent and one or more members of administrative staff.....	1		3		1		5	2.3
Committee of teachers.....	1		1		4		6	2.8
Elementary teachers.....	..		..		1		1	0.5
Board of education and staff.....	12	28.6	14	19.5	23	22.8	49	22.8
Board of education or school committee.....	6		9		14		29	13.5
Committee of the board.....	..		1		4		5	2.3
President of board of education.....	1		1		..		2	0.9
Superintendent and board of education.....	2		3		4		9	4.2
Superintendent and a committee of board.....	1		..		..		1	0.5
Superintendent and secretary of board.....	1		..		1		2	0.9
Board, superintendent, and teachers associations..	1		..		..		1	0.5
Teachers associations.....	13	30.9	5	6.9	3	3.0	21	9.7
Teachers association.....	9		4		2		15	6.9
Superintendent and teachers association.....	1		..		..		1	0.5
Superintendent and committee of teachers association.....	1		1		..		2	0.9
Committee of teachers association.....	2		..		1		3	1.4
Other groups.....	..		2	2.8	1	1.0	3	1.4
Taxpayers' association.....	..		1		..		1	0.5
State legislation.....	..		1		1		2	0.9
Total replies.....	42	100.0	72	100.0	101	100.0	215	100.0

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

Personnel Participating in Preparing the Salary Schedule

In the majority of cities from which reports were received, the superintendent not only initiated work on the salary schedule but continued to take the lead in the various stages of its preparation. Evidence on the service of other groups is given in Tables 7 to 10.

Chief responsibility—Information on the official or group having chief responsibility for drafting the schedule is given in Table 7. In 129 replies the superintendent of schools alone is mentioned as having chief responsibility; 24 mention the superintendent working with other members of the staff; 28 mention the superintendent working in cooperation with representatives of the board of education; and 2 report the superintendent and a committee of the teachers association as having chief responsibility. This leaves only 39 replies which do not mention the superintendent. Of these, 15 report that chief responsibility was retained by the board of education or one of its committees. Chief responsibility by staff officers or committees of teachers is mentioned in 7 replies;

4 mention the board working in cooperation with teachers; one the board working with a taxpayers' association, and one a citizens' committee appointed by the board of education. Official recognition of teachers associations to the extent of delegating chief responsibility for the schedule to the associations or their committees is indicated in 11 replies.

TABLE 6.—AUTHORIZATION BY BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR PRELIMINARY WORK ON SALARY SCHEDULE

Question and replies	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Was board action taken authorizing preliminary work on schedule?				
Yes.....	28	44	66	138
No.....	17	28	35	80
Total replies....	45	72	101	218
Percent replying Yes	62.2	61.1	65.3	63.3

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

TABLE 7.—OFFICIAL OR GROUP HAVING CHIEF RESPONSIBILITY (1) FOR PREPARATION OF SCHEDULE (2) FOR MAKING SYSTEMATIC STUDY UNDER AUTHORITY OF BOARD OF EDUCATION

Official or group	Chief responsibility for schedule								Responsibility for making study							
	Groups I and II*		Group III		Groups IV and V		Total		Groups I and II		Group III		Groups IV and V		Total	
	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent	Num-ber	Per-cent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Superintendent and staff.....	25	55.5	57	77.0	78	75.7	160	72.0	21	55.3	40	75.5	57	70.4	118	68.6
Superintendent of schools.....	15		46		68		129	58.1	6		29		46		81	47.1
Superintendent and committee representing teachers and administrative staff.....	2		4		...		6	2.7	2		2		2		6	3.5
Superintendent and committee of teachers.....	2		6		2		10	4.5	2		5		1		8	4.7
Superintendent and one or more members of administrative staff.....	2		1		5		8	3.6	3		2		4		9	5.2
Staff officer other than superintendent.....	4		...		...		4	1.8	3		...		...		3	1.7
Committee representing the entire staff.....	...		...		1		1	0.4	3		1		1		5	2.9
Committee of teachers.....	...		...		2		2	0.9	2		1		3		6	3.5
Board of education.....	12	26.7	14	18.9	23	22.4	49	22.1	14	36.8	12	22.6	23	28.4	49	28.5
Board of education or school committee.....	...		2		6		8	3.6	...		...		2		2	1.2
Committee of the board.....	4		1		2		7	3.2	1		3		2		6	3.5
Secretary of board of education.....	...		...		...		...	...	...		...		...		1	0.6
Superintendent and board of education.....	2		2		5		9	4.1	...		2		...		2	1.2
Superintendent and a committee of board.....	...		7		7		14	6.3	2		1		9		12	6.9
Superintendent and one member of board.....	...		...		2		2	0.9	...		1		2		3	1.7
Superintendent and secretary of board.....	1		1		1		3	1.4	...		...		1		1	0.6
Committee representing board of education and school staff.....	3		...		...		3	1.4	3		...		...		3	1.7
Board committee and committee of teachers association.....	1		...		...		1	0.4	1		...		...		1	0.6
Board, superintendent, and teachers association.....	...		...		...		...	...	2		...		...		2	1.2
One member each from taxpayers' association and board of education.....	...		1		...		1	0.4	...		...		...		...	...
Citizens' committee, appointed by board.....	1		...		...		1	0.4	1		...		...		1	0.6
Group or official (not stated, working under authority of board of education).....	...		...		...		...	...	3		5		7		15	8.7
Teachers associations.....	8	17.8	3	4.1	2	1.9	13	5.9	3	7.9	1	1.9	1	1.2	5	2.9
Teachers association.....	2		1		1		4	1.8	...		...		...		...	...
Superintendent and teachers association.....	...		...		...		...	...	1		...		...		1	0.6
Superintendent and committee of teachers association.....	2		...		...		2	0.9	2		1		...		3	1.7
Committee of teachers association.....	4		2		1		7	3.2	...		...		1		1	0.6
Total replies.....	45	100.0	74	100.0	103	100.0	222	100.0	38	100.0	53	100.0	81	100.0	172	100.0

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

The tendency to call upon personnel other than the superintendent is stronger in the larger cities. Twenty-two of the 45 cities in Groups I and II report that teachers or staff officers shared in the responsibility for preparing the schedule, 14 of 74 in Group III, and only 12 of 103 in Groups IV and V.

Systematic studies—An important part of the process of salary schedule preparation is the collection and study of information on which recommendations are to be based. In response to the question, "Was a systematic study and report made in connection with preparing the schedule?" 172 replies indicated that such a study was made by a group or official working under the authority of the board of education. Ten replies (4 in Groups I and II, 4 in Group III, and 2 in Groups IV and V) state that 2 studies were made—one under the board and one by teachers associations working independently. In 12 other cities a study was made by teachers associations only; in one city a study was made by the state taxpayers' association, and in one by an intercity council of superintendents.

The last five columns of Table 7 indicate the personnel responsible for making the studies which were conducted under the authority of the board of education. It will be noted that the percent distribution is similar to that indicated as having chief responsibility for preparation of the schedule. A practise which is observable in a number of the questionnaire replies, but is not revealed in this tabulation, is to have the study made by a committee representing the staff, while chief responsibility for the preparation of the schedule is left in the hands of the superintendent.³

Staff committees—Since published reports on salary adoptions in several school systems⁴ have emphasized the service rendered by staff committees, information was collected thru the questionnaire on the extent to which such general committees, representing the entire staff, are appointed officially to assist in the preparation of the schedule. As shown in Table 8, forty replies state that such committees were

TABLE 8.—PARTICIPATION OF COMMITTEE REPRESENTING THE STAFF IN PREPARATION OF SALARY SCHEDULE

Question and replies	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Was a general committee, representing staff, appointed?				
Yes.....	16	17	7	40
No.....	29	57	94	180
Total replies....	45	74	101	220
Percent replying Yes	35.6	23.0	6.9	18.2
Number of members:				
21 or more.....	5	..	..	5
16-20.....	1	..	..	1
11-15.....	4	1	..	5
6-10.....	5	8	5	18
5 or less.....	1	4	2	7
Total replies....	16	13	7	36
Median.....	13.5	7.6	7.5	9.0
Not stated.....	..	4	..	4
Percent of classroom teachers in membership of committee:				
76-100 percent.....	4	5	4	13
51-75.....	7	5	3	15
26-50.....	4	2	..	6
1-25.....	1	1	..	2
Total replies....	16	13	7	36
Median.....	61.7	68.5	79.1	67.7

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

appointed, with a median membership of nine, six of whom were classroom teachers. The policy is reported more often in the larger than in the smaller cities.

Review by teaching staff—A different kind of participation by members of the teaching staff is the privilege of review and criticism of a preliminary draft of the salary schedule. This plan was used in preparing seventy-six of the schedules in the questionnaire study, as shown in Table 9. The replies indicate that changes were suggested by teachers in slightly more than half of the cities, and that in nearly all cases the changes were incorporated into the schedule.

³ Further discussion of questionnaire findings on local studies appears in the second major section of this bulletin.

⁴ See the salary studies for Cincinnati and Springfield, listed in the "References to Local Studies of Teachers' Salary Schedules" at close of second major section. These studies are referred to in this bulletin by name of city, without further bibliographical citation.

See also: Cross, Harry A., and De Silva, Lionel. "The Inglewood Teachers' Salary Policy." (Inglewood, California) *American School Board Journal* 91: 24-25; November, 1935. † Jensen, F. H. "Development of a Salary Schedule: How Rockford, Illinois, Built a New Teachers Salary Plan." *American School Board Journal* 78: 45-46; June, 1929. ‡ Scott, Zenos, and Granrud, John. "Program for the Revision of Teachers' Salaries in Springfield." *American School Board Journal* 82: 39-40, 127-28; April, 1931. § Stoddard, A. J. "Old and New Principles of Salary Schedule Making." (Providence, Rhode Island.) *American School Board Journal* 81: 43-44, 126; October, 1930.

TABLE 9.—REVIEW OF SCHEDULE BY TEACHING STAFF

Questions and replies	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Was a preliminary draft of schedule submitted to staff for criticism?				
Yes.....	24	22	30	76
No.....	20	51	72	143
Total replies....	44	73	102	219
Percent replying Yes	54.5	30.1	29.4	34.7
Were changes suggested by teachers?				
Yes.....	14	12	14	40
No.....	9	9	15	33
Total replies....	23	21	29	73
No answer.....	1	1	1	3
Were any of the changes suggested by teachers incorporated in schedule?				
Yes.....	14	11	12	37
No.....	..	1	1	2
Total replies....	14	12	13	39
No answer.....	..	..	1	1

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

An example of teacher participation thru staff committees and a review of the schedule by the entire staff, reported from Louisville, Kentucky, is described as follows:

A salary committee of 150 members, including about 125 classroom teachers, was elected in 1933 to represent all schools and special groups in the system. The large committee was broken down to thirty members, and that to six, for certain detailed work. During 1933-34, the committee drew up principles and recommendations which were taken back to the individual members of the staff for criticism and vote, in May 1934. An eight-page questionnaire was submitted to teachers, which stated eight fundamental assumptions for approval or disapproval, and offered a series of choices on twenty-four debatable issues in differentiation of salaries, bases for salary, number and size of increments, transfer from old to new schedule, and adjustments in case of change of position.

The votes of teachers on these proposals were carefully considered in the preparation of a preliminary draft of the salary schedule which was submitted to the committee of 150 on April 2, 1935, and, with further revisions, to the entire teaching staff on April 20, 1935. Teachers were asked to choose between two statements of position regarding the proposed schedule:

1. I have no suggestions to make. (This does not necessarily mean that every provision is wholly concurred in theory, but that, in light of all conditions, the schedule appears to be as practicable as it can be made at this time.)

2. I suggest the following modifications: (Please refer to page number, item number, and subject, and let comments follow.)

The teachers' suggestions were organized by the steering committee and submitted to the superintendent of schools along with the April 20 draft of the schedule. The schedule adopted by the board of education on July 2, 1935, includes most of the provisions of the salary committee's schedule, but provides a higher minimum salary.

Individual reports by teaching staff—Another way in which teachers have helped in the making of salary schedules is by individual reports on income, expenses, dependents, training, and other personal and professional factors which are considered as a basis for determining salary levels.⁵ Several questionnaire replies indicate that teachers cooperated in this way.

Board of education members—Mention was made earlier of the part taken by the board of education in proposing the need for new schedules and in authorizing the preliminary work of preparation. Fifty-four replies, or nearly a fourth of the 222 reporting, indicate no further service by board members other than the adoption of the completed salary schedule. Certain facts on the extent to which board members participated in other ways, as reported in the remaining 168 replies, are given in Table 10. The service mentioned most frequently is that of criticizing and proposing changes in preliminary draft of schedule. Evidence is not lacking of the thoughtful consideration which lay boards of education have given to the problem of salary scheduling. Such a statement as the following, regarding the service of the Springfield, Massachusetts, School Committee in considering a salary schedule which was based in large part on the

⁵ An outstanding example of such cooperation was given by the 2566 teachers who took part in the detailed month-by-month study of teachers' finances made by the National Education Association Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher. See, National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher (B. R. Buckingham, chairman). *The Teacher's Economic Position: Facts and Recommendations*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. 103 p. (Published also as the September, 1935 issue of the *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association, 13: 165-267.)

See also discussion on pages 29-34 of this bulletin.

TABLE 10.—PARTICIPATION BY MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION IN PREPARATION OF THE SALARY SCHEDULE

Type of participation	Groups I and II*		Group III		Groups IV and V		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Criticizing and proposing changes in preliminary draft of schedule.....	31	79.5	44	77.2	64	88.9	139	82.7
Serving on special committee on salaries.....	23	59.0	25	43.9	23	31.9	71	42.3
Helping present case for revised schedule to the public.	9	23.1	7	12.3	8	11.1	24	14.3
Other participation:								
Holding hearings for delegations of teachers.....	2	5.1	..	..	..	..	2	1.2
Presenting case to city officials.....	..	..	1	1.8	..	..	1	0.6
Total replies.....	39	(100.0)	57	(100.0)	72	(100.0)	168	(100.0)
No answer, or indefinite.....	6		17		31		54	

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

work of a staff committee, could probably be made regarding other boards of education:

Their work was distinguished by good judgment, keen business sense, intimate knowledge of conditions in the city, and unfailing devotion to the interests of both teachers and children. The children, the teachers, and the City of Springfield are indebted to the School Committee as a whole for its sympathetic and stimulating direction of the work, for the establishment of definite policies concerning the several phases of this program, and for its vision and courage in assuming responsibility for its successful conduct.⁶

Citizens' committees and expert service from outside the system—The wide publicity given to the service of citizens' committees and to the utilization of expert service from outside of the school system in the salary studies made several years ago in New York, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco, made it seem desirable to seek information on these practices thru the questionnaire. Only two replies stated that citizens' committees had been appointed. It seems that boards of education are hesitant in delegating responsibility to another lay group for the framing of policies so important in their effect on personnel administration and school finance. Nine replies mentioned that help was received from outside educators, two of which indicated that a charge was made for such service. In one city the cost (amount not stated) was borne by the board of education; in the other the cost of \$1200 was shared by the board of education and the teachers association.

Proposed changes in personnel participating—One other line of evidence on the participation of various groups in the preparation of

salary schedules is available, based on the replies to the last item of the questionnaire, "If a new salary schedule were to be prepared now in your school system, how would you vary from the former procedure in organization, personnel, points of emphasis?" Of the seventy-eight replies to this question which report different procedures that would be followed, thirty-one refer to personnel. They have been summarized in Table 11. Altho the table does not show the original organization from which changes are being proposed, there seems to be some significance in the fact that almost all of the recommendations are in the direction of bringing in more groups. Only two suggest that the service of any group which had formerly helped be omitted: The superintendent who favors the employment of an outside supervisor reports from a system where the present salary schedule was prepared by teachers associations and reviewed by the teaching staff; the superintendent who recommends more participation by the superintendent, now administering a schedule prepared by the board and a taxpayers' association, suggests participation by a board committee, the superintendent, and staff committees. The following statements are representative of the replies which suggest new procedures:

City A. Group III, Middle Atlantic. Would appoint a special committee representing the board of education, one lay group, and the teaching staff.

City B. Group V, Middle Atlantic. Thoro study made by a committee of representative teachers headed by superintendent after formal decision of board to study salary schedule. The committee's proposed salary schedule to be submitted to board by superintendent for discussion and finally for adoption.

⁶ Springfield, p. 14.

City C. Group III, New England. Form a committee made up of board of education representatives, principals' representatives, teachers' representatives, possibly a layman or two.

City D. Group III, Middle Atlantic. The committee would consist of superintendent, member of finance committee of board of education, a representative of each department of the school system, a representative of each P. T. A. in the city, and three prominent business men.

Personnel participation which has proved satisfactory—A number of replies stated that former practises had proved satisfactory. Synopses of the entire questionnaire replies from several of these cities, so far as they refer to personnel and procedures, are given in the following paragraphs:

Springfield, Massachusetts (Group I)—Upon the recommendation of the superintendent, a special salaries committee of the school committee was appointed in January 1928. In December 1928 the school committee approved a recommendation of

the special salaries committee that the superintendent appoint a teachers' committee on salary schedules to conduct with the superintendent a study of the whole problem of salaries.

The committee of thirty-one members included eight principals and twenty-one teachers from elementary, junior high, continuation, senior high, and trade schools, and two from the supervisory staff. Within the group were the president of each of the teachers organizations. An assistant superintendent and the director of research were assigned as director and assistant director, respectively, of the salary study. Seven bulletins were published during the spring of 1929, presenting statistical findings and statements of principles. Assistance was received from nine leading school superintendents and college professors; generous support was given by the city newspapers.

The salary schedule was finally drafted by the administrative staff under the direction of the school committee, and was adopted December 13, 1929, to go into effect the following September. As the new schedule provided for variations in salary on basis of training, a committee of twelve members of the staff was appointed to formulate general policies for the evaluation of the training of teachers. The department of research then evaluated each teacher's training for the purpose of classification of teachers under the new schedule.

Alameda, California (Group II)—The superintendent of schools proposed that work be undertaken on a new salary schedule, a recommendation which was approved by the board of education. Chief responsibility for preparation of the schedule was given to the following group: four classroom teachers, appointed by classroom organization; one administrator, appointed by administrators' organization; superintendent of schools and a committee of three members of the board of education. This group made the study used in the preparation of the schedule. A preliminary draft of the schedule was submitted to the teaching staff for criticism; changes suggested by teachers were incorporated in the final draft. One year was spent in the preparation of this schedule, which was adopted in 1928. The local tax rate was raised, with the approval of the city board of councilmen, to provide the increased funds which were needed to pay the higher salaries provided by the schedule. Newspaper publicity, talks to parent-teacher groups, and distribution of reports on the salary situation were used to develop public support for the new schedule.

Muncie, Indiana (Group II)—New schedule was proposed by federation of teachers and the superintendent, to the board of education. The board of education took formal action authorizing preliminary work. The superintendent was responsible to the board for drafting the schedule but the federation's recommendations, made by a committee of five classroom teachers who conducted a study in cooperation with the superintendent, were very helpful. The superintendent made a survey of salary practises in all large cities in the state and cities of the same size in the country as a whole. Members of the board of education met twice with the teach-

TABLE 11.—CHANGES FROM FORMER PROCEDURES IN PERSONNEL PARTICIPATION IF NEW SALARY SCHEDULE WERE TO BE ADOPTED, PROPOSED BY 31 SUPERINTENDENTS IN SYSTEMS WHERE SALARY SCHEDULES HAVE BEEN ADOPTED RECENTLY

Changes proposed	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
More participation by staff:				
Teachers, or staff in general.....	4	10	10	24
Principals.....	1	1	..	2
More participation by board members.....	1	5	1	7
More participation by laymen other than board members:				
Citizens; laymen....	..	4	2	6
P.T.A. cooperation..	..	1	1	2
Business men.....	..	1	1	2
Would interest more groups.....	..	..	1	1
Board would employ supervisor for study and schedule from outside of system.....	1	..	..	1
More participation by the superintendent.....	..	1	..	1

Read table as follows: Of 31 superintendents reporting variations in procedure which would be made if a new schedule were to be adopted, 4 superintendents in Groups I and II state that the teaching staff would be called on for more participation. Similarly read for other items and population groups.

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

ers' committee, criticized preliminary draft of schedule, and helped present the need for a revised schedule to the public. A preliminary draft of the schedule was submitted to teachers for criticism; they made no suggestions for changes. Three months were devoted to the preparation of the schedule, which was adopted in 1935. Increased funds were approved by the county tax adjustment board; property reevaluation made higher tax rate unnecessary. Efforts were made to develop public support by newspaper publicity, presentation of case to service clubs and parent-teacher groups, and by distribution of reports on the local salary situation.

Chelsea, Massachusetts (Group II)—First proposal for schedule made by teachers club and superintendent; formal authorization by board; chief responsibility by a general committee of thirteen members, consisting of board members, superintendent, and five classroom teachers. A systematic study was made by the general committee, all working together. The schedule was adopted in 1930, two years from the date of beginning work on its preparation. It provided higher salaries, making increased funds necessary and requiring a slight increase in the local tax rate. Special efforts to develop public support were unnecessary; no objections were offered.

Natick, Massachusetts (Group III)—The teachers association made the first proposal for a new schedule. The school board authorized the preliminary work on the schedule, and members of the board addressed the teachers, advising them that time was ripe for a new schedule and that they would take action if one were presented. A committee of the teachers association had the chief responsibility for drafting the schedule, made a systematic study of the problem, and submitted preliminary drafts of the schedule to the teaching staff for criticism. Three months were spent in the preparation. The approval of the finance board and the town meeting being necessary in order to raise the tax rate and put the schedule into effect, the school board and the teachers association presented to the town meeting the need for the new schedule. "The sympathy and understanding of the school board, and the cooperation of the teachers when called to attend special meetings for partial reports, made it possible for the committee to accomplish their work in a manner satisfactory to all."

Clayton, Missouri (Group IV)—The superintendent prepared the schedule, without seeking formal authorization from the board in advance. He submitted the proposed schedule to all staff members and then made formal recommendation for adoption to the board of education. The time for preparation of the schedule was one month.

Financing the New Schedule

The new schedules have provided higher salaries in a majority of the cities reporting.

As shown by Table 12, 189 schedules, or 86.7 percent, tended to raise salaries. There were

TABLE 12.—FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF THE SALARY SCHEDULE ADOPTION

Questions and replies	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
What was the effect of new schedule on the general level of salaries?				
Raised salaries.....	42	59	88	189
Lowered salaries.....	1	6	12	19
Equalized salaries....	2	5	3	10
Total replies....	45	70	103	218
Percent which:				
Raised salaries..	93.3	84.3	85.4	86.7
Lowered salaries..	2.2	8.6	11.7	8.7
Equalized salaries	4.5	7.1	2.9	4.6
Were increased funds required?				
Yes.....	39	62	72	173
No.....	6	11	30	47
Total replies....	45	73	102	220
Percent replying Yes..	86.7	84.9	70.6	78.6
Was approval of other agency needed for raising additional funds?				
Yes.....	18	21	16	55
No.....	21	41	56	118
Total replies....	39	62	72	173
Percent replying Yes..	46.2	33.9	22.2	31.8
Other agency approving the raising of additional funds:				
Electorate.....	..	6	5	11
Municipal agency	18	12	9	39
County agency..	..	2	3	5
State agency....	..	1	1	2
Total replies	18	21	18	57 ^b
Was local tax rate raised to put new schedule into effect?				
Yes.....	17	29	26	72
No.....	17	32	45	94
Total replies....	34	61	71	166
Percent replying Yes..	50.0	47.5	36.6	43.4
Was increased state aid a factor in making it possible to adopt new schedule?				
Yes.....	6	18	31	55
No.....	32	43	38	113
Total replies....	38	61	69	168
Percent replying Yes..	15.8	29.5	44.9	32.7

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

^b Includes 4 cities—1 in Group III, 3 in Groups IV and V—in which funds for schedule were approved by 2 different agencies.

29 schedules which equalized or lowered salaries, 8 of which were adopted before 1932, 8 in 1932, 8 in 1933, and 5 in 1934.

Need for increased funds—Increased funds were required in 173 cities, in order to put the salary schedule into effect. The raising of these funds required the approval of some official agency other than the board of education, usually a municipal body, in 55 cities. In 72 cities, or less than half of those requiring increased funds, the local tax rate was raised to put the new schedule into effect; in 55 cities increased state aid is reported as a factor in making it possible to adopt a new schedule. The replies which mention state aid come from 24 states; only New York, Kentucky, Washington, Oklahoma, and Idaho are represented by more than 2 replies each in the group of 55 cities.

It will be noted that more cities report higher salaries than report the need for increased funds, and that more cities report a need for increased funds than the combined number of those reporting a higher tax rate or increased state aid. The questionnaire replies do not fully explain these apparent paradoxes. It seems, however, that in a number of cities where the new schedule tended to raise salaries, the need for larger funds did not arise the first year. In some places where increased funds

were required, property assessments were rising in value thus making a higher tax rate unnecessary.

Developing public support—The questionnaire included an item on methods used to develop public support for the new schedule. Four publicity methods which had been mentioned in published accounts of salary schedule adoptions⁷ were listed for checking, and respondents were asked to mention other methods. Table 13 summarizes the replies, showing that in 65 cities, or 30.5 percent, efforts were made to enlist public support. Newspaper publicity was used in 52 of the 65 cities, reports on salaries were distributed in 32, and in 30 support of parent-teacher groups was sought.

Several replies indicate an unfavorable attitude toward the items suggested in the question on public support, by an emphatic negative reply, or a comment that publicity would not be helpful. On the other hand, several replies to the question on procedures if a new schedule were to be adopted mentioned the desirability of informing the public, enlisting parent-teacher cooperation, and providing greater participation by the community. It may be that the question, as worded in the inquiry form, suggested the "campaign" type of publicity, sometimes associated with efforts to raise teachers' salaries.⁸ Writers on educational in-

⁷ "Vote of Confidence." (Cincinnati, Ohio.) *Journal of the National Education Association* 16: 53-54; February, 1927. See also the New York Citizens study, p. 196-222.

⁸ Almack, John C., and Lang, Albert R. *Problems of the Teaching Profession*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. p. 250-52. [†] Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 173-210.

TABLE 13.—METHODS USED TO DEVELOP PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR NEW SCHEDULE

Procedure	Groups I and II ^a		Group III		Groups IV and V		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Efforts made to develop public support for new schedule:								
Yes.....	24	54.5	18	25.7	23	23.2	65	30.5
No.....	20	45.5	52	74.3	76	76.8	148	69.5
Total replies.....	44	100.0	70	100.0	99	100.0	213	100.0
Methods used:								
Newspaper publicity.....	22	91.7	14	77.8	16	69.6	52	80.0
Distribution of reports on salary situation.....	9	37.5	8	44.4	15	65.2	32	49.2
Presentation of case to parent-teacher groups.....	13	54.2	7	38.9	10	43.5	30	46.2
Presentation of case to service clubs.....	3	12.5	2	11.1	8	34.8	13	20.0
Other methods used ^b	4	16.7	4	22.2	2	8.7	10	15.4
Total replies.....	24	(100.0)	18	(100.0)	23	(100.0)	65	(100.0)

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

^b Other methods: Presentation of case to chamber of commerce, 2; presentation of case to city officials, 2; informal presentation to certain citizens, 2; presentation of case to town meeting, 2; public hearings, 1; posters, 1.

terpretation have pointed out that campaigns for school support, while frequently successful, are likely to induce exaggeration, to depend upon emotional appeal, and to develop an opposition which may continue active when the campaign is over.⁹ More good for education, in the long run, may be done by a continuous effort to keep the community fully informed at all times on important school policies and proposed changes in such policies.

Format and Organization of Schedule

Information is not available for the 222 schedules reported on by the questionnaire as to the format and length of the official document in which the salary schedule, when finally adopted, was published or otherwise released to the public. In some cities, the complete schedule is not available at all except thru a few typed copies. But more frequently the schedule is printed or mimeographed. Of the 150 schedules which were analyzed for this bulletin,¹⁰ 103 were mimeographed and 47 were printed, as shown in Table 14. Fifty-nine of the schedules consist of a single page; the others range from two to thirty-four pages.

Essential items in completed schedule—Some of the schedules consist of a mere outline of minimum and maximum salaries paid to teachers; others include salaries for all employees. Some give no explanatory discussion whatever; others give many details regarding qualifications, placement on schedule, and methods of salary administration. Essential items of information which frequently are included are the following:

1. Official identification—city and state, name of body adopting the schedule, date of adoption.
2. Classification of salaries.
3. Minimum qualifications for appointment to each salary class.
4. Minimum salaries for each class or position.
5. Maximum salaries for each class or position.
6. Number and size of increments; conditions governing the granting of increments.
7. Basis for granting supermaximum salaries when such salaries are provided.
8. Differentials, if any, on basis of sex, race, marriage, dependents.
9. Transfer of teachers in service from old schedule to new schedule.
10. Amount of salary credit allowed to new teachers for approved experience in other systems.

TABLE 14.—FORM OF PUBLICATION AND LENGTH, 150 SALARY SCHEDULES

Form, length	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Printed:				
Separate document...	26	9	3	38
Part of rules.....	2	3	..	5
Part of annual report.	2	..	..	2
Part of handbook....	1	1	..	2
Total printed...	31	13	3	47
1 page.....	7	2	..	9
2-5 pages.....	8	7	2	17
6-10 pages.....	11	3	1	15
11-15 pages.....	1	1	..	2
16 or more pages....	4	..	..	4
Total printed...	31	13	3	47
Mimeographed:				
1 page.....	9	15	26	50
2-5 pages.....	10	13	19	42
6-10 pages.....	4	2	2	8
11-15 pages.....	2	..	..	2
16 or more pages....	1	..	..	1
Total mimeographed....	26	30	47	103
Total.....	57	43	50	150

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

A number of schedules include facts on policies governing leaves of absence, substitute service, retirement system, payroll procedures, efficiency ratings, and other policies affecting the teaching personnel.

Time Required for Salary Schedule Preparation

For the schedules in the questionnaire study, the time required from the date of beginning work on the schedule until it was adopted by the board of education ranged from a few days to two years. The median time in the larger cities was six months and in the two groups of smaller cities was four months. Table 15 reports these figures in some detail.

Considerable time would seem to be necessary for the thoughtful effort which the preparation of an adequate salary schedule requires, especially when the services of committees are drawn upon and opinions of the teaching staff are consulted. Democracy is not always expeditious in its workings. Even if the work is

⁹ Farley, Belmont. *School Publicity*. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1934. p. 8-11. [†] Moehlman, Arthur B. *Public School Relations*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1927. p. 57-65. [‡] National Education Association, Department of Superintendence. *Critical Problems in School Administration*. Twelfth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1934. p. 239.

¹⁰ See Introduction, p. 7.

TABLE 15.—TIME REQUIRED TO GET
NEW SCHEDULE PREPARED AND
PUT INTO EFFECT

Time	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total	
				Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6
Time required from beginning work on schedule until adoption:					
2 months or less.....	5	22	33	60	29.3
3-4 months.....	12	19	26	57	27.8
5-6 months.....	12	12	14	38	18.5
7 months.....					
1 year.....	8	10	18	36	17.6
More than 1 year.....	7	3	4	14	6.8
Total...	44	66	95	205	100.0
Median.	6 mos.	4 mos.	4 mos.	4 mos.	
Time from adoption to date when schedule was put into effect:					
At once....	7	10	14	31	14.6
2 months or less.....	6	14	19	39	18.4
3-4 months.....	12	18	30	60	28.3
5-6 months.....	10	19	30	59	27.8
More than 6 months...	8	7	8	23	10.9
Total...	43	68	101	212	100.0
Median.	4 mos.	4 mos.	4 mos.	4 mos.	

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

to be done by the superintendent alone, he will need time to gather facts and consider the various possibilities for classifying salaries, fixing their limits, and planning for flexibility in their administration. The board of education will want time to weigh the provisions of so important a policy as a proposed salary schedule. These considerations seem to suggest that the median time reported by the questionnaire replies—four to six months—might be considered as a desirable minimum for school officials undertaking the preparation of new schedules.

Of the questionnaire replies mentioning different procedures which would be followed if a new schedule were adopted, only one refers specifically to time, suggesting "longer time for preparation to enable more scientific approach." This superintendent was reporting from a Group III city, on a schedule which

had been prepared and adopted in two months. A number of other replies proposed the organization of committees, the privilege of review by teachers, the making of a more careful statistical study, and other procedures which would take additional time.

The replies to a question on the time which elapsed from date of adoption to date when schedule was put into effect are included in Table 15. The typical practise appears to be to adopt the schedule in April, May, or June, and to put it into effect at the opening of the next school year. A few cities, however, report a longer period, in order to allow more time for adjustments from an older schedule to the new one.

Transition from Old to New Schedule

Altho the questionnaire did not include an item on the method of transferring from the old schedule to the new one, several replies make reference to the administrative problems raised in putting the new schedule into effect. A number of the local salary studies included suggestions on the application of the proposed salary schedules to teachers already in service.¹¹ Among the provisions noted frequently are the following: that no salary be reduced as a result of adopting the new schedule; that teachers be placed on the salary step in the new schedule which is next above their present salary; and, in the case of preparation schedules, that service credits in lieu of professional training be allowed for the teachers of longest service. The Lynn study makes these suggestions for the transfer to the new schedule:

1. No teacher's salary shall be reduced as a result of the new schedule.
2. All new teachers coming into the system should be placed on the new schedule at once.
3. All teachers should be increased at least to the minimum to which their training entitles them.
4. Teachers now receiving the minimum or more for their group shall receive the regular annual increment until the maximum is reached.
5. Teachers now receiving the maximum, or more, for their group shall not be eligible for further increases until further training is secured.
6. Teachers who come into the system with teaching experience should be placed above the minimum for their group. The committee suggests that two years outside the system be equal to one in the system.¹²

¹¹ See local salary studies: Cincinnati, p. 42; Ft. Worth, p. 313-14; Lexington, p. 44; Los Angeles, p. 103; Lynn, p. 162; Nashville, p. 241-42; San Francisco Teachers, p. 98-99; San Francisco Citizens, p. 99-101; Springfield, p. 105-106.

¹² Lynn, p. 162.

Summary

This section has summarized questionnaire replies on the preparation of teachers' salary schedules from 222 school systems where schedules have been adopted recently. It has been shown that in the majority of these school systems the new schedule replaced an older schedule. The typical procedure was found to be (1) preliminary authorization by the board of education for work on the schedule, (2) a systematic study of the salary problem, made by the superintendent or other agency working under the authority of the board of education, and (3) chief responsibility for preparing the schedule carried by the superintendent of schools, with some assistance from teachers and other staff members, and with criticism

and comment of proposed schedule given by members of the board of education. The tendency for increased participation by other staff members is favored by superintendents who report on desirable changes in procedure. The new schedules have in general tended to raise salaries and to require increased funds but special efforts to develop public support for financing the new schedules have been necessary in relatively few of the communities represented. The time required for preparation of the new schedules averages from four to six months. The section also presents suggestions as to the essential items to be included in the completed schedule, and calls attention to the need for a considered policy in making the transition from the old to the new schedule.

PRINCIPLES for the establishment of teachers' salary schedules: (1) The welfare of the child and not the teacher should take first place in the determination of what teachers' salaries should be. (2) The salary schedule of a city is a potent factor in determining the quality, both in character and ability, of the persons attracted to its teaching force. (3) The salary schedule of a city and its administration determine the quality of preparation and degree of continued professional growth of its teachers. (4) The salary schedule of a city school system and its plan of administration tend to determine the quality of the teachers who remain in the system.

Adoption of a new salary schedule, however well conceived, will not correct all the mistakes of the past; it will not re-create at once the teaching personnel, or free a school system overnight from the evils of tradition and interference. But it will serve to prevent the repetition of mistakes; to gradually re-create the staff; and ultimately, to exclude non-professional influences. A salary plan conceived upon the fundamental principles stated above should be looked upon not as a panacea, but as the basis of a program of reconstruction within a school system, the full effect of which may not be fully realized for ten or fifteen years.—F. W. Hart and L. H. Peterson, *Teachers' Salaries in San Francisco*, 1929, p. 89-90.

Gathering and Presenting the Facts on Salaries

The administrative procedures described in the first section suggest the framework in which the actual process of preparing the salary schedule is set. This process is considered as consisting of two main divisions: first, a study of the facts which must be recognized in setting up the local salary schedule; and second, a series of decisions on the questions which arise as each section of the schedule is written. This section deals with the study of facts. It presents evidence from the questionnaire and from published reports of 22 local salary studies. It also offers suggestions as to certain sources of basic information needed in the making of salary studies.

Form of Report of Salary Studies

Altho 186 of the 222 questionnaire replies stated that a systematic study and a report were made in connection with preparing the schedule, it appears that in many school systems the desired facts on salaries and related items are collected and used but are not assembled into a single document. The school officials who stated that a study had been made were asked certain questions on the kind of report issued as a result of the study.¹ Four types of report were described, as follows:

1. A proposed salary schedule, without the supporting statistical data collected in the study.
2. A proposed salary schedule, accompanied by separate exhibits giving the more important statistical findings of the study.
3. A proposed salary schedule accompanied by a comprehensive written interpretation and presentation of the statistical data.
4. A written interpretation and presentation of the statistical data, without definite recommendations for a schedule.

The replies from 137 superintendents indicate that 52 of the reports were of the first type, 55 of the second, 25 of the third, and 5 of the fourth. Copies of the reports, other than the salary schedules themselves, were furnished for only 11 studies. Of these, 3 were of the second type, schedules and exhibits; 5 were of the third type, comprehensive reports and recommendations; and 3 of the fourth type. The

replies seem to indicate that in the majority of these cities the information studied in the preparation of teachers' salary schedules is used informally, more or less as a general background of information for those responsible for preparing and adopting the salary schedule.

The 22 reports which were analyzed in detail for this bulletin were all of the third type mentioned in the preceding paragraph—a proposed salary schedule accompanied by a comprehensive written interpretation and presentation of supporting statistical data. Eleven of them are printed as parts of general school surveys; eleven are separate reports dealing with salaries only. Table 16 lists the school systems represented, the size of city, date of study, personnel making the study, and sponsorship.²

Factors Studied in the Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules

The kinds of information needed in the study of teachers' salary schedules are suggested by the list of "Conditions and Standards To Be Recognized" given in Figure 1 on page 6. Some of the items in that list, such as "community attitudes and traditions" and "legislative standards," may be considered without compiling statistics. Other items such as "salaries in other school systems," and "financial resources," can be considered most intelligently after studying pertinent statistical material.

All but two of the 222 superintendents replying to the questionnaire reported on the kinds of information used in preparing the salary schedule. Altho no facts are available as to the detail in which this information was collected and studied in the 220 school systems, the frequencies reported in Table 17 may be taken as an index of the relative importance of these items in the judgment of the superintendents reporting.

A general overview of the topics emphasized in the 22 published reports is given in the "composite table of contents," Table 18. The frequency count is based on the number of reports using the topic indicated in the title

¹ A one-page inquiry was sent to the first 160 superintendents who reported that a study had been made.

² See items marked with asterisk in list of "References to Local Studies of Teachers' Salary Schedules," at the close of this section, for complete reference to reports. All items in the bibliography are referred to in this bulletin, either in text or footnotes, by citation to the name of the city only.

TABLE 16.—SCHOOL SYSTEM, CITY SIZE, DATE, PERSONNEL, AND SPONSORSHIP, 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

City	Population, 1930	Date of report	Personnel and sponsorship
1	2	3	4
Chicago, Illinois.....	3,376,438	1932	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of education.
Cincinnati, Ohio.....	451,160	1926	Committee of teachers, with an assistant superintendent as chairman. Appointed by board of education.
Closter, New Jersey.....	2,502	1928	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of education.
Fort Worth, Texas.....	163,447	1931	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of education.
Hammononton, New Jersey.....	7,656	1926	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of education.
Holyoke, Massachusetts.....	56,537	1930	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by school committee.
Jacksonville, Florida.....	129,549	1927	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of public instruction.
Lexington, Kentucky.....	45,736	1935	Bureau of school service of state university. Made at the request of the superintendent of schools.
Los Angeles, California.....	1,238,048	1931	Director and consultant employed for the study by the board of education.
Lynn, Massachusetts.....	102,320	1927	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by school committee.
Nashville, Tennessee.....	153,866	1931	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of surveys and field studies. Authorized by board of education.
Newburgh, New York.....	31,275	1929	Staff of general school survey, made by a university division of field studies. Authorized by board of education.
New York, New York.....	6,930,446	1927	Executive committee of citizens' committee, executive secretary in charge of publicity and finance, advisory committee of experts in economic and statistical surveys, and college professor as director to conduct the survey.
(1) Citizens' Committee.....		1927	Citizens' committee was self-constituted.
(2) Mayor's Committee.....		1927	Committee of 15 citizens, with an executive secretary. Appointed at request of Board of Estimate and Apportionment, 10 members by mayor, 5 by board of education.
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.....	669,817	1927-29	Study of salaries in relation to cost of living made by two university professors for teachers association. Supplementary reports made by committees of teachers association.
(1) Teachers.....		1928	Executive committee of citizens' committee, advisory committee, consultants on procedure, two university professors as research director and assistant director for the survey. Committee appointed by board of education.
(2) Citizens' Committee.....		1930	Committee, with high-school teacher as chairman, appointed by city teachers association.
San Diego, California.....	147,995	1929	Consolidated salary study committee, executive committee, advisory committee, study made by two university professors. Sponsored by twelve organizations of teachers.
San Francisco, California.....	634,394	1929	Committee working with school officials; director of research employed by board of education. Committee appointed by board.
(1) Teachers.....		1929	Study directed by an assistant superintendent in cooperation with special committee of school committee and a committee of teachers. Authorized by school committee.
(2) Citizens' Committee.....		1930	Staff of general school survey made by a university division of field studies. Report submitted to town meeting of Watertown.
Springfield, Massachusetts.....	149,900	1931	Staff of general school survey made by a university division of field studies.
Watertown, Massachusetts.....	34,913	1929	Professor from a university division of field studies. Authorized by Yonkers branch of state teachers association.
Yonkers, New York.....	134,646		

of a chapter or major section. Several of the reports follow the general outline of chapters which Table 18 suggests.

The statistical items presented in these various chapters have been classified under the following seven headings:

1. The salary schedule already in effect
2. Salaries paid in other school systems
3. Salaries in occupations other than teaching
4. The present teaching personnel
5. Cost of living and standard of living in relation to teachers' salaries
6. Service conditions and administrative practices affecting personnel and salaries
7. Financing the salary schedule.

The discussion of each of the seven topics in this bulletin will report the kinds of statistical information presented in the 22 reports, and will call attention to the significance of certain items in relation to salary schedules.

Several tables are reproduced, in Figures II-XII, which illustrate methods of tabular presentation of salary information. These eleven figures are presented not as models but as practical examples of ways in which some of the facts on salaries have been organized for

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS,
ACCORDING TO ANNUAL SALARIES, PASADENA
CITY SCHOOLS, 1928-1929

Salaries	No. of Teachers in High Schools and Junior College		No. of Teachers in Junior High Schools		No. of Teachers in Elementary Schools	
		Per Cent		Per Cent		Per Cent
3400-3499						
3300-3399						
3100-3199						
3200-3299						
3000-3099	21	17.2	17	6.2		
2900-2999	23	18.8	25	9.2		
2800-2899	8	6.5	11	4.0		
2700-2799	14	11.4	15	5.5		
2600-2699	9	7.3	29	10.7		
2500-2599	12	9.8	29	10.7	1	.3
2400-2499	8	6.5	16	5.9	15	4.6
2300-2399	3	2.5	29	10.7	94	28.9
2200-2299	6	5.0	21	7.7	46	14.2
2100-2199	7	5.7	16	5.9	26	8.0
2000-2099	5	4.1	25	9.2	26	8.0
1900-1999	2	1.6	7	2.6	30	9.2
1800-1899	3	2.5	19	7.0	18	5.5
1700-1799	1	.8	2	.7	22	6.8
1600-1699			10	3.7	38	11.7
1500-1599					1	.3
1400-1499					8	2.5
Total	122	100	271	100	325	100
Upper Quartile	\$2959		\$2792		\$2331	
Median	2735		2440		2175	
Lower Quartile	2444		2199		1868	

Pasadena study, 1929, p. 30.

FIGURE II
TABLE SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF
TEACHERS ON SALARY SCHEDULE,
REPRODUCED FROM PASADENA
STUDY

TABLE 17.—BASIC INFORMATION USED IN PREPARATION OF SALARY
SCHEDULE, AS REPORTED BY SCHOOL OFFICIALS

Kind of information	Number of salary schedules ^a for which the information was used					
	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total		
				Number	Percent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Personnel data for individual members of the staff, on:						
Professional status, including such items as training and experience.....	40	68	94	202	91.8	
Economic status, including such items as income, expenditures, savings, and outside earnings.....	14	26	23	63	28.6	
Personal status, including such items as marital status, living conditions, and number of dependents.....	14	24	24	62	28.2	
Salaries paid employees in other school systems.....	42	61	90	193	87.7	
Ability of community to finance the salary schedule as shown by tax rate, assess- ments, wealth, income, state aid, etc.....	34	65	81	180	81.8	
Estimated additional cost of putting proposed schedule into effect.....	36	53	57	146	66.4	
Salaries paid to public employees other than school employees.....	31	39	46	116	52.7	
Evidence on loss of employees to other systems where higher salaries are paid.....	14	32	45	91	41.4	
Incomes of professional groups other than school employees.....	23	24	38	85	38.6	
Index numbers of cost of living or purchasing power of the dollar.....	23	26	30	79	35.9	
Wage rates of unskilled labor.....	20	18	34	72	32.7	
Other kinds of information reported ^b	3	3	6	12	5.5	
Total replies.....	45	73	102	220	(100.0)	

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

^b Other kinds of information: State legislative provisions, 4; relationship of salaries paid in different positions, 2; size of class and pupil-teacher ratio, 1; cost of additional training in service, 1; financial statistics for other school systems, 1; data on annual turnover, 1; efficiency ratings of local teachers, 1; additional income possible thru state aid, 1.

study. In general they have been selected to represent the seven types of statistical information, as follows:

- The salary schedule already in effect
 - Distribution on schedule, Figure II
 - Trends over period of years; percent of change, Figures III and X
- Salaries paid in other school systems
 - Minimum, median, and maximum salaries; group averages, Figure IV
 - Average salaries, rank of cities compared, Figure V
- Salaries in occupations other than teaching, Figure VI
- Present teaching personnel^a
 - Professional preparation, Figure VII
 - Teaching experience, Figure VIII
- Cost of living in relation to teachers' salaries, Figure X
- Service conditions and administrative practises
 - Teacher turnover, Figure IX
 - Pupil-teacher ratio, over period of years, Figure X
- Financing the schedule
 - Municipal and school expenditures, Figures X and XI
 - Estimated cost of putting schedule into effect, Figure XII.

^a A series of illustrative tables on living conditions, sex, marital status, number of dependents, total income, length of school service, and sources and uses of income may be found in: National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher (B. R. Buckingham, chairman). *The Teacher's Economic Position: Facts and Recommendations*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. 103 p. (Published also as the September, 1935 *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association, 13: 165-267.)

TABLE 18.—COMPOSITE TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR REPORTS OF 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Chapters	Frequency	
	1	2
I. Introduction.....	11	
II. Summary.....	8	
III. Plan of procedure.....	5	
IV. The school department.....	3	
V. Economic trends and teachers' salaries....	2	
VI. The teaching profession.....	1	
VII. The present salary schedule.....	12	
VIII. Trend of salaries of local teachers.....	6	
IX. Teachers' salaries in other comparable cities.....	14	
X. Teachers' salaries and incomes of other vocational groups.....	6	
XI. Cost of living and teachers' salaries.....	14	
XII. The teaching personnel—professional, economic, and personal status.....	20	
XIII. Working conditions of local staff.....	5	
XIV. Employment, retention, and promotion of local teachers.....	9	
XV. Financial ability of the city to support schools.....	4	
XVI. School revenues and expenditures.....	4	
XVII. Factors requiring consideration in determining salaries.....	13	
XVIII. Principles of a good salary schedule.....	4	
XIX. Basic principles followed in construction of proposed new schedule.....	6	
XX. Proposed new salary schedule.....	22	
XXI. Cost of the proposed new schedule.....	8	

AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY OF CINCINNATI DAY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS BY TYPES OF SCHOOLS, 1930-31 TO 1933-34 (1)

Types of Schools	Average Annual Salary by Years				
	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	Percent of Decrease Since 1930-31
Kindergarten					
1—Teachers	\$2,181	\$2,177	\$2,063	\$2,052	5.9
Elementary Schools					
1—Teachers	2,438	2,353	2,214	2,196	9.9
2—Principals	3,992	3,731	3,482	3,468	13.1
Junior High Schools					
1—Teachers	2,635	2,495	2,344	2,307	12.4
2—Principals	4,239	4,091	3,810	3,735	11.9
Senior High Schools					
1—Teachers	2,964	2,801	2,627	2,564	13.5
2—Principals	4,399	4,169	4,346	3,934	10.6
Special Schools and Classes					
1—Teachers	2,428	2,469	2,297	2,277	6.2
2—Principals	3,864	4,730	4,365	3,532	8.9
Vocational High Schools					
1—Teachers	2,801	2,852	2,611	2,138	23.7
2—Principals	4,428	3,467	4,590	3,404	23.1

(1) These data were secured by the Cincinnati Bureau of Governmental Research from the records of the Cincinnati Board of Education.

Cincinnati survey, 1935, p. 240.

FIGURE III

FIGURES ON TRENDS IN SALARIES OVER A PERIOD OF YEARS, AS PRESENTED IN TABLE REPRODUCED FROM CINCINNATI SURVEY

Altho this section emphasizes the statistical approach to the preparation of salary schedules, it must be remembered that the statistics collected in salary studies are significant not for themselves but for the use which is made of them. Statistical material in itself cannot answer the basic questions of policy. All statistical information which will be directly helpful in the decisions to be made should be assembled, and no more.

The Salary Schedule Already in Effect

The value which the community places on teaching service is often indicated by the salaries already being paid to teachers and by the trends in salaries over a period of years. All 22 reports include information on the salary schedule already in effect, the variety of presentation being suggested in Table 19.

The figures on minimum salaries; increments; average, median, maximum, and supermaximum salaries; and distribution of salaries are given separately, in every case reported, for elementary- and high-school teachers, and for junior high schools where they have been organized. In some of the reports there are several additional subdivisions used consistently thruout, such as teachers in kindergarten classes, trade schools, and junior colleges, also principals and supervisors.

It will be noted that a number of reports show trends in salaries over a period of years. For the most part these figures go back at least ten years. One report uses 1898 as the first year. Three use 1900 for certain comparisons and 1913 and 1914 for others. Five other reports use dates from 1913 to 1918 as the starting point; one uses 1919-20.

The fact that various indexes of prices and cost of living have been based on the years 1913 and 1914 doubtless explains the frequent use of these years as a point of reference in the early studies of salary trends. It is probable, however, that a later year will be more frequently used in future studies of salaries. A recent announcement that the United States Department of Labor intends to shift to a 1923-25 average for the base of its retail price index suggests the possibility of using these years in studies of teachers' salary trends.⁴

TABLE 19.—ITEMS ON THE LOCAL SALARY SCHEDULE AND ON SALARIES PAID IN OTHER SCHOOL SYSTEMS, IN REPORTS OF 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	For	
	local city	comparable cities
1	2	3
Minimum salaries.....	17	14
Present amounts.....	17	14
Amounts in an earlier year, or years.....	7	1
Percent of change since an earlier year.....	4	..
Index of change, by years.....	3	..
Increments.....	4	3
Present amount and number.....	4	3
Amount and number, by years.....	1	..
Average salaries.....	8	6
Present amounts.....	6	5
Amounts in an earlier year, or years.....	4	1
Percent of change since an earlier year.....	1	1
Median salary.....	14	12
Present amounts.....	14	11
Amounts in an earlier year, or years.....	4	1
Index of change, by years.....	2	..
Ratio of median salary to maximum salary.....	1	1
Maximum salaries.....	21	20
Present amounts.....	21	20
Amounts in an earlier year, or years.....	8	1
Percent of change since an earlier year.....	3	..
Index of change, by years.....	4	..
Number of teachers receiving the maximum salary.....	8	..
Percent at maximum.....	7	..
Number of years since maximum was reached.....	1	..
Range between elementary maximum and high-school maximum.....	1	1
Ratio of maximum salaries to minimum salaries.....	1	1
Supermaximum salaries.....	3	3
Present amounts.....	2	2
Basis for supermaximum.....	1	1
Distribution of salaries—number or percent of teachers at each salary level.....	11	4
Present year.....	11	4
Over period of years.....	1	..
Other items:		
Index of relative amounts paid in various positions		
Elementary salary equaling 100.....	6	5
High-school salary equaling 100.....	1	1
Use of single salary schedule.....	..	3
Salary differentials to teachers of handicapped pupils.....	1	1
Differentials in salary for men teachers.....	1	1
Salaries in local private schools.....	1	..
Studies represented.....	22	22

Read table as follows: Seventeen of the local salary studies present figures on the minimum salaries scheduled for teachers in the city being studied and 15 give this information for comparable cities. Seven of the 17 cities give figures on minimum salaries for an earlier year or by years over a period of years; one city gives such information for comparable cities. Similarly read for other items.

Salaries Paid in Other School Systems

Such unity as exists in the American system of education, with its 127,000 separate school

⁴ Williams, Faith M.; Hogg, Margaret H.; and Clague, Ewan. "Revision of Index of Cost of Goods Purchased by Wage Earners and Lower-Salaried Workers." *Monthly Labor Review* 41: 819-37; September, 1935.

SALARY SCHEDULE DATA IN THE FIVE LARGEST CITIES—PRINCIPALS									
City	Elementary School			Junior High School			Senior High School		
	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Median	Maximum
New York	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$7,000	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$10,000
Chicago	3,000	4,909	4,800	3,600*	5,434	5,400	4,300	5,943	6,450*
Philadelphia	2,600	4,126	4,500	4,000	5,440	5,000	4,000	5,945	5,000
Detroit	3,000	3,689	5,000	5,000	5,550	5,700	5,000	6,500	6,500
Cleveland		3,286			4,648			5,071	
Average	3,400	4,382	5,325	4,400	5,604	5,675	5,200	6,692	6,800
88 cities of 100,000 population or over	2,169	3,519	3,657	3,467	4,500	4,510	3,850	5,100	5,060

* Supermaximum.

Chicago survey, 1932, p. 368.

FIGURE IV

TABLE ILLUSTRATING USE OF COMPARATIVE FIGURES ON MINIMUM, MAXIMUM, AND MEDIAN SALARIES, REPRODUCED FROM CHICAGO SURVEY

districts, probably is due to the persistent habit which school officials have of trying to base changes in local policies on the best practises which have been developed in communities willing to try out new plans.

A study of the history of the city-school superintendency shows that one of the first duties of the office was to study school systems in other cities.⁵ When the New Orleans school board, in 1841, sent the new superintendent

to visit the school systems of New York and Philadelphia, they were obeying the same urge which in 1936 impels school board members when presented with a new salary schedule for consideration and adoption, to ask "How do these salaries compare with those paid in other cities in the state?" or "Have they tried out this scheme of increments anywhere else?" Whether the new salaries are higher or lower than those paid in other cities, whether the

⁵ Gilland, Thomas McDowell. *The Origin and Development of the Power and Duties of the City-School Superintendent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935. p. 68-69.

**AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARIES FOR DAY SCHOOL TEACHERS BY TYPES OF
SCHOOLS IN CINCINNATI AND OTHER CITIES, 1933-34 (1)**

City	Average Annual Payments and Ranks, by Types of Schools															
	Kinder- garten		Elementary		Junior High		4-Year High		6-Year High		Vocational High		All Day Schools			
	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank	Amount	Rank
Baltimore	\$1,453	10	\$1,620	12	\$1,763	10	\$2,282	7	--	--	\$1,738	9	\$1,743	12		
Buffalo	1,970	2	1,964	3	--	--	2,320	6	--	--	--	--	2,047	7		
CINCINNATI	2,052	1	2,196	1	2,307	3	2,564	2	\$2,382	3	2,138	4	2,288	1		
Cleveland	1,701	7	1,714	10	1,885	9	2,130	11	--	--	2,103	5	1,843	11		
Columbus	--	--	1,886	5	2,203	4	2,188	10	--	--	--	--	2,038	9		
Dallas	--	--	1,323	15	1,406	12	1,770	14	--	--	--	--	1,457	15		
Denver	1,934	3	1,930	4	2,153	5	2,207	9	--	--	1,971	7	2,145	3		
Indianapolis	--	--	1,594	13	--	--	2,009	13	--	--	--	--	1,732	14		
Jersey City	1,570	9	1,879	6	2,722	1	2,555	3	--	--	--	--	2,088	4		
Milwaukee	1,775	5	2,003	2	1,974	7	2,326	5	2,005	4	2,360	3	2,068	5.5		
Pittsburgh	1,834	4	1,868	7	2,385	2	2,957	1	2,730	1	2,896	1	2,232	2		
Portland (2)	968	11	1,744	9	--	--	1,729	15	--	--	1,844	8	1,733	13		
Providence	--	--	1,643	11	1,918	8	2,280	8	--	--	2,543	2	1,845	10		
St. Paul	1,585	8	1,488	14	1,634	11	2,025	12	--	--	2,063	6	2,068	5.5		
San Francisco	1,741	6	1,862	8	2,035	6	2,492	4	2,574	2	--	--	2,041	8		

(1) Data for this table taken from the statistical reports of the school systems to the United States Office of Education.

(2) Possibly for one-half day sessions.

Cincinnati survey, 1935, p. 246.

(1) Data for this table taken from the statistical reports of the school systems to the United States Office of Education.

(2) Possibly for one-half day sessions.

Cincinnati survey, 1935, p. 248.

FIGURE V

TABLE MAKING COMPARISONS OF AVERAGE SALARIES, AND INDICATING RANK OF CITIES IN COMPARISON, FROM CINCINNATI SURVEY

scheme of paying increments really is a new one, the comparative facts are needed in evaluating the policy which is being proposed.

Salary comparisons recommended—Altho few authorities would say that common practise should be the most important factor in fixing salaries, there is rather general agreement that the levels of salaries paid elsewhere deserve consideration.⁶ The National Education Association has recognized the general tendency to use the comparative method in studying salaries by publishing salary information on a city-by-city basis.⁷ Elsbree suggests specifically that:

The minimum salaries paid in other communities of similar type and size and especially in municipalities in the immediate vicinity, should be ascertained. . . . After a careful study of this information, a tentative minimum for the basic group should be established, relatively high enough to enable the community to compete for teachers on equal terms with its neighbors and peers.⁸

Elsbree makes a similar suggestion for a comparative study of maximum salaries. Standiford's survey of principles governing salary schedules in certain cities includes this comment:

Current practise has evidently a large amount of influence in determining the rates of salary schedules. Just what amount of influence it has is indeterminable, but the fact that 84 cities, or approximately 69 percent of those replying to the questionnaire, report surveys of current practise conducted in connection with the formulation of their salary schedules indicates that it is considerable, perhaps greater than that of any other factor.⁹

There are those, however, who deny the value of intercity comparison in salary scheduling. Ross, Reeves, and Russell give these arguments against the comparative method: (1) it is impossible to select really comparable cities; (2) purchasing power varies from city to city; (3) reliable salary data are not avail-

able; (4) comparisons cannot take administrative efficiency into account; (5) there is no criterion for meeting the standard of comparability, whether a given system should seek the average, top, or bottom level.¹⁰

One reason for making intercity comparisons is the fact that school systems are competing with one another for the best teaching talent, and hence are trying to fix salaries which will attract superior individuals. Morrison points out that such competition, altho it works to the advantage of the high-salary district, is destructive of the purpose of the public schools. He recommends that teachers should be classified as civil servants and paid by the state.¹¹

Use of salary comparisons in local studies—Every one of the 22 salary studies gives figures on salaries paid in other cities, as shown by Table 19. Maximum salaries are compared in 20 studies, minimum salaries in 14, and median or average salaries in 18. Several reports show the relative amounts paid in various positions, usually computed as an index, with elementary teachers' salaries as a base.

The number of cities used for salary comparisons ranges from 4 in one report to 35 in another. Four studies use fewer than 10 cities for comparison; 4 studies use more than 20. Two studies compare local salaries with only the average for the population group, as reported by the studies of the National Education Association. Seven of the reports limit the comparison to cities within the state. The sources of the figures used for salary comparisons are not stated in all cases, but it is shown in 11 studies that the reports of the National Education Association were used for at least a part of the comparative data.¹²

Salaries in Occupations Other Than Teaching

Public education is in competition with industry and the professions in securing the serv-

⁶ Clark, R. C. "Principles Underlying the Minimum Teachers' Salary." *American School Board Journal* 80: 55-56; February, 1930. ⁷ Cooke, Dennis H. *Problems of the Teaching Personnel*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. p. 279. ⁸ Eells, Walter Crosby. *Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living*. Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1933. p. 89. ⁹ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 92, 96, 101. ¹⁰ National Education Association, Research Division. "The Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries." *Research Bulletin* 5: 164-66; May, 1927.

¹¹ National Education Association, Research Division. *Special Salary Tabulations, 1934-35*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. (Published biennially since 1924-25.)

¹² Elsbree, Willard S. *op. cit.*, p. 92.

¹³ Standiford, Francis Wilbur. *Principles Governing Salary Schedules in Cities of 20,000 to 50,000*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1930. Master's thesis, ms. p. 34.

¹⁴ Ross, Clay C.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and Russell, John Dale. "Technique for the Local Determination of the Adequacy of Teachers' Salaries." *American School Board Journal* 78: 48-50; February, 1929.

¹⁵ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 229. ¹⁶ See also: Elsbree, Willard S. "Future of Teachers' Salaries and Salary Scheduling." *Teachers College Record* 36: 490-96; March, 1935.

¹⁷ National Education Association, Research Division, *Special Salary Tabulations, op. cit.*

ices of competent persons to carry forward the work of the schools. The influence of salaries paid in other occupations is recognized in a number of the local studies which compare the salaries of teachers with the incomes of other important occupational groups.

Intervocational comparisons recommended—Moehlman has proposed that the wages paid locally to unskilled labor be used as a basis for developing salary schedules for teachers, proposing an index based on existing relationships as studied in a number of cities.¹³ Dix has insisted that the relationship which happens to exist between unskilled labor and any other occupational group does not furnish a justification for continuing the relationship.¹⁴ He proposes, as a better procedure, to determine the general level of income for all gainfully occupied persons and subsequently to develop index figures for teachers' wages from that level. His recommendation is that comparisons of teachers' salaries with those in other occupations should be made in terms of the relative scarcity of abilities needed for successful activity in various occupations. He presents figures (admittedly based on limited samplings) to indicate that the general intelligence of teach-

ers falls approximately at a percentile position of 91 in the general population, or 1.38 standard deviations above the mean. The fair wage for teachers, by his reasoning, would fall at 1.38 standard deviations above the mean wage of the entire gainfully occupied group.¹⁵ He is discussing average rates of pay, without specific reference to minimum and maximum salaries. Holy discusses four bases for determining teachers' pay—(1) supply and demand, (2) living needs, (3) variations in cost of living, and (4) comparisons with salaries in other lines of work—and concludes that only the last is a valid basis.¹⁶ He suggests that such comparisons must take into account differences in native ability, training requirements, experience, sureness of position, retirement provisions, and advantages and disadvantages of each type of work. Morrison recognizes the competition with other occupations but claims that the salaries of socialized professions such as teaching are of necessity determined politically and not by the primary operation of the law of wages.¹⁷ He mentions state retirement plans for teachers as an important factor to be considered when intervocational competition is effective.¹⁸

¹³ Moehlman, Arthur B. *Public School Finance*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1927. p. 148.

¹⁴ Dix, Lester. *The Economic Basis for the Teacher's Wage*. Lincoln School Research Studies. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 15.

¹⁵ Dix, Lester, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

¹⁶ Holy, T. C. "How Shall Teachers' Pay Be Determined?" *School Executives Magazine* 52: 243-44; March, 1933.

¹⁷ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 234-44, 256.

¹⁸ Morrison, Henry C., *op. cit.*, p. 274-83.

COMPARISON OF MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM SALARIES PAID BY THE CITY OF CLEVELAND AND THE CLEVELAND BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR WORK IN WHICH COLLEGE GRADUATION WAS PREFERRED DURING 1931				
	UNIVERSITY GRADUATION REQUIRED		UNIVERSITY GRADUATION PREFERRED	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
City of Cleveland.....	\$3,037	\$4,216	\$2,820	\$3,848
Cleveland Board of Education.....	1,500	3,600	1,350	3,240
Difference in favor of the City of Cleveland	\$1,537	\$ 616	\$1,470	\$ 608

Cleveland study, 1932, p. 52.

FIGURE VI
USE OF COMPARISONS BETWEEN SALARIES OF TEACHERS AND OTHER PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, IN TABLE FROM CLEVELAND STUDY

Use of intervocational comparisons in local studies—Comparisons of teachers' salaries with incomes of persons in other occupations—called "non-teachers" in the title of Table 20—were made in 10 of the reports. Wages of union labor and other skilled workers in the city are given in 6 reports; salaries of municipal or county employees, in 3; salaries of federal employees, in 2; and incomes of other professional groups and business workers, in 4.

TABLE 20.—ITEMS ON NON-TEACHERS' INCOMES WITH WHICH TEACHERS' SALARIES ARE COMPARED, IN 10 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Wages of union labor and skilled craftsmen.....	9
Present amounts, or trends over period of years, in city.....	6
Trends over period of years, in state.....	1
Present amounts, or trends over period of years, in United States.....	4
Salaries of municipal or county employees.....	3
Present amounts, or trends over period of years, in local city or county.....	3
Present amounts, in comparable cities.....	1
Salaries of federal employees.....	2
Salaries of custodians and tradesmen employed by board of education.....	1
Incomes of various professional groups and business workers, not publicly employed.....	4
Average incomes of all gainfully employed persons. Percent of teachers and of all other gainfully employed persons, receiving salaries at different levels.....	2
National income, per capita, over period of years.....	1

* Ten studies represented in table: Chicago, Cincinnati, Holyoke, Los Angeles, New York Citizens, New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Teachers, and Watertown.

The Present Teaching Personnel

A prominent feature of most of the published reports on teachers' salaries is the presentation of facts on the personal, professional, and economic status of the teaching staff already in service. Figures are included on professional training, years of experience, and such other factors as age, race, sex, marital status, living conditions, income, expenditures, and dependents. The extent to which the various elements of the status of the teaching staff are presented in the 22 salary studies is summarized in Table 21, and reported in more detail in Tables 22 to 25.

This information is used variously to contrast the teachers' professional qualifications with the level of their salaries, to show the extent to which their salaries are augmented

by outside earnings, to indicate the proportion of teachers who are responsible for the maintenance of dependents, to indicate the extent to which teachers are dependent upon their relatives for maintenance during the summer months, to show whether teachers are spending a disproportionate part of their incomes for living necessities—in general, to show whether or not teachers as a vocational group are at an economic disadvantage. In addition to giving a general picture of the professional status and economic needs of the teaching staff as a whole, the figures have been used directly in the drafting of the schedule for computing basic subsistence costs, as one factor in determining minimum salaries; and for estimating probable costs of adopting a schedule which varies salaries according to level of professional preparation.

Eleven reports give items on age of teachers, 4 on race, 21 on education and professional growth, 18 on teaching experience, 6 on income, and 12 on expenditures. Eight reports include items on dependents, 2 giving figures on dependent children, one on adult dependents, one on sole dependents and partial dependents, and 8 on all dependents. Other eco-

TABLE 21.—ITEMS ON STATUS OF TEACHING STAFF, IN 21 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	By sex	By marital status	By living conditions	By school division	On any basis
1	2	3	4	5	6
Number of teachers; percent of teachers.....	12	8	8	16	21
Age.....	2	..	..	8	11
Race.....	..	..	2	3	4
Education and professional growth.....	5	2	2	20	21
Teaching experience.....	6	3	3	16	18
Income.....	6	2	2	5	6
Expenditures.....	6	4	4	8	12
Dependents.....	6	4	1	3	8
Studies represented *.....	13	8	9	20	21

* Studies represented in table: Column 2—Hammonton, Lexington, Los Angeles, Nashville, Newburgh, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers. Column 3—Chicago, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Newburgh, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, and Yonkers. Column 4—Lexington, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Teachers, and Yonkers. Column 5—Chicago, Cincinnati, Closter, Fort Worth, Hammonton, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, Newburgh, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers. Column 6—reports in Column 5, plus Lexington.

TABLE 22.—ITEMS ON LOCAL TEACHERS' EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL GROWTH, IN 21 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Number of years of training.....	18
Percent of teachers at various training levels.....	12
Number of college credits held.....	3
Certificates held.....	5
Education of probationers and recent appointees.	4
Training of local teachers compared with teachers in comparable cities.....	6
Estimated costs of one or more years of professional education for teaching.....	3
Estimated amounts to yield return on investment in training.....	2
Extent of recent summer school attendance and other recent in-service education.....	10
Number of credits earned since entering system..	2
Extent of recent educative travel.....	2
Number of professional books and magazines read recently.....	1

* Twenty-one studies represented in table: Chicago, Cincinnati, Closter, Fort Worth, Hammonton, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Lexington, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, Newburgh, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers.

nomic factors (not included in the tables) are ownership of automobile and ownership of home, each reported in one study.

The items mentioned in Tables 21 to 25 merely suggest the variety of presentation of facts on the teaching staff in the 22 reports.

For example, the items summarized in Table 23 might have been reported in greater detail, showing that certain studies give a distribution of the number of teachers according to levels of experience (the year-intervals for each level varying among reports); other reports give the percent at each level but not the number; still others show, for each school division, the range of least and greatest experience, the range of the middle 50 percent, or the median years of

TABLE 23.—ITEMS ON TEACHING EXPERIENCE, IN 18 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Years of experience of local teachers.....	18
In local system.....	10
Elsewhere.....	5
Total experience.....	15
Percent of teachers at various levels of experience.	3
Number or percent of teachers having local experience only.....	3
Percent of total experience gained locally.....	1
Years of trade experience.....	2
Experience of probationers and recent appointees.	1
Experience of local teachers compared with teachers in comparable cities.....	1
Number of different positions held in local system.	1

* Eighteen studies represented in table: Chicago, Cincinnati, Closter, Fort Worth, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, Newburgh, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers.

Preparation of Teachers in Years of Regular Full-time School Work since High School Graduation.

	TOTALS	TEACHERS						Principals, Supervisors, etc.	
		Elemen- tary	Junior H. S.		Senior H. S.		Men	Women	
			Men	Women	Men	Women			
Totals	488	205	19	71	51	86	27	29	
Years									
0	26	16		6		4			
1	24	8		4	4	6	1	1	
2	100	72		11	1	12	1	3	
3	91	60	2	17	2		3	7	
4	98	32	5	17	9	22	4	8	
5	80	8	6	10	13	26	10	7	
6	33	3	2	3	11	10			
7	13			2	4	3	2	2	
8	4					2	1	1	
9	4			1	1	1	1		
Omitted	15	5	4		6				
Average years of regular training	3.5	2.6	4.5	3.3	4.8	4.1	4.9	4.0	
Average yrs. since last attendance	7.1	7.6	1.3	7.5	6.6	7.3	7.5	7.2	

Fresno study, 1932, p. 85.

FIGURE VII

TABLE REPRODUCED FROM FRESNO STUDY, ILLUSTRATING PRESENTATION OF DATA ON PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION OF TEACHING STAFF

experience for each teaching group. Comparisons of figures from one salary report to another are seldom possible.

In 17 reports it is stated that the information on status of teachers is based in whole or in part on a questionnaire to members of the staff.¹⁹ It appears that for the most part teachers have cooperated willingly in filling out the detailed questionnaire forms submitted to them. In 8 of the 17 cities more than 90 percent of the teachers submitted usable replies to the questionnaires. The questionnaire findings, however, are seldom presented in full in the published studies.

Cost of Living and Standard of Living in Relation to Teachers' Salaries

Since the appointment of the National Education Association Committee on Teachers'

¹⁹ Copies of questionnaires used are reproduced in these studies: Cleveland, opposite p. 196; Fresno, p. 79-82; Lexington, appendix; Los Angeles, p. 169-78; New York Citizens, p. 32-39; Pittsburgh Teachers (1927), p. 13; San Francisco Teachers, p. 123-29; Yonkers, p. 44-49.

See also: Ross, Clay C.; Reeves, Floyd W.; and Russell, John Dale, *op. cit.* These writers emphasize the value of data reported by teachers as among the most valid criteria for judging the adequacy of salaries.

TABLE 24.—ITEMS ON INCOME OF LOCAL TEACHERS, IN 6 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY SCHEDULES

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Income received from board of education.....	4
Day school salary.....	4
Evening school work.....	2
Vacation school.....	1
Other school work.....	2
Total income from board.....	1
Income from outside sources.....	5
During school year.....	2
During vacation.....	3
Total income from outside sources.....	4
Percent of teachers receiving any outside income.....	3
Total earned income.....	3
Unearned income.....	1

* Six studies represented in table: Los Angeles, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Teachers, and Yonkers.

DISTRIBUTION OF WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS, PERSONNEL ACCORDING TO YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
NOVEMBER, 1930

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE	ELEMENTARY TEACHERS	JUNIOR SCHOOL TEACHERS	SENIOR SCHOOL TEACHERS	PRINCIPALS	SUPERVISORS AND ASSISTANTS	TOTAL
0-1	11	5	5	0	1	22
2-3	18	8	5	0	1	32
4-5	26	2	3	1	2	34
6-7	10	2	0	0	2	14
8-9	10	2	7	0	1	20
10-11	6	3	3	0	2	14
12-13	8	3	4	1	3	19
14-15	3	5	2	0	0	10
16-17	6	2	0	1	0	9
18-19	8	2	1	0	0	11
20-21	4	5	2	1	1	13
22-23	3	3	0	0	0	6
24-25	1	1	1	1	0	4
Over 25	8	8	6	4	2	28
Totals	122	51	39	9	15	236
Medians	7.2	14.2	9.8	25.0	10.5	9.6

Watertown survey, 1931, p. 181.

FIGURE VIII

TABLE REPRODUCED FROM WATERTOWN SURVEY, PRESENTING FIGURES ON TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL

**TABLE 25.—ITEMS ON EXPENDITURES
BY LOCAL TEACHERS, IN 12 OF THE
22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES**

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Average or median amounts expended.....	12
Total expenditures.....	3
Food.....	6
Housing or rent.....	6
Food and rent.....	2
Food, rent, and laundry.....	2
Clothing.....	2
Health and care of person.....	1
Transportation, auto, travel.....	1
Recreation, entertainment.....	1
Extension training.....	2
Summer school.....	3
Education and culture.....	1
Professional improvement.....	2
Church and charity.....	1
Insurance.....	2
Savings and investments.....	3
Miscellaneous.....	2
Percent of expenditures devoted to:	
Food.....	2
Housing.....	2
Food and rent.....	1
Clothing.....	1
Miscellaneous.....	1
Percent of salary for food, rent, and laundry.....	2

* Twelve studies represented in table: Cincinnati, Fort Worth, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Teachers, and Yonkers.

Salaries and Cost of Living, in 1912, the emphasis on cost of living in relation to teachers' salaries has continued. Evenden's study in 1919, the report of the Salary Committee in 1923, the studies of the Research Division of the National Education Association, the 1935 report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, and a number of the 22 published salary reports have considered this topic, with special reference to the effect of changes in the cost of living on the purchasing power of teachers' salaries.²⁰ Recent trends in

cost of living have changed somewhat the approach to the subject, but it continues to be studied.

Application of cost-of-living indexes to teachers' salaries—For the most part the studies of changes in cost of living, with their reciprocal effect on the purchasing power of the dollar, have been based on the indexes of cost of living begun in 1913 and 1914 by the United States Department of Labor. As these indexes are computed on the basis of the standard of living of workingmen's families, the uncritical application of the figures in connection with teachers' salaries has been challenged.²¹ It has been claimed that teachers' distributions of expenditures are so different from workingmen's as to render the indexes invalid when applied to the purchasing power of teachers' salaries. This whole discussion is reviewed, and a tentative cost-of-living index for teachers, based on teachers' budgets, is given in the recent report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher.²² The Committee's cost-of-living index for teachers indicates that the reduction in the cost of living during the period from 1929 to 1933 was greater for wage-earners in general than it was for city teachers, but does not show a striking difference.

The loss in purchasing power of teachers' salaries during the inflation period prior to 1920 was so great, and salary increases had been so small, that many teachers during the early 1920's were actually receiving less in real wages than teachers had received in 1913 and 1914. The possible return of such conditions is foreseen by Shuttleworth, who shows that the dollar incomes of teachers, over a period of forty-five years, have lagged about two years behind changes in the cost of living.²³

²⁰ Among the earlier reports which emphasize this topic, see: National Education Association. *Report of the Committee on Teachers' Salaries and Cost of Living*. (Joseph Swain, chairman; Robert C. Brooks, executive secretary.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: the Association, 1913. 328 p. ¶ Boykin, James C., and King, Roberta. *Tangible Rewards of Teaching*. Compiled for the Committee on Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living of the National Education Association (Joseph Swain, chairman). U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1914, No. 16. Whole Number 589. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1914. 465 p. ¶ U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, in cooperation with the Committee on Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living of the National Education Association (Joseph Swain, chairman). *A Comparative Study of the Salaries of Teachers and School Officers*. Bulletin, 1915, No. 31. Whole Number 658. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1915. 126 p. ¶ National Education Association, Committee on Teachers' Salaries, Tenure and Pensions (Joseph Swain, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1918. 73 p. ¶ Evenden, E. S. *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Schedules in the United States, 1918-19*. Commission on the Emergency in Education Series No. 6, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1919. 169 p. ¶ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. 115 p. (Published also as the May 1923 *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association.)

²¹ See: Eells, Walter Crosby. *Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living*, op. cit. p. 3-8. ¶ Holy, T. C. "Cost of Living Indexes and Teachers' Salaries." *Educational Research Bulletin* 12: 42-45; February 8, 1933.

²² National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, op. cit. p. 58-78. (*Research Bulletin* 13:222-42.)

²³ Shuttleworth, Frank K. "Dollar and Real Incomes of Public School Teachers and of Wage Workers, 1889-1890 to 1934-35." *Educational Administration and Supervision* 21: 81-96; February, 1935.

He suggests that a more alert use of indexes showing the movement of the cost of living would help to shorten this lag. The proposal by Ludeman that teachers' salaries should be financed from a state fund based on an income tax, the amounts of which would fluctuate with business conditions,²⁴ and Nancarrow's suggestion that teachers' salaries should fluctuate according to a composite index of industrial prices and living costs,²⁵ are both related to the general idea that teachers' salaries should be adjusted in terms of the cost of living and business conditions generally.

Use in local salary studies—Tables 26 and 27 show the extent to which the 22 salary studies present figures on cost of living.²⁶ Nine reports show the effect of cost-of-living trends on the purchasing power of teachers' salaries. Altho the figures in all cases are based either in whole or in part on the indexes published by the United States Department of Labor, they have been variously recomputed, using different combinations of commodities, or different base years.

TABLE 26.—ITEMS ON EFFECT OF CHANGES IN COST OF LIVING ON VALUE OF TEACHERS' SALARIES, IN 9 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	Frequency *
1	2
Minimum salaries, in terms of dollars of an earlier year.....	3
Amounts.....	3
Index of purchasing power.....	3
Average salaries, in terms of dollars of an earlier year.....	3
Amounts.....	3
Index of purchasing power.....	1
Median salaries, in terms of dollars of an earlier year.....	3
Amounts.....	3
Index of purchasing power.....	1
Maximum salaries, in terms of dollars of an earlier year.....	6
Amounts.....	6
Index of purchasing power.....	5
Theoretical minimum and maximum salaries if local salaries had kept pace with changes in cost of living, or per capita national income, or union wage rates.....	3

* Nine studies represented in table: Cincinnati, Holyoke, Los Angeles, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, and Yonkers.

TABLE 27.—ITEMS ON COST OF LIVING AND STANDARD OF LIVING, IN 11 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	For local city	For comparable cities	On any basis
1	2	3	4
Index of total cost of living (also purchasing power of dollar).....	5	2	7
Index number of trends in various sub-items of cost of living.....	4	2	4
Index of cost of living of local professional workers.....	2	..	2
Distribution of expenditures reported by teachers in one or more other school systems.....	..	3	3
Distribution of items of expenditure at professional standard of living—Heller Committee report.....	..	2	2
Distribution of items of expenditure of laborers' families.....	..	..	2
Index number of wholesale prices.....	..	..	1
Opinion of local teachers as to adequacy of salary.....	2	..	2
Living conditions of local teachers during summer vacation.....	1	..	1
Studies represented in table *.....	9	5	11

* Studies represented in table: Column 2—Lexington, Los Angeles, Nashville, New York Citizens, New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Citizens, and San Francisco Teachers. Column 3—Cincinnati, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Citizens, and San Francisco Teachers. Column 4—reports in columns 2 and 3, plus San Diego.

One application of cost-of-living indexes has been suggested in the Pasadena Survey in the proposal that:

When the index of the cost of living, as determined by the United States Department of Labor, varies from the index of the last date of adoption of the salary schedule either way by an amount approximating 10 percent, it shall be the duty of the school authorities to adjust the salary schedules to conform to the changes in the cost of living in the local community.²⁷

Standard of living—The phrase "cost of living" is used not only with reference to trends in purchasing power of the dollar but also with reference to the amount of money which the teacher will require in a given community to maintain an acceptable plane of living, this amount to be considered as a factor in determining salaries of teachers. Two methods of determining this amount of money have been noted.

²⁴ Ludeman, W. W. "Flexible Teachers' Salaries." *Peabody Journal of Education* 10: 363-65; May, 1933.

²⁵ Nancarrow, J. E. "What Next in Teachers' Salaries?" *American School Board Journal* 88: 42, 44; June, 1934.

²⁶ The earlier salary studies report at length on the loss in purchasing power of teachers' salaries during the period of the World War. See especially the following: New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, and San Francisco Teachers.

²⁷ Pasadena (1931), p. 72.

In some studies the computation begins with the sums already being spent for board and room and other necessities by teachers in service.²⁸ Altho a number of the salary reports call attention to the circular reasoning used in basing future salaries on what teachers with their present salaries can afford to pay for room and board, this plan is frequently used.

A different approach is made by ascertaining the money cost of a hypothetical budget to meet the needs of the individual. Harry's study of the cost of living of teachers in the state of New York is of this type,²⁹ also the quantity and cost estimates prepared for teachers' budgets in Minneapolis and Oakland.³⁰ Either type of study utilizes certain information on teachers' expenditures, such as the local salary studies have reported.

Table 27 shows that certain reports have included items on distribution of expenditures in standard budgets, or by teachers in other cities. These figures were used for comparison with the reported expenditures and distribution of income of local teachers.

Administrative Practises Affecting Personnel and Salaries

Information in the salary studies on the working conditions of teachers and on administrative policies affecting the status of teachers is reviewed in Table 28. The extent of turnover is studied as a measure of the holding power of the present schedule. Policies in other cities governing sabbatical leave, sick leave, and efficiency ratings are studied. Data on hours of service, and on length of school day and of school year are presented on a comparative basis. Figures on pupil-teacher ratio, also compared with other cities, are studied in connection with the relative burden carried by local teachers and are considered in dealing with problems of finance.

The information referred to in Table 28 is presented in the salary reports under such captions as "Employment and Promotion," "The

Teaching Load," and "Protective Conditions of Service," comparing the advantages and dis-

TABLE 28.—ITEMS ON SERVICE CONDITIONS OF TEACHING PERSONNEL AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS, IN 21 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	For local city	For comparable cities
1	2	3
Teachers.....	16	6
Qualifications required for appointment to various positions.....	3	3
Number of recent transfers, resignations, appointments.....	6	..
Percent of annual turnover.....	6	..
Number of recent applications for local teaching positions.....	2	1
Reasons for recent separation of teachers from service.....	2	..
Provisions for sabbatical leave.....	..	1
Provisions for sick leave.....	..	1
Use of ratings to determine salaries.....	..	2
Distribution of efficiency ratings of local teachers.....	1	..
Percent of men teachers.....	10	3
Percent of teachers born in other states..	1	..
Percent of "home-town" teachers on staff..	5	..
Pupils.....	9	6
Percent of total population enrolled in school.....	1	..
Average daily attendance, over period of years.....	5	2
Percent of pupils enrolled in high school..	1	1
Percent of increase in high-school membership.....	1	..
Average pupil-teacher ratio, by school divisions.....	7	6
For most recent year only.....	7	6
Over a period of years.....	2	1
School terms and hours.....	3	2
Number of days in school year.....	3	2
Length of school day.....	1	1
Average number of hours of school service rendered by teachers.....	2	1
Teaching.....	2	1
Other school work.....	1	..
All school work.....	1	..
Studies represented in table *	21	9

* Studies represented in table: Column 2—Chicago, Cincinnati, Closter, Fort Worth, Hammoncton, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Los Angeles, Lynn, Nashville, Newburgh, New York Citizens, New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers. Column 3—Chicago, New York Citizens, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, and Yonkers.

²⁸ See salary reports: Cincinnati, p. 37; Lexington, p. 12, 29; Los Angeles, p. 74; Nashville, p. 230-31; New York Citizens, p. 147.

For an example of a proposed standard salary scale for civil engineers in public employ, adjusted in terms of cost of living in different parts of the country, see: "Civil Engineers Publish Revised Salary Figures," *Engineering News-Record*, 113: 115-17; July 26, 1934.

For statements denying the validity of regional variations in salary on basis of cost of living, see: Achinstein, Asher. "Can Budget and Cost-of-Living Studies Be Used as Aids in Determining a Differential Wage?" *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 24: 28-39; March, 1929. ¶ Young Women's Christian Associations, National Board. *Recommended Salary Scales*. New York: the Board, 1935. p. 6.

²⁹ Harry, David P. *Cost of Living of Teachers in the State of New York*. Contributions to Education, No. 320. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928. 184 p.

³⁰ See salary reports: Minneapolis (1926), and Oakland.

advantages of the local teaching service with corresponding provisions in other school systems and in other occupations. The importance of such comparisons is emphasized by Morrison⁸¹ and Holy⁸² as factors in intervocational competition between teaching and other occupations into which capable people may be drawn.

Financing the Salary Schedule

The financing of salaries is a large part of the entire financial administration of the schools. In the average city, in 1932, salaries of teachers, supervisors, and principals took 73 percent of the current expense budget and 54 percent of the total budget for all purposes.⁸³ Altho the total problem of school finance is outside the scope of this bulletin, its importance in the improvement of teachers' salaries must be recognized.⁸⁴ Any realistic study of teachers' salaries, looking to the preparation of a salary schedule in a given school system, must take account of the financial resources of that school system. Financial ability to support schools depends upon a large num-

ber of interrelated factors. One group of these factors has to do with the economic assets and productive capacity of the people in the community. After the fundamental necessities of subsistence are met, it is to a considerable extent a matter of choice as to what the people will buy with their economic resources. They may choose to spend most of their money as individuals or to spend a considerable proportion cooperatively thru taxes. They may choose to spend a small proportion of their tax money for schools and other cultural services, or they may devote a relatively large proportion to such purposes. They may choose to spend a relatively high amount of the school money for buildings, equipment, and other purposes, or a relatively high amount for teachers' salaries.

In addition to this long-range economic ability and willingness of a community to support an adequate salary schedule, there is an immediate or legal ability to support education which is determined by the tax system, the existing debt obligations, and the allocation of public funds in general.⁸⁵ However, in the long

⁸¹ Morrison, Henry C., *op. cit.*, p. 293-314.

⁸² Holy, T. C., *School Executives Magazine*, *op. cit.*

⁸³ U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, *Biennial Survey of Education, 1930-1932*. Bulletin, 1933, No. 2. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1935. Chapter II, "Statistics of City School Systems, 1931-32," p. 35.

⁸⁴ National Education Association and Department of Superintendence, Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education. *Report of National Conference on the Financing of Education*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1933. 78 p.

⁸⁵ Morrison, Henry C. *School Revenue*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930. 242 p.

THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF SEPARATIONS FROM EACH STEP IN THE SCHEDULE
FOR A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD, 1926-31

Senior High	Per Cent	Junior High	Per Cent	Elementary	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
\$3,600 up.....	2	\$3,240 up.....	2	\$2,880 up.....	1
3,450.....	1	3,105.....	2	2,760.....	1
3,300.....	4	2,970.....	2	2,640.....	2
3,150.....	2	2,835.....	1	2,520.....	3
3,000.....	5	2,700.....	2	2,400.....	5
2,850.....	3	2,565.....	4	2,280.....	9
2,700.....	6	2,430.....	6	2,160.....	6
2,550.....	6	2,295.....	6	2,040.....	10
2,400.....	5	2,160.....	7	1,920.....	12
2,250.....	9	2,025.....	9	1,800.....	13
2,100.....	13	1,890.....	12	1,680.....	15
1,950.....	13	1,755.....	15	1,560.....	16
1,800.....	11	1,620.....	16	1,440.....	15
1,650.....	16	1,485.....	13	1,320.....	12
Up to \$1,649..	12	Up to \$1,484..	7	Up to \$1,319..	6

Cleveland study, 1932, p. 27.

FIGURE IX

TABLE FROM CLEVELAND STUDY, SHOWING THE AVERAGE ANNUAL PERCENT OF WITHDRAWALS FROM EACH STEP OF THE SALARY SCHEDULE, OVER A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD

SALARIES EARNED BY TEACHERS IN THE LOS ANGELES DAY HIGH SCHOOLS, 1915-16 TO 1928-29

Period	Total expenditures for salaries, regular teachers		Teachers engaged		Average salary paid per teacher		Cost of living 1915 equals 100 per cent	Real average salary per teacher based on the 1915 dollar		SALARY SCHEDULES IN EFFECT				Average daily attendance		Pupils per teacher
	Dollars	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Dollars	Per cent		Normal maximum		Actual maximum based on the value of the 1915 dollar		Number	Per cent			
								Dollars	Per cent	Dollars	Per cent					
1915-16	\$1,150,024.08	100.0	722	100.0	\$1,592.83	100.0	100.0	\$1,592.83	100.0	\$1,680.00	100.0	\$1,680.00	100.0	14,403	100.0	19.9
1916-17	1,187,176.93	103.2	732	101.4	1,621.83	101.8	109.8	1,477.08	92.7	1,680.00	100.0	1,530.05	91.1	15,303	106.2	20.9
1917-18	1,239,590.92	107.8	765	106.0	1,620.38	101.7	131.4	1,233.17	77.4	1,680.00	100.0	1,278.54	76.1	15,423	107.1	20.2
1918-19	1,267,765.40	110.2	794	110.0	1,506.68	100.2	161.1	991.11	62.2	1,680.00	100.0	1,042.83	62.1	16,283	113.1	20.5
1919-20	1,640,313.25	142.6	863	119.5	1,900.71	119.3	182.9	1,006.20	63.2	2,000.00	119.0	1,058.76	63.0	18,803	130.5	21.8
1920-21	2,252,042.05	195.8	998	138.2	2,256.56	141.7	200.5	1,125.47	70.7	2,400.00	142.9	1,197.01	71.3	21,290	147.8	21.3
1921-22	2,691,610.02	234.0	1,142	158.2	2,353.93	148.0	179.8	1,310.86	82.3	2,600.00	154.8	1,446.05	86.1	24,623	171.0	21.6
1922-23	3,185,917.00	277.0	1,367	189.3	2,330.59	146.3	177.9	1,310.06	82.2	2,600.00	154.8	1,461.50	87.0	30,316	210.5	22.2
1923-24	3,733,633.71	324.7	1,627	225.3	2,294.80	144.1	182.3	1,258.80	79.0	2,600.00	154.8	1,426.22	84.9	35,365	245.5	21.7
1924-25	4,892,256.99	408.0	1,995	276.3	2,352.01	147.7	178.8	1,315.44	82.6	2,700.00	160.7	1,510.07	89.9	41,227	286.2	20.7
1925-26	5,734,417.00	498.6	2,430	336.6	2,359.84	148.2	180.8	1,305.22	81.9	2,800.00	166.7	1,548.67	92.2	49,375	342.8	20.3
1926-27	6,572,038.10	571.5	2,782	385.3	2,362.34	148.3	175.5	1,346.06	84.5	2,800.00	166.7	1,595.44	95.0	57,132	396.7	20.5
1927-28	7,414,020.16	644.7	3,097	428.9	2,393.94	150.3	173.9	1,376.62	86.4	2,930.00	174.4	1,684.88	100.3	66,578	462.3	21.5
1928-29	8,040,804.82	699.2	3,296	456.5	2,439.56	153.2	174.3	1,399.63	87.9	3,040.00	181.0	1,744.12	103.8	70,246	487.7	21.3

Los Angeles study, 1931, p. 118.

FIGURE X

TABLE FROM LOS ANGELES STUDY, SHOWING TREND IN SALARIES OF HIGH-SCHOOL TEACHERS, EFFECT OF CHANGES IN PURCHASING POWER OF DOLLAR ON THE VALUE OF THE SALARY, AND RELATED FIGURES

run, the attitude of the people toward the distribution of their economic resources will influence largely the immediate legal ability of a community to pay adequate salaries to its teachers.

Recognition of financial problem in local studies—Many reports of local salary studies include figures on property valuations, tax rates, tax collections, municipal expenditures, and the relationship of these items to present and proposed school expenditures for salaries and other purposes. State-aid funds also are scrutinized and made the subject of prediction. Tables 29 and 30 indicate the kinds of information presented. It should be noted that for the most part these two tables represent only the eleven studies which deal exclusively with salaries. In analyzing the salary reports included as parts of general school surveys, only the sections dealing with teaching personnel and the salary schedule were studied, thus omitting the general treatment of school finance which the school survey usually includes.

Altho no reliable single measure of a community's ability to support schools has been found, comparisons of certain items related to financial ability are often made, as shown in Table 29 and column 3. These comparisons are perhaps least subject to error when made within a single state, where only one state fiscal system is concerned.

Estimates of cost of new schedule—The one kind of financial information given in the largest number of the reports is an estimate of the probable cost of putting the proposed schedule into effect. Sixteen studies present this information; only six include estimates as to probable costs in subsequent years. The Cincinnati³⁶ and Lexington³⁷ reports show in some detail the method used in calculating the cost of the schedule. The Cleveland study presents estimates of the probable cost of continuing the present schedule in effect.³⁸ Elsbree makes detailed suggestions for estimating costs of both position and preparation schedules, recommending that costs be computed for both the present and the proposed schedule, over a pe-

riod of years.³⁹ For position schedules, he suggests five major steps:

1. Subtract the teacher turnover from each step of the salary schedule.
2. Transfer the remaining teachers to the next year's step on the schedule.
3. Add the replacing teachers at appropriate steps of the schedule.
4. Add the extra teachers required for normal expansion at appropriate steps of the schedule.
5. Sum the cost.

For preparation schedules, in which training is an additional variable, he proposes that minimum and maximum costs be estimated and that probable cost be adjusted between the two.

TABLE 29.—ITEMS ON TAXATION, MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES, AND SCHOOL REVENUES IN 11 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	For local city	For comparable cities
1	2	3
Valuation of taxable property.....	6	5
Assessed valuation of property.....	2	1
Total amount.....	2	1
Amount over period of years.....	1	..
Estimated 100 percent valuation.....	6	5
Total amount.....	3	2
Amount per capita of population....	2	2
Amount per pupil attending school..	3	3
Amount per classroom teacher.....	1	1
Tax rates and collections.....	9	5
School tax rates.....	3	1
On assessed valuation.....	3	1
Over period of years.....	1	..
In purchasing power of an earlier year.....	1	..
On estimated 100 percent valuation..	1	1
Total tax rate.....	6	4
On assessed valuation.....	4	2
Over period of years.....	1	..
On estimated 100 percent valuation..	4	4
Tax collections, per capita of population..	1	1
Percent that school tax is of total tax....	1	..
Percent of total tax devoted to teachers' salaries.....	1	..
Estimated increase in tax rate to put proposed salary schedule into effect.....	2	..
Municipal expenditures.....	7	4
Distribution and total.....	1	1
Per capita of population.....	2	2
Percent for schools.....	3	2
Sources of school revenue.....	2	..
Studies represented in table *	11	7

* Studies represented in table: Column 2—Cincinnati, Hammon, Los Angeles, New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, and Yonkers. Column 3—Los Angeles, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, and Yonkers.

³⁶ Cincinnati, p. 44-52. The section from the Cincinnati report on the probable cost of the schedule is reproduced in Elsbree, Willard S., *Teachers' Salaries*, op. cit., p. 266-80.

³⁷ Lexington, p. 46-55.

³⁸ Cleveland, p. 26-34. Figure IX in this bulletin illustrates one step of the prediction process.

³⁹ Elsbree, Willard S., *Teachers' Salaries*, op. cit., p. 124-64.

Suggested Sources of Information on Salaries

Altho much of the material to be considered in the preparation of a salary schedule is available in the records of the local school system, certain types of information may be needed from outside sources. This section calls attention to sources of information on several of the main topics considered in salary studies.

Salaries paid in city school systems—The Research Division of the National Education

TABLE 30.—ITEMS ON SCHOOL EXPENDITURES IN 21 OF THE 22 LOCAL SALARY STUDIES

Item	For local city	For comparable cities
1	2	3
School expenditures, most recent year.....	9	8
Total expenditures.....	4	1
Current expenses.....	8	7
Percent distribution.....	4	1
Per pupil in attendance.....	8	3
Per capita of population.....	4	4
Expenditures for teachers' salaries.....	7	4
Total amount.....	4	1
Per pupil in attendance.....	7	4
Percent which expenditures for salaries are of current or total expenditures.....	1	1
School expenditures over a period of years....	8	2
Total expenditures.....	3	1
Current expenses, per pupil.....	2	1
Teachers' salaries.....	6	2
Total.....	6	2
Per pupil in attendance.....	1	..
Capital outlay.....	1	..
Debt service.....	1	..
Present expenditure compared with an earlier year, making adjustment for increased attendance and lower purchasing power of dollar.....	2	..
Estimated cost of putting schedule into effect.	16	..
First year.....	16	..
Subsequent years.....	6	..
Studies represented in table *	21	8

* Studies represented in table: Column 2—Chicago, Cincinnati, Closter, Fort Worth, Hammon, Holyoke, Jacksonville, Lexington, Los Angeles, Lynn, Newburgh, New York Citizens, New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield, Watertown, and Yonkers. Column 3—Chicago, Los Angeles, Lynn, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, and Springfield.

⁴⁰ National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries of School Employees, 1934-35." *Research Bulletin* 13: 1-30; March, 1935. ⁴¹ National Education Association, Research Division. *Special Salary Tabulations, 1934-35*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935.

School systems adjacent to large cities will find useful comparative material for individual cities, grouped according to metropolitan areas, in: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division. *Teachers' Salaries in Suburban School Systems, 1934-35*. Educational Research Service Circular No. 2, 1935. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. 25 p.

⁴² A list of states having minimum-salary laws for teachers, and a table showing amounts of salary provided in eight such laws are given in: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division. *Organization and Content, Teachers' Salary Schedules*. Educational Research Service Circular No. 6, 1935. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1935. p. 24-27.

Suggestions as to features which should be included in such laws are given in: National Education Association, Research Division. "A Self-Survey Plan for State School Systems: Part II: Handbook." *Research Bulletin* 8: 89-164; May, 1930.

Association publishes figures every two years on median salaries paid to various groups of employees in city school systems of all sizes.⁴⁰ It is now planned that the next study, for the year 1936-37, will present figures on minimum and maximum salaries scheduled, as well as the median salaries actually paid, for teachers and principals. If the published reports do not give the comparative figures in the exact detail desired for a given local community, a letter may be addressed to the Research Division, definitely indicating the aid desired.

Salaries paid in rural and small-town school systems—Unfortunately the prevailing small-district organization for rural schools has not led to the widespread adoption of salary schedules for teachers in rural areas. A number of states have salary schedules on a minimum basis, enacted by the state legislatures, which apply to rural teachers.⁴¹ In addition, some states using larger units of rural school control have encouraged the development of salary schedules for rural teachers somewhat comparable to those generally found in city school systems. The Research Division of the National Education Association has on file copies of salary schedules adopted in a number of county school systems which may be loaned to individuals having use for such information. School officials in other rural systems and in small towns are invited to send copies of their local salary schedules to the Research Division, for use in this loan collection.

A number of state departments of education present figures on salaries in their published reports, and have additional figures on file which may be consulted on request. As these figures are usually compiled on a county or school-district basis, they are especially helpful in connection with salaries in rural and small-town school systems. Figures on average annual salaries paid to rural teachers in thirty-two states, as reported by state departments of education, are given in a recent

issue of the *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association.⁴²

The United States Office of Education collects figures from time to time on the status of teachers and principals in rural schools. The latest compilation, for the year 1930, includes figures on salaries by state and type of school.⁴³

Salaries in occupations other than teaching—The Division of Economic Research of the United States Department of Commerce has collected figures on average annual incomes of certain occupational groups other than teachers, for the years 1929 thru 1933, which are presented in the 1935 report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher.⁴⁴ The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor frequently publishes figures on prevailing wage rates in the various cities and districts of the nation.⁴⁵ The publications of this bureau are available in most city libraries; they are also available for purchase at nominal cost from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office,

Washington, D. C., who will send a price list upon request.

Cost of living and standard of living in relation to teachers' salaries—Much helpful information on this topic is presented in the recent report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher.⁴⁶ It discusses the use of the indexes of cost of living published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Industrial Conference Board, and presents an index of cost of living for city teachers.

Administrative practises affecting personnel and salaries—A comprehensive review of practises affecting personnel and salaries is available in an issue of the *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association.⁴⁷ Information is presented on training and experience requirements, employment of married women, appointment of local residents, routine procedures in selection of teachers, term of employment, certain factors determining salaries, sick leave and related problems, leaves of absence for professional improvement, and teacher rat-

⁴² National Education Association, Research Division, "Salaries of School Employees, 1934-35," *op. cit.*, p. 27-29.

⁴³ Gaumnitz, Walter H. *Status of Teachers and Principals Employed in the Rural Schools of the United States*. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1932, No. 3. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1932. 122 p.

⁴⁴ National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, *op. cit.*, p. 79-82. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 243-46.) See also the Cleveland study, p. 42-64, for citation to sources of information on incomes in other professions.

⁴⁵ For example, see: "Union Scales of Wages and Hours in the Building Trades in 1934 and 1935." *Monthly Labor Review* 41: 1166-77; November, 1935.

⁴⁶ National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, *op. cit.*, p. 58-78. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 222-42.) † Recent figures from the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics are given in: "Cost of Living." *Monthly Labor Review* 41: 1714-29; December, 1935.

⁴⁷ National Education Association, Research Division. "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part I: Part II." *Research Bulletin* 10: 1-75; January, March, 1932.

COMPARATIVE UNIT EDUCATIONAL COSTS IN THE FIVE LARGEST CITIES, 1928

CITY	EXPENDITURE FOR OPERATION OF ALL MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENTS, PER CAPITA	EXPENDITURE FOR EDUCATION ONLY, PER CAPITA	PERCENTAGE APPLIED TO EDUCATION	COST PER PUPIL IN AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE		PER CENT SALARIES OF CURRENT EXPENSE
				Current Expense of Education	Expense for Educational Salaries	
New York	\$53.27*	\$19.06*	35.8%*	\$144.50†	\$99.14	68.6%
Chicago	45.98	14.66	31.9	119.26	77.97	65.3
Philadelphia	46.20	13.45	29.1	117.32	75.75	64.6
Detroit	50.92	15.03	29.5	109.42	81.26	74.4
Cleveland	45.57	18.09	38.0	134.92	84.58	62.7
Average	\$48.79	\$16.06	32.9%	\$123.64	\$83.74	67.3%

* *Financial Statistics of Cities for 1928*. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D. C.

† *Biennial Survey of Education, 1926-1928*, Bulletin 1930, No. 16. United States Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

Chicago survey, 1932, p. 309.

FIGURE XI

TABLE FROM CHICAGO SURVEY, USING COMPARATIVE INFORMATION ON MUNICIPAL AND SCHOOL EXPENDITURES AND AMOUNTS FOR SALARIES

ing. Comprehensive figures on the extent and nature of the professional preparation of teachers in service in 1930-31 have been published by the United States Office of Education.⁴⁸

Financing the salary schedule—Facts on school expenditures in city school systems are collected by the federal Office of Education. Detailed figures on expenditures, receipts, and personnel are published every two years as a part of the *Biennial Survey of Education*.⁴⁹ There is in addition a less comprehensive report, issued annually, which gives figures on per capita costs and percent distributions for the main character classifications of the current expense budget.⁵⁰

Figures on municipal receipts, expenditures, debt, and taxes, including certain comparable figures for schools, are published annually by the United States Bureau of the Census for cities above 100,000 in population.⁵¹ Figures on debt and tax rates are published annually in the *National Municipal Review*, for all cities above 30,000 in population.⁵²

County school systems and small school districts, in most states, will be able to obtain helpful information on comparative school expenditures and governmental finances from their state departments of education and other state agencies.

⁴⁸ Evenden, Edward S.; Gamble, Guy C.; and Blue, Harold G. *Teacher Personnel in the United States*. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Vol. II. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1933, No. 10. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1935. p. 40-63.

⁴⁹ U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education. *Biennial Survey of Education, 1930-1932*. Bulletin, 1933, No. 2. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1935. Chapter II, "Statistics of City School Systems, 1931-32," p. 1-105.

⁵⁰ Comstock, Lula Mae. *Per Capita Costs in City Schools, 1933-34*. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Pamphlet No. 61. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1935. 19 p.

⁵¹ U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Financial Statistics of Cities Having a Population of Over 100,000*. 1933. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1935. 168 p.

⁵² Rightor, C. E. "Bonded Debt of 274 Cities as at January 1, 1935." *National Municipal Review* 24: 335-47; June, 1935.

† Rightor, C. E. "Comparative Tax Rates of 301 Cities, 1935." *National Municipal Review* 24: 686-98; December, 1935.

Estimated Cost of the Proposed Salary Schedule

Salary Year	Cost of Schedule for Preceding Year ^a	Increase for Experience	Increase for Preparation	Increase for Expansion	Decrease for Turn-over	Cost of Schedule ^b	Total Salary Budget ^c	Per Cent of Increase
September, 1934	\$316,756						\$372,566	
January, 1935	316,756						382,066	2.5
1935-36	324,756	\$8,000	\$2,836	\$4,700	\$4,628	336,363	395,721	3.5 (2.7) ^d
1936-37	328,363	5,894	2,836	1,200	4,628	341,665	401,950	1.6
1937-38	341,665	5,989	2,836	1,200	4,628	347,062	408,308	1.5
1938-39	347,062	4,465	2,836	1,200	4,628	350,935	412,865	1.1
1939-40	350,935	3,325	2,836	1,200	4,628	353,668	416,090	0.8
1940-41	353,668	2,275	2,836	1,200	4,628	355,351	418,069	0.5
1941-42	355,351	1,505	2,836	1,200	4,628	356,264	419,134	0.3

^a The estimated cost for the 231 teachers covered by the schedule.

^b The figures in this column are estimated from those in the preceding column. In each case the cost of the schedule is assumed to be 85 per cent of the total budget for instructional salaries.

^c If, as recommended, the salary schedule begins operation in September, 1935, on the training status of September, 1934, this per cent will be 2.7 rather than 3.5 and the total budget for the year will be \$392,885 instead of \$395,721. However, the accumulated training will have to be paid for the next year unless the board elects to run the schedule one year behind with respect to preparation. This is the procedure recommended by the survey committee.

Lexington study, 1935, p. 48.

FIGURE XII

METHOD OF COMPUTING COST OF PROPOSED NEW SALARY SCHEDULE, AS SHOWN IN TABLE REPRODUCED FROM LEXINGTON STUDY

References to Local Studies of Teachers' Salary Schedules¹

1. AKRON, OHIO. Special Research Committee (Oscar Himebaugh, chairman). *Some Studies Relative to Teachers' Salaries in Akron and Other Cities of the United States*. Akron: Teachers Association, 1931. 44 p. (Mimeographed.)
2. BUFFALO, NEW YORK. Salary Committee (Elizabeth I. Leary, chairman). *What Other Cities Pay Their Teachers*. Buffalo: Federation of Educational Associations, 1928. 15 p.
- *3. CHICAGO, ILLINOIS. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Chicago, Illinois: Volume I*. (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. Chapters 12-16 (by Lester Dix), "The Educational Personnel of the Chicago Schools," p. 243-327.
- *4. CINCINNATI, OHIO. Committee on the Study of Salaries in the Cincinnati Public Schools (Charles Ottermann, chairman). *Report*. Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1926. 78 p.
5. CINCINNATI, OHIO. *Survey Report of the Cincinnati Public Schools*. (Bess Goodykoontz, director.) Report No. 64. Cincinnati: Bureau of Governmental Research, 1935. Chapter 12, "Salaries and the Salary Schedule," p. 234-62.
6. CLEVELAND, OHIO. *Cleveland Teachers' Salaries*. (T. C. Holy, director.) Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 16. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1932. 196 p.
- *7. CLOSTER, NEW JERSEY. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Closter, New Jersey*. (George D. Strayer, director.) Closter: Board of Education, 1928. Chapter 6, "The Teaching Personnel," p. 114-22.
8. DETROIT, MICHIGAN. Mayor's Salary Schedule Committee (Mrs. James E. Hancock, chairman). *Report of the Salary Schedule Committee*. Detroit: Detroit Teachers Association, 1931. 20 p.
- *9. FORT WORTH, TEXAS. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Fort Worth, Texas*. (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. Chapter 8, "The Professional Personnel of the Fort Worth Schools," p. 294-320.
10. FRESNO, CALIFORNIA. *Salary and Cost Study of Fresno Schools*. (By Walter Crosby Eells.) Fresno: City Council of Education, 1932. 190 p.
- *11. HAMMONTON, NEW JERSEY. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of the Town of Hammonton, New Jersey*. (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926. Chapter 3, "The Teaching Staff," p. 29-37.
- *12. HOLYOKE, MASSACHUSETTS. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Holyoke, Massachusetts*. (George D. Strayer, director.) Holyoke: the School Committee, 1930. Chapter 10, "Teaching Personnel," p. 375-405.
- *13. JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Duval County, Florida, Including the City of Jacksonville*. (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. p. 65-91.
14. LAWRENCEVILLE, NEW JERSEY. *Report of the Survey of the Public Schools of Lawrence Township*. (Samuel Engle Burr, director.) Lawrenceville: the Public Schools, 1927. Chapter 9, "The Teaching Staff," p. 173-87.
- *15. LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY. *A Salary Study for the Lexington Public Schools*. Bulletin, Vol. 7, No. 3. Lexington: Bureau of School Service (Leo M. Chamberlain, director), University of Kentucky, 1935. 62 p.
16. LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA. *Staff and Salary Survey of the Long Beach City Schools*. (By E. H. Staffelbach.) Long Beach: Affiliated Teachers of Long Beach, 1935. 29 p.
17. LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA. *Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools*. (Osman R. Hull and Willard S. Ford, directors.) Los Angeles: the Board of Education, 1934. "Teachers' Salary Schedules," p. 308-18.
- *18. LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA. *Teachers' Salaries in the Los Angeles City Elementary and High School Districts*. (W. S. Field, director, and O. T. Johnston.) Los Angeles: the Board of Education, 1931. 178 p.
- *19. LYNN, MASSACHUSETTS. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Lynn, Massachusetts*. (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. Chapter 4, "Teachers' Salaries," p. 149-64.
20. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA. *A Study of Costs and Standards of Living of Minneapolis Teachers in Relation to Their Salaries*. (By Royal Meeker.) Minneapolis: Central Committee of Teachers Associations, 1926. 39 p.
21. MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA. Taxpayers Association. *A Study of Teachers' Salaries*. Minneapolis: the Association, 1928. 31 p.
- *22. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE. *Public Schools of Nashville, Tennessee: A Survey Report*. (Frank P. Bachman, director.) Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1931. Part 3, "Teaching Personnel," p. 195-245.

* The studies marked with an asterisk are included in the detailed analysis given in the second major section of this bulletin.

¹ All separately published local salary studies dated 1926 or later which were available for examination are included, also all general city school surveys which include specific recommendations for a new salary schedule. Certain other general surveys which emphasize salaries, without actually recommending schedules, are also included.

- *23. NEWBURGH, NEW YORK. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Newburgh, New York.* (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929. Chapter 7, "Teaching Personnel in Newburgh," p. 156-71.
- *24. NEW YORK, NEW YORK. Citizens Committee on Teachers Salaries. *Teachers' Salaries in New York City.* (James R. McGaughy, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927. 256 p.
- *25. NEW YORK, NEW YORK. Committee on Teachers' Salaries (Lincoln Cromwell, chairman.) *Report.* New York: Board of Estimate and Apportionment, City of New York, 1927. 21 p.
26. OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA. Public Schools, Department of Research and Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, University of California. *Adequacy of Salaries Paid to Oakland School Teachers.* Bulletin, No. 11, June 1, 1932. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1932. 24 p.
27. PASADENA, CALIFORNIA. *The Instructional Staff: Salaries, Training, and Teaching Loads Comparatively Treated.* Administrative Research Series, Monograph No. 2. Pasadena: Bureau of Administrative Research (W. Hardin Hughes, director), the Schools, 1929. 45 p.
28. PASADENA, CALIFORNIA. *Survey of the Pasadena City Schools.* (Harold A. Stone, director.) Los Angeles: California Taxpayers' Association, 1931. Chapter 4, "The Teaching Personnel," p. 61-66; Chapter 5, "Salary Schedules," p. 67-76.
29. PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA. Teachers' Salary Study Committee (M. C. Schafer, chairman.) *Report.* Pittsburg: the Committee, 1935. 28 p. (Mimeographed.)
- *30. PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA. Citizens' Committee on Teachers' Salaries (Charles Reittel, research director). *Bulletins 1-15.* Pittsburgh: the Committee, % the Board of Education, 1928.
- *31. PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA. *Salary Campaign of the Pittsburgh Teachers Association, 1926-1929.* (Clarissa A. Moffitt and Sara Douglas, editors.) Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Teachers Association (1003 Bessemer Bldg.), 1929. 84 p.²
- *32. PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA. *Survey of the Salaries of Teachers in the Public Schools of Pittsburgh in Relation to Cost of Living.* (Marion K. McKay and Colston E. Warne, compilers.) Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Teachers Association, 1927. 98 p.²
33. SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA. *Sacramento School Survey, Volume I.* (Jesse B. Sears, director.) Sacramento: Board of Education, 1928, Chapter 3, "The School Staff," p. 67-107.
- *34. SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA. Teachers Association, School Finance Committee (Gilbert D. Deere, chairman). *A Survey of Teachers' Salaries in the San Diego Public Schools.* San Diego: the Association, 1930. 88 p.
- *35. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA. Citizens Committee for the Study of Teachers' Salaries (James W. Mullen, chairman). *Salary Schedules for San Francisco Public Schools.* San Francisco: Board of Education, 1929. 102 p.
- *36. SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA. Teachers Consolidated Salary Study Committee. *Teachers' Salaries in San Francisco.* (By F. W. Hart and L. H. Peterson.) San Francisco: the Committee, 1929. 148 p.
37. SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA. City Schools, Salary Status Committee of the Administrative Council and City Teachers League (Isabel F. Lindsay, chairman). *Salary Study.* Santa Ana: the Committee, 1932. 63 p. (Mimeographed.)
38. SHELBYVILLE, KENTUCKY. *A Survey of the Public Schools of Shelbyville, Kentucky.* (Dale Russell, director.) Bulletin, Vol. 1, No. 1. Lexington, Kentucky: Bureau of School Service, University of Kentucky, 1928. Chapter 6, "The Teaching Staff," p. 121-33.
39. SHOREWOOD, MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN. Teachers' Salary Committee (H. S. Hemenway, secretary). *Suburban School Salaries, 1932-33.* Shorewood: Board of Education, 1933. 21 p.
- *40. SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS. *Annual Report of the Springfield Public Schools: Qualifications of the Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors, and Conditions of Their Employment.* Springfield: the School Committee, 1930. 126 p.
41. TRACY, CALIFORNIA. *Tracy Union High School Survey.* (Jesse B. Sears, director.) Tracy: Tracy Union High School District Board of Education, 1935. Chapter 8, "The School Staff," p. 153-76.
- *42. WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Watertown, Massachusetts.* (George D. Strayer, director.) New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. Chapter 9, "The Professional Personnel of the Watertown, Massachusetts, Schools," p. 177-96.
- *43. YONKERS, NEW YORK. *Teachers' Salaries in Yonkers.* (Willard S. Elsbree, director.) Yonkers: Yonkers Branch of the New York Teachers Association, 1929. 49 p.

² References 31 and 32 are both parts of one study, referred to in this bulletin as the Pittsburgh Teachers study.

Copy of Questionnaire Form

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D. C.

Research Division

October, 1925

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS' SALARY SCHEDULE

IN _____ ADOPTED IN _____

(The date of adoption is based on the reply from your office to a questionnaire circulated in October, 1924. If your school system has adopted a new schedule since replying to that inquiry, please insert the correct date above and answer the questions for the new schedule.)

Reported by _____
 Official position _____
(The names of individual cities will not be used in presenting the results of this inquiry.)

1. Personnel, Organization, and Procedure in Preparation of Schedule:

- a. By what official or group was the first formal proposal for the new salary schedule made? _____
- b. Did the board of education take formal action authorizing the preliminary work on the schedule? Yes _____ No _____
- c. What official or group had the chief responsibility for drafting the schedule? _____
- d. In some cities a general committee, representing the entire staff, is appointed by school authorities to assist in the preparation of the schedule. Was this done in your school system? Yes _____ If so, how many members were on the committee? _____ How many were classroom teachers? _____
- e. Was a systematic study and report made in connection with preparing the schedule?
 - (1) By an official or group working under the authority of the board of education? Yes _____ What official or group? _____
 - (2) By teachers' organizations working independently of the board of education? Yes _____
 - (3) By other agency? Yes _____ What agency? _____
- f. In some cities educators from outside the school system help in the preparation of the schedule. Was this done in your school system? Yes _____ If so, were they paid for this service? Yes _____ What was total cost of such service? _____ By what agency was this charge paid? _____
- g. In some cities a committee of citizens, other than the board of education, is appointed to assist in the preparation of the schedule. Was this done in your city? Yes _____ No _____
- h. Was a preliminary draft of the salary schedule, before its adoption, submitted to the teaching staff for criticism? Yes _____ If so, were any changes suggested by teachers? Yes _____ Were any of these changes incorporated in the final draft of the schedule? Yes _____ No _____
- i. Were efforts made to develop public support for a new schedule? Yes _____ If so, please check methods used and report others:
 - (1) Newspaper publicity
 - (2) Presentation of case to service clubs
 - (3) Presentation of case to parent-teacher groups
 - (4) Distribution of reports on salary situation
 - (5) Other methods (please list): _____

(Please send copies of publicity material. They will be returned if you so request.)

j. Check the ways in which members of the board of education participated in the preparation of the schedule:

- (1) By serving on special committee on salaries
- (2) By criticizing and proposing changes in preliminary draft of schedule
- (3) By helping present the case for a revised schedule to the public
- (4) Other service (please list): _____

k. Approximately how long a time elapsed from the date of beginning work on the schedule until it was adopted by the board of education? (Weeks, months, or years) _____

l. Had an earlier salary schedule been adopted in your school system before the schedule referred to in this questionnaire was prepared? Yes _____ No _____

2. Basic Information Used in Preparation of Salary Schedule:

Please check at the left the kinds of information used in preparing the salary schedule.

- a. Personnel data for individual members of the staff, on:
 - (1) Professional status, including such items as training and experience
 - (2) Economic status, including such items as income, expenditures, savings, outside earnings, etc.
 - (3) Personal status, including such items as marital status, living conditions, number of dependents, etc.
- b. Index numbers of cost of living or purchasing power of the dollar
- c. Salaries paid to public employees other than school employees
- d. Income of professional groups other than school employees
- e. Wage rates of unskilled labor
- f. Salaries paid employees in other school systems
- g. Evidence on loss of employees to other systems where higher salaries are paid
- h. Estimated additional cost of putting proposed schedule into effect
- i. Ability of community to finance the salary schedule as shown by tax rate, assessments, wealth, income, state aid, etc.
- j. Other kinds of information (please list): _____

3. Difficult Decisions in Drafting the Salary Schedule:

In setting up a salary schedule, a number of administrative decisions must be made, 10 of which are indicated by the questions (a to j) which follow. In some cities sharp differences of opinion arise regarding these and similar questions.

Will you please check at the left the three questions which were most difficult to decide upon in drafting your own schedule? If there were other issues, not stated below, which were more controversial, please name them and include them among the three which you check.

Do not answer the questions; merely check the three which were most difficult to decide upon in setting up the schedule.

- a. Shall the basic classification of salaries be of the position type or of the preparation (single salary) type?
- b. What amounts shall be paid as minimum salaries?
- c. What amounts shall be paid as maximum salaries?
- d. How many increments shall there be in progressing from minimum to maximum salary?
- e. Shall extra amounts be paid in recognition of professional training higher than the minimum requirements?
- f. Shall the schedule be so devised as to compel teachers to secure additional professional training at stated intervals?
- g. Shall men and women of similar qualifications be paid equal salaries for equal work?
- h. Shall efficiency ratings be used in determining a teacher's progress on the salary schedule?
- i. What differentials or special salaries shall be set for teachers with extra duties or special assignments, such as committee, heads of departments, demonstration teachers, etc.?
- j. What salaries shall be paid to principals and other supervisory and administrative officers?
- k. Other questions: _____

4. Putting the Schedule into Effect:

- a. Were increased funds for teachers' salaries made necessary by the adoption of the schedule? Yes _____ No _____
- b. Was the approval of any official agency other than the board of education required before money could be raised to put the schedule into effect? Yes _____ If so, what was this other agency? _____
- c. Was the local tax rate raised in order to put the salary schedule into effect? Yes _____
- d. Were increased state and funds a factor in making it possible to adopt a new salary schedule? Yes _____
- e. Approximately how long was the time between the adoption of the schedule and the date when it was put into effect? _____

5. Check below whether the new schedule tended, on the whole, to raise or to lower salaries:

To raise salaries: _____

To lower salaries: _____

6. If a new salary schedule were to be prepared now in your school system, how would you vary from the former procedure? (In organization, personnel, points of emphasis) _____

Return one copy only, in the enclosed envelope, to:

National Education Association of the United States

Research Division,

1201 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

Please send also copies of any mimeographed or printed material dealing with the preparation of the salary schedule.

List of 222 School Systems Adopting a New Salary Schedule Since 1927 Which Submitted Usable Replies to Questionnaire

Group I Cities (Over 100,000 in Population)

Birmingham, Ala.	Louisville, Ky.	Jersey City, N. J.	Providence, R. I.
San Francisco, Calif.	New Orleans, La.	Newark, N. J.	San Antonio, Texas
New Haven, Conn.	Lynn, Mass.	Rochester, N. Y.	Salt Lake City, Utah
Fort Wayne, Ind.	Springfield, Mass.	Tulsa, Okla.	
South Bend, Ind.	Minneapolis, Minn.	Reading, Pa.	

Group II Cities (30,000 to 100,000 in Population)

Alameda, Calif.	Rockford, Ill.	Newton, Mass.	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Berkeley, Calif.	Muncie, Ind.	Dearborn, Mich.	Watertown, N. Y.
Fresno, Calif.	Richmond, Ind.	(Fordson District)	Zanesville, Ohio
Glendale, Calif.	Brockton, Mass.	Kearny, N. J.	Woonsocket, R. I.
Pasadena, Calif.	Chelsea, Mass.	Perth Amboy, N. J.	Beaumont, Texas
New Britain, Conn.	Chicopee, Mass.	Jamestown, N. Y.	(City District)
Waterbury, Conn.	Medford, Mass.	Mount Vernon, N. Y.	Lynchburg, Va.
			West Allis, Wis.

Group III Cities (10,000 to 30,000 in Population)

Bessemer, Ala.	Clinton, Iowa	Englewood, N. J.	Piqua, Ohio
Alhambra, Calif.	Mason City, Iowa	Neptune, N. J.	Salem, Ohio
Beverly Hills, Calif.	Emporia, Kansas	Nutley, N. J.	Enid, Okla.
Ontario, Calif.	Ashland, Ky.	Ridgefield Park, N. J.	Ponca City, Okla.
San Mateo, Calif.	Owensboro, Ky.	Summit, N. J.	Salem, Oregon
Santa Cruz, Calif.	Lake Charles, La.	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Ambridge, Pa.
Grand Junction, Colo.	Bangor, Maine	Cohoes, N. Y.	Coraopolis, Pa.
East Hartford, Conn.	Milton, Mass.	Corning, N. Y.	Mt. Lebanon, Pa.
Key West, Fla.	Natick, Mass.	Dunkirk, N. Y.	Westerly, R. I.
Rome, Ga.	Needham, Mass.	Glen Cove, N. Y.	Huron, S. Dak.
Elmhurst, Ill.	Wellesley, Mass.	Glens Falls, N. Y.	Johnson City, Tenn.
Elmwood Park, Ill.	Weymouth, Mass.	Little Falls, N. Y.	Denison, Texas
Freeport, Ill.	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Massena, N. Y.	Pampa, Texas
Pekin, Ill.	Grosse Pointe, Mich.	Peekskill, N. Y.	Burlington, Vt.
Winnetka, Ill.	Mount Clemens, Mich.	Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	Staunton, Va.
Crawfordsville, Ind.	Jefferson City, Mo.	Valley Stream, N. Y.	Port Angeles, Wash.
Huntington, Ind.	Billings, Mont.	Grand Forks, N. Dak.	Walla Walla, Wash.
Michigan City, Ind.	Great Falls, Mont.	Ironton, Ohio	Manitowoc, Wis.
Burlington, Iowa	Fremont, Neb.		

Group IV Cities (5,000 to 10,000 in Population)

Opelika, Ala.	Andover, Mass.	Scotia, N. Y.	Pendleton, Oregon
Tarrant, Ala.	Concord, Mass.	Seneca Falls, N. Y.	Exeter, Pa.
Globe, Ariz.	Montague, Mass.	Solvay, N. Y.	Lansdowne, Pa.
Miami, Ariz.	North Andover, Mass.	Galion, Ohio	Summit Hill, Pa.
Pittsburg, Calif.	Stoughton, Mass.	Miamisburg, Ohio	Yankton, S. Dak.
Santa Paula, Calif.	Negaunee, Mich.	Norwalk, Ohio	Cleveland, Tenn.
Putnam, Conn.	Clayton, Mo.	Rocky River, Ohio	Longview, Texas
Southington, Conn.	Livingston, Mont.	St. Bernard, Ohio	Logan City, Utah
Charleston, Ill.	Canandaigua, N. Y.	Wapakoneta, Ohio	Kelso, Wash.
Wheaton, Ill.	Catskill, N. Y.	Elk City, Okla.	Beaver Dam, Wis.
Wabash, Ind.	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.	Baker, Oregon	Rock Springs, Wyo.
Corbin, Ky.	Penn Yan, N. Y.	Bend, Oregon	
Plaquemine, La.	Salamanca, N. Y.	Oregon City, Oregon	

Group V Cities (2,500 to 5,000 in Population)

Jerome, Ariz.	Huntingburg, Ind.	Whitefish, Mont.	Perrysburg, Ohio
Benton, Ark.	Cynthiana, Ky.	Gering, Neb.	Wauseon, Ohio
El Monte, Calif.	Elizabethtown, Ky.	Sparks, Nev.	Pawnee, Okla.
El Segundo, Calif.	Princeton, Ky.	Glen Rock, N. J.	Tonkawa, Okla.
Gilroy, Calif.	Lee, Mass.	Ballston Spa, N. Y.	Grant's Pass, Oregon
San Bruno, Calif.	Bessemer, Mich.	Corinth, N. Y.	Meyersdale, Pa.
Fort Morgan, Colo.	Anoka, Minn.	Le Roy, N. Y.	Madison, S. Dak.
Haines City, Fla.	Edina, Minn.	Perry, N. Y.	Perryton, Texas
Monroe, Ga.	Gilbert, Minn.	Sloan, N. Y.	Camas, Wash.
Burley, Idaho	Marshall, Minn.	Roanoke Rapids, N. C.	Edgerton, Wis.
Caldwell, Idaho	Pipestone, Minn.	Geneva, Ohio	Port Washington, Wis.
Preston, Idaho	Worthington, Minn.	Lebanon, Ohio	
Dolton, Ill.	Philadelphia, Miss.	Lowellville, Ohio	
Staunton, Ill.	West Point, Miss.	Oberlin, Ohio	

List of Tables

	Page
1. Questionnaires on Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules, Number Issued and Percent of Return	7
2. Date of Adoption of 222 Schedules in Questionnaire Study.....	8
3. Size of School Systems Represented by 150 Salary Schedules Analyzed, and Year of Adoption....	8
4. Number of Cities Where New Salary Schedule Replaced a Previous Schedule.....	9
5. Official or Group Making First Proposal for Preparation of New Salary Schedule.....	10
6. Authorization by Board of Education for Preliminary Work on Salary Schedule.....	10
7. Official or Group Having Chief Responsibility (1) for Preparation of Schedule (2) for Making Systematic Study under Authority of Board of Education.....	11
8. Participation of Committee Representing the Staff in Preparation of Salary Schedule.....	12
9. Review of Schedule by Teaching Staff.....	13
10. Participation by Members of Board of Education in Preparation of the Salary Schedule.....	14
11. Changes from Former Procedures in Personnel Participation if New Salary Schedule Were To Be Adopted, Proposed by 31 Superintendents in Systems Where Salary Schedules Have Been Adopted Recently	15
12. Financial Aspects of the Salary Schedule Adoption.....	16
13. Methods Used To Develop Public Support for New Schedule.....	17
14. Form of Publication and Length, 150 Salary Schedules.....	18
15. Time Required To Get New Schedule Prepared and Put into Effect.....	19
16. School System, City Size, Date, Personnel, and Sponsorship, 22 Local Salary Studies.....	22
17. Basic Information Used in Preparation of Salary Schedule, as Reported by School Officials.....	23
18. Composite Table of Contents for Reports of 22 Local Salary Studies.....	24
19. Items on the Local Salary Schedule and on Salaries Paid in Other School Systems, in Reports of 22 Local Salary Studies	25
20. Items on Non-Teachers' Incomes with Which Teachers' Salaries Are Compared, in 10 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	29
21. Items on Status of Teaching Staff, in 21 of the 22 Local Salary Studies.....	29
22. Items on Local Teachers' Education and Professional Growth, in 21 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	30
23. Items on Teaching Experience, in 18 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	30
24. Items on Income of Local Teachers, in 6 of the 22 Local Salary Schedules.....	31
25. Items on Expenditures by Local Teachers, in 12 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	32
26. Items on Effect of Changes in Cost of Living on Value of Teachers' Salaries, in 9 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	33
27. Items on Cost of Living and Standard of Living, in 11 of the 22 Local Salary Studies.....	33
28. Items on Service Conditions of Teaching Personnel and Other Administrative Items, in 21 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	34
29. Items on Taxation, Municipal Expenditures, and School Revenues in 11 of the 22 Local Salary Studies	37
30. Items on School Expenditures in 21 of the 22 Local Salary Studies.....	38

List of Figures

	Page
I. Essential elements in the scheduling of teachers' salaries.....	6
II. Table showing distribution of teachers on salary schedule, reproduced from Pasadena study....	23
III. Figures on trends in salaries over a period of years, as presented in table reproduced from Cincinnati survey	24
IV. Table illustrating use of comparative figures on minimum, maximum, and median salaries, reproduced from Chicago survey.....	26
V. Table making comparisons of average salaries, and indicating rank of cities in comparison, from Cincinnati survey	26
VI. Use of comparisons between salaries of teachers and other public employees, in table from Cleveland study	28
VII. Table reproduced from Fresno study, illustrating presentation of data on professional preparation of teaching staff	30
VIII. Table reproduced from Watertown survey, presenting figures on teaching experience of school personnel	31
IX. Table from Cleveland study, showing the average annual percent of withdrawals from each step of the salary schedule, over a five-year period.....	35
X. Table from Los Angeles study, showing trend in salaries of high-school teachers, effect of changes in purchasing power of dollar on the value of the salary, and related figures.....	36
XI. Table from Chicago survey, using comparative information on municipal and school expenditures and amounts for salaries.....	39
XII. Method of computing cost of proposed new salary schedule, as shown in table reproduced from Lexington study	40

AVAILABLE RESEARCH BULLETINS

Better Reading Instruction. Vol. XIII, No. 5, November, 1935. 51 p.....	\$.25	Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers. Part II. The Retention, Promotion and Improvement of Teachers. Vol. X, No. 2, March, 1932. 44 p.....	\$.25
The Teacher's Economic Position. Vol. XIII, No. 4, September, 1935. 104 p.....	.50	Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers. Part I. The Selection and Appointment of Teachers. Vol. X, No. 1, January, 1932. 32 p.....	.25
Creating Social Intelligence. Vol. XIII, No. 3, May, 1935. 96 p.....	.50	Teacher Demand and Supply. Vol. IX, No. 5, November, 1931. 102 p.....	.25
Salaries of School Employees, 1934-35. Vol. XIII, No. 2, March, 1935. 32 p.....	.25	The Outlook for Rural Education. Vol. IX, No. 4, September, 1931. 72 p.....	.25
The Nation's School Building Needs. Vol. XIII, No. 1, January, 1935. 36 p.....	.25	Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31. Vol. IX, No. 3, May, 1931. 64 p.....	.25
Modern Social and Educational Trends. Vol. XII, No. 5, November, 1934. 48 p.....	.25	Current Issues in Teacher Retirement. Vol. VIII, No. 5, November, 1930. 68 p.....	.25
National Deliberative Committees in Education. Vol. XII, No. 4, September, 1934. 92 p.....	.25	Investing in Public Education. Vol. VIII, No. 4, September, 1930. 56 p.....	.25
Education for Character, Part II. Improving the School Program. Vol. XII, No. 3, May, 1934. 64 p.....	.25	A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems. Part II. Handbook. Vol. VIII, No. 3, May, 1930. 76 p.....	.25
Education for Character, Part I. The Social and Psychological Background. Vol. XII, No. 2, March, 1934. 40 p.....	.25	A Self-survey Plan for State School Systems. Part I. Check-lists. Vol. VIII, No. 2, March, 1930. 36 p.....	.25
Five Years of State School Revenue Legislation, 1929-1933. Vol. XII, No. 1, January, 1934. 40 p.....	.25	The Questionnaire. Vol. VIII, No. 1, January, 1930. 52 p.....	.25
Current Conditions in the Nation's Schools. Vol. XI, No. 4, November, 1933. 20 p.....	.25	Salary Scales in City School Systems, 1928-29. Vol. VII, No. 3, May, 1929. 68 p.....	.25
Constructive Economy in Education. Vol. XI, No. 3, September, 1933. 36 p.....	.25	The Principal and Progressive Movements in Education. Vol. VII, No. 2, March, 1929. 60 p.....	.25
Salaries in City School Systems. Vol. XI, No. 2, March, 1933. 16 p.....	.25	Can the States Afford to Educate Their Children? Vol. VII, No. 1, January, 1929. 44 p.....	.25
The School Board Member. Vol. XI, No. 1, January, 1933. 44 p.....	.25	Can the Nation Afford to Educate Its Children? Vol. VI, No. 5, November, 1928. 48 p.....	.25
Facts on School Costs. Vol. X, No. 5, November, 1932. 24 p.....	.25		
Crime Prevention Through Education. Vol. X, No. 4, September, 1932. 68 p.....	.25		
Estimating State School Efficiency. Vol. X, No. 3, May, 1932. 58 p.....	.25		

All orders for publication should be accompanied by funds in payment for same and must be so accompanied when orders for material amount to \$1.00 or less. Orders not accompanied by funds in payment are subject to transportation charges. Make checks or money orders payable to the National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

THE ECONOMIC STATUS of teachers as a group is, or should be, a matter of fundamental professional concern to all educators and to parents and citizens generally. From the purely personal point of view, a satisfactory economic status is important because it means having the necessities of life in sufficient amounts for one's self and dependents; a reasonable amount for giving to worthy causes outside one's own household; ample opportunity for wholesome recreation and for cultural and professional growth; and a chance to make adequate provision for future emergencies and for retirement. From the strictly professional point of view, these things are important because they help to maintain the morale of teachers and to improve generally the efficiency of our schools. The profession of education may well give even more careful consideration than in the past, to the economic conditions and problems of its members and to ways of getting other citizens to do the same. This is essential to the well-being of one of society's most potentially valuable groups, and hence essential to the effectiveness of the work which society expects this group to do.—National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, *Report*, 1935, p. 5.
