

MAR 13 1936

RESEARCH BULLETIN

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

OF THE NATIONAL
EDUCATION
ASSOCIATION

VOL. XIV · No. 2

MARCH · 1936

The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules

Part II: Drafting the Schedule

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
INTRODUCTION	52
QUESTIONS OF POLICY IN DRAFTING THE SALARY SCHEDULE.....	53
Basic Classification of Salaries—Position or Preparation.....	55
Minimum Salaries	61
Maximum Salaries	66
Increments	70
Requirements for Continued Professional Training.....	74
Sex as a Basis for Variations in Salary.....	75
Teaching Efficiency and the Salary Schedule.....	80
Differentials for Special Teaching Services.....	83
Salaries of Principals and Other Officers.....	84
Summary	91
SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES AND POLICIES IN SCHEDULING TEACHERS' SALARIES.....	93
Preliminary Steps	93
Personnel and Responsibilities.....	93
Studying the Facts.....	93
Policies Governing the Salary Schedule.....	94
Organization and Format of Schedule.....	95
Financing the Schedule.....	95
Putting the Schedule into Effect.....	96
REFERENCES TO TWENTY-TWO LOCAL STUDIES OF TEACHERS' SALARIES.....	97
LIST OF TABLES.....	98

Introduction

The January 1936 *Research Bulletin*¹ discusses administrative procedures in the preparation of a salary schedule and calls attention to the types of information on salaries which frequently are studied. This bulletin deals with a further stage of the process of schedule-making. In setting up a salary schedule for teachers, as in any other problem where human and economic factors are present, a number of decisions must be made on the basis of judgment. Altho progress has been made toward objective procedures in scheduling teachers' salaries, no formulas which have been developed provide wholly objective bases for answering the questions which arise. The necessity still remains for a careful study of conditions, and a choice, among possible courses of action, of the policies which seem most likely to accomplish the purposes to be served by salary schedules. Certain basic decisions are already made when it has been determined to have a schedule. The adoption of a salary schedule presupposes that salary classes will be set up, that the basis for assigning employees to those classes will be a matter of public knowledge, and that each salary class will provide for progress from an initial salary to a higher salary, the basis for progress also being a matter of public knowledge.

Before the actual formulation of the schedule can be completed, however, decisions must be reached on the adoption or rejection of certain principles of salary scheduling, and on the interpretation of those adopted. Principles such as these have been proposed: "School years and subjects are of equal importance in the de-

velopment of children and should therefore be so recognized in salary schedules."² "Salary schedules should recognize the value of training."³ "Salary schedules should be adjusted to cost of living and to living conditions."⁴ "The minimum salary should be a living wage."⁵ "The schedule should avoid overpaying beginning teachers at the expense of teachers with long records of successful experience."⁶ "Maximum salaries should be high enough to justify looking upon teaching as a career, rather than as a temporary or 'stepping stone' job."⁶ "The salary schedule should encourage the professional growth of teachers while in service."⁷ "Persons in the same type of position should receive equal salaries for equivalent training and experience."⁸ "Merit should be recognized and rewarded."⁸

Are such principles as these to be accepted in the school system for which the schedule is being prepared? And if they are accepted, what do they mean in a salary schedule, in terms of dollars and cents? These are real questions when salary schedules are being prepared. This bulletin presents evidence that may help those responsible for drafting schedules to clarify their thinking on these issues.

A brief closing section summarizes the discussion of the preparation of teachers' salary schedules given in this and the preceding bulletin. The summary is given in the form of an itemized list of procedures which may prove useful in a local school system in considering plans and checking progress in the preparation of a salary schedule.

¹ National Education Association, Research Division. "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures." *Research Bulletin* 14: 1-48; January, 1936.

² Lewis, E. E. "Desirable Principles of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *American School Board Journal* 80: 45-46; May, 1930.

³ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 73-75. (Published also as the May, 1923, *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association.)

⁴ Clark, R. C. "Principles Underlying the Minimum Teachers' Salary." *American School Board Journal* 80: 55-56; February, 1930.

⁵ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. *The Economic Welfare of Teachers*. Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. p. 34.

⁶ Evenden, Edward S. "Fundamental Principles of Grading Teachers' Salaries." *Proceedings*, 1921. Vol. 59. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1921. p. 817-20.

⁷ Long Beach, Calif. *Staff and Salary Survey of the Long Beach City Schools*. (By E. H. Staffelbach.) Long Beach: Affiliated Teachers of Long Beach, 1935. p. 15.

⁸ Munzenmayer, L. H. "Constructing Salary Schedules." *Nation's Schools* 12: 38; September, 1933.

Questions of Policy in Drafting the Salary Schedule

A study of the provisions of 150 recently adopted salary schedules¹ and the content of 22 local salary studies² suggested ten questions which appear to be particularly difficult to answer in setting up a salary schedule. The questions deal with the following topics:

1. Basic classification of salaries—position or preparation
2. Recognition of additional professional training
3. Minimum salaries
4. Maximum salaries
5. Increments
6. Requirements for continued professional training
7. Sex as a basis for variations in salary
8. Efficiency ratings and the salary schedule
9. Differentials for special teaching services
10. Salaries of principals and other officers.

A questionnaire to superintendents of school systems where a salary schedule recently had been adopted included a section which asked respondents to indicate the three questions in the list of ten which had been most difficult to answer in framing their local schedules and to suggest other topics which were more controversial.³ Table 1 quotes the ten questions in full and shows for each the number of superintendents who included that question as among the three most difficult. A few superintendents checked four or five questions instead of three; their replies are included, thus increasing the total of the frequencies. The few additional questions mentioned in the replies are also listed.

It appears from Table 1 that every one of the ten questions has proved to be particularly hard to answer in certain school systems and that no one of the ten stands out as strikingly more difficult than the others. There were 212 superintendents checking the ten questions; the possible frequency in checking any question as difficult thus ranged from zero to 212. If each of the questions had been checked by a third of those replying, or approximately

seventy, it would have seemed to indicate that on the whole the questions were of nearly equal difficulty. The actual range of frequencies was from 39, or 18.4 percent, on the question relating to salaries of principals and other officers, to 94, or 44.3 percent, on the question regarding the amounts to be paid as maximum salaries.

The inquiry to superintendents included another question, the answers to which throw some light on the issues raised by the ten questions, which reads as follows: "If a new schedule were to be prepared now in your school system, how would you vary from the former procedure in organization, personnel, points of emphasis?" No answers were suggested for checking; space was provided for writing in replies. The replies from the 43 superintendents who answered this question by mentioning items connected with the content of the schedule are presented in Table 2. The suggestions made most frequently are related to the questions on efficiency, type of schedule (single salary or otherwise), and recognition of professional training.

The discussion which follows deals with the questions in turn. A section is devoted to each of the ten questions except the second, on recognition of professional training, which is included in the section on basic classification of salaries. The discussion of each question is organized as follows: first, a brief statement of the scope of the question and of the relative difficulty assigned to it by the superintendents of schools replying to the questionnaire; second, a section on "present practise" which gives evidence as to the way the question is being answered in existing salary schedules; and third, a section on "opinion and studies," which calls attention to recommendations of the National Education Association, and cites the points of view expressed in the local salary studies and in publications by individual students of the problem of salary scheduling.

¹ The 150 salary schedules represent school systems of all sizes. They were selected on the basis of availability (in printed or mimeographed form) and date (1928 or later). A list of the 150 schedules and a report on certain of their provisions is 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. 56 p. See also: National Education Association, Research Division, "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures." *Research Bulletin* 14: 7-8; January, 1936.

² The 22 studies report on statistical investigations of teachers' salaries in local school systems and propose new salary schedules for adoption. A list of the studies is given on page 97 of this bulletin. For information on organization and statistical content of the studies, see: National Education Association, Research Division, "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I," *op. cit.*, p. 21-37.

³ For copy of the questionnaire, list of 222 school systems submitting usable replies, and tabulations of findings on other questions, see: National Education Association, Research Division, "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I," *op. cit.*, p. 9-20, 43-44.

TABLE 1.—DIFFICULT QUESTIONS IN THE SCHEDULING OF TEACHERS' SALARIES, AS REPORTED BY SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS IN SYSTEMS WHERE SALARY SCHEDULES HAVE BEEN ADOPTED RECENTLY

Question	Number of replies rating question as difficult					Rank of question in frequency of mention				
	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Group IV and V	Total		Groups I and II	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total	
				Number	Percent					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1. Shall the basic classification of salaries be of the position type or of the preparation (single-salary) type?.....	12	32	42	86	40.6	6	1.5	1	2	
2. Shall extra amounts be paid in recognition of professional training higher than the minimum requirements?.....	13	21	30	64	30.2	4.5	4.5	5.5	5	
3. What amounts shall be paid as minimum salaries?.....	10	27	37	74	34.9	9	3	3	3	
4. What amounts shall be paid as maximum salaries?.....	23	32	39	94	44.3	1	1.5	2	1	
5. How many increments shall there be in progressing from minimum to maximum salary?.....	18	21	30	69	32.5	2	4.5	5.5	4	
6. Shall the schedule be so devised as to compel teachers to secure additional professional training at stated intervals?.....	13	20	18	51	24.1	4.5	6.5	9	8	
7. Shall men and women of similar qualifications be paid equal salaries for equal work?.....	8	20	31	59	27.8	10	6.5	4	6	
8. Shall efficiency ratings be used in determining a teacher's progress on the salary schedule?.....	17	10	23	50	23.6	3	10	8	9	
9. What differentials or special salaries shall be set for teachers with extra duties or special assignments, such as counselors, heads of departments, demonstration teachers, etc.?.....	11	16	29	56	26.4	7.5	8	7	7	
10. What salaries shall be paid to principals and other supervisory and administrative officers?.....	11	13	15	39	18.4	7.5	9	10	10	
Other questions ^b	3	3	3	9	4.2					
Total replies.....	44	71	97	212	(100.0)					
No answer.....	1	3	6	10						

^a Population ranges as follows: Group I, cities over 100,000 in population; Group II, 30,000 to 100,000; Group III, 10,000 to 30,000; Group IV, 5,000 to 10,000; Group V, 2,500 to 5,000.

^b Other questions: How can schedule be adapted to financial ability of district?—3 replies; shall extra amounts be paid for long service?—1; how soon shall teachers be placed on appropriate salary levels?—1; shall differential be made for colored teachers?—1; what shall be the relationship between elementary, junior, and senior-high salaries?—1; should sabbatical leave be provided?—1; shall married men receive higher salaries than single men?—1.

Basic Classification of Salaries—Position or Preparation

"Shall the basic classification of salaries be of the position type or of the preparation (single-salary) type?" The question may oversimplify the situation by suggesting that only two choices are possible. It is true that there are two main types of salary schedules:

1. *Position schedules*, in which the basic groups are established in terms of school positions, such as elementary-school teacher, junior high-school teacher, senior high-school teacher. The elementary-school teacher receives the elementary-school salary, whether he is the graduate of a two-year normal school or the holder of a doctor's degree. This is the traditional type of schedule, in which salaries are lowest in elementary school and highest in senior high school.

2. *Preparation schedules*, also known as single-salary schedules,¹ in which the basic groups are established in terms of the amount of professional training which the teacher has completed. The college graduate receives the salary scheduled for college graduates, whether a teacher of kindergarten children or of seniors in high school—the higher the professional qualifications, the higher the salary.

Within these two basic classifications there are many variations. A number of schedules which recognize both position and preparation are regarded in this bulletin as a subgroup of the position type as described above and are referred to as:

Position-preparation schedules, in which the basic groups are in terms of elementary, junior-high or senior-high teaching, with variations within groups to recognize differing levels of preparation.

The basic classification of salaries was reported as difficult more often than any other question by the superintendents in cities of Groups IV and V, and ties with the fourth question for first rank in Group III (see Table 1). Altho given a lower place in Group I cities, it takes second rank when the entire 212 replies are considered, being mentioned by 40.6 percent of those reporting. The fact that the question receives relatively slight consideration in Group I may be due to the fact that salary schedules have been in effect in those cities for many years, and the basic classification has become rather definitely fixed in an accepted pattern. The question of paying extra amounts in recognition of profes-

sional training higher than the minimum requirements was rated as difficult by 30.2 percent of the superintendents replying.

The factors of experience (recognized as a basis for salary increments in all schedules),

TABLE 2.—POINTS WHICH WOULD BE EMPHASIZED IN A NEW SALARY SCHEDULE, AS REPORTED BY 43 SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS IN SYSTEMS WHERE SALARY SCHEDULES HAVE BEEN ADOPTED RECENTLY

Proposed new emphasis	Groups I and II*	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5
Recognition of efficiency, individual merit.....	1	5	6	12
Single-salary schedule favored.....	2	3	5	10
Recognition of additional training.....	..	1	5	6
Differential for outstanding teachers.....	1	3	1	5
Higher maximum.....	..	1	4	5
Lower minimum; higher maximum.....	..	1	2	3
Longer time to go from minimum to maximum.....	..	..	3	3
Larger increments.....	..	..	2	2
Reduction from maximum in case of decreased efficiency	1	1	..	2
Less emphasis on additional training.....	..	2	..	2
Require summer school work at stated intervals.....	1	..	1	2
Higher training requirements	1	..	1	2
Change from single-salary to position type favored....	1	..	..	1
Elimination of rating as salary determinant.....	1	..	..	1
One minimum salary for elementary and high-school teachers.....	..	1	..	1
Allow salary credit for experience elsewhere.....	..	1	..	1
Differential for married men.	..	..	1	1
Evaluation of additional training submitted for salary credit.....	..	..	1	1
Health examination.....	..	..	1	1
Salaries on 12-month basis..	..	..	1	1
Recognition of extracurriculum work.....	..	..	1	1
Differentiation on basis of teaching load.....	..	..	1	1
Differentiation on basis of dependents.....	..	..	1	1
Higher minimum.....	..	..	1	1
Increments on basis of examination.....	..	..	1	1
More increments.....	..	..	1	1
Smaller increments.....	..	..	1	1
Increments larger in early years of service.....	..	..	1	1
Total replies.....	4	14	25	43

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

¹ Altho the term "preparation schedule" seems to be more accurately descriptive, "single-salary schedule" is also used in this bulletin to refer to the same type of schedule.

sex, and merit are not regarded in this discussion as affecting the basic classification. They are treated in subsequent sections of this bulletin.

Present Practise

In 1930-31, when 1162 school systems reported to the Research Division of the National Education Association on provisions of the salary schedule in effect, 197 schedules, or 17 percent, were of the preparation type and the remaining 83 percent of the position type.² Many of these schedules reported on in 1930-31 had been in effect for many years. The 150 salary schedules of recent adoption (1928 or later) studied in the preparation of this bulletin include a higher proportion of preparation schedules. As shown in Table 3, there are 104 position schedules and 46, or 30.7 percent, of the preparation type.³

Salary classes provided in position schedules—The typical classification in position schedules provides three salary levels, one each for elementary, junior-high, and senior-high positions. None of the 150 schedules examined follows the plan which once was common of paying the lowest salaries in the first grade and

gradually increasing the amounts for each grade. Seven schedules, however, have a separate salary class for kindergarten teachers; 14 others have a separate salary class which applies only to kindergarten assistants or teachers of one-session kindergartens; and 12 schedules provide higher salaries in Grade VII or Grade VIII. Of the 59 schedules which mention junior high-school teachers, 12 include the junior-high teachers in the same salary class as senior-high teachers. Four position schedules provide a salary class for junior college teachers.

Some position schedules, especially those in the larger cities, provide salaries for a long list of professional employees other than regular teachers, setting up separate salary classes for each. A few of the schedules studied simplify the classification by combining many positions in a few groups, named by a letter or number. For example, the positions included in the first two groups of the Pittsburgh schedule are as follows:

Schedule A (\$1200-\$2200; supermaximum, \$3200):

1. Elementary teachers
2. Kindergarten teachers
3. Household economy teachers in elementary centers
4. Speech-improvement, adult foreign, and home class teachers who are fully qualified under state law
5. Teachers of mental deviates
6. Swimming teachers in elementary centers
7. Teachers in special schools—open-air schools, children's hospital, and home for crippled children
8. Advisers to girls who have not qualified as high-school teachers.

Schedule B (\$1800-\$2850; supermaximum, \$3800):

1. Junior high-school teachers
2. Continuation-school teachers
3. Girls' trade-school teachers
4. Manual training teachers in elementary schools and elementary centers
5. Supervisors in the elementary and kindergarten field
6. Pre-vocational school teachers
7. Advisers to girls who have qualified as high-school teachers.

The schedule for Providence, Rhode Island, groups forty-three positions—teachers, super-

TABLE 3.—BASIC CLASSIFICATION OF SALARIES IN 150 CITY SCHOOL SALARY SCHEDULES, BY POPULATION GROUPS AND BY YEARS

Groups; * year of adoption	Position type		Preparation type		Total
	Position only	Position-preparation	Total	(single-salary)	
1	2	3	4	5	6
Group I.....	7	13	20	5	25
Group II.....	2	19	21	11	32
Group III.....	12	19	31	12	43
Group IV.....	5	15	20	8	28
Group V.....	4	8	12	10	22
Total					
Number.....	30	74	104	46	150
Percent.....	20.0	49.3	69.3	30.7	100.0
1928.....	6	9	15	8	23
1929.....	9	18	27	6	33
1930.....	5	15	20	13	33
1931.....	3	7	10	5	15
1932.....	5	6	11	3	14
1933.....	..	8	8	5	13
1934.....	2	11	13	6	19
Total					
Number.....	30	74	104	46	150
Percent.....	20.0	49.3	69.3	30.7	100.0

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

² Based on data in: National Education Association, Research Division. *Special Salary Tabulations, 1930-31*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931.

³ The classification is based on the method of scheduling classroom teachers' salaries, disregarding the plan used for salaries of principals and other employees.

visors, principals, psychologists, student counselors, and others—in three salary classes, providing differentials above or below normal rate for some positions.⁴

Recognition of preparation in position schedules—Almost all position schedules recognize professional preparation indirectly to the extent that initial requirements for appointment are commonly higher for the positions which carry larger salaries, such as high-school teachers. A large number of position schedules, however, make additional variation in salary on the basis of preparation. Table 3 shows that 74 schedules of the 150 studied are of this "position-preparation" type. The methods of recognizing training which were used as a basis for counting the schedules in the "position-preparation" group in Table 3 include the following:

1. Basing the major classifications of salary on position, with sub-classifications in which minimum and maximum salaries vary on the basis of training (49 schedules). For example, an elementary-school teacher will receive an initial salary of \$1100 if a 2-year normal-school graduate, \$1200 if a 3-year graduate, and \$1300 if a graduate of a 4-year college. The 4-year college graduate appointed as teacher in high school, however, will receive not \$1300 but \$1400; the holder of a master's degree appointed to the high school will receive a still higher amount as minimum salary. Maximum salaries will likewise vary with the amount of training. These schedules provide 2, 3, or 4 training levels for elementary-school salaries and most frequently provide 2 levels for junior and senior high-school salaries. There are in addition 6 schedules which provide differences for training in the minimum salary only.

2. Providing a supermaximum salary, the granting of which is conditioned in whole or in part on additional professional training (31 schedules).

3. Requiring teachers to give evidence of additional training, at stated intervals, in order to receive increments or to remain at maximum of schedule (22 schedules).⁵

Salary classes provided in preparation schedules—When teachers are paid by a preparation schedule, they are classified in groups according to the level of professional training

each one has completed, higher minimum and maximum salaries being paid to teachers with higher levels of training. The number of salary groups ranges from 2 to an indefinite number in the 46 preparation type schedules analyzed. The distribution follows:

2 salary levels, in each of	4 schedules
3 " " " " " "	9 "
4 " " " " " "	22 "
5 " " " " " "	1 "
6 " " " " " "	2 "
7 " " " " " "	3 "
13 or more salary levels, in each of	5 schedules

The classification found most frequently recognizes 4 levels of training—2 years, 3 years, 4 years (bachelor's degree), and 5 years (master's degree). Only 2 schedules provide a salary class for less than 2 years of training; 36 begin with the 2-year level; 4 set 3 years of training as the lowest level recognized; and one schedule recognizes no training below the 4-year level. Two schedules provide for one or more levels above 5 years of training. The 5 schedules having 13 or more salary levels base the salary on small units of professional training; in one city a variation is made for each semester hour of credit.

To carry out in full the idea that the term "single-salary schedule" implies, professional requirements would be equally high, whether for teachers of younger or older children. So long as secondary teachers are required to have more training than elementary teachers, there is a differentiation in favor of the secondary schools. Altho the relationship between the training levels in the salary schedule and the requirements for assignment to the various school divisions is not stated in all of the preparation schedules studied, those which give this information show that lower requirements are set for the elementary teachers.⁶

Other bases for classification of salaries—Other schemes of classification have been noted, which in some ways resemble plans of

⁴ For copy of Providence salary classification, 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. 28-29.

⁵ See also the section on "Requirements for Continued Professional Training," in this bulletin.

⁶ The important process of defining the training and other qualifications required for appointment to various positions in the school service is not discussed in this bulletin. The National Education Association passed a resolution in 1920 which has been reaffirmed several times since, in favor of a minimum requirement of four years of professional training for all teachers (*Proceedings*, 1920, p. 24). Helpful suggestions for defining qualifications in terms of training, native ability and personality, teaching experience, residence and family responsibilities, and attitude toward teaching are given in: National Education Association, Research Division. "The Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries." *Research Bulletin* 5: 161-64; May, 1927. See also: National Education Association, Research Division. "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part I: The Selection and Appointment of Teachers." *Research Bulletin* 10: 1-32; January, 1932.

grading the salaries of university faculties. One position-preparation schedule (Summit, New Jersey) provides for dividing the teaching staff into four groups, or levels of experience, as follows:

1. Beginners
2. Journeymen teachers
3. Graduate teachers
4. Master teachers.⁷

The exact basis for salary differentiations for the above groups is not stated in the schedule. Another unusual classification of teaching positions is given in the recently adopted preparation schedule in Inglewood, California:

1. Interpretation teacher
2. Research teacher
3. Regular teacher
4. Special service teacher
5. Assistant teacher.⁸

The salaries of interpretation and research teachers are set by adding certain amounts to the basic preparation schedule, which is paid to the regular and the special service teachers without modification. The assistant teacher receives the basic salary less a fixed amount.

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—Resolutions adopted by the National Education Association in 1920, 1921, and 1922 favor the adoption of salary schedules of the preparation type.⁹ The 1922 resolution reads as follows:

We urge that salaries be based upon professional preparation, the skill attained, and the quality of service rendered, irrespective of the grade or age of the children to be taught.¹⁰

The National Education Association Salary Committee, reporting in 1923, stated it as a principle that "salary schedules should recog-

nize the value of training," and recommended a standard salary schedule of the preparation type, based on five levels of training.¹¹ The National Education Association Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, which served from 1928 to 1935, included in its 1935 report a hypothetical salary schedule of the preparation type.¹²

Local salary studies—Ten of the 22 local salary studies¹³ recommend schedules of the position-preparation type.¹⁴ The San Francisco Citizens study includes a statement in favor of the position schedule, from which the following sentences are quoted:

In some schedules the teacher's salary is based upon the type of certificate held. The injustice of such a classification is quite obvious. It is unsound practice to pay a teacher with a secondary school certificate with training directly related to high school teaching, under assignment to an elementary school, a higher salary than a teacher with an elementary certificate whose training has been specifically designed for elementary school work. . . .

Again there are schedules in other communities which graduate compensation according to the extent of professional training. This is justifiable if the training is immediately related to the field of teaching, but not, as in many actual cases, if it is without regard to its relation to the particular field of work. . . .

A sound salary schedule must be based upon a recognition of essential differences in positions, and gradations of salaries must be in accordance with this principle.¹⁵

Five studies recommend different minimum and maximum salaries within positions, on basis of training (Chicago, Lexington, New York Citizens, New York Board of Estimate, and Springfield). They do not emphasize the advantage of this particular type of schedule organization, except as a step toward the

⁷ For copy of the Summit salary schedule, see: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division, *Organization and Content, Teachers' Salary Schedules*, op. cit., p. 48-49.

⁸ Inglewood, Calif. *Salary Policy for Teachers of Inglewood City Schools*. Inglewood: Board of Education, 1935. p. 16-19. ¶ See also: Cross, Henry A., and DeSilva, Lionel. "The Inglewood Teachers' Salary Policy." *American School Board Journal* 91: 24-25; November, 1935.

⁹ National Education Association. *Proceedings*. 1920, p. 25; 1921, p. 27; 1922, p. 45.

¹⁰ National Education Association, op. cit., 1922, p. 45.

¹¹ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 73, 78.

¹² 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. p. 88. (Published also as the September, 1935, *Research Bulletin* of the National Education Association, 13: 252.)

¹³ A list of the 22 studies is given on p. 97. The studies are referred to in this bulletin by name of city only, without further bibliographical citation.

¹⁴ Chicago, Lexington, Los Angeles, New York Citizens (as a first step preparatory to the later adoption of a preparation schedule), New York Board of Estimate, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, and Springfield.

¹⁵ San Francisco Citizens, p. 25.

adoption of the complete preparation schedule. The following statement is representative:

It has been thought wise not to recommend too drastic a change in the existing salary plan. The single salary schedule is recommended for continued study by the personnel division, in recognition of the probability that educational authorities in Chicago will sooner or later find it desirable to adopt such a provision. The schedules recommended ... represent a modification of the existing provisions in the direction of a greater recognition of training. If they are adopted, the teacher's salary will be determined not only by type of school and length of service, but also, partially, by the amount of training completed.¹⁸

The remaining twelve studies propose schedules of the preparation type. The following statement from the Watertown survey is illustrative of the recommendations in justification of this type of schedule:

The proposed schedule accepts the principle of the single salary schedule: that it is equally important that a teacher be well trained for work in the kindergarten, elementary, or high school. There may have been a time when it required teachers of greater ability and training to educate adolescent than younger children. With the accumulation of scientific knowledge the large importance of the early education of children has become better understood.

Therefore, under the proposed salary schedule, an elementary teacher with four years of professional preparation will receive the same salary as a high school teacher with the same amount of training. This will permit a teacher to work at the particular level where he is likely to render the greatest service uninfluenced by salary considerations.

The incorporation of this principle into the schedule will give Watertown a well-trained staff. It will make impossible a situation such as now exists in which, in some groups, the less well-trained teachers are receiving the higher salaries.

This does not mean that elementary school teachers in Watertown will immediately receive the same salaries as high school teachers. The average high school teacher in Watertown has had two years more training than the typical elementary school teacher, and therefore, will receive a substantially larger salary. The schedule does open the way, however, to any teacher to prepare fully for service at his chosen school level and to receive recognition in salary of such preparation.¹⁷

Individual opinion—There appears to be less emphasis on the issue of the single-salary schedule in recent discussions of salaries than was to be noted a decade ago.¹⁸ Several writers discuss the relative advantages and disadvantages of the preparation schedule, neither recommending nor discouraging its general use.¹⁹ Elsbree emphasizes the importance of a critical evaluation of the professional preparation which is recognized as a basis for differences in salary:

Superintendents of schools have been so delighted by the alacrity with which teachers have met the training requirements for increased compensation that they have frequently lost sight of the fact that the character of the training received is even more important than the quantity. This situation can be largely controlled through careful attention on the part of superintendent, principal, and supervisors to the courses taken by teachers. This does not mean rigid prescription of subject matter; it does mean a careful evaluation of the teacher's preparation at the time of selection and subsequent supervision of her program for further study. To do this intelligently, the superintendent must be familiar both with the courses offered in colleges and universities and with the needs and weaknesses of individual teachers. In no other way can the board of education be assured that additional training will result in improved teaching.²⁰

The arguments in favor of the single-salary plan emphasize the value of retaining teachers of superior ability and qualifications in the elementary grades, the incentive to pursue further training which such schedules provide, and the economic desirability of providing salaries which are commensurate with varying investments in training.²¹ The following statement by Lewis is illustrative:

Teaching in one grade or subject is just as important a service, and requires approximately equivalent skill, as teaching in any other grade or subject and should be so recognized in the schedule of salaries. The same kind of pre-service and in-service training is not required of all but like amounts are required. We are beginning to realize that teaching in the lower grades is as highly a skilled service as teaching elsewhere. This is borne out by modern psychological, psychiatric and med-

¹⁸ Chicago, p. 305.

¹⁷ Watertown, p. 190-91.

¹⁸ See the list of references on the single-salary schedule in: National Education Association, Research Division. "The Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries." *Research Bulletin* 5: 186-89; May, 1927.

¹⁹ For example, see: Clark, R. C. "Principles of Advancing the Salaries of Teachers." *American School Board Journal* 80: 41-42, March, 1930; 50, 142, April, 1930. ¶ Cooke, Dennis H. *Problems of the Teaching Personnel*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. p. 270-72. ¶ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 55-59.

²⁰ Elsbree, *op. cit.*, p. 58. See also: Los Angeles, p. 17; Springfield, p. 102; Yonkers, p. 33.

²¹ For example, see: Ball, C. C. "In Defense of a Single Salary Plan." *Nation's Schools* 15: 39; March, 1935. ¶ Carpenter, W. W., and Capps, A. G. "Unfair to Whom?" *Nation's Schools* 15: 33-34; April, 1935. ¶ Grover, Elbridge C. "Brief Résumé of Studies on the Single-Salary Schedule." *American School Board Journal* 91: 26, 75; July, 1935.

ical opinion. The training of young children is in the opinions of a number of experts a more important service than the training of the same children when they are older. No salary schedule should deprive any level of the service of its finest teachers. Advancement to higher grades or other types of positions should not be used as an incentive. The expert should remain in the field of his specialization. Every grade should be dignified by the retention of its specialists and they should be paid as well as equal service would be paid elsewhere.²²

The arguments on the other side claim that training alone is an inadequate basis for evaluating a teacher's worth to the system; that there is no proof of superior service from elementary-school teachers who have advanced training, as compared with those with two or three years of training; that high-school teaching is more difficult and deserves a higher compensation; and that the added expense of a preparation schedule therefore cannot be justified.²³ Engelhardt suggests that the single-salary schedule is at present less effective than it would be if a plan were developed for greater differentiation among teachers in the kinds of duties assigned to them. He says:

Administrative genius must devise some plan of school organization in which the teaching processes may be carried on to provide occupation for educational workers with varying amounts of professional preparation and different levels of competence. In this type of organization the superior teacher will have under his direction a number of persons of different levels of training and skill. Thus, the schools of the future will be organized to profit by and make efficient use of the one-year, the two-year, the three-year, the four-year, as well as the five-year trained persons.

These people of varying degrees of ability and training will not be employed at the same task, but the work associated with teaching will be so differentiated that each person may be occupied at a level which challenges his best abilities and at a salary commensurate with the services rendered. In such a scheme of things the single salary schedule will have significance, devices to measure teaching ability will have validity, and intelligence will correlate with teaching accomplishment.²⁴

Researches by Morris and Bowles—An evaluation of the preparation schedule was

²² Lewis, E. E. "Desirable Principles of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *American School Board Journal* 80: 45-46; May, 1930.
²³ For example, see: McGinnis, W. C. "The Salary Schedule." *School and Society* 31: 61-62; January 11, 1930. † Shouse, R. D. "The Salary Question: Is It Fair that High School Instructors Are Paid More Than Elementary Teachers?" *Nation's Schools* 15: 25-26; January, 1935.

²⁴ Engelhardt, Fred. "Differentiation in Classroom Teaching." *Educational Administration and Supervision* 16: 321-29; May, 1930.

²⁵ Morris, Lyle L. *The Single Salary Schedule*. Contributions to Education No. 413. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930. 79 p.

²⁶ Morris, Lyle L., *op. cit.*, p. 72, 77.

²⁷ Bowles, Roswell Page. *The Operation and Effects of a Single Salary Schedule*. Contributions to Education, No. 518. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. 140 p.

made by Morris, who studied factors in the salary schedule, cost of salaries, and administrative practise in a group of approximately fifty single-salary cities, making comparisons on certain items with a group of cities having position-type salary schedules.²⁵ He found that the teachers in the first group were somewhat better trained altho training requirements were not significantly different between the two groups of cities. The figures on costs showed no significant differences between the two groups in percent of total current expenses going to teachers' salaries. The single-salary cities showed considerably greater increases in salaries paid elementary-school teachers from 1919-20 to 1925-26, and slightly greater increases in high-school teachers' salaries, than were reported by the other group of cities. There was some evidence that salary costs were being kept down, in the single-salary cities, by increasing the number of pupils per teacher. The percent of men teachers increased equally in both groups of cities in the period from 1920 to 1926.

The following statements are quoted from the summary of Morris' study:

The single salary schedule as now operated will not suffice. Its measures are inadequate and inequitable especially from the standpoint of the better teachers. The number of years of college training is not a fair measure of a teacher's worth. There are two primary faults inherent in this measure. The first is that no college can guarantee that the training given will produce an efficient teacher. The second fault is that there is such a divergence in the quality of the training secured by different individuals at different institutions. . . .

Perhaps the most serious indictment that may be made against the single salary as it is being operated is that attention is given chiefly to the amount of training alone and that too little attention is being given to the kind of training secured.²⁶

Bowles studied the operation and effects of the single-salary schedule from 1923-24 to 1930-31 in Newport News, Virginia, comparing it with a neighboring city where a position schedule was in effect, and with other cities in the state.²⁷ The conclusions from his study include the following statements:

The changes which took place with respect to the composition and qualifications of the teaching corps while the single salary schedule was in operation were desirable. Better prepared teachers were secured, equally well-trained teachers were provided at every stage of the children's development, teachers were placed upon a professional basis which provided equal opportunity for careers in positions in which the most effective work might be done; these certainly are desirable changes.

The most significant difference found between the single salary city and the regular salary cities was the degree to which the training of the teachers in the former exceeded the training of teachers in the latter....

In this instance and during the particular period

²⁸ Bowles, Rosewell Page, *op. cit.*, p. 115-16, 121, 123.

Minimum Salaries

"What amounts shall be paid as minimum salaries?" This question was rated among the most difficult in salary scheduling by 34.9 percent of the school officials reporting. It ranks third in frequency among the ten questions for Groups III, IV, and V, but is ninth in rank for Groups I and II. To answer the question, thought must be given to the standard of living which the young teacher should be able to maintain, and the professional preparation required of new appointees. The minimum salaries being paid in comparable and possibly competing school systems, the opportunities in other occupations, and the ability of the community to finance the schedule must be recognized.¹ The disadvantages of a low minimum may be balanced against the advantages of a high maximum. The relative amounts to be paid in elementary and secondary schools, or for different levels of training, must be considered. The question of fixing minimum salaries needs to be considered in relation to the further problem of establishing the maximum salary.²

Present Practise

The most recent comprehensive figures on minimum and maximum salaries scheduled for

of the operation of the single salary schedule, the schedule had not caused any greater increase in instruction costs than had taken place in the regular salary city....

The percentage of men teachers increased in about the same amount in both the single and the regular salary cities during the period of this study....

The single salary schedule principle is recommended to superintendents of schools as being a means of economically securing a better trained, more efficient, satisfied teaching staff. With careful adaptations to suit local conditions, refinements of means for measuring a teacher's worth, and a continuing study of the operation and effects upon the teaching staff the superintendent of schools should be able to get desirable results from inaugurating a single salary schedule.²⁸

city teachers are those reported by the Research Division for the school year 1930-31.³ Table 4 reports the medians of the minimum salaries scheduled in that year, for 1162 cities reporting. It should be remembered that half of the school systems paid lower minimum salaries and half paid higher salaries than the figures shown in Table 4.

Relative amounts in three school divisions—The relative position of teachers in elementary, junior high schools, and senior high schools as to minimum salaries is also shown in Table 4. The beginning teacher, in 1930-31, typically was paid from 11 to 14 percent more for service in junior high school than in elementary school. For high-school service the difference above elementary-school salaries was from 21 to 27 percent. When compared with corresponding figures for 1922-23, it appears that junior-high salaries in 1930-31 were nearer the level of senior-high salaries but senior-high salaries were not so far above elementary salaries as they were in 1922-23.

Relative amounts for varying levels of training—The minimum salaries reported in Table 4 are organized on the basis of position. Figures are given in Table 5 on minimum salaries for the different training levels in the 46

¹ Common practise in other school systems, salaries paid in other occupations, and the limitation of financial resources are considerations in fixing both minimum and maximum salaries. For discussion of these topics, see: National Education Association, Research Division, "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures." *Research Bulletin* 14: 1-48; January, 1936.

² See section on "Maximum Salaries" in this bulletin.

³ National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931.

Figures on minimum and maximum salaries were collected by the Research Division in its 1932-33 salary study but were not summarized; they were not collected at all in 1934-35. The administration of salary schedules during those years was affected by depression conditions so as to make figures on salary provisions unreliable.

TABLE 4.—MINIMUM SALARIES PAID TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, 1930-31, AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP, 1930-31 AND 1922-23 (ELEMENTARY = 100)

School division; year	Group I ^a	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
1	2	3	4	5	6
Medians of minimum salaries scheduled, 1930-31:					
Elementary.....	\$1,227	\$1,084	\$1,068	\$1,056	\$ 999
Junior high.....	1,390	1,234	1,187	1,195	1,135
Senior high.....	1,507	1,344	1,294	1,288	1,269
Index of relationship, 1930-31:					
Elementary.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	113.3	113.8	111.1	113.2	113.6
Senior high.....	122.8	124.0	121.2	122.0	127.0
Index of relationship, 1922-23:					
Elementary.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	113.2	113.6	108.4	113.3	111.9
Senior high.....	123.7	133.6	124.8	130.2	132.4

Read table as follows: In Group I cities the median of minimum salaries scheduled for elementary teachers in 1930-31 was \$1227, for junior high-school teachers, \$1390. If the elementary salary is given the value 100, then the junior high-school salary has a value of 113.3, or is 13.3 percent higher than the elementary salary. Similarly read figures for other positions and population groups. The figures on index of relationship for 1922-23 are similarly computed, on the basis of figures not reproduced in this bulletin.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923." *Research Bulletin* 1: 139-251; May, 1923; and National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931.

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

preparation schedules among the 150 given special study for this bulletin. Table 5 reports the median of the minimum salaries at each level of training, and the index of relationship, with the 2-year training level as the point of reference. For this small group of schedules, the minimum salary at the 4-year training level is \$266 above the 2-year level, a difference of 25.5 percent. This relationship is very similar to that shown between elementary and high-school salaries in Table 4. The 5-year level is \$373 above the 2-year level, or 35.8 percent higher.

Recognition of experience in fixing initial salary—The minimum salary is not necessarily the initial salary. Many schedules include provisions for the evaluation of previous experience for the purpose of placing new teachers at the appropriate level of the salary schedule;

TABLE 5.—MINIMUM SALARIES PAID IN 46 PREPARATION SCHEDULES, AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP (TWO YEARS' TRAINING = 100)

Level of training	Number of schedules ^a	Median of minimum salaries	Index
1	2	3	4
2 years.....	38	\$1,042	100.0
3 years.....	34	1,141	109.5
4 years (or bachelor's degree)...	43	1,308	125.5
5 years (or master's degree)...	35	1,415	135.8

^a Two schedules reported monthly salaries only; one did not report definite amounts of minimum salaries; others did not include all training levels.

62 of the 150 recent schedules refer to such a practise. In some of these systems the newly appointed teacher may not be placed above the third or fourth step of the schedule; others give full credit for previous experience. The general purpose of such provisions is to enable a local school system to employ experienced teachers who would be unwilling to accept a beginner's salary. Standiford, reporting on provisions of salary schedules in 148 cities of 20,000 to 50,000 in population, noted the following practises with regard to evaluating previous teaching experience:⁴

Full value	57 cities
Full value up to 2 years.....	1
Full value up to 3 years.....	3
Full value up to 5 years.....	2
Full value up to 6 years.....	5
Full value up to 8 years.....	1
Full value up to 10 years.....	1
Full value less one year.....	4
Half value	5
Partial value according to judgment of superintendent	66
No value	3
	148

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—No recent report of the National Education Association has mentioned a specific amount as a recommended minimum salary for teachers. Such a recommendation was made in 1923, when the Salary Committee suggested \$1200 as a minimum salary for the teacher with 2 years of professional training in Group V cities.⁵

⁴ 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. 64.

⁵ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 78.

Higher rates were recommended for larger systems, \$1300 for Groups IV and III, \$1400 for Group II, and \$1500 for Group I, with differentials upward for higher levels of training. The figures in Table 4 show that this modest standard is still far from realization.

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association, in its Sixth Yearbook, states two principles which relate to minimum salaries:

A fundamental principle in the payment of teachers is that even the teacher with the minimum qualifications required by law should receive at least as much as it will cost her to live at the minimum standard necessary for the maintenance and improvement of her efficiency.... In many school systems the cost of maintaining a minimum comfort standard of living for the single woman living away from home may be used satisfactorily to determine the beginning salary for teachers with the minimum qualifications. Whether or not a school system should pay more than this amount to its beginning teachers will depend upon... the calibre and training of the beginners whom it desires to recruit; the degree of competition from other systems; and the financial ability of the community....

The schedule should avoid overpaying beginning teachers at the expense of teachers with long records of successful experience.⁶

The Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, reporting in 1935, suggests that minimum salaries be established as follows:

It is recommended that the minimum salary for teachers be tentatively established at a figure not less than one and one-third times the total annual cost of appropriate necessities for an inexperienced teacher without dependents, and living apart from relatives but not maintaining a home. Thus, if the cost of appropriate necessities for an inexperienced teacher in a given community were found to be \$900, the recommended minimum salary would be not less than \$1200. This amount would permit the average beginning teacher rooming and boarding in that community to pay for all necessities out of 75 percent of income, and to have left 10 percent for saving, 5 percent for giving, and 10 percent for betterments.

However, if the salary so determined were found to be significantly less than the average income obtainable by inexperienced persons of equivalent abil-

ity and training in other lines of work, it might need to be raised in order to attract the kind of individuals desired as teachers. Some communities will wish to raise the minimum still further so as to attract the best inexperienced persons available.⁷

"Appropriate necessities," as the term is used by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, include food, rent, house operation, clothing, taxes, interest, health, transportation, and miscellaneous items. The average amounts used for these purposes in 1932-33 by 430 single women teachers rooming and boarding were reported to the Committee as follows:⁸

	Amount
Food, rent, and house operation..	\$521
Clothing	222
Taxes	26
Interest	20
Health	113
Transportation	132
Miscellaneous	79
Total necessities	\$1,113

The figures just given, for this group of experienced teachers, do not include aid to dependents, gifts, donations, education, recreation, and savings, which totaled \$788 in addition to the cost of necessities.

Cost of living at appropriate standard as a basis for the minimum salary—One standard which is proposed frequently in connection with the minimum salary is that the beginning teacher's salary, at the very lowest, shall not be less than twice the average cost of board and room.⁹ This represents a bare subsistence wage, to which varying amounts are added for savings, training, and other purposes. The Nashville survey calls attention to the subjective elements that enter into the determination of the subsistence wage:

Shall it be the "subsistence wage" computed on the average cost for room and board of such white teachers as board or live at home, that is, two times \$545.00 or \$1090.00? Or shall it be the "subsistence wage" computed on the average cost for such teach-

⁶ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. *The Economic Welfare of Teachers*. Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. p. 20, 33-34.

⁷ 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. p. 87. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 251.)

⁸ National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, *op. cit.*, p. 96. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 260.)

⁹ For example, see: Chicago, p. 300; Cincinnati (average cost of housing and food as 60 percent), p. 37; Lexington, p. 27; Los Angeles, p. 25-27, 70; Nashville, p. 239; Yonkers (55 percent), p. 16. ¶ Also: Eells, Walter Crosby. *Teachers' Salaries and the Cost of Living*. Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1933. 94 p. ¶ 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. ¶ Woods, Roy C. "A Technique for the Determination of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *Kadelphian Review* 12: 183-85; January, 1933.

ers as support families and keep house, that is, two times \$1,353.00 or \$2,706.00? The answer to this question involves profound educational and sociological considerations which have probably never been faced by any American commonwealth or city. It must, however, be frankly admitted that data essential to a satisfactory answer are not available.¹⁰

The New York study accepts the principle that average expense for food and rent should not exceed 55 percent of the basic annual salary of the "indispensable teacher" who, for the elementary school, is judged to be the unmarried woman living away from home; and for the high school, the married man with a wife and one child.¹¹ The 55 percent standard is not aimed at for the first year, but after six years of service for the elementary teacher and after eight years for the high-school teacher.

The Chicago study suggests that the consideration of teachers' salaries should not begin at the minimum or maximum salary but at the average level for the competent teacher who has passed the probationary period and has not yet acquired any special superiority.¹² It mentions the following items which this average salary should provide: basic subsistence; provision for emergencies; reasonable comfort and decency in living standards; and professional culture and study.

Differential on basis of professional preparation—The desirability of recognizing differing levels of professional preparation by amounts large enough to make a return on the investment in training is recommended frequently. A number of these recommendations have been summarized by Eells.¹³ Ross, Reeves, and Russell estimate that additional training of one year justifies an added salary

of \$75 per year, in the schools of Kentucky.¹⁴ Almack and Lang on a different basis work it out as \$126 a year.¹⁵ Elsbree estimates that an added year of training warrants an increase of \$200 in annual compensation.¹⁶ Staffelbach, by including the factors of investment, deferred earnings, depreciation over a period of 30 years, and risk, arrives at a figure of \$234.¹⁷ The Cleveland study estimates the average cost of professional preparation to be \$700 a year; the total cost of 4 years' training with accrued interest, \$3177; and the amount per year to amortize the investment in 36 years, \$217.¹⁸ The proposed Los Angeles schedule allows \$109 for an additional year of training;¹⁹ the Nashville survey, \$69.²⁰ The average of the seven estimates of a fair salary allowance for each additional year of professional preparation is \$147. The wide range of the estimates, from \$69 to \$234, is due largely to differences in (1) estimated cost of initial training, (2) rates of interest allowed, and (3) number of years allowed to amortize the investment.

In the hypothetical salary schedule proposed by the Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, the salary differential for each successive year of training is only \$100 in the first year of service, while for teachers of ten years' experience the corresponding differential for each year of training is \$600.²¹

Relationship to maximum salary—Several writers have suggested that salary schedules in the past have tended to overpay the inexperienced teacher at the expense of the teacher of proved competence who is following the teaching profession as a life work.²²

¹⁰ Nashville, p. 231.

¹¹ New York Citizens, p. 146-48.

¹² Chicago, p. 298-99.

¹³ Eells, Walter Crosby, *op. cit.*, p. 80-81.

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

¹⁵ Almack, John C., and Lang, Albert R. *Problems of the Teaching Profession*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. p. 248.

¹⁶ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 100.

¹⁷ Staffelbach, Elmer H. *California Teachers Salaries*. San Francisco: California Teachers Association, 1932. p. 21. See also: Long Beach, Calif. *Staff and Salary Survey of the Long Beach City Schools*. (By E. H. Staffelbach.) Long Beach: Affiliated Teachers of Long Beach, 1935. p. 16-17.

¹⁸ Cleveland, p. 40.

¹⁹ Los Angeles, p. 82.

²⁰ Nashville (half of amounts allowed for investment in training to teacher with two years of preparation, first year of service), p. 239.

²¹ National Education Association, Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, *op. cit.*, p. 88. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 252.)

²² For example see: San Francisco Citizens, p. 27. § Lewis, Ervin Eugene. *Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff*. New York: Century Co., 1925. 287-88. § Norton, John K. "Major Trends in Teacher Salary Scheduling." *Teachers College Record* 32: 719-23; May, 1931.

Cubberley, in commenting on certain weaknesses of salary schedules, says:

Another defect, and one that tends to keep teaching from becoming a professional service, is that the beginning salary is frequently too high and the maximum salary is reached too soon. These conditions tend to attract into teaching many who use it merely as a well-paid temporary employment, thus increasing the turnover in the teaching ranks. The beginning salary need not be high, if the service increments continue for a long time.²³

The Chicago study also suggests that the minimum must be thought of in its relation to the upper end of the scale:

A definite amount of money in the salary fund may be distributed over a wide range or compacted within narrow limits. The lower the low end, the higher the upper end may be. The compacted distribution is suitable to a group whose characteristics and whose needs vary but little. The wider range has certain applications which indicate that it fits the teaching situation better.²⁴

Methods used in local studies for establishing minimum salaries—Few of the 22 local salary studies indicate the mathematical processes used in arriving at the minimum salaries recommended. The Los Angeles study sets the minimum for high-school teachers by comparison with the average minimum salaries for comparable cities.²⁵ The minimum for elementary teachers is based on the salary of the old schedule, plus \$109 which is estimated as the amount necessary to amortize in thirty years the cost of an additional year of professional preparation which was added to the entrance requirements in 1930.²⁶

The Nashville report uses the following method for determining the initial salary of a teacher without experience, with 2 years of preparation:²⁷

Cost of room and board for twelve months multiplied by two ("subsistence wage")	\$1,092.00
Savings, ten percent of "subsistence wage"	109.20
Reimbursement, two and a half percent of capital invested in training and accrued interest (\$750 a year plus \$112.50 accrued interest)	40.31

Interest at six percent for one year on capital invested in training and accrued interest. (This item is reduced yearly as investment in training is amortized over period of 40 years) 96.75

Initial salary \$1,338.26

In similar manner the initial salaries of inexperienced teachers with 3, 4, 5, and 6 years of training are determined.

As indicated on page 64, the New York Citizens study arrives at the proposed minimum salaries by working downward from a computed basic salary.²⁸ The average expenditure for food and rent reported by the "indispensable group" of high-school teachers—the married man with wife and one child—was \$2169. Taking this amount as 55 percent, the basic salary of \$3900 was computed. According to the report, the committee then "decided that there should be four beginning increments of \$192 per year followed by increments of \$252 and that high-school teachers should arrive at the basic salary after eight years of service."²⁹ The minimum salary was established by this method. A similar process was used in fixing salaries of elementary-school teachers.

The Lexington salary study shows that \$1074 represents approximately twice the median cost of board and room for local teachers for one year, suggesting that without other considerations this figure would seem to represent the appropriate basic salary.³⁰ However, it is pointed out that the young teachers appear to receive some assistance from parents and relatives and are less likely to have dependents than the older teachers. Mention is made also of the desirability of setting the maximum salary at a higher level than in the past. The minimum salary recommended then is slightly less than twice the cost of board and room, \$1000 for white teachers and \$850 for negro teachers. The salary ratio of 100 to 85 for white and negro teachers is maintained thruout the proposed Lexington schedule, based on a consideration of the relative

²³ Cubberley, Ellwood P. *State School Administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927. p. 656.

²⁴ Chicago, p. 300.

²⁵ Los Angeles, p. 74.

²⁶ Los Angeles, p. 17, 82.

²⁷ Nashville, p. 239. See also the formula based on subsistence, training, improvement, experience, teaching-load, and efficiency, proposed in: Almack, John C., and Lang, Albert R., *op. cit.*, p. 248-49.

²⁸ New York Citizens, p. 147, 156.

²⁹ New York Citizens, p. 147-49.

³⁰ Lexington, p. 29.

living costs for the two groups of teachers and "the general tradition of the South that negroes and whites are not to be paid equivalent salaries for equivalent work."³¹

Altho it is possible that at some future time a mathematical formula for determining teachers' salaries will be developed which will gain general acceptance, there are wide differences among the proposals so far made. The more typical procedure for fixing salaries at present appears to be that stated by the San Francisco Citizens Committee:

The fact remains and must be conceded initially that no matter how fully the data are investigated and tabulated, no matter how thoroughly each factor of an ideal salary schedule may be analyzed, the

final result cannot be a scientific, mathematical formula for the only solution of the problem. The setting up of a salary schedule is after all a matter of human relationship; each situation must be approached in the light of its peculiar conditions and the facts studied and analyzed in such fashion as to temper conclusions by practical considerations.

The various aspects of a problem involving the delicate task of appraisal of intangibles makes it possible to reach somewhat varying conclusions with almost equal justification. There is no way of completely reconciling these differences. We could do no more than give the data available the closest scrutiny, testing and adjusting tentative conclusions with the aid of expert opinion. The decisions reached by us and embodied in the recommendations of this report may not be proof against criticism but we feel confident that in the main they are accurate and just.³²

³¹ Lexington, p. 25-27. See also: Caliver, Ambrose. *Education of Negro Teachers*. National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Vol. IV. U. S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1933, No. 10. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1933. p. 41-43. ↑ Cooke, Dennis H. "Adequacy of Teachers' Salaries." *Peabody Journal of Education* 2: 145-53; January, 1934.

³² San Francisco Citizens, p. 4. See also: Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 219-314. Morrison claims that "the whole apparatus of cost of living, desirable culture levels, extent of training, measured merit, which are the customary criteria in use in determining salaries" is the wrong approach. He emphasizes instead low risk and retirement pay—economic factors which belong naturally to the socialized services.

Maximum Salaries

"What amounts shall be paid as maximum salaries?" Ninety-four of the superintendents replying to the questionnaire, or 44.3 percent, stated that this question was among the three most difficult to answer. It was either first or second in frequency in all population groups.

Among the factors to be considered in establishing the maximum salary are the upper levels of salaries in other school systems and in other occupations, the cost of an appropriate standard of living for the mature teacher with typical adult responsibilities, recognition of level of professional preparation, relative amounts to be paid in different school positions, the increased value which years of experience bring to a teacher's services, and resources for financing the schedule. When differentials are made for sex and for merit these provisions affect the maximum salary. The maximum salary is perhaps the most important economic factor in determining whether competent persons will decide to devote themselves to the teaching service of a community as a professional career.

Present Practise

Amounts; relationships among salary classes
—The medians of maximum salaries paid in

cities of various sizes in 1930-31 are reported in Table 6, also the ratio of other maximum salaries to the amounts scheduled for elementary-school teachers in 1930-31 and 1922-23. When Table 6, on maximum salaries, is compared with Table 4, on minimum salaries, it is noted that the relative positions of salaries in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools are almost the same, whether minimum or maximum salaries are considered, in Groups I and II. In Groups III, IV, and V the difference between elementary- and high-school salaries is slightly greater at the maximum than at the minimum salary.

Table 7 shows the relative position of the maximum salaries in each classification of 46 single-salary schedules. These figures may be compared with Table 5. It appears that the differences between the lowest and the highest levels of training are less at the maximum than at the minimum salary.

Relationship of maximum salary to minimum—An important question in connection with the maximum salary is the amount of difference between the lowest salary and the highest. Table 8 gives this information for elementary, junior-high, and senior-high teachers, using index numbers with the mini-

imum salary as 100. The table shows a marked change between 1922-23 and 1930-31 in the range between minimum and maximum salaries. In Group I cities, for example, maximum salaries paid elementary teachers in 1922-23 averaged only 52.6 percent higher than the minimum salaries; by 1930-31 they were 85.8 percent higher. Similar increases are shown for other school divisions and other groups.

Supermaximum salaries—The figures on maximum salaries in Table 6 are derived from tabulations in which the highest salary scheduled is recorded as the maximum. In many cities this amount is a "supermaximum" which may be from \$100 to \$1000 or more above the maximum salary attainable by all teachers who render satisfactory service. A study of certain salary schedule policies in 1930-31 revealed that a supermaximum salary was pro-

TABLE 6.—MAXIMUM SALARIES PAID TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY, JUNIOR HIGH, AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, 1930-31, AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP, 1930-31 AND 1922-23 (ELEMENTARY = 100)

School division; year	Group I ^a	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
1	2	3	4	5	6
Medians of maximum salaries scheduled, 1930-31:					
Elementary.....	\$2,280	\$1,996	\$1,729	\$1,611	\$1,411
Junior high.....	2,671	2,267	2,008	1,854	1,657
Senior high.....	2,840	2,469	2,253	2,097	1,983
Index of relationship, 1930-31:					
Elementary.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	117.1	113.6	116.1	115.1	117.4
Senior high.....	124.6	123.7	130.3	130.2	140.5
Index of relationship, 1922-23:					
Elementary.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	127.9	108.9	110.1	106.6	114.8
Senior high.....	132.3	122.4	141.7	128.1	135.5

Read table as follows: In Group I cities the median of maximum salaries scheduled for elementary teachers in 1930-31 was \$2280, for junior high-school teachers, \$2671. If the elementary salary is given the value 100, then the junior high-school salary has a value of 117.1, or is 17.1 percent higher than the elementary salary. Similarly read figures for other positions and population groups. The figures on index of relationship for 1922-23 are similarly computed, on the basis of figures not reproduced in this bulletin.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923." *Research Bulletin* 1: 139-251; May, 1923; and National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931.

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

TABLE 7.—MAXIMUM SALARIES PAID IN 46 PREPARATION SCHEDULES, AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP (TWO YEARS' TRAINING = 100)

Level of training	Number of schedules ^a	Median of maximum salaries	Index
1	2	3	4
2 years.....	38	\$1,750	100.0
3 years.....	36	1,800	102.9
4 years (or bachelor's degree).....	44	2,000	114.3
5 years (or master's degree).....	38	2,150	122.9

^a Two schedules reported monthly salaries only; others did not include all training levels.

vided in 44.1 percent of the 1153 city school systems reporting.¹ In some school systems the supermaximum is available only to the select few who have demonstrated outstanding ability. In others, where the supermaximum appears to be a more or less automatic scale of additional increments beyond the normal maximum, given to any teacher who meets certain training requirements, the supermaximum tends to become the normal maximum for all teachers. The bases for granting a supermaximum, as reported by 509 school systems in 1930-31, are as follows:

Additional training, in 66.4 percent of the cities
Superior rating and performance, in 57.0 percent of the cities

Extra duties, in 55.4 percent of the cities

Length of service, in 30.0 percent of the cities

Written examination, in 0.6 percent of the cities.²

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—The resolutions of the National Education Association for more than seventy years have been urging adequate compensation for teaching. Altho the resolutions do not refer to the maximum salary, the continuing emphasis has been on salaries which shall be commensurate with the professional standards and demands on teachers, factors which are related to the level of the maximum salary. A resolution in 1898 is typical:

We are glad to recognize that the schools exist solely for the education of the pupils, and not as a means of support for teachers; yet, because of the increasing demands made upon teachers, and the exacting character of their preparation and work, it is in the public interest that their compensation be so adjusted as to encourage them to make teach-

¹ National Education Association, Research Division. "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part II: The Retention, Promotion, and Improvement of Teachers." *Research Bulletin* 10: 45; March, 1932.

ing a life work, and to secure recognition for long-continued service and efficiency.²

The 1923 report of the Salary Committee³ includes a number of principles which have been widely quoted.⁴ Each of the three general principles, if acted upon in setting up a salary schedule, would tend in most communities to raise the level of maximum salaries:

1. Salary schedules should tend to make teaching a profession.
2. Salary schedules should serve to secure and retain competent and desirable people as teachers.
3. Salary schedules should assure a maximum of service and professional growth from all teachers.⁵

TABLE 8.—INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP OF MAXIMUM SALARY FOR TEACHERS TO MINIMUM SALARY, 1930-31 AND 1922-23 (MINIMUM SALARY=100)

School division; year	Index of relationship, minimum salary=100				
	Group I ^a	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
1	2	3	4	5	6
Elementary:					
1930-31.....	185.8	184.1	161.9	152.6	141.2
1922-23.....	152.6	163.1	139.5	137.8	131.4
Junior high:					
1930-31.....	192.2	183.7	169.2	155.1	146.0
1922-23.....	172.4	156.4	141.6	129.7	134.7
Senior high:					
1930-31.....	188.5	183.7	174.1	162.8	156.3
1922-23.....	163.1	149.5	158.4	135.6	134.5

Read table as follows: In 1930-31 the median of maximum salaries scheduled for elementary teachers in Group I cities was 85.8 percent higher than the median of minimum salaries for the same position. In 1922-23 the maximum was 52.6 percent higher than the minimum. (The figures for 1930-31 are based on those given in Tables 4 and 6. When the minimum salary of \$1227 is given the value of 100, the maximum salary of \$2280 then has the value of 185.8, or is 85.8 percent higher than the minimum for the position. The figures for 1922-23 are similarly computed, on the basis of figures not reproduced in this bulletin.) Similarly read figures for other positions and population groups.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931; and National Education Association, Research Division. "Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923." *Research Bulletin* 1: 139-251; May, 1923.

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

The relationship of maximum salaries to appropriate standards of living for teachers is emphasized in the Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Classroom Teachers, which makes this recommendation:

The maximum salary offered should be at least sufficient to support a family of average size at a genuinely cultural standard of living. This does not mean that teachers should be paid different amounts according to the number of dependents they have. It means, rather, that because the raising of a family is a normal and desirable function, it should be adequately provided for at the upper levels of the salary scale. If this is not done, many competent persons will either be driven from the educational profession, or prevented from maintaining their maximum efficiency.⁶

The desirability of providing a supermaximum salary for outstanding service is also recommended in the Sixth Yearbook:

The salary schedule should be sufficiently flexible to care for special cases of unusual merit.... It is wise to make provision for special cases of obviously unusual success in teaching. One way of meeting this need is to establish one or more supermaximum levels above the normal maximum, for persons who deserve additional reward for preeminently valuable service.⁷

Using cost and standard of living as a basic criterion, the National Education Association Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher offers the following suggestion for determining maximum salaries:

It is recommended that wherever financial resources permit, the maximum salary for teachers be tentatively established at a figure not less than twice the total annual cost of appropriate necessities for an experienced teacher, these necessities to include the maintenance of a home and adequate provision for the average number of persons dependent upon such teachers for support. Thus, if the cost of appropriate necessities for an experienced teacher in a given community were found to be \$1750, the recommended maximum salary would be not less than \$3500. This amount would enable the average teacher maintaining a home in that community to pay for all necessities, including the maintenance of a home for himself and dependents, out of 50 percent of income.

² National Education Association. *Proceedings*. 1898, p. 35.

³ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington D. C.: the Association, 1923. 115 p.

⁴ For example, see: Closter, p. 119; Jacksonville, p. 83; Lynn, p. 157; Also: Lewis, Ervin Eugene. *Personnel Problems of the Teaching Staff*. New York: Century Co., 1925. p. 284-88.

⁵ National Education Association, Salary Committee, *op. cit.*, p. 71-77.

⁶ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. *The Economic Welfare of Teachers*. Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. p. 33.

⁷ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

However, if the maximum arrived at in this manner were found to be less than the average income received by persons of similar ability, training, and experience in other occupational groups, it might need to be increased somewhat in order to attract persons of the calibre needed in teaching. Some communities may find it desirable to raise the maximum still further in order to attract the very best teaching talent available.⁸

Relationship of maximum salary to minimum—It is frequently urged that the maximum salary should be substantially larger than the beginning salary.⁹ The San Francisco study recommends that the maximum salary be double the salary of a beginner.¹⁰ Cubberley suggests that the maximum salary should be from two to two and a half times the minimum and that it should be reached after 18 or 20 years of service.¹¹ Of the schedules recommended by the 22 studies, 18 meet the suggested standard of providing maximum salaries twice as large as those at the minimum. In three of the preparation schedules the maximum is nearer three times the minimum (Fort Worth, Holyoke, Watertown).

Supermaximum salary—An opportunity to place a few teachers of outstanding qualifications at a salary above the general level of teachers, thus adding a desirable element of flexibility in the administration of the salary schedule, is provided by a supermaximum salary. As defined by Elsbree, the supermaximum salary provides one or more additional salary steps beyond the normal maximum "for the elect few who are fortunate enough to qualify for it."¹² Since the supermaximum thus is necessarily limited in its application, he urges that the normal maximum should first be established at an adequate amount before considering a supermaximum salary.

Nine of the 22 local salary studies recommend a supermaximum salary. In two studies the supermaximum is based on extra training (New York Citizens, San Diego); in two on outstanding service (Closter, Lexington); and in the others (Chicago, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco

Teachers, Yonkers) on both training and service. The Chicago study agrees with those for Lexington, Pittsburgh Citizens, and Yonkers, in specifying that the supermaximum salary be made available only to a relatively small proportion of the staff.

The use of written examinations as a measure of a teacher's professional preparation, to be considered as a factor in determining whether or not a teacher shall pass from the maximum of one salary group to the next salary group, or to a supermaximum salary, is mentioned in several local studies.¹³ The significance of such a policy, already in effect in Chicago, is discussed in the Chicago survey, but is not recommended for use in the proposed schedule.

Methods used in local studies for establishing maximum salaries—The studies for Los Angeles and Nashville report in some detail the mathematical processes used in arriving at the maximum salaries recommended; the New York study indicates that the maximum salary was fixed in relation to a computed basic salary¹⁴ but does not explain the calculation in full.

In the Los Angeles study twelve possible amounts for the maximum salary of high-school teachers are computed, on the following bases:

1. Salaried employees, National Bureau of Economic Research study, 1927.
2. Los Angeles positions, professional workers in private employ.
3. Los Angeles positions, non-professional workers in private employ.
4. U. S. Government Personnel Classification Board, second class professional salaries, 1930.
5. Los Angeles Fire Department, privates.
6. Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering, assistant engineers.
7. Los Angeles union scale, skilled trades.
8. United States family incomes, median of income class \$2000 to \$5000.
9. The cost of living, Los Angeles high-school man teacher, standard family of 3.5, \$2836 plus 10 percent for savings.

⁸ 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. p. 87. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 251.)

⁹ For example, see: Hart, F. W., and Peterson, L. H. "Professional Salary Scale Forms." *American School Board Journal* 80: 42-43; June, 1930. ¹⁰ Lewis, E. E. "Desirable Principles of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *American School Board Journal* 80: 45-46; May, 1930. ¹¹ See also references cited in paragraph on "Relationship to maximum salary," on p. 64 of this bulletin.

¹² San Francisco Citizens, p. 27.

¹³ Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Public School Administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1929. p. 396.

¹⁴ Elsbree, Willard S., *op. cit.*, p. 67.

¹⁵ Chicago, p. 279, 313; New York Citizens, p. 118-19; San Francisco Teachers, p. 94.

¹⁶ See page 64 of this bulletin, for explanation of method of computing basic salary in New York study.

10. Twice the cost of rent and food of the standard family of 3.5 (\$1521 x 2).
11. Average normal maximum paid in cities studied.
12. Median normal maximum paid in cities studied.¹⁵

In the case of average or median salaries, 13.6 percent is added to arrive at the computed maximum, and for positions typically requiring less than five years' professional training (the requirement for Los Angeles high-school teachers) \$109 is added for each additional year of training to bring the salary to a five-year training level. The twelve salaries are averaged to arrive at the maximum salary proposed for Los Angeles high-school teachers, \$3330, which is used as a point of reference for fixing all other salaries in the schedule.

A computed maximum for each of 79 ranks or positions in the Los Angeles school system

then is presented, based on the ratio of the maximum salaries for the ranks named to the maximum salaries of senior high-school teachers in sixteen comparable school systems and in Los Angeles. The proposed schedule recommends maximum salaries which are substantially the same as the computed maximums for all groups except kindergarten teachers, elementary teachers, junior high-school teachers, counselors and registrars in high school, attendance officers, and certain administrative and supervisory officers.

In the proposed Nashville schedule the maximum salary is determined by adding \$800 (the median total amount of increments paid in comparable cities) to the computed minimum salaries, making an adjustment of allowance for interest on account of partial reimbursement of capital invested in preparation.¹⁶

¹⁵ Los Angeles, p. 74.

¹⁶ Nashville, p. 236-41.

Increments

"How many increments shall there be in progressing from minimum to maximum salary?" The one basis for variation in pay which is used in all salary schedules for teachers is experience, recognized by additional amounts in salary. The increases are so frequently granted on a yearly basis, beginning with the second year of experience in the school system and continuing until the maximum is reached, that they are often called "annual increments." Sixty-nine, or nearly a third, of the superintendents replying to the questionnaire, ranked the question on the number of increments among the three most difficult in salary scheduling. Several indicated in their replies that a related inquiry on the amounts of the increases was assumed as a part of the question. Salary increments are usually discussed in connection with recognition of the value of years of teaching experience, so that the amount is sometimes adjusted on that basis. The granting of the increment may be conditioned on the meeting of certain requirements as to professional preparation or teaching efficiency. According to another point of view, the salary increment is not a reward for service but a device for getting a teacher from

the bottom of the salary schedule to the top at a rate of progress which will recognize the advancing needs of the individual as he grows older.

Present Practise

The number of increments provided for classroom teachers in 150 recently adopted schedules is shown in Table 9. The median number is 8 in elementary schools and 9 in high schools, with the larger school systems tending to provide more increments. It will be noted that 5 schedules provide 15 or more increments in elementary schools, and 9 schedules provide 15 or more in high schools. The number of increments is not always the same as the number of years over which increments are provided. In schedules from several cities on the Pacific coast the first increment is delayed until after the second or third year of service, and in a few schedules the last few salary steps are spaced out over several years. In one city the raises continue indefinitely, at widening intervals of time.¹

Amount of increments—Table 10 shows that in two-thirds of the schedules the amount

¹ For description of schedule in Providence, Rhode Island, which provides an indefinite maximum, see: Stoddard, A. J. "Old and New Principles of Salary Schedule Making." *American School Board Journal* 81: 43-44; October, 1930.

of the increment is uniform thruout. In those which vary the amounts, the division is almost equal between those which provide larger raises in the early years of service and those which provide larger raises in the later years of service. The median amount of the increments provided in the schedules in which the amounts are uniform thruout the teacher's period of service is indicated in Table 11. The

amounts range from a median of \$104 in Group I to \$57 in Group V in elementary schools, and from \$108 to \$58 in the high schools.

Approximately a third of the cities set up conditions, concerning either training or efficiency, for the granting of increments. These are referred to in more detail in later sections of the bulletin.²

² See p. 74, 75, 80, 81.

TABLE 9.—NUMBER OF SALARY INCREMENTS GIVEN FOR EXPERIENCE TO TEACHERS WITH BASIC QUALIFICATIONS, 150 SALARY SCHEDULES

Number of increments	Elementary schools (or 2 years' training)				High schools (or 4 years' training)			
	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total	Groups I and II	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.....	..	1	3	4	..	..	2	2
3.....	..	..	2	2	..	..	2	2
4.....	..	3	3	6	..	2	1	3
5.....	3	4	3	10	3	3	2	8
6.....	3	1	3	7	2	4	4	10
7.....	4	5	8	17	2	2	7	11
8.....	10	6	11	27	7	7	10	24
9.....	8	3	4	15	7	3	3	13
10.....	8	6	4	18	8	4	2	14
11.....	8	4	..	12	10	6	1	17
12.....	4	2	3	9	7	2	..	9
13.....	..	1	1	2	1	1	..	2
14.....	1	1	..	2	2	2	..	4
15.....	2	..	..	2	2	..	2	4
16.....	..	..	..	..	1	..	1	2
17.....	2	1	..	3	..	..	..	..
18.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	1
19.....	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
20.....	..	..	..	..	1	1	..	2
Total number of schedules..	53	38	45	136	53	37	38	128
Median number of increments.....	9	8	8	8	10	9	8	9
Number of increments not stated..	4	5	5	14	4	6	12	22

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

TABLE 10.—PLACING OF INCREMENTS GIVEN FOR EXPERIENCE TO TEACHERS WITH BASIC QUALIFICATIONS, 150 SALARY SCHEDULES

Practise	Elementary schools (or 2 years' training)					High schools (or 4 years' training)				
	Groups I and II ^a	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total		Groups I and II	Group III	Groups IV and V	Total	
				Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Amount of increments uniform thruout period.....	33	23	36	92	67.6	35	23	29	87	68.5
Larger increments in early years of service.....	3	11	4	18	13.2	3	8	6	17	13.4
Larger increments in later years of service.....	14	4	3	21	15.5	8	5	1	14	11.0
Amounts varying.....	3	..	2	5	3.7	6	1	2	9	7.1
Total number of schedules..	53	38	45	136	100.0	52	37	38	127	100.0
Not stated.....	4	5	5	14	..	5	6	12	23	..

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

TABLE 11.—MEDIAN AMOUNTS OF INCREMENTS GIVEN FOR EXPERIENCE TO TEACHERS WITH MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS, SALARY SCHEDULES IN WHICH INCREMENTS ARE UNIFORM^a

Group ^b	Number of schedules		Median amounts of increments	
	Elementary	High school	Elementary	High school
1	2	3	4	5
Group I.....	10	12	\$104	\$108
Group II.....	23	23	102	104
Group III.....	23	23	75	101
Group IV.....	21	18	59	74
Group V.....	12	9	57	58
Total.....	89	85	...	...
Amount not stated.	3	2	...	...

^a Based on the schedules in which increments are uniform, referred to in Table 10; elementary-school salaries in 92 schedules; high-school salaries in 87 schedules.

^b For population ranges, see Table 1.

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—The Salary Committee of the National Education Association, in its report of 1923, makes the following recommendations on the granting of increments:

Salary schedules should assure a reasonable rate of progress from the established minimum salary to the maximum provided in the schedule. Salary increases or increments should be of sufficient size to be perceptible in the teacher's annual budget. . . . This increase should approximate 10 percent of the salary. . . . Increases should vary in number and amount for teachers with varying amounts of training and experience.³

A recommendation regarding the number of increments is given in the Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Classroom Teachers:

The incentive offered by increments in salary should be spread over a large proportion of the teaching career. The maximum of most schedules is reached too soon. The number of years during which increases are provided in most schedules ranges from five to fifteen. Probably the increases should be continued over a period of from twenty to thirty years.⁴

The Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher recommends a hypothetical salary schedule of the preparation type which provides ten increments in each salary class.⁵ The

teacher who begins teaching at one of the lower training levels and by pursuing additional training is transferred to a higher salary class receives additional increments. The annual increases are larger in the salary classes provided for the higher training levels; for example, the teacher with two years' training receives a uniform annual increment of \$50 and the teacher with five years' training receives a uniform annual increment of \$200.

Scheduling of increments in the 22 local salary studies—The number of increments recommended in the 22 local salary studies averages 10 when the positions or classes having fewest salary steps are counted, and 12 when the positions with the largest number of increments are averaged. Six schedules provide 15 or more increments. In the San Francisco Citizens schedule, providing 19 increases, the first is given in the fourth year of service. The proposed Fort Worth schedule spaces out the later salary steps, taking 27 years to grant the 16 increments provided for the 5-year training level. In 13 of the proposed schedules, the increases are granted without qualification; in 6 it is recommended that certain increments be conditioned on additional training, outstanding service, or both; and in 3 others the increments may be withheld if service is unsatisfactory.

Fourteen of the 22 recommended schedules provide that the salaries increase more rapidly in the later years of service, increments of four or five different sizes being provided in several schedules. In three schedules the increases vary in size thruout the period of service. Five schedules give uniform increments within classes; four of these are preparation schedules which give smaller increments—\$75 or \$100—for the 2-year and 3-year levels of training, and larger amounts—\$125 to \$175—at the higher training levels. The provision of higher increments for the higher training levels or for the higher paid positions is typical of the other schedules as well.

Increments as a recognition of the value of teaching experience—Discussions of increments in the 22 salary studies make frequent reference to the value of continued years of expe-

³ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 74-75.

⁴ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. *The Economic Welfare of Teachers*. Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. p. 34-35.

⁵ 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. p. 88. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 252.)

rience. It is frequently suggested that experience alone does not add materially to teaching efficiency after from five to ten years of service.⁶ On the other hand, it is conceded that thru study and experimentation, a teacher may continue thruout his period of activity to improve the quality of his teaching. That the continuation of efficiency may depend in part on a stimulating supervisory program is also mentioned.

It is sometimes recommended that increments should be larger in the first few years, because that is the period when experience adds most to the teacher's efficiency. The argument to the contrary is advanced more often, to the effect that the early increments should be small until the teacher has passed thru the novice stage.⁷ The New York Citizens study states this position:

The Committee proposes that beginning teachers shall receive small annual increments for three or four years. This recommendation is made because of the fact that there are many teachers who remain in the system only a short time. These teachers have no real interest in teaching as a profession, but are using it as a means of livelihood while preparing for another profession, or as a temporary source of income. It is the belief of the Committee that the greatest possible proportion of the total money available for teachers' salaries should be reserved for those who will make this type of public service their permanent professional interest.⁸

Increments as deferred compensation—The theory that increments are not to be justified on the basis of increased efficiency but on the basis of deferred compensation has been suggested. Scates holds that the granting of increments is based on psychological factors, giving the young teacher assurance that his future salary will be large enough to meet increasing needs as he advances in age.⁹ Brink recognizes the principle of deferred compensation, citing the example of the doctor, whose larger income in later years comes not from increased

efficiency but thru becoming established as an active member of his profession.¹⁰ He believes that the question is not whether each increase corresponds precisely to an increased value, but whether a life's work is too fully or too meanly repaid. Morrison also denies that gradations in salary represent rewards for meritorious service. He says:

We teachers enjoy salaries which are incidental to our professions and not to us as individuals. Graded salaries are determined by the conditions which it is necessary to set up in order to secure a profession rather than by our individual worth. Hence, whether it be in the public-school service or in the university, our salaries commonly move up in terms of length of satisfactory service, not because length of service necessarily makes us any more valuable, but because that is the only way to secure a teaching profession which offers financial prospects.¹¹

Number of years for granting increments—Altho there is difference of opinion as to the reason for granting increments, there seems to be general agreement that it is desirable to extend the payment of increments thru the greater part of a teacher's career of service.¹² Norton comments as follows on the trend which he observes toward an extension of the number of years in progressing from the minimum to the maximum:

The tendency to draft schedules so that long and successful experience promises continued advancement to a salary at the professional level should do much to professionalize teaching service. The example of the medical profession shows that the initial financial reward of a service need not be high to attract capable recruits provided an ultimate reward of substantial amount is possible. Much may be said in favor of salary schedules which imply that the professional growth of a teacher continues until the time of retirement.¹³

Increments as multiples of a smaller unit—Several studies¹⁴ have proposed a form of schedule in which the annual increments for

⁶ Closter, p. 116; Lexington, p. 31; Los Angeles, p. 61; Nashville, p. 236-39; New York Citizens, p. 114-15; Pittsburgh Teachers (1929), p. 57; San Francisco Teachers, p. 90; Springfield, p. 80; Yonkers, p. 34.

⁷ Holyoke, p. 402; Jacksonville, p. 84; Lynn, p. 160; Nashville, p. 237.

⁸ New York Citizens, p. 137.

⁹ Scates, Douglas E. "Needed Changes in the Single-Salary Schedule." *Educational Research Bulletin* (Ohio State University) 11: 337-42; October 26, 1932.

¹⁰ Brink, Laurence B. "Automatic Salary Increases for Teachers." *School and Society* 33:402-3; March 21, 1931.

¹¹ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 256.

¹² For example see: Cooke, Dennis H. *Problems of the Teaching Personnel*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. p. 281-82. ¶ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 108. ¶ Also: Lexington, p. 31; Nashville, p. 237-39; San Francisco Citizens, p. 24.

¹³ Norton, John K. "Major Trends in Teacher Salary Scheduling." *Teachers College Record* 32: 719-23; May, 1931.

¹⁴ For example, see: Cincinnati, Ohio. *Survey Report of the Cincinnati Public Schools*. (Bess Goodykoontz, director.) Report No. 64. Cincinnati: Bureau of Governmental Research, 1935. p. 257-60. ¶ Inglewood, Calif. *Salary Policy For Teachers of Inglewood City Schools*. Inglewood: Board of Education, 1935. 43 p. ¶ Los Angeles, Calif. *Survey of the Los Angeles City Schools*. (Osman R. Hull and Willard S. Ford, directors.) Los Angeles: Board of Education, 1934. p. 313-15. ¶ Pasadena, California. *Survey of the Pasadena City Schools*. (Harold A. Stone, director.) Los Angeles: California Taxpayers' Association, 1931. p. 71.

experience are not a fixed amount, but multiples of a small unit which is used in providing variations within the schedule, above a fixed basic salary. The Inglewood schedule referred to on p. 58 follows this plan; the salaries for the first two and the last two steps are scheduled as shown in the right-hand column.

The proposed schedules of this form all have been of the preparation type, with certain increments conditioned on training and service requirements. The distinctive features of the plan, however—the basic salary and the small increment unit, the amounts of which can be

changed independently of each other while the essential framework of the schedule remains unchanged—might be applied to any type of schedule.

Year of teaching	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV
1		b*	b+33i*	b+55i
2		b+8i	b+42i	b+64i
...				
24	b+89i	b+108i	b+150i	b+172i
25	b+94i	b+113i	b+155i	b+177i

*For 1935-36, "b," the basic salary, is \$1400; "i," the increment, is \$4.50.¹⁵

¹⁵ Inglewood, California, *op. cit.*, p. 20. Groups I-IV in the schedule are based on years of professional training. The interpretation teacher receives 25 increments above the regular schedule; the research teacher, 12 increments; the assistant teacher, \$200 less than the regular schedule.

Requirements for Continued Professional Training

"Shall the schedule be so devised as to compel teachers to secure additional professional training at stated intervals?" Fifty-one superintendents, or slightly less than a fourth of those replying, checked this question as among the three most difficult in salary scheduling. The practise of requiring teachers to attend summer school or undertake other study in order to make normal progress on the salary schedule represents one of the methods used to carry out the purpose of encouraging the professional growth of teachers while in service. Such provisions do not offer a reward for additional study, such as is given by adopting a preparation schedule or establishing advanced salary classes for preparation above the minimum, but they provide a penalty for failure to carry on such study.

Present Practise

Thirty-three of the 150 schedules analyzed require teachers to attend summer school or give other evidence of professional study at stated intervals. There are only three of the number in which the practise of requiring continued training is not associated with some other provision for recognizing professional preparation.

The typical plan is to require the completion of a certain number of professional study credits every 3, 4, or 5 years to receive increments and to remain at the maximum of the

schedule after it is reached. Seven schedules limit the required training to the period when the teacher is making progress from the minimum to the maximum salary; the others continue the requirement during the entire period of service, providing for "decrements" (actual reduction of salary) or non-reappointment if the requirement for study is not met.

In several schedules such items as the following are accepted in lieu of part or all of the academic credits required:

1. Professional activity such as:
 - a. Especially valuable work on curriculum committees
 - b. Special research projects
 - c. Creation of professional materials
2. Educative travel.

It is frequently stated that college courses or other professional growth activities shall be approved in advance in order to be accepted as meeting the requirement for continued study.

Opinion and Studies

No reference is found in the recommendations of the National Education Association or its committees to the policy of requiring continued professional study. It has been discussed in the local salary studies and by individual students of salary scheduling.

The schedules recommended in five of the 22 salary studies (Chicago, Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco Citizens, San Francisco

Teachers) provide that additional training be required at certain steps in the schedule in order to reach the maximum, but none of them includes a requirement for continued training after the maximum is reached.

The argument in favor of limiting advancement to those who continue their professional study rests chiefly on the claim that salary increments which occur automatically do not encourage teachers to better their professional training or to keep in touch with educational progress.¹ Hart and Peterson make the following statement of the principle underlying the policy:

The rapid and continuous advances in the science of education are such that the preparation of a teacher, however satisfactory at the time, is soon inadequate. The teacher should, therefore, be expected to keep pace with the advances in his field, and salary increases beyond stipulated points on the salary scale should be conditioned upon evidence of such advance.

Conditioned upon satisfactory service, salary increases should be automatic for a specified number of years, at which point the increases should cease, until evidence of additional preparation or growth is approved and recorded to the teacher's credit.²

Coercion in requiring teachers to take additional professional courses is opposed by Mc-

Ginnis, who believes that the results are measurable only in terms of points of credit and not in actual professional growth. He says:

What about the effect of the compulsory professional improvement plan upon educational democracy, group-directed cooperation and inspirational leadership in the school system? Educational administration and supervision through the application of rules and regulations and super-imposed authority never have produced good results, and there is no very good reason in the evidence at hand to expect that they will do so in the case of professional improvement of teachers....

Even if the taking of professional courses while in service does represent professional improvement, compulsion is not necessary. Common sense, as well as an understanding of the laws of learning, tells us that, other things being equal, a person will do better the thing he wants to do, and over which he exercises freedom of choice, than he will do something else. He will also do better the thing he wants to do if coercion is absent. In Massachusetts the percent of teachers who took professional courses in service in 1927 was greater in a city in which there were no school board requirements than in any other Massachusetts city.... These courses were sponsored by the Principals Club and the Teachers Club. Enrollment was entirely voluntary. No salary increases were involved. The only coercion was the coercion of individual and group pride in achievement.³

¹ Los Angeles, p. 61. See also: Long Beach, Calif. *Staff and Salary Survey of the Long Beach City Schools*. (By E. H. Staffelbach.) Long Beach: Affiliated Teachers of Long Beach, 1935. p. 21. ¶ Fresno, Calif. *Salary and Cost Study of Fresno Schools*. (By Walter Crosby Eells.) Fresno: City Council of Education, 1932. p. 75-76.

² Hart, F. W., and Peterson, L. H. "Professional Salary Scale Forms." *American School Board Journal* 80: 42-43; June, 1930.

³ McGinnis, W. C. "Professional Improvement and Salaries." *School and Society* 29: 545-47; April 27, 1929.

Sex as a Basis for Variations in Salary

"Shall men and women of similar qualifications be paid equal salaries for equal work?" Altho this question has been a lively one for many years, it ranks sixth among ten difficult problems in the scheduling of teachers' salaries, according to the questionnaire replies. Fifty-nine superintendents, 27.8 percent of those reporting, rated the question as among the three most difficult. The proportion is somewhat less in the large cities, somewhat larger in the cities of Groups IV and V. In some states there are legislative standards which require equal pay for men and women teachers.¹ When the replies are omitted from

states where equal-pay legislation is in effect, the proportion of superintendents regarding the question as difficult is slightly higher, 30.1 percent. Many conditions enter into the answering of this question—local customs and policies, salaries paid men in other occupations, the supply of men teachers available for appointment, and the cost of an appropriate standard of living for a professional man and his family.

Present Practise

Information published by the Research Division of the National Education Association shows that in 1930-31 equal salaries were

¹ Elsbree has reported that, in 1930, laws requiring equal pay for men and women teachers were in effect in the District of Columbia and the following ten states: California, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming. (Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 45.) Summaries of state school legislation since 1930 make no reference to any recent laws requiring equal pay.

scheduled for men and women in high-school positions in 45.2 percent of the large group of city school systems reporting.² The proportion varied among cities of different sizes. Equal salaries for men and women were paid in 84.5 percent of the cities in Group I, 57.8 percent in Group II, 39.5 percent in Group III, 36.5 percent in Group IV, and 40.0 percent in Group V.

The 150 schedules of recent adoption studied for this bulletin include 59 from states where equal-pay legislation is in effect. Of the remaining 91 there are 54, or 59.3 percent, which make no difference in salary between men and women. Of the 37 that do make such a difference, 6 merely specify that the schedule applies only to women teachers; 2 apply the differential only in the beginning salary. In 2 schedules the differential applies only to married men; in 3 the differential is twice or three times as large for married men as for single men. The following distribution shows the amount of difference at the maximum salary, in favor of men, in 28 schedules which give the figures on an annual basis:

<i>Number of Schedules</i>	<i>Amount of Differential</i>
2 schedules	Less than \$100
7 "	\$100—\$199
6 "	200—299
4 "	300—399
2 "	400—499
3 "	500—599
2 "	600—699
2 "	700 or more
—	
28	

The percent by which the maximum salary for men exceeds the maximum for women is indicated in the following distribution:

<i>Number of Schedules</i>	<i>Amount of Differential</i>
1 schedule	Less than 5%
9 schedules	5.0%—9.9%
7 "	10.0%—14.9%
2 "	15.0%—19.9%
5 "	20.0%—24.9%
2 "	25.0%—29.9%
2 "	30.0% or more
—	
28	

The median differential is \$200; the median percent of difference in favor of men is 12.6.

Opinion and Studies

The problem of equal pay for men and women has received attention by the National Education Association for a number of years, was considered in most of the 22 salary studies, and has been discussed extensively by individual writers. The related problem of family allowances as a salary schedule device has also been considered.

National Education Association—The first resolution of the National Education Association recommending equal pay for men and women teachers, passed in 1914, was worded as follows:

The Association regards efficiency and merit, rather than sex, as the principle on which appointments and selections should be made, and therefore declares itself in favor of the political equality of the sexes and equal pay for equal services.³

Resolutions expressing the same point of view were adopted in 1924 and 1929, and are included in the Platform for 1934 and 1935.⁴

The report of the Salary Committee, in 1923, includes the following recommendation and comments:

Schedules should be based primarily upon the salaries which will attract capable women.

There is no logical economic or social justification for providing a salary schedule for men differing in its provisions from the schedule provided for the women in the same city holding the same positions. Whether or not salary distinctions between men and women shall be made, however, is a matter for local consideration and local settlement...

Provision has not been made in the schedules suggested... for different salaries for men and women because of the growing tendency not to make such distinctions. When, however, it is desired to make such a difference, the difference should be expressed in terms of a flat sum which the men should receive over and above the salary which they would be entitled to in the proposed schedule.⁵

The Committee on the Economic Status of the Teacher, proposing a hypothetical salary schedule of the preparation type, makes this comment with regard to its application to women and men:

One such schedule might be used for women, and a different one for men, or the same one might be used for both men and women. In the latter case, the necessities used as the basis for the minimum salary

² National Education Association, Research Division. "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part II: The Retention, Promotion, and Improvement of Teachers." *Research Bulletin* 10: 43; March, 1932.

³ National Education Association. *Bulletin* of the National Education Association, September, 1914, p. 21.

⁴ National Education Association. *Proceedings*, 1924, p. 53; 1929, p. 1135; 1934, p. 183; 1935, p. 211.

⁵ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923, p. 74.

should be those of the single women without dependents and not maintaining a home, while the necessities used as the basis for the maximum salary should be those of the married man maintaining a home and supporting dependents.⁶

Arguments opposing and favoring equal pay—A number of the conflicting opinions on sex as a factor in fixing salaries have been summarized in the following statement:

The arguments in favor of higher salaries for men are listed somewhat as follows:

1. If salaries of women teachers are raised to the level of those paid men teachers, great increases in taxes will be necessary.

2. On the other hand, if salaries of men teachers are reduced to equal those of women, many capable men teachers will leave school work for other occupations.

3. Our public schools are already suffering from overfeminization. Growing children should have contacts with both men and women teachers.

4. The supply of men teachers is limited; higher salaries must therefore be paid to secure their services.

The arguments on the contrary side have been stated thus:

1. Equal pay for equal work is a growing practise and is fundamentally sound.

2. Salaries should be based on service rendered and not on extraneous questions, such as sex.

3. The assumption that men are the only ones who carry the burden of dependents is fallacious.

4. Women are rapidly attaining equality with men in other occupations and in other aspects of life.⁷

Local salary studies—Only two of the salary schedules recommended by the 22 salary studies propose a differential for men teachers. The Lexington study points out that there is no justification, from a theoretical point of view, for discriminating against women in the scheduling of salaries, but insists that there is a need for men of ability in the teaching service, which cannot be met without paying salaries which will attract the type of men desired.⁸ In the Springfield study, the Teachers' Committee on Salary Schedules recommended that salary differentials on the basis of sex be eliminated from the salary schedule.⁹ The report

mentions on one side the economic argument—competition with other occupations and high cost of paying the women teachers salaries high enough to attract men teachers—and on the other the social argument—the decline in morale when women are required to do the same kind of work at a decidedly lower salary than men receive for similar work. The schedule which was finally adopted, however, includes a differential for men in the high-school salary class based on four years of training, but provides no differential at the five-year training level.

Other local studies claim that from the social and psychological standpoint it is desirable to have children taught by both men and women and mention the economic problem involved in paying equal salaries to the two sexes, but do not recommend a differential for men.¹⁰ The small percent of men in the teaching personnel is deplored; it is suggested that at least 25 percent of the staff should be men.¹¹

The persistence of the position schedule, with its higher salaries for high-school teachers, is explained in part by the fact that men are regarded as essential in high-school teaching.¹² A statement from the San Francisco Citizens study is illustrative:

In establishing salaries for secondary school teachers we kept measurably in view the purpose of making the field of secondary school classrooms inviting to men instructors. Our statute justly lays down the principle of equal pay for equal service, without regard to sex. Our recommendations conserve this principle and still, by adequate compensation, encourage proper balance between men and women instructors in the secondary schools.¹³

Several studies make reference to the existence of state laws requiring that women and men be paid alike. The San Francisco Teachers study, in calling attention to the California law, gives a brief summary of the evolution of the equal-pay principle:

Two reasons have sustained the practise of paying men teachers higher salaries than women teachers; one, the fact that men as a rule have been in

⁶ 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. p. 88. (*Research Bulletin* 13: 252.)

⁷ National Education Association, Research Division, "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part II," *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁸ Lexington, p. 37-38.

⁹ Springfield, p. 73, 90-92.

¹⁰ Holyoke, p. 381; Newburgh, p. 164; New York Citizens, p. 108-9; San Francisco Teachers, p. 92; and Yonkers, p. 7.

¹¹ For example, see: Holyoke, p. 376; San Francisco (recommends 50 percent of men in secondary schools), p. 29.

¹² Los Angeles, p. 31.

¹³ San Francisco Citizens, p. 28-29.

positions of authority as board members and executives; the other, an indirect operation of the law of supply and demand. It is an indisputable fact that women teachers of equivalent training can be had for less money than men. The range of openings in commerce, industry, and business has, until very recently, been very much more restricted for women than men. This situation is rapidly changing and promises fair to alter this play of supply and demand in teaching. It is no longer seriously contended that men are better teachers merely by virtue of being men, and therefore deserving of higher salaries. There are types of situations and positions in a school to which men are better suited than women, in fact necessary; on the other hand there are situations and positions to which women are better suited. The matter therefore resolves itself into the necessity of having both men and women teachers. The principle of equal pay for equal work has been recognized in California and made effective by law.¹⁴

The recent Cincinnati survey mentions the difficulty of securing accurate evidence on number of dependents; shows that practise in the larger cities is strongly in favor of the equal-pay principle; and offers the following recommendation:

On the basis of the information now at hand, the survey staff does not feel justified in recommending a salary differential on the basis of sex. Rather the staff reaffirms the principle that *equal pay should be given for equal qualifications and services*. When one of the sexes is able to demonstrate that it has greater qualifications or gives larger educational service than the other sex, that will be the time to give a salary differential to that sex.¹⁵

Individual opinion and research—Recently published individual discussions of this problem emphasize the claim that, as a matter of expediency rather than justice, school boards will find it necessary to pay higher salaries to men than to women in order to increase the number of capable men in the teaching profession.¹⁶

Hathaway presents figures to show that salaries of women are typically much lower than men's in industrial occupations, even for a similar grade of work, concluding that similar differences should be recognized in the teaching profession.¹⁷ Ludeman reports a study of the salaries paid men and women teachers during the period 1905-1930 in some 500 high schools in the Middlewest, showing that the salaries for men have been higher thruout the period and that the disparity is not tending to grow smaller.¹⁸ McGaughy has been particularly emphatic in opposition to the policy of equal pay, stating it as his belief that:

The major obstacle to scientific schedule-making is now found in the state laws which make equal pay for men and women mandatory, and in the sentimental acceptance by the teachers themselves that this principle is sound professionally and economically. We believe that there is no sound argument, professional or educational, in favor of paying men teachers higher salaries than women. Men are not better teachers; they do not render more valuable service; even if they have more dependents, that is not a sound argument for paying them higher salaries. The one insurmountable fact which makes it absolutely necessary, economically, to pay men higher salaries is the inexorable working of the law of supply and demand. So long as our professional and industrial organization remains as it now is, there is bound to be a greater demand for the services of able young men than for the services of equally able young women. . . . No board of education has the moral right to pay women teachers higher salaries than the economic demand for their services justifies. To do so is just as pernicious as to waste public money upon some other project for which there is no such well-organized, sentimental propaganda.¹⁹

Among those who accept the policy of equal pay for equal work are Lewis²⁰ and Reeder.²¹ Reeder states the principle as follows:

Granted that qualifications and services are equal, women teachers should receive the same pay as

¹⁴ San Francisco Teachers, p. 92.

¹⁵ Cincinnati, Ohio. *Survey Report of the Cincinnati Public Schools*. (Bess Goodykoontz, director.) Report No. 64. Cincinnati: Bureau of Governmental Research, 1935. p. 254.

¹⁶ For example, see: Clark, R. C. "The Principles Underlying the Maximum Salary." *American School Board Journal* 80: 47-48; May, 1930. ¶ Elsbree, Willard S., *op. cit.*, p. 37-50. ¶ McGaughy, J. R. "Equal Pay for Equal Work?" *American School Board Journal* 82: 60, 124, 126; February, 1931. ¶ Scates, Douglas E. "Needed Changes in the Single-Salary Schedule." *Educational Research Bulletin* (Ohio State University) 11: 337-42; October 26, 1932.

¹⁷ Hathaway, Arthur H. "Should There Be Salary Distinctions Between Men and Women Teachers?" *American School Board Journal* 79: 45-46; July, 1929.

See also: Cleveland, Ohio. *Cleveland Teachers' Salaries*. (T. C. Holy, director.) Bureau of Educational Research Monographs, No. 16. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1932. p. 54-59. States that most of the members of professions with which teaching is usually compared as to income are men; that when women teachers are compared with women in other professions the disparity in salary is much less than when salaries of men are compared.

¹⁸ Ludeman, Walter W. "What of Equal Pay?" *American School Board Journal* 82: 60, 133; June, 1931.

¹⁹ McGaughy, J. R. "The Movement Toward Scientific Salary Schedules." *Teachers College Record* 30: 752-59; May, 1929.

²⁰ Lewis, E. E. "Desirable Principles of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *American School Board Journal* 80: 45-46; May, 1930.

²¹ Reeder, Ward G. *The Fundamentals of Public School Administration*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1930. p. 125-27.

men. Right and justice demand this parity. A different schedule for the two sexes brings never-ending trouble with both the women teachers and the public. If to secure a larger number of men teachers it is deemed expedient to pay them larger salaries, let the extra pay be given them for special duties, such as administering a department.²²

Family allowances—In considering the cost of an appropriate standard of living for teachers it is often pointed out that cost varies with the needs of the individual and that the man teacher who marries is at such an economic disadvantage that it is impossible for him to maintain a suitable living standard for his family. This fact has led some students of the problem to recommend a system of family allowances, administered by the state.²³ The provision of a larger differential for married than for single men is closely related to the plan of granting family allowances. Several of the 22 local salary studies mention family allowances as a possibility, but none of them incorporates such a provision in the schedules proposed.²⁴ The comment in the New York Citizens study is representative:

It is the belief of the Citizens' Committee that the number of dependents which teachers have must be taken into consideration in determining salary schedules, but only to the extent that the uniform salary paid to all teachers with and without dependents shall be high enough that the indispensable teaching groups who have dependents may live comfortably and respectably.

To allow differentials in salary on account of varying numbers of dependents would most certainly defeat the very purpose which the proponents of this plan hope to achieve. . . . Under such conditions married men with children would find it in-

creasingly difficult to secure employment in competition with young men and unmarried women who are equally well qualified to do the actual job of teaching. . . . Teachers should be paid upon the basis of their teaching ability, measured as objectively as can be done, and not on the basis that boards of education are charitable institutions or are in some peculiar way to be held responsible for administering the State's obligation to provide for its own progress and perpetuity.²⁵

Family allowances are provided in teachers' salary schedules in several European countries, including Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, and Holland.²⁶ Swift's studies describe in some detail the plan of supplementary allowances to school functionaries in France. He makes this comment:

Expenditures for personnel include salaries, *indemnités*, and pensions. One of the most significant characteristics of the French system of paying public employees and one most deserving the thoughtful consideration of American students of social and educational problems is the careful endeavor on the part of the government to ensure to each employee an income adjusted to his legitimate individual needs. This is done, first, by providing a fixed and stable salary, *traitement*, based upon the recipient's professional qualifications and consequent official classification; second, by maintaining an extensive system of supplementary allowances, *indemnités*, designed to cover almost every unusual situation or obligation which may befall a functionary. . . .

The most significant, and to the American mind the most noteworthy *indemnités*, are those designed to ensure to teachers and other school employees, satisfactory living and family conditions and to assist them in times of illness and dire necessity. Included in this group are supplementary allowances for living quarters, for residence or differences in cost of living, for children, and for illness, including maternity allowances for women.²⁷

²² Reeder, Ward G., *op. cit.*, p. 127.

²³ Elsbree, Willard S., *Teachers' Salaries, op. cit.*, p. 33-36; and "The Future of Teachers' Salaries and Salary Scheduling," *Teachers College Record* 36: 490-96; March, 1935. † Scates, Douglas E., *op. cit.*

The salary schedule adopted recently in Garden City, New York, contains the following provision for family allowances: "Upon application to the Superintendent (form to be supplied by the Board) and with the approval of the Board of Education, a family allowance may be granted to any classroom or special teacher under conditions such as, to a married teacher with wife or to a widow with dependent children, where a maximum of \$300 for such dependent wife and a maximum of \$100 for each child under 18 years of age may be allowed. No application will be considered where the yearly income of the dependent or dependents is more than \$300."

²⁴ New York Citizens, p. 120-21; Pittsburgh Teachers (1927), p. 43; San Diego, p. 74; San Francisco Citizens, p. 94; and Springfield, p. 92-94.

See also the recommendation against allowances for dependents in the Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Classroom Teachers, quoted on p. 68 of this bulletin.

²⁵ New York Citizens, p. 120-21.

²⁶ "Family Allowances for Teachers in Certain Foreign Countries," *Monthly Labor Review* 35: 1355-57; December, 1932. † Swift, Fletcher Harper, *European Policies of Financing Public Educational Institutions. I. France. II. Czechoslovakia. III. Austria.* University of California Publications in Education, Vol. 8, Nos. 1-3. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1933, 1934. 343 p.

²⁷ Swift, Fletcher Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 40-42.

Teaching Efficiency and the Salary Schedule

"Shall efficiency ratings be used in determining a teacher's progress on the salary schedule?" Altho this question refers to formal efficiency ratings, the discussion will call attention also to other methods of recognizing merit as a basis for salaries. The problem of basing salaries on efficiency has been the subject of much argument. In the actual preparation of salary schedules, however, the question is ninth in frequency of mention among the ten questions. Fifty superintendents, 23.6 percent of those replying, checked this issue as among the three most difficult. It is third in rank in Groups I and II, but lowest of all in Group III, and eighth in Groups IV and V.

The evaluation of a teacher's efficiency enters into many phases of personnel administration. It is considered in determining whether he shall stay on after the first probationary year; it enters into decisions affecting assignment, extra duties, and promotion. When the purpose of a salary schedule has been stated in terms of encouraging professional growth, and retaining the most competent, it seems logical that some systematic recognition of efficiency should enter into the fixing of the amount of salary paid. But it does not appear that methods of measuring efficiency which have been devised so far are accurate enough to be generally satisfactory for use in the administering of salaries.

The use of efficiency ratings as a device for supervision, apart from the salary schedule, does not come within the scope of this study.

Present Practise

Several ways in which merit or efficiency is recognized in salary schedules have been noted. The most complete dependence on efficiency ratings is found when the size of the annual increment depends upon the teacher's rating for the previous year. The plan of rewarding meritorious service which seems least formalized is that which authorizes the school board, by special action in individual cases, to pay salaries above the regular maximum to teachers of "exceptional merit" or "conspicuous efficiency."

Information collected in 1930-31 from 1077 school systems of all sizes shows that in 114 systems, or 10.6 percent of the total, ratings on an efficiency scale were among the factors which automatically determined a teacher's place on the regular salary schedule.¹ The use of "superior ratings and performance" as one of the bases for granting the supermaximum salary was reported for 290, or 57.0 percent, of the 509 cities in which a supermaximum was scheduled.²

In the 150 recent salary schedules, six methods of recognizing efficiency have been noted. Listing first the most direct use of merit ratings, the six practises are:

1. Size of increment varies with rating. For example, teachers with "A" ratings will receive increments of \$75; "B" ratings, \$50; "C" ratings, \$35; "D" ratings, no increment; and "E" teachers shall not be retained in the system. Such a plan is used in connection with 7 position schedules and 4 of the preparation type.

2. Maximum salaries vary with rating. This has no reference to supermaximum salaries, but to the normal maximum for the position or training level. One schedule provides, at the 4-year training level, a maximum of \$1700 if rating is "fair"; \$1800 if "good"; \$1900 if "excellent"; and \$2000 if "very superior." Provisions of this sort are found in 10 schedules, including 5 which vary the size of increment on basis of rating. Two of these include a provision for reducing the maximum salary if the rating falls.

3. Ratings affect placement on supermaximum salary. For example, in one schedule where the basis for the supermaximum is stated in detail, teaching skill counts for 20 points in a possible 100 in determining whether or not to grant the supermaximum. In another, there are four levels in the supermaximum salary, each step of which depends on a higher efficiency rating than the preceding step, plus added professional training. There are several other variations among the 26 schedules which recognize efficiency in awarding the supermaximum.

4. Increments are withheld if rating is unsatisfactory. The group of 30 schedules making this stipulation include most of those under "1" above. It appears that in the majority of these schedules the withholding of increment is a warning of dismissal.

5. Increments are based on satisfactory service. The schedules include statements such as: "All increases of salary under this schedule are based upon merit and efficiency." Just what this provision means in actual operation is not known. It

¹ National Education Association, Research Division, "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part II: The Retention, Promotion, and Improvement of Teachers," *Research Bulletin* 10: 40-41; March, 1932.

² National Education Association, Research Division, "Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers: Part II," *op. cit.*, p. 45.

may be another way of stating the practise indicated under "4." For the most part, the 21 schedules in which it occurs make no other provision for recognition of merit.

6. Higher salary may be provided, by special action, to teachers of "exceptional distinction," "unusual or peculiar worth," or "for service of exceptional length and distinction." These provisions, in 16 schedules, seem to refer to special board action, on an individual basis, rather than to stated supermaximum salaries such as are covered under "3." There is no overlapping between the two groups, however, and it may be that the practises are very similar in the two groups of cities.

Seventy-one of the 150 schedules, nearly half, include one or more of the six practises described.

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—Altho resolutions of the National Education Association have recommended that salaries be based on quality of service, the suggestions have been made in connection with some other principle, such as the single-salary plan, or equal pay for men and women. The Salary Committee in its 1923 report states two principles which have a bearing on the recognition of efficiency thru the salary schedule:

Salary schedules should provide for flexibility in their operation.... It is poor economy for any school system to lose its best teachers because the salary schedule makes it impossible to pay those teachers slightly more than other teachers with the same experience and training, though much inferior in teaching ability. Teachers should realize that it is to their personal advantage as a group, and in the end as individuals, as well as to the advantage of the community, to have reasonable flexibility and especially at the top of the salary schedule.... The mere fact that such additional salaries are paid to even a few teachers will be constant incentive to all ambitious teachers in the city system and will help to secure the maximum service at all times from all teachers.

Salary schedules should be readily adjustable to the payment of teachers on a "merit basis," when such is desired.... Schemes for paying teachers according to merit rating can only succeed when both teachers and those who rate their work are interested in having the plan succeed. When all members of the educational staff believe that it will be for the best interests of the schools to pay some exceptionally strong teachers more than other teachers with the same training and experience

doing the same work, it will be possible *co-operatively* to develop plans for paying teachers on this basis.³

The Sixth Yearbook of the Department of Classroom Teachers disapproves of the use of merit ratings as a basis for increments, but states that the salary schedule should be sufficiently flexible to care for special cases of unusual merit, either by supermaximum salaries or by directing unusually successful teachers into special types of work, such as department heads or demonstration teachers, at higher salaries.⁴

Local salary studies—The recommendations just cited distinguish between (1) efforts to reward small variations in teaching effectiveness, as measured by rating scales, with small variations in pay, and (2) efforts to distinguish the extremes of teaching ability—the unsatisfactory and eminently superior—from the larger group of satisfactory teachers, and to pay salaries above the normal maximum to the outstanding group. These two possibilities are considered separately in most of the local salary studies which discuss the problem.

None of the 22 local studies recommends that efficiency ratings be used in determining the size of increments. Several studies refer to such plans and state specifically that they are not favored.⁵

The Holyoke study, while not recommending any immediate use of merit ratings in fixing salaries, offers suggestions regarding such a policy:

Certain standards for the administration of a merit system should be met. The supervisory staff should be adequate in number, highly trained in the art of helping teachers to increase their efficiency, and impersonal in judging the work of the teachers with whom they deal. The superintendent, in arriving at the estimate of a teacher's merit, should have the benefit of ratings from several supervisors, taken during the course of the year. Some systems even include a rating from the teacher herself.

Two sources of difficulty are inherent in the merit system. First, there is constant pressure on the superintendent to class most of his teachers as superior, either because of political influence, or because of doubt on his part as to the teacher's exact standing on the merit scale. The result in some systems has been to include practically all teachers

³ National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries, and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 75-76.

⁴ National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers. *The Economic Welfare of Teachers*. Sixth Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. p. 34.

⁵ Cincinnati, p. 30; New York Citizens, p. 107-8; San Diego, p. 73; San Francisco Citizens, p. 30; San Francisco Teachers, p. 92-93; Yonkers, p. 34.

in the top group. Another objection to the merit system is that when the judgment of the supervisor as to the efficiency of the teacher is part of the salary administration, it may interfere with the teacher-supervisor relationship. The ideal supervisor situation, as regards the supervisor and the teacher whom she is helping, concerns itself only with the improvement of teaching efficiency. The addition of the salary element, then, may hamper the supervisor's work...

It is clearly evident that the merit system of salary increases is dependent upon an adequate and highly trained supervisory staff.⁶

Methods of recognizing the extremes of teaching efficiency in the administration of salaries as proposed in several studies include the following: withholding increments if service is unsatisfactory;⁷ giving double increments in cases of outstanding merit;⁸ granting specified increments only upon the basis of a general appraisal of the teacher's work, allowing automatic increases in the intervals between "hurdles";⁹ and using merit as a factor in granting the supermaximum salary.¹⁰ The difficulties that lie in the use of subjective ratings must be considered as well as the value to the school system of selecting the outstanding teachers for special salary recognition. The Chicago study, in discussing the problem, makes this comment:

Subjective rating of teachers is no new thing; it goes on and has gone on at all times when teachers have had to be selected, retained, or promoted. If merit, as such, is to be recognized, some administrative officer must assume the responsibility for training himself in the best technique of subjective rating possible. . . . Effective rating of teachers is possible on a subjective basis, but it requires high qualities of intelligence, insight, and courage. . . .

There should be some means of discovering the very small group, probably not more than 10 percent of the teachers, who become very able, recognized leaders of their profession in every school system. This leadership should be capitalized to

the advantage of the whole organization. Such teachers would be the ideal supervisors of novices. . . . If freed from a considerable part of their teaching load, they might become responsible for a number of beginners and serve to knit together the efforts of these young teachers to fit themselves effectively into their new responsibilities. Such teachers should also be the recognized professional leaders in their respective groups. . . . The recognition of such master teachers within a great city system, if it could be established on high professional grounds, would be of outstanding benefit to the whole teaching effort.¹¹

Individual opinion and study—Plans for paying teachers on the basis of merit ratings are seriously questioned by several writers.¹² It is claimed that rating devices now available are too crude to justify their use in determining salaries and that such salary plans harm the morale of the staff more than they improve the quality of the service. It is usually conceded that salary differences based on merit would be justified if merit could be measured. Morrison, however, insists that, as teaching is a socialized rather than an individualistic profession, advancement would better be determined by presumptive rise thru the levels of a graduated salary schedule than by the personal judgment of school officers as to the relative merit of individual teachers.¹³

Other writers call attention to both the advantages and the disadvantages of merit plans for paying salaries.¹⁴ Young presents an analysis of the administration of merit-type salary schedules in 59 city school systems.¹⁵ He states neither approval nor disapproval of such schedules, but suggests criteria which should govern their administration, and reports in some detail (1) on the relationship of the merit ratings to the provisions of the salary schedule, and (2) on the method of making the ratings. The following summary of the factors which should enter into the considera-

⁶ Holyoke, p. 399-400.

⁷ Lexington, Pittsburgh Citizens, San Francisco Teachers, Springfield.

⁸ Lexington.

⁹ Los Angeles, San Francisco Citizens.

¹⁰ Chicago, Closter, Lexington, Pittsburgh Citizens, Pittsburgh Teachers, San Francisco Teachers, Yonkers.

¹¹ Chicago, p. 280-81.

¹² For example, see: Clark, R. C. "Principles of Advancing the Salaries of Teachers." *American School Board Journal* 80: 50, 142; April, 1930. ¶ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 70-84.

¹³ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 265-67.

¹⁴ For example, see: Cooke, Dennis H. *Problems of the Teaching Personnel*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1933. p. 272-74.

¹⁵ Young, Lloyd Percy. *The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules*. Contributions to Education, No. 552. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933. 104 p.

tion of merit plans is quoted from Young's study:

The type of salary schedule which should be used in a particular school system is not a matter of right type or wrong type, but a question of relative values.

As long as the measures of teaching efficiency are largely subjective, the incorporation of merit rating into salary schedules attempts to pay teachers according to their relative worth but increases the possibilities for friction and misunderstanding by reducing the degree of objectivity and reliability of

measurement. A schedule based upon training and experience, which may be measured objectively and reliably, sacrifices to a certain degree the recognition and direct control of teaching efficiency.

This study makes no attempt to prove or disprove that teachers' salary schedules should be based in whole, or in part, upon merit rating as a measure of teaching efficiency; nor does this study plead for the adoption or continued use of a merit-type salary schedule. That issue must be decided by the educational authorities in each system in the light of the type of teaching personnel, qualifications of the administrative staff, policy of the school board, and public opinion.¹⁰

¹⁰ Young, Lloyd Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

Differentials for Special Teaching Services

"What differentials or special salaries shall be set for teachers with extra duties or special assignments?" Slightly more than a fourth of the 212 superintendents replying to the questionnaire indicated that this question was among the three most difficult. It does not involve such controversial issues as those raised by the questions on sex and merit as bases for salary, but in some ways is related to those questions. Some writers who are unwilling for differentials on the basis of sex or merit to be provided officially in the salary schedule have suggested that they be provided unofficially thru positions which carry extra salary, such as heads of departments, counselors, and demonstration teachers. Others would consider the purposes to be served by these special positions and would set up standards for appointment and remuneration in terms of the need to be filled. Additional assignments for which special salaries are sometimes given are the teaching of exceptional pupils—physically, mentally, or socially atypical children—and the teaching of certain subjects such as manual training and home economics.

Present Practise

Salaries for various special teaching assignments are provided in a number of the 150 salary schedules of recent adoption, as shown in Table 12. Forty-seven mention heads of departments, 23 provide for teachers of atypical classes, and smaller numbers include differentials for various subjects. Counselors' salaries are included in 16 schedules. The extra salary is most frequently provided thru a dif-

ferential above the salary the teacher would receive on the regular schedule. Information on the median salaries paid to certain special groups, in relationship to the amounts paid to elementary teachers, is given in Table 13.¹

Salary allowances are sometimes made for extra duties such as teaching a double grade, dividing teaching time between two buildings, carrying an unusual amount of extracurriculum service, and serving in outlying schools. Twelve of the 150 schedules provide salary allowances for one or more of these extra services.

Opinion and Studies

The publications of the National Education Association, the local salary studies, and other published material on salaries give little space to discussing the scheduling of salaries for special teaching assignments. Two justifications for such special salaries are stated: (1) the extra training required, and (2) the special ability required. Current practise is also considered in fixing the relative amounts.

The element of extra training is recognized in the report of the Salary Committee of the National Education Association, published in 1923:

Salary schedules should provide financial recognition for work requiring special training in addition to the regular training of teachers.

Where it is necessary for a teacher to have special training in dietetics, or in nursing, or in handling backward and feeble-minded children, or any other such work in addition to his regular training as a teacher, the additional salary paid such a teacher should be enough to warrant the ad-

¹ For a discussion of the usefulness of figures such as those presented in Table 13, see: Eells, Walter Crosby. "Relative Salaries For Different School Positions." *American School Board Journal* 85: 30, 78; November, 1932.

ditional investment of time and money needed to secure this special training.²

The Chicago study, which makes no recommendations for extra salaries for special services, says that length of training should be the only basis for such extra salary:

Differential salaries for teachers of special types of classes are defensible on only two grounds. If special training or experience in excess of ordinary standards is required, or if there is an actual shortage of teachers qualified for such service, an increased salary has an economic justification. If training and experience are recognized in the regular schedule, the first condition will be met. If there is a continuing shortage, sufficient salary reward to bring increased numbers into the work will have to be offered until the shortage is adjusted. Usually, however, such service does not require increased training or experience beyond that recommended in this report. A different training may be demanded, but with the increased tendency to recognize and provide for individual differences, differential training is tending to become a general condition. In the absence of the need of an increased length of the period of training, no differentials are recommended.³

The Los Angeles and New York Citizens studies, after fixing salaries of elementary and secondary teachers, determine the salaries for all other positions largely on the relationship of salaries for those positions to elementary and secondary salaries in other large cities.⁴ Specialized abilities are also recognized. For example, the Los Angeles study says, in reference to a differential for counselors, that "counselors are a distinct group performing

well-defined duties which differ from those of teachers and demand an ability not always possessed by teachers."⁵

Only two of the schedules proposed by the 22 studies set up salary differences on the basis of subject taught (Pittsburgh Citizens, Springfield). The statement by Lewis that "school years and subjects are of equal importance in the development of children and should therefore be so recognized in salary schedules"⁶ seems to represent majority opinion, so far as subjects are concerned.

Elsbree states that it is neither necessary nor desirable to have a separate scale for each classification, suggesting that the regular schedule for teachers can be used as the basis of payment, with suitable adaptations:

There are several simple methods of modifying the application of the formal schedule for particular groups, chief of which are payment of bonuses, upgrading, and higher initial placement on the scale. Bonuses are stipulated sums of money to be added to the salary called for by one of the regular scales; they may be uniform in size or graduated according to amount of training, experience, or responsibility; they may be automatic or contingent upon fulfilling certain requirements; they may be temporary or continuing. . . . The difference between upgrading and higher initial placement is that in the latter case individuals are placed on the level for which their training or position qualify them and that they continue on this same level, with the sole advantage of a "head start," while those who have been upgraded continue on the upper level, which usually implies larger increments and a higher maximum than for those on the planes below.⁷

² National Education Association, Salary Committee (E. S. Evenden, chairman). *Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1923. p. 73.

³ Chicago, p. 311, 313.

⁴ Los Angeles, p. 75-87; New York Citizens, p. 5.

⁵ Los Angeles, p. 83.

⁶ Lewis, E. E. "Desirable Principles of Teachers' Salary Schedules." *American School Board Journal* 80: 45-46; May, 1930.

⁷ Elsbree, Willard S. *Teachers' Salaries*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. p. 113-14.

Salaries of Principals and Other Officers

"What salaries shall be paid to principals and other supervisory and administrative officers?" This question was rated among the most difficult to answer in salary scheduling by 39 superintendents, or 18.4 percent of the 212 superintendents reporting. It is ranked low in all population groups, and is lowest among the ten questions when the groups are totaled. A prior question is that of having any sched-

ule at all for principals; the practise is not universal. In fixing the salaries of principals and other officers, the same factors which apply to teachers' salaries must be considered, plus a recognition of the degree of directive responsibility exercised by these employees, and the special abilities needed to discharge such responsibility effectively.

Present Practise

Positions included in schedules—Some schedules do not establish salaries at all for principals and other officers, leaving the salaries of such employees to be determined by the board of education on an individual basis. Table 12 reports on the extent to which 150 recently adopted schedules provide definite salaries for school employees other than reg-

ular teachers in elementary and secondary day schools. Salaries of principals are included in 74 schedules; those of supervisors, in 49.

Comparison with salaries of elementary teachers—Information is presented in Table 13 which makes it possible to study the median salaries of administrative and supervisory officers in relation to the salaries paid in other positions in the school system.¹ They have been

¹ Table 13 is based on 1930-31 figures because it is believed that the 1930-31 figures are more representative of normal salary policies than are 1932-33 or 1934-35 salaries. The depression cuts which were in effect in many cities during the more recent years were not uniform in their application at different salary levels and resulted in temporarily unbalanced relationships.

TABLE 12.—SCHOOL EMPLOYEES OTHER THAN REGULAR TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY DAY SCHOOLS, INCLUDED IN 150 SALARY SCHEDULES OF RECENT ADOPTION

Position	Number of schedules including the position					Total		
	Group I ^a	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Number	Percent	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teachers:								
Heads of departments in secondary schools..	13	21	8	3	2	47	31.3	
Substitute teachers.....	12	7	6	3	5	33	22.0	
Classes for atypical pupils.....	8	8	5	1	1	23	15.3	
Part-time and continuation schools.....	9	6	3	..	1	19	12.7	
Manual training.....	8	7	2	..	..	17	11.3	
Counselors or advisers.....	6	9	1	..	..	16	10.7	
Night schools.....	8	3	2	2	..	15	10.0	
Special teachers, subject not stated.....	5	3	1	1	4	14	9.3	
Athletic coaches.....	3	3	5	..	3	14	9.3	
Home economics.....	6	3	2	1	1	13	8.7	
Vocational classes.....	2	3	5	1	1	12	8.0	
Trade or vocational school.....	6	3	..	..	..	9	6.0	
Physical education, health.....	3	2	3	1	..	9	6.0	
Summer schools.....	3	2	..	1	..	6	4.0	
Junior colleges.....	3	3	..	..	..	6	4.0	
Music.....	2	1	2	..	..	5	3.3	
Home and visiting teachers.....	3	2	..	..	..	5	3.3	
Assistant teachers.....	1	2	..	..	..	3	2.0	
Critic teachers.....	2	..	..	..	..	2	1.3	
Art.....	..	..	2	..	..	2	1.3	
Principals:								
Elementary.....	18	18	20	11	7	74	49.3	
Junior high.....	13	12	5	3	..	33	22.0	
Senior high.....	16	9	8	7	3	43	28.7	
Vice-principals:								
Elementary.....	9	5	1	1	..	16	10.7	
Junior high.....	8	7	3	..	..	18	12.0	
Senior high.....	12	6	6	1	1	26	17.3	
Deans.....	7	5	2	1	1	16	10.7	
Other administrative and supervisory officers:								
Superintendent.....	4	2	4	1	..	11	7.3	
Assistant superintendents.....	7	2	..	..	..	9	6.0	
Supervisors, directors.....	16	13	13	4	3	49	32.7	
Other employees:								
Librarians.....	9	5	3	2	..	19	12.7	
Research staff.....	5	..	..	..	..	5	3.3	
Attendance department staff.....	7	2	1	..	..	10	6.7	
Health department staff—not teachers.....	7	8	5	2	2	24	16.0	
Playground employees.....	2	1	..	..	..	3	2.0	
Registrars.....	2	..	..	..	..	2	1.3	
Clerical employees.....	8	4	2	..	1	15	10.0	
Janitorial and engineering staff.....	5	2	..	..	..	7	4.7	
Total number of schedules.....	25	32	43	28	22	150	(100.0)	

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

TABLE 13.—MEDIAN SALARIES PAID AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIPS, 50 POSITIONS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS, 1930-31

Position	Median salary paid					Index of relationship, elementary teacher's salary = 100					
	Group Ia	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Teachers:											
Kindergartens.....	\$2,077	\$1,609				98.1	100.0				
Atypical classes.....	2,372	1,850				112.0	115.0				
Elementary.....	2,118	1,609	\$1,428 ^b	\$1,303 ^b	\$1,162 ^b	100.0	100.0	100.0 ^b	100.0 ^b	100.0 ^b	
Junior high.....	2,348	1,860	1,619 ^c	1,494 ^c	1,360 ^c	110.9	115.6	113.4 ^c	114.7 ^c	117.0 ^c	
Senior high.....	2,731	2,111	1,876 ^d	1,692 ^d	1,547 ^d	128.9	131.2	131.4 ^d	129.9 ^d	133.1 ^d	
Part-time and continuation.....	2,695	2,166	1,864	1,454	700	127.2	134.6	130.5	111.6	60.2	
Department heads (high school).....	3,436	2,575				162.2	160.0				
Principals:											
Elementary											
Teaching.....	2,436	2,011	1,742	1,583	1,409	115.0	125.0	122.0	121.5	121.3	
Supervising.....	3,519	2,646	2,349	2,175	2,175	166.1	164.4	164.5	171.8	187.2	
Junior high.....	4,500	3,353	2,763	2,184	1,775	212.5	208.4	193.5	167.6	152.8	
Senior high.....	5,100	4,281	3,613	2,825	2,403	240.8	266.1	253.0	216.8	206.8	
Part-time and continuation.....	4,111	3,050				194.1	189.6				
Vice-principals:											
Elementary.....	4,280	2,756				202.1	171.3				
Junior high.....	3,496	2,743				165.1	170.5				
Senior high.....	5,544	3,053				261.8	189.7				
Deans:											
Junior high.....	3,092	2,367				146.0	147.1				
Senior high.....	2,942	2,523				138.9	156.8				
Other administrative and supervisory officers:											
Superintendent of schools.....	10,000	6,758	5,149	4,188	3,565	472.1	420.0	360.6	321.4	306.8	
First assistant superintendents.....	5,786	4,583	2,950	3,300	1,575	273.2	284.8	266.6	253.3	135.5	
Business managers.....	5,500	3,690	3,200	2,500		259.7	229.3	224.1	191.9		
Directors and supervisors											
Research, tests, and measurements.....	3,967	2,620	2,150	2,425	1,200	187.3	162.8	150.6	186.1	101.1	
Kindergartens.....	3,200	2,780	2,217	1,950	1,500	168.3	174.0	155.3	149.2	101.1	
Junior high schools.....	3,800	2,800	2,217	1,950	1,500	168.3	174.0	155.3	149.2	101.1	
Senior high schools.....	3,500	2,500	2,550	2,550	2,500	168.3	174.0	155.3	149.2	101.1	
Continuation schools.....	4,850	3,600	3,000	3,000	2,200	213.8	223.2	213.8	213.8	101.1	
Senior high schools.....	3,900	2,700	1,800	1,550		184.8	162.2	135.0	38.4		
Continuation schools.....	3,300	1,000		500		159.0	136.7	73.5	38.4		

Kindergarten, tests, and measurements.....	3,967	2,620	2,510	2,418	1,700	187.3	162.8	150.6	186.1	104.3
Kindergarten.....	3,200	2,780	2,513	1,967	1,700	172.8	172.8	172.8	172.8	104.3
Primary.....	3,500	2,800	2,217	1,980	1,500	165.1	165.1	165.1	165.1	104.3
Intermediate grades.....	3,500	2,800	2,550	2,450	1,500	165.1	165.1	165.1	165.1	104.3
Senior high schools.....	4,850	3,600	3,800	3,050	2,200	213.8	203.7	193.3	213.8	104.3
Continuation schools.....	3,900	2,700	3,000	1,500		183.1	167.8	126.1	119.0	104.3
Kindergarten.....	3,400	2,400	2,500	1,500		155.8	136.2	135.0	135.0	104.3
Elementary.....	3,400	2,400	2,500	1,500		155.8	136.2	135.0	135.0	104.3
Vocational education.....	3,400	2,400	2,500	1,500		155.8	136.2	135.0	135.0	104.3
Manual training.....	3,567	3,050	3,050	2,600	2,500 +	209.3	209.3	211.8	199.5	215.1 +
Home economics.....	3,271	2,485	1,852	2,103	1,867	168.4	168.4	168.4	168.4	160.7
Health.....	4,120	2,520	1,875	1,650	1,526	154.4	154.4	154.4	154.4	131.3
Physical education.....	3,690	2,933	2,344	1,700	1,300	194.5	156.6	131.3	130.5	111.9
Art.....	3,383	2,395	1,875	1,696	1,450	174.2	182.3	164.1	166.7	159.2
Music.....	3,556	2,693	2,043	1,772	1,460	159.7	148.9	131.3	130.2	124.8
Penmanship.....	3,083	2,320	1,888	1,586	1,275	167.9	167.9	143.1	136.0	125.6
Other employees:										
Attendance officers.....	3,125	2,033	1,215	500	500	147.5	126.4	85.1	38.4	43.0
Attendance officers.....	2,078	1,736	1,140	600	600	98.1	107.9	79.8	46.0	51.6
Nurses.....	2,138	1,973	1,716	1,639	1,533	100.9	122.6	120.2	125.8	131.9
School nurses.....	1,715	1,651	1,798	1,643	1,558	81.0	102.6	125.9	126.1	134.1
Secretarial and clerical employees.....	4,450	2,600	1,250	558	500	210.1	161.6	87.5	42.8	43.0
Secretary to the board of education.....	2,400	1,855	1,453	1,192	885	113.3	115.3	101.8	91.5	76.2
Assistant secretary to the superintendent.....	1,900	1,420				89.7	88.3			
School clerks in principals' offices.....	1,281	1,046	966	800	781	60.5	65.0	67.6	61.4	67.2
Clerks in other offices.....	1,581	1,268	1,113	1,057	764	74.6	78.8	77.9	81.1	65.7
Custodial employees.....	4,133	2,857	2,175	1,900	2,150	195.1	177.6	152.3	145.8	185.0
Superintendents of buildings and grounds.....	3,050	2,114	1,892	1,692	1,573	144.0	131.4	132.5	129.9	135.4
Head janitors.....	1,782	1,906				84.1	118.5			
Assistant head janitors.....	1,541	1,444	1,347	1,255	1,087	72.8	89.7	94.3	96.3	93.5
School janitors.....										

Read table as follows: In Group I cities the median salary paid to kindergarten teachers in 1930-31 was \$2077. If the median salary paid to kindergarten teachers, \$2118, is given the value 100, then the median salary paid to kindergarten teachers has a value of 98.1 (see Column 7) or is 98.1 percent of the elementary teacher's salary. Similarly read figures for other positions and other population groups.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division, "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31," *Research Bulletin* 9, 161-228; May, 1931.

a For population ranges see Table 1.
b Includes kindergarten and special class teachers; also vice-principals in elementary schools.
c Includes vice-principals and deans.
d Includes heads of departments, vice-principals, and deans.

reduced to a common basis by the preparation of an index, with the median salary of elementary-school teachers in each population group as 100. These figures are of most significance for positions which are very generally found in all school systems, such as the three major groups of teachers, principals, and the superintendent of schools. Positions which occur infrequently are likely to be found only in the school systems which pay high salaries, resulting in a high median for the position. For example, the median salary for elementary-school vice-principals, in 28 Group I cities, is higher than the median salary for elementary-school supervising principals in 86 Group I cities. The figures in Table 13, then, are very rough approximations, but the best now avail-

able, of the relative median salaries paid to the various positions found most frequently on school staffs.

The relationships given in Table 13 refer to median salaries. Figures are also available on the medians of minimum and maximum salaries scheduled for certain positions—teachers and principals in elementary, junior high, and senior high schools.² Table 14 presents these figures, and an index of relationship, with elementary teachers' salaries as the basis for comparison. The figures for teachers are the same as those for 1930-31 given in Tables 4 and 6 and are reproduced here for convenience in studying the salaries of principals. One fact is conspicuous—that the salaries of principals are further above elementary teachers' salaries

² Minimum and maximum salaries for individual cities are reported in: National Education Association, Research Division, *Special Salary Tabulation, 1930-31*. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931.

The bases for scheduling salaries of elementary-school principals—size of school, preparation, or both—for Group I cities are reported in: National Education Association, Department of Superintendence and Research Division, *Salary Schedules for Elementary School Principals, 1930-31: 88 Cities Over 100,000 in Population*. Educational Research Service Circular No. 10, 1931. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1931. 26 p. (Mimeographed.)

TABLE 14.—MEDIAN OF MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM SALARIES PAID TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS IN CITY SCHOOL SYSTEMS, 1930-31, AND INDEX OF RELATIONSHIPS (ELEMENTARY TEACHERS = 100)

Position	Amount of salary					Index of relationship, elementary teacher's salary = 100				
	Group I ^a	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Median of minimum salaries						Index of minimum salaries				
Teachers:										
Elementary.....	\$1,227	\$1,084	\$1,068	\$1,056	\$ 999	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	1,390	1,234	1,187	1,195	1,135	113.3	113.8	111.1	113.2	113.6
Senior high.....	1,507	1,344	1,294	1,288	1,269	122.8	124.0	121.2	122.0	127.0
Principals:										
Elementary										
Teaching.....	1,925	1,725	1,572	1,380	1,271	156.9	159.1	147.2	130.7	127.2
Supervising....	2,169	2,007	1,925	1,633	1,650	176.8	185.1	180.2	154.6	165.2
Junior high.....	3,467	3,013	2,250	1,725	1,525	282.6	278.0	210.7	163.4	152.7
Senior high.....	3,850	3,580	2,850	2,367	2,031	313.8	330.3	266.9	224.1	203.3
Median of maximum salaries						Index of maximum salaries				
Teachers:										
Elementary.....	\$2,280	\$1,996	\$1,729	\$1,611	\$1,411	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Junior high.....	2,671	2,267	2,008	1,854	1,657	117.1	113.6	116.1	115.1	117.4
Senior high.....	2,840	2,469	2,253	2,097	1,983	124.6	123.7	130.3	130.2	140.5
Principals:										
Elementary										
Teaching.....	2,800	2,600	2,086	1,854	1,592	122.8	130.3	120.6	115.1	112.8
Supervising....	3,657	3,200	2,600	2,350	2,200	160.4	160.3	150.4	145.9	155.9
Junior high.....	4,510	4,036	3,064	2,467	1,875	197.8	202.2	177.2	153.1	132.9
Senior high.....	5,060	4,529	3,940	3,038	2,507	221.9	226.9	227.9	188.6	177.7

Read table thus: In Group I cities the median of minimum salaries scheduled for elementary teachers in 1930-31 was \$1227; for junior high-school teachers, \$1390. If the minimum elementary salary is given the value 100, then the minimum junior high-school salary has a value of 113.3 (see Column 7), or is 13.3 percent higher than the elementary salary. Similarly read figures for other positions and population groups. The index for maximum salaries is based on the maximum salary of elementary teachers in each population group.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931.

^a For population ranges, see Table 1.

when minimum salaries are considered than when maximum salaries are considered. For example, the minimum salary for elementary teaching principals in Group I cities is 56.9 percent above the teachers' minimum, but the maximum salary is only 22.8 percent above the teachers' maximum. The senior high-school principals' salary in Groups I, II, and III is close to 125 percent above the elementary teachers' maximum, but falls to 77.7 percent in Group V.

Maximum salaries of principals compared with minimums—Another sort of comparison is made in Table 15, which refers to salaries of principals only. The elementary teacher's salary is no longer the point of reference, but the minimum salary paid to the principal. In view of the importance attached by many students of salaries to the establishing of sched-

ules which provide a wide range of salary from minimum to maximum, the figures in Table 15 are of particular interest. They compare 1930-31 schedules with those reported eight years earlier on the relationship of the maximum to the minimum salary. In seventeen of the twenty comparisons in Table 15, the maximum exceeds the minimum by a larger percent in 1930-31 than in 1922-23. The greatest range reported is in the 1930-31 salary of supervising elementary principals, which is 68.6 percent higher than the minimum salary.

Opinion and Studies

National Education Association—A professional salary schedule for supervising elementary-school principals was proposed by the Committee on Standards and Training for the Elementary School Principalship, reporting in 1928 to the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association.³ The salary classes are based on (1) enrolment, in 5 levels—below 500 pupils, 500-999, 1000-1999, 2000-2999, 3000 and over; (2) years of professional preparation, in 3 levels—4 years, 5 years, and 6 years; and (3) years of experience as principal—4 increments at each level of training, over a period of 12 years, with the opportunity of qualifying for a higher training level and earning extra increments. The lowest salary is \$2000, the highest is \$7000. Emphasis is laid on the fact that principals' salaries must be considered in relationship to other salaries in the system. The committee opposes the plan of fixing principals' salaries by adding a few hundred dollars to the schedule for teachers, holding that the better plan is first to set up the specifications for the office, and then to establish the salary at a level which will secure people with the desired qualifications.

Bases for administrative and supervisory salaries—The local salary studies and the contributions of individual writers mention most frequently the following possible bases for scheduling the salaries of principals and other officers:

- (1) Ratio between salaries paid teachers and the salaries paid to other employees, in comparable school systems.
- (2) Directive responsibility which the position carries.

TABLE 15.—INDEX OF RELATIONSHIP OF MAXIMUM SALARY FOR PRINCIPALS TO MINIMUM SALARY, 1930-31 AND 1922-23 (MINIMUM SALARY = 100)

School division; year	Index of relationship, minimum salary = 100				
	Group Ia	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
1	2	3	4	5	6
Elementary					
Teaching					
1930-31.....	145.5	150.7	132.7	134.3	125.3
1922-23.....	128.6	125.5	122.7	124.4	124.9
Supervising					
1930-31.....	168.6	159.4	135.1	143.9	133.3
1922-23.....	159.3	140.7	126.7	118.3	109.1
Junior high					
1930-31.....	130.1	134.0	136.2	143.0	123.0
1922-23.....	132.0	122.4	120.3	116.8	108.6
Senior high					
1930-31.....	131.4	126.5	138.2	128.3	123.4
1922-23.....	138.6	133.2	122.4	120.9	113.4

Read table as follows: In 1930-31 the median of maximum salaries scheduled for elementary teaching principals in Group I cities was 45.5 percent higher than the median of minimum salaries for the same position. In 1922-23 the maximum was 28.6 percent higher than the minimum. (The figures for 1930-31 are based on those given in Table 14. When the minimum salary of \$1925 is given the value of 100, the maximum salary of \$2800 then has the value of 145.5, or is 45.5 percent higher than the minimum for the position. The figures for 1922-23 are similarly computed, on the basis of figures not reproduced in this bulletin.) Similarly read figures for other positions and population groups.

Source of figures: Based on information reported in: National Education Association, Research Division. "Salaries in City School Systems, 1930-31." *Research Bulletin* 9: 163-226; May, 1931; and National Education Association, Research Division. "Teachers' Salaries and Salary Trends in 1923." *Research Bulletin* 1: 137-251; May, 1923.

* For population ranges, see Table 1.

³ National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals. *The Elementary School Principalship*. Seventh Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: the Association, 1928. Chapter 24, "The Economic Position of the Elementary School Principal," p. 468-95.

- (3) Scarcity of the executive ability required to fill the position.
- (4) Level of salaries paid in comparable school systems; level of preparation; years of experience, and other factors which apply to the salaries of teachers as well as officers.

Relationship to teachers' salaries—The plan of basing principals' and officers' salaries upon the relationship to teachers' salaries is emphasized in the New York Citizens study, which says:

It was recognized by the Committee that every board of education in the United States has faced and solved in some manner, haphazard or otherwise, the problem of the relationship between the salary of a principal and the salary of the regular teachers in his school. Expressed concretely and directly, the relationship between the average salary paid to elementary principals and to elementary teachers, for instance, in a given city, represents that community's evaluation of the relative economic importance of these two educational positions. The Committee reasoned that it could find no more valid basis for establishing the salary of principals than that of the combined judgment expressed in the most common practise in other large American cities.⁴

Increased responsibility—Of the 14 local studies which include salaries for principals of elementary schools in the proposed schedules, 12 recommend a variation in salary on the basis of school size. Eleven studies recommend salaries for junior and senior high-school principals, 4 of which recognize differences in size of junior high schools and 2 in size of senior high schools.

The Nashville study gives explicit recognition to the element of increased responsibility in fixing salaries for both supervisors and principals.⁵ Salaries for supervisors are scheduled as follows: (1) the salary on the teachers' schedule, based on preparation, plus (2) an increment of \$750 for increased responsibilities, and (3) experience increments over a period of eleven years. Principals' salaries are scheduled in the same way, except that the increment for increased responsibility is scaled according to size of school, in 4 levels, \$500, \$750, \$1000, and \$1500.

No differences on basis of school size are suggested in the principals' salary schedules proposed in the Chicago survey or the New York Citizens' report. Hubbard calls attention to the educational improvements and the financial savings which are possible thru grouping small elementary schools into supervising units containing from 800 to 1000 pupils, each unit to be under the direction of a skilled supervising principal.⁶ Under such a plan there would be no need for variations in salary on basis of school size. Fewer principals would be employed and salaries large enough to command the services of competent persons could be paid for the amount formerly needed to employ a larger number of principals at salaries only slightly above the teachers' schedule.

Executive ability—Scarcity of the kind of ability needed for successful administrative and supervisory service is emphasized in the Chicago study, which includes the following comment on rewarding leadership:

The qualities which underlie leadership in effective supervision and wise administration tend to be somewhat scarce. This is true in all fields of activity, and necessitates a higher level of remuneration for persons possessing such qualities. In addition, rising levels of rank proportionately make necessary expenditures which are escaped at lower levels. The necessity of conserving health, energies, and time is increasingly expensive, and the busy person cannot spend an undue amount of time or concern preserving the economic attitude toward unimportant details of living.⁷

Qualities of leadership are also emphasized in the Pittsburgh Citizens study, which includes the following as a statement of principle:

The Committee is of the firm and deep conviction that in the proper operation of salary schedules lies the possibility of obtaining better and superior teaching in the public schools. To gain this high objective however, the schools must have forceful and intelligent leadership. In short, superior teaching is predicated upon superior leadership. The Committee, therefore, places great stress upon having strong outstanding principals. Thus, it recommends such salary changes for principals as will attract and hold the highest types of persons, with outstanding educational and teaching leadership.⁸

⁴ New York Citizens, p. 165-66. See also: Fresno, Calif. *Salary and Cost Study of Fresno Schools*. (By Walter Crosby Eells.) Fresno: City Council of Education, 1932. p. 57-58.

⁵ Nashville, p. 242-45.

⁶ Hubbard, Frank W. "More About Salaries and Supervision." *Bulletin* 9: 119-22; January, 1930. Washington, D. C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association.

⁷ Chicago, p. 301.

⁸ Pittsburgh Citizens, p. 11. See also: Los Angeles, p. xxix, 87-90.

Only three studies make definite recommendations on the salary of the superintendent of schools (New York Board of Estimate, New York Citizens, San Francisco Citizens). Morrison calls attention to the uncertainty of this office, calling it an adventure rather than a position, and stating that the large economic risk carried by the superintendent of schools is a justification for a much higher salary than is typically paid.⁹ The New York Citizens study, which recommends a salary of \$25,000 for the superintendent of schools, gives the following statement regarding the salaries pro-

posed for the higher administrative and supervisory officers:

It was agreed by the Committee . . . that the establishment of relatively high salaries for the highest administrative positions, while costing the city very little because there are so few of these positions, should yield a very great return in the stimulation to professional achievement which it would generate in the entire school system. In recommending these salaries the Committee assumes that these positions would be filled by those candidates whose merit and fitness for the particular position were most outstanding and that full publicity would be given to the considerations which guided the Board of Education in their selections.¹⁰

⁹ Morrison, Henry C. *The Management of the School Money*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. p. 248.

¹⁰ New York Citizens, p. 173.

Summary

Evidence has been presented from practise, research, and opinion on certain practical questions which arise in the preparation of salary schedules in local school systems.

Position and preparation—Altho there is a tendency toward increasing recognition of professional preparation in setting up the basic classification of salary schedules, the majority of schedules still are organized on the basis of position. Additional professional training above the minimum required for appointment is being recognized by providing special salary groups and supermaximum salaries, and by requirements for continued training in order to advance on the salary schedule.

Minimum and maximum salaries—In the scheduling of minimum and maximum salaries for the main group of employees, classroom teachers, emphasis is placed on these considerations: (1) costs of suitable standards of living for the beginning teacher and for the mature teacher, (2) return on the teacher's investment in professional preparation, (3) relationships now existing among positions in amount of salary, and (4) the range from the minimum to the maximum salary. Other factors to be recognized are these: salaries paid in other school systems, salaries paid in other occupations, and the resources for financing the schedule. The general trend of opinion favors the establishment of maximum salaries at levels adequate to maintain the experienced teacher and his dependents twelve months in the year at a standard in keeping with the cultural de-

mands on the teaching profession and to enable him to face old age with an assurance of economic security.

Increments—Increments granted on the basis of years of experience should be substantial in amount and should extend over a long period of years, according to several recommendations. Increments are frequently regarded as a recognition given for the value which each year of experience adds to a teacher's service; it also has been suggested that increments are not rewards for service but a method of gradually raising a beginner's salary to a professional level, over a suitable period of years.

Sex—The majority of schedules provide equal pay for men and women; recently published discussions emphasize the economic difficulties arising under this policy. The argument for equal pay is based on a claim for justice to women, who render service which is as useful as that of men; the argument for a differential hinges on the scarcity of competent men willing to accept the low salaries for which competent women will consent to work.

Efficiency—Relatively few schedules use efficiency ratings as a factor in determining a teacher's place on the regular salary schedule. There is greater support, both in practise and in published discussions, for a policy of selecting a few outstanding teachers for advanced salaries beyond the normal maximum. There are some who insist that all such plans are likely to work injustice, holding that adequate

supervision and the personal knowledge of the teacher himself that he is doing superior work which is being appreciated offer more satisfactory incentives to maximum service than a salary increment would provide.

Specialized services—The scheduling of salaries for specialized teaching services, such as counseling, the teaching of atypical pupils, demonstration teaching, and service as heads of departments, may be done in terms of the extra training and the special abilities required for the special assignments. It is frequently recommended that, in the interests of simplicity

and flexibility of administration, such special assignments be paid by a differential above the teachers' schedule, rather than by establishing separate salary classes.

Administrative and supervisory services—In fixing salaries of administrative and supervisory officers, special attention should be given to these factors: (1) degree of directive responsibility which the positions carry, (2) special economic risks involved, and (3) scarcity of the ability, specialized experience, and qualities of leadership needed to fill the positions adequately.

THE PRIMARY PURPOSE in making a new salary schedule for teachers, especially if it results in increasing salaries, is to provide better service for the boys and girls of the community and, therefore, richer returns on the investment by the taxpayers. Salaries should not be increased merely because teachers are more poorly paid than other professional workers with the same training and experience, nor because the salaries received are below the cost of living, nor because the salaries of teachers in a particular city are below the average paid in other cities of the same class, unless in addition to these considerations there results a proportionate increase in efficiency of service. . . . The criterion that should be applied to any provision in a salary schedule should be the probability that it will tend, directly or indirectly, to produce better teaching service. The final question is not whether the provision is theoretically sound or generally approved, but whether in its operation it will result in better service.—A. J. Stoddard, *American School Board Journal*, Vol. 81, October, 1930, p. 43.

Summary of Procedures and Policies in Scheduling Teachers' Salaries

The previous discussion has called attention to the administrative steps in setting up a salary schedule for school employees, the facts to be studied, and decisions to be made on certain questions of policy. Statistical findings and a review of part of the published material on the scheduling of salaries have been presented.

This section is organized in the form of an itemized list of procedures and policies for convenient use by those responsible for the preparation of salary schedules. It calls attention to various steps in the process and to certain possibilities for variation within the schedule itself. The list does not propose standards; the fact that an item is included is not a recommendation for its adoption in any given school system. The list is intended only to serve as a reminder of some of the possibilities to be considered in preparing the salary schedule. The numbers in parentheses following each item in the list refer to pages in the two parts of this study,¹ by reference to which further suggestions as to the possible significance of the item will be found.

Preliminary Steps

1. Official action is taken by some agency recommending that the salary situation be studied and that a new schedule be prepared, if necessary. The action may be taken by:

- a. The superintendent of schools.
- b. The board of education.
- c. Teachers associations.² (p. 9-10.)

2. The proposal to begin preliminary work on the salary schedule is approved by the board of education:

- a. By formal board action.
- b. By informal agreement. (p. 9-10.)

Personnel and Responsibilities

3. The personnel for carrying on the systematic study preliminary to actually writing the schedule is selected. It may include:

- a. The superintendent of schools.
- b. Representatives of the whole staff.
Appointed by school authorities.
Elected by schools and groups of employees.
Elected by organizations of school employees.

- c. Members of the board of education.
- d. Citizens other than board members.
- e. Outside educators. (p. 11-12.)

4. The chief responsibility for drafting the schedule itself is fixed. It may be carried by:

- a. The superintendent of schools.
- b. A committee which includes the superintendent. (p. 10-12, 15-16.)

5. The entire teaching staff may be called upon for assistance. The individual members of the staff may help by:

- a. Furnishing information on personal status for use in preliminary study.
- b. Reviewing and criticizing proposed drafts of schedule. (p. 12-13.)

6. The board of education has a responsibility in dealing with the schedule. It may be exercised by:

- a. Appointing a special committee on the salary schedule.
- b. Reviewing and criticizing proposed drafts of the schedule.
- c. Adopting the schedule.
- d. Putting the schedule into effect. (p. 13-14.)

Studying the Facts

Facts are assembled which are considered necessary for a wise determination of local salary policies. The facts may include certain of the following:

7. The salary schedule already in effect

- a. Trends over a period of years in minimum, maximum, median, and average salaries paid in local school system.
- b. Distribution of personnel on present schedule. (p. 25.)

8. Salaries paid in other school systems

- a. Minimum, maximum, median, and average salaries paid.
- b. Number and amount of increments.
- c. Standards and principles of salary scheduling accepted elsewhere. (p. 25-27.)

9. Salaries in occupations other than teaching

- a. Trends in wage rates of union labor.
- b. Salaries of public employees other than the school staff.
- c. Incomes of other professional groups. (p. 27-29.)

¹ For first part, see: National Education Association, Research Division, "The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules: Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures." *Research Bulletin* 14: 1-48; January, 1936.

² Only three agencies are mentioned; there are others. No effort is made, in this or subsequent items in the list, to name all possibilities for variation.

10. Status of the present teaching staff—personal and economic factors

- a. Age, sex, marital status.
- b. Living conditions.
- c. Income.
- d. Expenditures.
- e. Proportion of income devoted to food and housing.
- f. Dependents. (p. 29-31.)

11. Trends in cost of living

- a. Salaries paid to local teachers, over period of years, in terms of purchasing power of an earlier year. (p. 31-34.)

12. Status of the present teaching staff—professional factors

- a. Amount and kind of professional preparation.
- b. Evidence of recent professional growth.
- c. Amount and kind of professional experience. (p. 30-31.)

13. Service conditions and administrative practises affecting salaries

- a. Policies in local and comparable school systems as to qualifications for appointment, use of ratings, leaves of absence, etc.
- b. Amount of turnover in teaching positions.
- c. Teaching load. (p. 34-35.)

14. Financing the salary schedule

- a. Property assessments for taxation purposes.
- b. Tax rates and collections.
- c. Municipal expenditures.
- d. School expenditures.
- e. Estimated costs:
 - Of continuing present schedule in effect.
 - Of putting proposed new schedule into effect. (p. 35-37.)

15. The facts which have been assembled are made available for study. The material may be:

- a. Incorporated in a comprehensive written report.
- b. Presented in separate statistical exhibits. (p. 21.)

Policies Governing the Salary Schedule

16. The groups of employees whose salaries are to be specified in the schedule are to be determined. The schedule may apply to:

- a. Classroom teachers.
- b. Principals.
- c. Supervisory staff.
- d. The superintendent and administrative assistants.
- e. Employees in auxiliary and coordinate activities—attendance, census, health, transportation.

f. Clerical and technical staff.

g. Custodial and engineering staff. (p. 85.)

17. Local standards as to qualifications for appointment to positions in the school service are reviewed and perhaps restated. They may be expressed in terms of:

- a. Training.
- b. Native ability and personality.
- c. Experience. (p. 57.)

18. The basic classification of the salaries for classroom teachers is to be determined. The schedule may be organized on the basis of:

- a. The position—elementary, junior high, senior high, or other assignment—filled by the teacher.
- b. The level of professional preparation—less than college graduation, bachelor's degree, master's degree—attained by the teacher. Further decision will be needed on:
 - Number of training levels to be recognized.
 - Upper and lower limits of training to be recognized.
- c. The position, with some recognition of preparation. It may be provided that:
 - Minimum and maximum salaries will vary with level of preparation.
 - Supermaximum will be granted on basis of extra training. (p. 55-61.)

19. Minimum salaries are determined. Among standards which may be considered in fixing the amounts are these:

- a. At least twice the local average annual expenditure by teachers for board and room—subsistence wage for twelve months.
- b. One and a third times the cost of necessities for an inexperienced teacher, thus making a small provision for savings, giving, and personal betterment.
- c. An amount equal to or better than the average minimum salary paid in comparable school systems.
- d. An amount large enough, over and above a subsistence wage, to represent a return on the teacher's investment in professional training. (p. 61-66.)

20. Maximum salaries are determined. Among standards which may be considered in fixing the amounts are these:

- a. At least twice the cost of necessities for an experienced teacher, these necessities to include the maintenance of a home and provision for the average number of persons dependent upon such teachers for support, thus providing (above necessities) for giving, education and cultural activities, and savings.

- b. An amount equal to or better than the average maximum salary paid in comparable school systems.
- c. An amount equal to or better than the average income received by persons of similar ability, training, and experience in other occupational groups.
- d. An amount, which, when the schedule is in full effect, the school system will be able to finance.
- e. At least twice the minimum salary. (p. 66-70.)

21. The increments from minimum to maximum in the various salary classes must be determined. Among provisions to be specified are:

- a. Size of increments.
- b. Spacing of increments:
 - May be granted annually, or at longer intervals.
 - May begin at once, or after probationary period.
 - May stop after specified period or continue thru entire service.
- c. Amount of increments:
 - Large enough to be perceptible additions to annual income.
 - Increments uniform in size thruout period when granted.
 - Smaller increments at outset, increasing in size.
 - Large increments at outset, with later ones smaller.
- d. Basis for granting increments:
 - Automatically, on basis of added years of experience.
 - Conditionally, on basis of quality of service, or the meeting of requirements for additional preparation. (p. 70-75.)

22. In states where the question has not been determined by legislation, it will be decided whether men and women of equal qualifications are to be paid equal salaries for equal work. (p. 75-79.)

23. The desirability of recognizing merit or efficiency in the salary schedule will be considered. Methods of recognizing merit which have been tried include the following:

- a. Size of increment varies with efficiency rating.
- b. Maximum salaries vary with efficiency rating.
- c. Efficiency ratings are one factor in placing teacher on supermaximum salary.
- d. Increments are withheld if rating is unsatisfactory.
- e. Supermaximum salary is granted to teachers of outstanding efficiency. (p. 80-83.)

24. Salaries to be paid for special teaching assignments will be fixed. The positions may be:

- a. Scheduled independently, with distinct minimums and maximums.
- b. Assigned a differential or bonus above the salary the individual would receive on the regular schedule for teachers. (p. 83-84.)

25. Salaries of principals and other employees will be determined. Among the methods of establishing these salaries the following have been suggested:

- a. Salaries fixed on basis of ratio of principals' and other employees' salaries to teachers' salaries in comparable school systems.
- b. For principals, salaries graded according to size of school. (p. 84-91.)

Organization and Format of Schedule

26. Time is taken to interpret the statistical findings, deliberate on the proposed policies, and arrive at decisions that seem most appropriate for the school system being served. (p. 18-19.)

27. The salary provisions agreed upon are brought together for official adoption by the board of education. The following items may be included:

- a. Official identification—city and state, date of adoption.
- b. Classification of salaries.
- c. Minimum qualifications for appointments to each salary class.
- d. Minimum salaries for each class or position.
- e. Maximum salaries for each class or position.
- f. Number, size, and scheduling of increments.
- g. Basis for supermaximum salary when granted.
- h. Differentials if any on basis of sex, race, marriage, dependents.
- i. Plan for transfer from old schedule to new schedule.
- j. Amount of salary credit allowed to new teachers for approved experience in other systems. (p. 18.)

Financing the Schedule

28. Steps will be taken to assure the funds for putting the salary schedule into effect. The procedure to be followed will be determined

by state law and local governmental relationships. (p. 16-17.)

29. It may be desirable to take special action to enlist public interest in support of the financing of the salary schedule. (p. 17.)

Putting the Schedule into Effect

30. The transition will be made from the old schedule to the new, taking time to evaluate preparation and experience of teachers already in service for equitable placement on the new schedule. (p. 19.)

IT IS ONLY WITHIN COMPARATIVELY RECENT YEARS that the salary schedule has become so important a factor in educational administration. Boards of education have welcomed it as a progressive business measure serving to check the haphazard requests for individual preferment and aiding them to arrive at definite costs for budgeting finances. Teachers have welcomed it as a guarantee for better and more definitely planned salaries. . . . We must avoid making it on the one hand an unreasonable check on expenditures where teachers are concerned, and on the other hand a mechanical adjustment which makes the compensation of the teacher a mere automatic operation. We must make it a constructive outline of procedure by which the whole teaching body may receive satisfactory remuneration, so that because of its operation, the children of the schools may experience the benefits of an increasingly professionalized instruction.—Committee on the Study of Salaries in the Cincinnati Public Schools, *Report*, 1926, p. 6-7.

References to Twenty-two Local Studies of Teachers' Salaries

1. 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.
2. CINCINNATI, OHIO. Committee on the Study of Salaries in the Cincinnati Public Schools (Charles Otterman, chairman). *Report.* Cincinnati: Board of Education, 1926. 78 p.
3. CLOSTER, NEW JERSEY. *Report of the Survey of the Schools of Closter, New Jersey.* (George D. Strayer, director.) Closter: Board of Education, 1923. Chapter 6, "The Teaching Personnel," p. 114-22.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA. Citizens' Committee on Teachers' Salaries (Charles Reitell, research director). *Bulletins 1-15.* Pittsburgh: the Committee, c/o the Board of Education, 1928.
16. 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 (1003 Bessemer Bldg.), 1927. 84 p. Also: *Salary Campaign of the Pittsburgh Teachers Association, 1926-1929.* (Clarissa A. Moffitt and Sara Douglas, editors.) 1929. 84 p.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. 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.
21. 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.
22. YONKERS, NEW YORK. *Teachers' Salaries in Yonkers.* (Willard S. Elsbree, director.) Yonkers: Yonkers Branch of the New York Teachers Association, 1929. 49 p.

List of Tables

	Page
1. Difficult Questions in the Scheduling of Teachers' Salaries, as Reported by Superintendents of Schools in Systems Where Salary Schedules Have Been Adopted Recently.....	54
2. Points Which Would Be Emphasized in a New Salary Schedule, as Reported by 43 Superintendents of Schools in Systems Where Salary Schedules Have Been Adopted Recently.....	55
3. Basic Classification of Salaries in 150 City School Salary Schedules, by Population Groups and by Years	56
4. Minimum Salaries Paid Teachers in Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High Schools, 1930-31, and Index of Relationship, 1930-31 and 1922-23 (Elementary = 100).....	62
5. Minimum Salaries Paid in 46 Preparation Schedules, and Index of Relationship (Two Years' Training = 100).....	62
6. Maximum Salaries Paid Teachers in Elementary, Junior High, and Senior High Schools, 1930-31, and Index of Relationship, 1930-31 and 1922-23 (Elementary = 100).....	67
7. Maximum Salaries Paid in 46 Preparation Schedules, and Index of Relationship (Two Years' Training = 100).....	67
8. Index of Relationship of Maximum Salary for Teachers to Minimum Salary, 1930-31 and 1922-23 (Minimum Salary = 100).....	68
9. Number of Salary Increments Given for Experience to Teachers with Basic Qualifications, 150 Salary Schedules	71
10. Placing of Increments Given for Experience to Teachers with Basic Qualifications, 150 Salary Schedules	71
11. Median Amounts of Increments Given for Experience to Teachers with Minimum Qualifications, Salary Schedules in Which Increments Are Uniform.....	72
12. School Employees Other Than Regular Teachers in Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, Included in 150 Salary Schedules of Recent Adoption.....	85
13. Median Salaries Paid and Index of Relationships, 50 Positions in City School Systems, 1930-31	86
14. Medians of Minimum and Maximum Salaries Paid Teachers and Principals in City School Systems, 1930-31, and Index of Relationships (Elementary Teachers = 100).....	88
15. Index of Relationship of Maximum Salary for Principals to Minimum Salary, 1930-31 and 1922-23 (Minimum Salary = 100)	89

OTHER N. E. A. PUBLICATIONS ON RELATED TOPICS

• The Economic Welfare of Teachers

A discussion of the principles of economic security and their application among teachers and teachers organizations. June, 1931. 244 p. \$1.00.

• Teacher Demand and Supply

A survey showing inarticulations between the demand for new teachers and the available supply. Indicates the potential danger of this condition to the economic welfare of teachers generally. November, 1931. 102 p. 25¢.

• Administrative Practices Affecting Classroom Teachers

Part II: The Retention, Promotion, and Improvement of Teachers

A review of salary schedule practices in more than 1000 city school systems. March, 1932. 44 p. 25¢.

• Salaries of School Employees, 1934-35

A report of the salaries paid in city school systems during the school year 1934-35. March, 1935. 32 p. 25¢. (Similar reports available for 1928-29, 1930-31, and 1932-33.)

• Teacher Personnel

The latest issue of the *Review of Educational Research* to summarize the literature bearing upon various aspects of teacher personnel, including salaries. June, 1934. 100 p. \$1.00.

• The Teacher's Economic Position

A study of the incomes and budgets of two thousand teachers; includes suggestions with regard to management of personal finances. September, 1935. 104 p. 50¢.

• The Preparation of Teachers' Salary Schedules

Part I: Administrative and Fact-Finding Procedures

Based upon the expert opinions of 222 city superintendents and an analysis of 22 local salary studies. January, 1936. 48 p. 25¢.

Single copies of these publications at prices quoted above. In quantity orders, accompanied by funds, the following discounts are allowed: 2 to 9 copies, 10 percent; 10 to 99 copies, 25 percent; 100 or more copies, 33⅓ percent.

Orders not accompanied by remittance are subject to transportation charges. Make checks payable to National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

THE APPLICATION of the principle of planning to the payment of teachers is perhaps the most significant recent trend in the field of salary scheduling. Not long ago in many communities the amount paid a given teacher, or the teaching staff as a whole, could not be justified on any sound basis. Individual opinion, guess work, favoritism, and political expediency too often dictated the salaries composing the payroll. This statement no longer applies in a growing number of situations. One community after another in recent years has made provision for the collection of the data and the formulation of the principles and policies upon which to base what may be justly called an intelligent plan for the compensation of its teachers. . . . It seems safe to say that the practice of scheduling teachers' salaries on the basis of factual data and carefully thought out principles is a tendency which has come to stay.—John K. Norton, *Teachers College Record*, 32: 719; May, 1931.
