

\$1.75

Merit Pay Programs for Teachers

A H A N D B O O K

Stayner F. Brighton

Cecil J. Hannan

81.25
sale

Merit Pay Programs for Teachers

A H A N D B O O K

by

Stayner F. Brighton, Ed. D.

Director of Research,

Washington Education Association

and

Cecil J. Hannan

Director of Field Services,

Washington Education Association

and member of the National Education

Association Executive Committee



FEARON PUBLISHERS
SAN FRANCISCO

Copyright, © 1962, by Fearon Publishers, Inc.
828 Valencia Street, San Francisco 10, California

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publishers.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 62-20512

Printed in the United States of America.

Preface

So much has been written in recent years on the pros and cons of merit pay programs for teachers that the typical teacher, school administrator, or school board member finds the task of separating the wheat from the chaff increasingly difficult. What does this vast amount of literature, research, and qualified opinion tell us about merit pay programs for teachers? Can workable merit pay programs be developed? If not, why not? If so, what conditions have to be met to assure an optimum degree of success? This handbook is designed to provide some answers to these questions for those interested people who lack the time to read through the volumes of reference materials themselves. For those who desire to probe the subject in depth, and have the time to do so, footnote references and a comprehensive bibliography are provided. A brief review of the more significant research findings is included.

The authors are well aware of the complexity of the problem of evaluating the teaching processes, the intangible nature of many factors that contribute to teacher morale, the difficulty of measuring pupil progress objectively, and the myriad other items involved in merit pay programs for teachers. All have been well established by other writers. The purpose of this book is to select, abstract, and report the more significant facts about merit pay programs for teachers. The reader must reach his own conclusion as to the feasibility of developing a merit pay plan on the basis of the knowledge presently available.

Seattle, Washington
August, 1962

S. F. BRIGHTON
C. J. HANMAN

Foreword

No aspect of American education is more controversial or more complex than evaluation of the teacher and the varied functions performed by the teacher. Overnight a school system can be thrown into a frenzy of emotionalism and misunderstanding by reports of a discussion of merit pay scales at the district board meeting. The reasons for this are understood only by those who have given considerable study to the problem.

Among conscientious students in this matter must be numbered the authors of *Merit Pay Programs for Teachers*. By the presentation of this handbook they are rendering a substantial service that will be easily recognized by school board members and others interested in exploring ways and means of adapting the "merit" concept to their salary schedules. The historical treatment, the review of experimentation, the reporting of related research, and the description of some developing trends with reference to merit pay programs combine in this single volume to form a distinct contribution to the professional literature.

This handbook, moreover, appears at the strategic time for maximum usefulness. School officials struggling with mounting budgets, multiplying school populations, and still highly critical teacher shortages may look herein for help. Teacher organizations concerned with improvement of the professional status of the teacher will find the book of interest because of its objective reporting on the historical and current situations of what the profession, with a strong majority voice, calls a "panacea."

Whatever the reader's point of view as he begins this book, he will find here the most complete story to date on the question of merit pay for teachers—and an invaluable bibliography as well.

VIRGIL M. ROGERS
Dean, School of Education
Syracuse University

I

What Do We Mean by Merit Pay Programs for Teachers?

A review of the literature shows that nearly everyone interested in the subject has his own definition of what is meant by a merit pay system for teachers. Programs have gone under many names, such as incentive pay, career increments, superior-service maximums, merit awards, and master teacher salary schedules. In general, these plans fall into three categories: (a) salary raises are withheld from teachers judged to be rendering unsatisfactory service; (b) merit bonuses are awarded teachers judged to be rendering exceptional service; and (c) master, or career, teachers are placed on a different schedule from that used for regular teachers. The career teacher is often employed on a 10- or 11-month contract, with a commensurate salary adjustment. Some districts assign such positions as department head, co-ordinator, grade chairman, or consulting teacher to outstanding teachers as a means of supplementing their salaries.

The term "merit pay program" is not easily defined. The following definitions have been put forth by various groups to describe the plans by which a teacher's salary is to some extent determined by a judgment as to his competency:

1. "A subjective, qualitative judgment of a teacher, made administratively by one or more persons, with or without the participation or the knowledge of the person rated for purposes of determining salary." (National Education Association, Department of Classroom Teachers, Conference on Merit, 1956.)
2. "Relating teachers' salaries to judgments of teacher competence." (*Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary*, New York State Teachers' Association, 1957.)

3. "Merit Rating is the effort to evaluate or measure more successfully the effectiveness of the performance of the teacher, with a view of rewarding excellence while avoiding over-payment to the mediocre or unsuccessful teacher." (Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, Syracuse University Workshop on Merit Rating in Teachers' Salary Schedules, July 7, 1958.)
4. "Merit Rating is a systematic method of evaluating employee performance for the following purposes:
 - a. To help determine promotions, transfers, demotions, dismissals, and salaries.
 - b. To provide an analysis of strong and weak points so that employees' performance may be improved through a guidance program.
 - c. To provide the personnel divisions with a yardstick to measure the effectiveness of testing, recruiting, and in-service training programs." (A composite definition prepared by the New Jersey Education Association Research Division, taken from *Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary*, New York State Teachers' Association, 1957, p. 6.)
5. "The evaluation of teacher techniques in the classroom applied to additional pay beyond the basic salary schedule." (Department of Classroom Teachers, Michigan Education Association.)
6. "Merit Rating refers to formalized systematic methods of appraising employees. Other terms frequently used to describe merit rating are: performance review, performance evaluation, service ratings, evaluation reports, and so forth." (William B. Wolf, *Merit Rating as a Managerial Tool*, Bureau of Business Research, University of Washington, 1958, p. 2)

"Merit" has become synonymous with "competent," "worthy," and "high quality" when these terms are used to describe a kind of teacher. It has been said that "... rating is what someone does to someone else."¹ Evaluation, by contrast, implies a co-operative process.² Boykin has added clarity by defining the verb "evaluate" as "to ascertain the value or amount of; to appraise carefully." He further explains that the very measurement means that "... act or process of ascertaining the extent, dimensions, quantity, etc., of something, especially by comparison with a standard."³ Evaluation is not an end

¹"The Superintendent as Instructional Leader," *35th Yearbook*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, NEA, 1957, pp. 71-72.

²*Ibid.*

³Leander L. Boykin, "Let's Eliminate the Confusion: What Is Evaluation?" *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 43, February, 1957, pp. 115-118.

product or a culminating activity, but an approach that leads to individual and group improvement. When rating, or evaluation, is used to determine a teacher's salary in any degree, this is a merit pay program, regardless of whether the district has a formal merit rating system.⁴ Lack of semantic agreement in the area of merit evaluation makes interpretation of the literature difficult. Inconsistencies of definition are noted throughout this handbook.

One more guideline is worth considering at the outset. In appraising merit evaluation it is important to keep in mind the basic purposes of education. A merit plan should improve the quality of education.

⁴"Call It Anything, but Don't Say Merit Pay," *School Management*, Vol. 4, January, 1960, pp. 34-38, 77.

The History of Teacher Merit Pay Programs

Merit pay for teachers goes back to the turn of the century. The 1920's saw the peak use of formal merit pay plans in school districts throughout the United States. During the depression years of the 1930's and the World War II period, the single salary schedule gained in acceptance and merit pay plans were abandoned by a majority of the districts that had formerly used them. In the first half of the decade of the 1950's, interest in merit pay was renewed, and it continues to the present time. Generally, teachers, school administrators, and those closest to the teaching process are most critical of formal merit pay programs today. School board members and other school patrons are baffled at the opposition of the profession to salary programs logically differentiated to recognize differences in the quality of teaching service. Pressure from critics of the single salary schedule has motivated school leaders to reevaluate traditional merit pay programs and to seek new and better ways of relating teacher pay to quality of service.

During the last 60 years, merit evaluation has been a much discussed topic. At the turn of the century, fewer and fewer teachers obtained their subsistence by boarding with the parents of the pupils. Gradually the more dignified position paid a specific wage for services rendered. This trend was accompanied by the problem of what basis to use for computing salaries. The National Education Association Proceedings of 1906 contain an address entitled, "What Should Be the Basis for the Promotion of Teachers and the Increase of Teachers' Salaries?"¹

¹*Proceedings*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1906, pp 177-183.

Baltimore adopted a very involved teacher promotion plan in 1906. The promotional examination was in two parts. Part one consisted of: (a) the teacher's efficiency record, which must be no lower than good, as determined by inspection of regular class work by the responsible principal and the school superintendent; and (b) an impersonal test of correct and effective use and interpretation of English. Part two included: (a) a written report of the working out of some problem of teaching; or of the study of a particular group of children; (b) such a defense of this written report as will evince familiarity with educational literature bearing upon the problem or study; and, when required, (c) a classroom demonstration. This plan is probably typical of the view of the day. It is noteworthy that the idea of inspection and the word "inspection" itself were used.²

The first significant change in the approach to the problem came seven years later. The 1913 Proceedings of the National Education Association contain an address by Superintendent William Davidson, of Washington, D.C., which signaled the beginning of the scientific approach to the problem. Dr. Davidson said:

This problem resolves itself upon inspection into three elements:

- (1) In definite terms, what do we mean by the efficiency of a teacher?
- (2) What effects upon the teaching corps may we legitimately seek to produce by our system of rating?
- (3) With answers to these questions in mind, precisely what system should be devised for the official measurement and record of the efficiency of our teachers?³

In elaboration upon these points, he stated:

When we speak of the efficiency of a teacher, we think (a) of the effects which are wrought upon pupils of the class by means of the teacher, or (b) of the multifarious qualities in the teacher which enable him to bring out such effects. It is obvious that, as a tree is to be judged by its fruits, so a teacher is to be judged by the effects he produces in the pupils of his class.⁴

By 1915 the merit rating movement had reached such proportions that there was a decided division between proponents and opponents. By this time it had become apparent that the problem had such dimensions that there could be no easy solution. The president of the State Normal School, River Falls, Wisconsin, speaking to the National Education Association delegates, remarked:

²*Ibid.*

³*Proceedings*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1913, pp. 286-290.

⁴*Ibid.*

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

Any system of rating teachers, to have my support, must not only give the classroom teachers a squarer deal than any I have studied, but it must actually promote their educational and financial welfare in a more pronounced manner than any I have seen in operation . . . I frankly admit that while I have hopes that we may sometime have a satisfactory system of rating teachers, I am not competent to prepare at this time anything like a scientific scheme to use as a basis for promotions and for salary increases in my own faculty.⁵

By this time one group of people, including both laymen and professionals, considered it impossible to find a safe, usable scheme of rating. This group was unable to spell out why they thought such delineation was impossible. At the same time, another group thought it was feasible to work out a satisfactory plan, but they did not know exactly how to do so.

Ava L. Parrot also spoke at the 1915 convention. She presented a highly emotional renunciation of merit rating.⁶ Her presentation, minus the zeal, contains arguments on all sides of the question, and a considerable amount of extraneous talk as well. The important point of this speech is that it signaled the beginning of unthinking, emotional opposition.

In the second decade of the present century, the role of the supervisor became prominent. This development had a definite influence on the merit rating problem. Professor Lotus D. Coffman of the University of Minnesota addressed the 1917 convention of the National Education Association on the subject, "The Control of Educational Progress Through School Supervision." To Coffman, the position of the school supervisor was unique in that it was that of mediator between the teachers and the superintendent. The supervisor was described as being neither a teacher of children nor an executive whose duties involved hiring and firing of teachers. Coffman described four essential duties of the supervisor: laying out and prescribing materials and methods, studying the qualities of merit and causes of failure among teachers, becoming familiar with the approved tests for determining the mental status of children and measuring educational achievement, and improving the teaching act. The school supervisor was apparently the inspecting master of instruction. As this concept of supervision spread in practice, a strong antsupervision feeling grew among teachers.

⁵*Proceedings*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1915, pp. 1165-1167.

⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 1168-1173.

⁷*Proceedings*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1917, pp. 187-194.

THE HISTORY OF TEACHER MERIT PAY PROGRAMS

The next important development came with World War I, when great impetus was given to group testing and intelligence tests. Many educators believed that problems of learning could best be solved by such a "scientific" attack. School leaders hoped that new tests would be developed for measuring the efficiency of teachers. Ratings, scales, and evaluative devices were being used by more and more supervisors.

Reacting to this trend, the Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association established a merit study committee in 1924. The committee's charge was to study and report on the status of merit evaluation. The committee's report to the 1925 convention was a compendium of the literature of the preceding 11 years.⁸

The report stated findings of a study made by Ohio State University in 1922 that indicated that 99 per cent of the cities in the United States with populations of over 25,000 had a system of teacher rating in operation. A survey conducted by the Research Bureau of the University of Minnesota the same year discovered rating plans in operation in 46 states. The salary committee of the National Education Association reported on a follow-up study that many reported merit rating plans were used solely for the dismissal of unacceptable teachers. Only a few cities placed teachers in merit categories for salary purposes.

About half of the superintendents queried in these studies indicated that teachers approved of the rating plans. A number of interesting reasons were given for favoring or opposing merit plans.⁹

Favorable comments:

- Helps teachers to improve their weak points.
- Good teachers want their work evaluated.
- It is definite and fair.
- Teachers believe in recognition of success and condemnation of failure.
- Establishes a basis for promotion.
- The salary schedule is based on the rating and a teacher committee makes the rating scale.
- Teachers regard rating as an essential facet of administration.
- Professional study has improved teachers.

Unfavorable comments:

- Teachers dread the human element of rating.
- Ratings are usually general and superficial.

⁸*Proceedings*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1925, pp. 202-215.

⁹*Ibid.*

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

Impossible to measure the values of a teacher's work. Teachers object to being categorized.

No one can visit often, long enough, and under all conditions as are necessary for proper judgment.

Rating is the judgment of a suspicion based on limited observation. We are well enough acquainted so that no rating is needed.

Information gathered in this report indicated a trend away from the earlier merit objectives of inspection and salary regulation and toward the improvement of instruction and the encouragement of teachers. A listing by order of the importance of specific items used in teacher rating emphasized the positive trend:

- Instructional skill or technique
- Pupil achievement or teacher results
- Initiative
- Personal characteristics
- Professional interest and growth
- Discipline
- Lesson preparation
- Scholarship and training
- Leadership
- Executive ability
- Spirit of co-operation
- School management
- School activity

The most persistent merit rating problems appearing in research and experimentation between 1900 and 1930 were concerned with the reliability and validity involved in measuring teacher effectiveness. In other words, was the device consistent in measuring whatever it measured—was the instrument reliable? Secondly, to what extent did the device measure what it was supposed to measure—was the instrument valid? The questions of reliability and validity led to the development of measurement devices that could be tested against such criteria.

Rating scales listing the personal and pedagogical attributes possessed by a successful teacher were the principal approach to teacher measurement by 1930. Formulation of trait scales required agreement on the relative importance of each item. After this decision was made, it became necessary to measure the degree to which a particular teacher possessed or failed to possess each particular attribute. Barr analyzed 209 of these rating scales in use by 1930.¹⁰ He concluded

¹⁰Dennis H. Cooke, *Administering the Teaching Personnel*. Chicago: Sanborn and Co., 1939, p. 190.

THE HISTORY OF TEACHER MERIT PAY PROGRAMS

that ten categories could include all the attributes that were being used in this approach to rating. They were:

Instruction	Discipline
Classroom management	Appearance of the room
Professional attitude	Personal appearance
Choice of subject matter	Co-operation
Personal habits	Health

Sheller reported that a similar study in Pennsylvania by Charters and Woples produced a list of 25 categories.¹¹ Twenty of these are not found in Barr's list. Shannon queried 164 public school administrators concerning 430 of their best and 352 of their worst teachers.¹² From the replies, he formulated ten categories important in defining teacher competence. Only four of the ten are found in Barr's list. Sheller studied five such lists and found little similarity among them.¹³

The obvious inconsistency between various lists caused Barr to comment: "Excellent as these earlier check lists are, they represent in most instances merely abbreviated statements of the author's own opinion of what constitutes good teaching and do not necessarily supply valid and reliable criteria of teaching success."¹⁴

Researchers encountered a second major difficulty in measuring teacher effectiveness by the traits approach, namely, what value should be placed on each particular trait. If desirable traits included appearance, financial management, and flexibility, just how nifty, thrifty, or shifty should a teacher be to guarantee success? Experiments reported by Young show little relationship between the rating of teachers with general reference to teaching ability and the rating of the same teachers on the specific qualities included in general ability. He further reported that Harold Rugg found little reliability among the scores given army officers when the same officer was rated by several fellow officers.¹⁵

¹¹H. Lynn Sheller, "Merit Rating as a Basis for Teachers' Salary Schedules," *California Teachers Association Southern Section Report*, Los Angeles, September, 1948, p. 24.

¹²J. R. Shannon, "Elements of Excellence in Teaching," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 27, No. 3, March, 1941, pp. 168-176.

¹³Sheller, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹⁴A. S. Barr, W. H. Burton, and L. J. Brueckner, *Supervision*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938, p. 391.

¹⁵Lloyd P. Young, *The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules*. Contributions to Education, No. 522. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933, p. 17.

As a result of the difficulties encountered in the traits approach, attempts were made to measure teacher effectiveness by measuring pupil achievement. McCall suggested that the ultimate criterion of teaching success is the number, kinds, and amounts of desirable changes produced in pupils.¹⁰ Researchers soon became aware of problems involved in this method. Barr cautioned that behavioral change tests were not presently adequate and that isolating other significant factors in the field situation was virtually impossible.¹¹ Studies of this type used achievement quotients, mental age units, and maturation level units. These tools were designed to do away with the subjective features of the traits approach, but they were subject to serious statistical difficulty and none resulted in a system that could be used with confidence in a regular school situation.

During the past 20 years the evaluation of teacher effectiveness has become the subject of greater research and debate than in any similar period in history. Rating scales and pupil performances are still being tested. Other devices reported in use include: teacher examinations, examination of teacher preparation, anecdotal records, interviews, inventories, and questionnaires. Each of these tools has some purpose and is subject to limitations. Barr said:

Teaching is a very complex activity, and the haphazard, unscientific, and superficial study of teaching that characterizes much of our supervision today should not be tolerated. While our means of studying teachers and teaching are still most crude and most inadequate, the work in this field has progressed to a point where general impressions and hit and miss methods of studying the teacher at work can no longer be justified.¹²

The improvement of educational practices requires an intensive and continuous study of teaching and teachers. At the same time, supervisors, principals, and superintendents should also be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in relation to the instructional program. Studies conducted over the past 60 years have made definite contributions toward better education, even though no specific device has been found successful in measuring relative teaching effectiveness. The most recent, and perhaps the most significant, are noted in Chapter 8.

¹⁰William A. McCall, "Measurement of Teacher Merit," *Bulletin No. 284*, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, April, 1952, p. 10.

¹¹Barr, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 472-473.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 380.

3

Merit Pay Programs in Practice

Merit rating has been practiced in many school systems with varying degrees of success or failure. Many districts that claim to have merit rating, however, are speaking only of increased salaries for experience and professional preparation—the two factors most frequently associated with single salary schedules. This chapter describes a few noteworthy plans now in operation and gives some general information about school districts' experiences with merit rating.

In the spring of 1958, Coen analyzed the programs of 71 school districts that reported having developed and used merit rating for salary purposes.¹ He found successful and unsuccessful merit pay programs in representative school districts throughout the United States. That same year, the National Education Association Research Division reported 170 urban school districts (30,000 or more population) that at one time or another during the preceding 20 years had listed a superior-service maximum salary allowance.² Of the 170 districts, the largest number reporting a superior-service maximum in any one year was 49; and there were only 33 listed in 1958-1959. In March, 1961, the Research Division published a study that reported the reasons given by 30 urban school districts (30,000 or more popu-

¹Alban W. Coen II, "An Analysis of Successful Merit Rating Programs," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 39, June, 1958, pp. 394-397.

²*Quality of Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-1959*, Research Report 1959-R24, Public School Salaries Series, Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1959, pp. 39-43.

lation) for having abandoned their merit pay programs.³ Six districts of the 30 that reported in this study indicated that their superior-service maximums were still in effect. Descriptions of some notable plans that are, or have been, in operation follow.

At an early date, Akron, Ohio, instituted a merit rating system, but it was later dropped. Pittsburgh established a system of merit rating in 1928, but dropped the plan in 1931 because of insufficient finances.⁴

In 1933, Young reported that in 67 of the 1,532 city school systems included in a National Education Association survey, "A teacher's rating directly and automatically determines the amount of her salary increase."⁵ A recheck of these districts revealed that all had abandoned their merit plans in subsequent years. The most common reasons given for abandoning merit plans were difficulty of administration and a feeling on the part of teachers that evaluation was too subjective.

Several merit plans now in operation have attracted nationwide attention. Among these are those of Summit, New Jersey; Newton, Massachusetts; Grosse Pointe, Michigan; Ithaca, New York; Glencoe, Illinois; West Hartford, Connecticut; and La Due, Missouri.

One of the more successful merit pay programs is that of Summit; it has been in operation approximately 20 years. The plan has been revised several times, the latest revision (February, 1959) included not only lay and staff committees but also the services of a firm of industrial consultants (Barrington & Associates). A job description, or position analysis, that outlines functions, duties, and responsibilities for each assignment has been written, and a performance manual that gives specific examples of performance levels is provided for the raters. Each teacher is rated annually; a rating sheet is used to arrive at a score. The school board establishes a basic pattern of compensation for all teachers each year, which includes: (a) a starting rate for inexperienced teachers; (b) a "pattern maximum," the salary to be paid a substantially good teacher of sufficiently long service; and (c) a progression period—the number of years of service after which a substantially good teacher would reach the pattern maximum salary.

³*Why Have Merit Plans for Teachers' Salaries Been Abandoned?* Research Report 1961-R3, Public School Salaries Series. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1961, pp. 5-7.

⁴*Relation of Salaries to Efficiency*. Research Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 4. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1928, p. 238.

⁵Lloyd P. Young, *The Administration of Merit-Type Teachers' Salary Schedules*. Contributions to Education, No. 552. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1933, p. 19.

This is, in effect, a single salary schedule based upon training and experience.

To the amounts called for by this schedule, however, may be added "merit increments." A superior teacher may be awarded a double increment every three years (after the second year) to the pattern maximum. Upon reaching the terminal point of the progression period, superior teachers may be rated "Master Career Teacher" and after a three-year waiting period become eligible for salary increases equal to 2½ times the pattern increment every five years.

West Hartford's career salary plan incorporates two features: (a) merit advancement for teachers not at maximum, and (b) "career" awards to superior teachers who have reached the usual maximum. In the first instance, double increments are given on the regular schedule to teachers of merit. In the case of career awards, granted in recognition of unusual teaching ability and outstanding service to the school and the community, an increase of \$500 per year is allowed. A similar award is available two more times at three-year intervals. The plan was developed co-operatively by teachers and administrators; 85 to 95 per cent of the teachers favor the plan.⁶

The teacher evaluation program in the La Due public schools is tied to three salary schedules. The first schedule ranges from \$4,000 to \$6,000, with eight increments of \$250 each. Schedule two ranges from \$4,600 to \$7,800, with eight increments of \$400 each. The third schedule ranges from \$5,600 to \$10,600, with ten increments of \$500 each. Placement on the schedules is made upon a recommendation based on a subjective evaluation by the principal. The rating is on the basis of superior personal qualities, superior professional qualities, and evidence of superior teaching. The plan was co-operatively developed by teachers and administrators and is deemed successful by both groups.⁷

The Glencoe career-teaching plan is unique in that it attempts to reward the merit of an entire faculty rather than select individual teachers for merit awards. Teachers are employed on a 12-month basis. An in-service program is held for five weeks each summer for all teachers not engaged in travel or advanced training. About half of the teachers are making professional advancement in the school district while the other half are away at school or engaged in foreign

⁶Edmund H. Thorne, "West Hartford's Career Salary Plan," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 143-147.

⁷Virginia R. Alexander, "Teacher Evaluation Program: La Due Public Schools," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 148-153.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

travel encouraged by a special \$250 district grant. The salary schedule has three levels: (a) the probationary teacher level lasts for a minimum of three years for inexperienced teachers, two years for experienced teachers; (b) the professional teacher level guarantees continuous salary advancement except in unusual circumstances; and (c) the career teacher level requires a master's degree and 11 years of experience. The minimum career salary is \$6,400; seven additional salary steps lead to an absolute maximum of \$8,000. The plan was co-operatively developed and is rated successful by most of the people involved.⁸

The Ithaca merit salary program provides for the evaluation of teachers by principals on the basis of teaching ability, classroom management, contribution to the total school program, personal qualities, and professional growth. The salary schedule contains three levels. Salaries are listed for those with four years of professional training. At the probationary level the beginning salary is \$3,800, with two \$200 increments. The regular teacher level ranges from \$4,600 to \$5,800, with \$300 increments. The distinguished service level begins at \$6,100 and reaches a peak of \$7,000; increments are of \$300. Actually this is a 12-step schedule; a recommendation is needed to progress from probationary to regular and from regular to distinguished service levels. The plan was co-operatively developed and nearly everyone involved is pleased with the operation.⁹

The system of Newton is to award \$150 as a special continuing increment to teachers deemed to be serving not just successfully, but notably, and the plan also makes teachers eligible for an additional \$150 every third year provided that high quality service is maintained. The number of teachers receiving these awards has ranged from 10 to 16 per cent. Notable service is over and above the regular salary schedule. Teachers were consulted when the plan was being developed by the superintendent. The principal evaluates the teacher and makes recommendations on the basis of personal qualifications, professional preparation, and professional performance.¹⁰

Grosse Pointe's professional growth program centers on the earned increment principle. In order to advance on the salary schedule, teachers must meet one of the following requirements: (a) complete an approved course at a college or university, (b) participate in a workshop or other practical in-service education project, (c) serve on professional committees, (d) supplement teaching with approved work experience, (e) undertake educational or cultural travel, (f) contribute outstanding community service or engage in state or national professional association work, or (g) successfully participate in other approved professional work. Salaries range from \$4,500 to \$8,750 in 17 steps. Additional pay for extra assignments runs the absolute maximum to \$9,200 for ten months' employment.¹¹ This program has been erroneously called merit pay. It is more accurately described as "professional growth" pay.

Description of merit plans in Alton, Illinois; Champaign, Illinois; Leon County, Florida; Riverside, California; Shaker Heights, Ohio; University City, Missouri; Waterloo, Iowa; Winnetka, Illinois; Upper Darby, Pennsylvania; Jamestown, New York; and many other districts can be found in the June, 1957, issue of *The Journal of Teacher Education*.

There are a number of districts that report successful merit pay programs. In 1959, the National Education Association reported that 81 of the nation's 3,805 urban school districts had some kind of merit program in operation. Some of these programs have been in operation many years; the majority, however, are still in the formative stages of development. It appears that merit pay programs work best in medium-size and smaller districts that have a relatively high assessed valuation per child and whose school patrons include a large number of professional and upper-income people. A study of successful merit pay programs shows that they usually have several of the following factors in common:

1. Plans developed locally in terms of local conditions.
2. Teachers, administrators, school board members, and patrons worked co-operatively on the project.
3. Merit awards, or bonuses, superimposed upon a good single salary schedule.
4. Merit awards sufficiently high to be worth working for.
5. A co-operatively developed rating instrument that emphasizes performance and pupil progress rather than teacher traits used along with personnel record files.

¹¹James W. Bushong, "The Story Behind Grosse Pointe's Professional Growth Program," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 170-175.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

6. Sufficient supervisory assistance to allow for adequate observation and teacher counselling.
7. An appeal committee and procedure through which a teacher may appeal what she considers an unfair appraisal.
8. No arbitrary limit on the number of teachers who can achieve merit status, although standards are high enough so that only a few teachers actually make superior ratings.
9. Ratings and files kept confidential, but access to them is always available to the individual teacher.
10. The program made a matter of constant review, evaluation, and improvement.

The great majority of bona fide merit pay programs for teachers that have been instituted in the last 20 years have been abandoned. This is especially true of large school districts (30,000 and more population). Many districts that at one time reported having adopted some sort of merit pay program have never actually put them into effect. Two states, Delaware and New York, enacted laws requiring state-wide plans of merit pay and later repealed them. One state, Florida, has a state-wide merit pay law on the books. Utah has enacted permissive legislation to subsidize districts using approved merit pay programs; the legislature, however, failed to appropriate money to put proposed plans into effect.

Reasons most often given for abandoning merit pay programs include: failure to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended, teacher resistance, lack of money to pay the merit bonuses, difficulty in obtaining satisfactory ratings by supervisory staffs, and lack of a satisfactory instrument for evaluating teacher competence. The best source of information for failure of merit pay programs is the National Education Association report cited previously.¹²

¹²*Why Have Merit Plans for Teachers' Salaries Been Abandoned? Loc. cit.*

4

Recent Arguments for Merit Rating

Arguments used in favor of merit pay programs for teachers include:

1. Teachers should be paid what they are worth and at the same time known to be worth it.
2. The principle of merit schemes is not only sound but also logical; it should become the basis for teacher pay.
3. There should be added incentive for better work through merit salary increments; such increments produce better teaching.
4. Merit ratings will improve the quality of work done, which, in turn, will raise the general level of education in our schools.
5. The public is interested in receiving dividends for money spent, so merit programs will make the public more willing to support higher salaries.
6. Merit programs will tend to draw and hold superior teachers in the profession, since they will have an opportunity to gain even better salaries if they are able.
7. Teachers are already rated daily by pupils, supervisors, parents, and fellow teachers, so there is no reason why there cannot be rating for pay.
8. Merit programs develop a demand for high quality work, which will produce higher quality of teaching.
9. A worker approaches his capacity as he is made to feel he is adequately rewarded; pay according to his worth will offer this reward.
10. Payment, among other things, should be made for quality, ability, service, efficiency, and effort.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

11. There is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals, and the present basis of pay perpetuates this inequality.
12. Our present system gives security to teachers on the lower side of the efficiency scale, whereas we should give security to those at the other end of the scale.
13. The merit principle offers an opportunity for democratic working relationships.
14. Competent administration can make ratings with few inequalities; this should be a regular part of the administrator's assignment.
15. If rating is interpreted as evaluation, it should enhance the supervisory relationships.
16. Rating can be done even though it is subjective.
17. Industry has used this merit or bonus incentive with good results, so we should be able to adapt this businesslike quality to our schools.¹

A secondary school principals' bulletin contained the following listing of factors favoring merit pay:

1. Teaching will be improved.
2. The professionalization of the teachers' calling will result.
3. Teachers will be motivated to improve.
4. The supply of teachers will be increased.
5. The communities' respect for teachers will be improved.
6. The value of the salary paid teachers will be increased.
7. Teachers will receive rewards more commensurate with their training and skills.
8. Teacher rating plans will increase the amount of money that the public will invest in education.
9. Snap judgments by supervisors are eliminated.
10. Such policies emphasize good personnel administration.
11. Teacher self-evaluation will be increased.
12. Incompetency is discouraged.
13. Professional status is raised.
14. Tenure increases the importance of evaluation.²

Burke said "The principle of merit in paying teachers' salaries is sound. The employment, retention, and advancement of teachers *Merit Salary Programs for Teachers* (and Supplements 1 and 2). San Diego, Calif.: Board of Education, 1957, pp. 4-6.

¹R. F. Stauffer and C. M. Withers, "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, April, 1958, pp. 214-218.

RECENT ARGUMENTS FOR MERIT RATING

should be based on merit teaching effectiveness. Preparation and experience by themselves are not a guarantee of ability to perform as teachers." He further explained that the New York merit rating law failed because it did not gain the co-operation of teachers, and also because teachers lacked confidence in their administrators. Burke recommended higher professional standards, better evaluation procedures, and specific job classification.³

The public is opposed to paying average or mediocre teachers as much as it is willing to pay superior teachers, according to Clarence Hines, who goes on to say, "The argument that superior teachers cannot be recognized is absurd. Professional teachers' organizations must either get their heads out of the sand or (a) taxpayers may rebel as inflationary salaries go higher and higher, (b) this rebellion could result in legislated merit plans, or (c) a stalemate could exist while the children suffer."⁴

Another view is that of Hertzler: "Base salary schedules provide adequate compensation for average performance of normal teaching functions. Merit awards should be reserved for exceptional and superior teaching accomplished by the exercise of initiative by individual teachers devoted to their calling."

He goes on to say that a merit award should be based on a measure of pupil progress, care of physical property, and the achievement of specific annual objectives designed to improve the quality of instruction.⁵

Loos emphasizes that merit rating is necessary to raise the level of the teaching profession. He suggests that better evaluation will help get rid of the incompetent.⁶

The general public is loathe to say that teaching is enormously more complicated than other jobs. Other people are being rated by clients, patients, patrons, and supervisors. "We can be fairly certain that, if teachers protest too loud and long about the infinite complexity of teaching, these protestations will be construed in many

³Arvid J. Burke, *Competent Teachers for America's Schools*, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1954, pp. 19-23.

⁴Clarence Hines, "To Merit Pay or Not to Merit Pay," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 117, August, 1958, pp. 9-10.

⁵John R. Hertzler, "A Layman's Slant on Merit Rating," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, pp. 171-172.

⁶L. E. Loos, "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, April, 1958, pp. 259-261.

quarters as merely another attempt to magnify a simple and routine job into an intricate and grandiose operation."⁷

"Teacher morale is not determined by the single factor of the salary plan used by a school system, but rather by numerous interrelated variable factors. Transition to a merit schedule should be gradual. Teachers themselves should participate in formulation of schools' new salary policies."⁸

Burns thinks that the profession must come up with a means of reward based on professional merit before the public forces us in an undesirable direction.⁹

The Nation's Schools conducted a superintendents' opinion poll on merit rating. They found that 86 per cent favored the principle of extra pay for superior teaching, only 42 per cent thought their teachers favored this principle, 82 per cent thought their school board members would favor it, and 43 per cent thought that rating a teacher's superiority was solely the responsibility of the administrative board and staff.¹⁰

Bushong registers his opposition to the automatic increment and proposes that the earned increment be substituted. The Grose Pointe program closely resembles his recommendations. He says, "Under this plan it is possible for all teachers to get good salaries, not just the chosen few."¹¹

A New Jersey principal suggests that we adopt the traditional college faculty rankings as a framework for modifying uniform teacher salary schedules.¹²

Nally suggests that teaching effectiveness and professional growth are difficult to measure but maintains that it must be done. He further states that the probability of injustices exists but we must not avoid the problem just because it is difficult to solve. There should be little difficulty in separating the nine-to-four teacher from the one who is active in the local teachers' organization. He adds a note of

⁷Harold B. Dunkel, "Merit Rating," *The School Review*, Vol. 65, Winter, 1957, pp. 488-489.

⁸B. J. Chandler, "Study Shows That Merit Rating Is Not Detrimental to Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, April, 1958, pp. 53-59.

⁹Robert W. Burns, "The Merit Plan: Boon or Bane?" *The Educational Forum*, Vol. 21, No. 4, May, 1957, pp. 443-451.

¹⁰"Favor Merit Rating in Principle," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 57, May, 1956, pp. 92, 94.

¹¹James W. Bushong, "Automatic Salary Increases Cannot Be Justified," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, February, 1958, pp. 43-45.

¹²William A. Cook "Merit Rating and Salary Increase," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 124, June, 1952, pp. 33-34.

caution, "... before any system of pay for merit can be effective, teachers must be paid an adequate beginning salary commensurate with those paid other professional people in the community with like education."¹³

A school board member reports that his district is rewarding teachers with a subject matter bonus. Every 15 hours of subject matter course work taken beyond the degree meets the requirements for a \$50 increment. The basic assumption is that subject matter knowledge makes teachers better, therefore, the bonus is a selective increase for the best teachers.¹⁴

A Michigan school superintendent proposed a complex plan designed to solve the teacher shortage and to recognize merit. The plan places teachers in classrooms after two years of college training. Her college education would continue after school and on Saturdays, at the rate of 20 semester hours per year for three years. A full-time helping teacher would be needed for each eight trainees in the elementary school. This supervising teacher would be selected for meritorious service and paid a higher salary as a result.¹⁵

Myron Lieberman proposes national specialty boards for teachers similar to those existing in the medical profession and best exemplified by the National College of Surgeons. Those who pass the board examinations in the various fields would receive higher pay. Student teachers would be supervised by specialty board members. The foundations would provide the money for the preparation of board exams and for getting the program established.¹⁶

Chandler quotes Dr. Lindley J. Stiles as saying, "We must research rather than debate our way to better schools." Chandler suggests that educators need to find out if salary policies and their administration are significantly related to morale, pupil achievement, teacher turnover, job satisfaction, financial support of schools, and attitudes of citizens toward teachers. The position here is one of proceeding only after the research findings are in and then in terms of pursuing the basic educational objectives.¹⁷

¹³Thomas P. Nally, "The Question of Merit Rating," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 134, February, 1957, pp. 35-36.

¹⁴Lytle Chazler, "Reward for Teachers," *The American School Board Journal*, May, 1956, pp. 43-44.

¹⁵Spencer W. Myers, "There Is an Answer to the Teacher Shortage," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 59, April, 1957, pp. 43-46.

¹⁶Myron Lieberman, "Foundation Approach to Merit Pay," *Pitt Delta Kappan*, Vol. 41, December, 1959, pp. 118-122.

¹⁷B. J. Chandler, "Teacher Salary Policies and Research," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, p. 171.

Gragg reports that, in addition to his own, "... other school systems are rewarding competent teachers without hurting the educational process or destroying teacher morale. Despite the NEA resolution, I would urge classroom teachers to see what is going on in some of the schools whose merit pay is working to the best interest of education and teachers." He further expresses the belief that the only chance for higher salaries is a merit system.¹⁸

Many other opinions could be noted that present the case for merit rating. The foregoing accounts are believed to be representative of those that have appeared in the past few years.

¹⁸W. L. Gragg, "The Logic of Merit Rating" *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, February, 1958, p. 46.

5

Recent Arguments Against Merit Rating

Arguments used against merit salary programs for teachers include:

1. Over a period of time, all programs tried have proven unsuccessful.
2. Thus far, it has not been possible to measure teacher competence accurately; likewise, it is difficult to judge equal or significant merit.
3. Morale, working relationships, and other psychological problems are too complex for simple answers; merit programs develop attitudes that are negative and competitive when they should be positive and co-operative.
4. Rating and gathering evidence for rating takes a lot more time than the benefits derived warrant; it takes time that administration and supervision staffs would use to help teachers.
5. Working conditions need improving before emphasis is placed on performance and will attract better teachers.
6. Young teachers are often denied competence ratings because of "full quotas" on merit levels, which discourages candidates from entering the field.
7. Merit regulations too frequently stereotype the teacher to standards and discourage creative teaching.
8. It is more important to recruit and train desirable people than to penalize those not so desirable.
9. Besides interfering with supervisory relationships, merit ratings increase teachers' work loads, and they are heavy enough already.

10. It is more important that the general level of teaching be raised than that a few be rewarded; in-service education programs get far better results than merit or bonus programs.
11. Industry usually makes "merit" or "bonus" awards on the basis of quantity and not quality.
12. Industry, except in sales work, has largely given up bonus and merit incentives and is adopting in-service training and providing better working conditions to get better production.
13. Experience has shown that communities soon reject merit plans after they get them.
14. Public interest is influenced more by lack of information on what the school is doing or by population and socio-economic conditions than by genuine concern about improving teacher quality.
15. Teachers, like other groups of people, represent a normal cross section of ability.
16. Merit programs too frequently presuppose that all improvement comes through changing the teachers.
17. The development of professional standards, increasingly better opportunities for professional training, more intensive teacher recruiting, and more efficient use of competent research develop better teaching more rapidly and at less cost than any punishment or reward system.¹

A secondary school principals' bulletin contained the following disadvantages of merit pay:

1. Increases hostility between teachers, administrators, and supervisors.
2. Costs more to initiate and implement than it is worth.
3. Teaching cannot be measured mathematically.
4. Teachers will be less willing to help each other.
5. All teachers cannot be measured by the same yardstick.
6. Rating will result in a form of class distinction within the teaching profession.
7. Rating will not necessarily increase the economic status of teachers.
8. The system is difficult to administer.
9. Will not eliminate the poor teacher.
10. Will not increase the supply of good teachers.
11. Good teaching cannot be measured accurately.

¹*Merit Salary Programs for Teachers*. San Diego, Calif.: Board of Education, 1957, pp. 4-6.

12. Lowers morale.
13. Produces conformity.²

Engleman said, "Certainly, if a system can be devised which does not violate sound principles of human relations, elevates the profession, and improves services to children, it should be seized upon." He goes on to list three problems that make rating difficult: (a) the complex character of the professional task of the teacher, (b) the range of specialization inherent in a modern school system, and (c) the difficulty of finding merit raters who can evaluate with validity and fairness.³

"Sound basic salary schedules, soundly administered, and written personnel policies which recognize professional preparation and experience, are more desirous than merit rating as such," according to Stauffer and Withers. They maintain that careful selection, wise supervision, and well-planned in-service programs are necessary for sound education and that such factors should not be isolated for salary payment purposes.⁴

A study conference on merit rating held in 1956, reported that participants voted against merit rating seven to one after study and discussion of the subject.⁵ The opposition of the majority of educators is frequently expressed through an alternate proposal—for example, "Professionalization is the answer; make it worth while for people who can teach and want to teach to do so" The professional associations should exercise greater influence on educational affairs by deciding who is allowed to enter the teaching group, thus guaranteeing high standards for the profession and eliminating the point of merit rating.⁶

Badders claims that "No salary inducement will improve the quality of poor teaching."⁷ Another writer felt that he had to use an assumed name in opposing merit rating. He said that pressure for

²R. F. Stauffer and C. M. Withers, "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, April, 1958, pp. 214-218.

³Finis E. Engleman, "Problems of Merit Rating" *NEA Journal*, April, 1957, pp. 240-241.

⁴*Loc. cit.*

⁵*Classroom Teachers Speak on Merit Rating*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1957, p. 10.

⁶"Any Merit in Merit Rating?" *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, pp. 173-174.

⁷D. R. Badders, "Salary Increases Alone Won't Eliminate Poor Teaching" *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 58, No. 5, November, 1956, p. 51.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

merit rating is coming from conservative industrialists and businessmen whose motives are to limit expenditures.⁸

The National Education Association Department of Classroom Teachers Merit Rating Committee concluded a study by reporting that: (a) rating limits teacher growth, (b) no system now existing fairly measures human growth, and (c) where teaching conditions are good there is no point in merit rating.⁹ Another National Education Association report spoke in favor of continuous evaluation but against rating for salary purposes. The report stated that ratings for salary do not accomplish their purpose.¹⁰

Fosdick holds that merit rating without teacher participation will probably fail; with teacher involvement, success is probable—even with the same rating instrument. In other words, the manner of approaching merit rating has more to do with success or failure than the specific measuring device.¹¹

The executive secretary of the Utah Education Association pointed out that many plans look good on paper but these same schemes create serious human relations problems when put into practice.¹² Mead points out that pupil records are woefully inadequate, let alone teacher records. He suggests that a comprehensive program of compiling data on teaching and teachers precede rating. The immediate roadblocks thwarting the establishment of merit pay are: (a) no one has the tools for evaluation, (b) lack of qualified raters, and (c) economical unfeasibility.¹³

Staehle emphasized the fact that money is not the only reward for teaching. Other rewards include the enlargement of functions, increased freedom, greater responsibility, and personal advancement. He raises the question of whether or not teachers' job responsibilities are equal. The implication here is that paying according to merit may require the reorganization of several aspects of the school.¹⁴

⁸Jay Belmoeck, "Why Teachers Fear Merit Ratings," *Clearing House*, No. 1, September, 1957, pp. 17-18.

⁹*Report of Committee on Merit Rating*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1954, p. 11.

¹⁰*Teacher Rating*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1954, p. 24.

¹¹Harry A. Fosdick, "Merit Rating—How and by Whom?" *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 57, January, 1956, pp. 58-62.

¹²Allen West, "The Case For and Against Merit Rating," *The School Executive*, Vol. 69, July, 1950, pp. 48-50.

¹³A. R. Mead, "Some Basic Considerations for Merit Rating of Teachers," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 44, September, 1958, pp. 272-277.

¹⁴J. F. Staehle, "Merit and Responsibility Factors in Teachers' Salaries," *School Life*, Vol. 41, December, 1958, pp. 18-19.

RECENT ARGUMENTS AGAINST MERIT RATING

Scholastic magazine listed a number of statements by various school personnel designed to sum up the point of view held by these groups. "Classroom teachers must reject merit ratings because such tests are neither scientific nor objective, nor do they improve the condition they are aimed at." (teachers) "As a pure matter of justice, there is nothing more unfair than paying unequals equally." (superintendents) "... merit pay should be seriously considered as a possible solution to teachers' salary problems." (school board members) "No valid method has been devised to measure teacher competence." (elementary principals)¹⁵

Stevenson writes that the greatest need is not merit evaluation but rather to "... put all teachers' salaries into a professional bracket ...".¹⁶ A school of education dean, Lindley Stiles, claims that when we talk of \$10,000 salaries for teachers, we must recognize that communities will pay this amount for top flight teachers only.¹⁷

Grieder cautions that some school boards are being stampeded into hasty and ill-advised action because of minority pressure for merit rating. He suggests four ranks for teachers—probationary, instructor, senior instructor, and professional teacher.¹⁸ Seven conditions basic to success were listed by Jones:

1. A professional high level basic salary schedule must apply to all teachers.
2. The staff must have a hand in developing any experimental plan.
3. Factors to be judged and procedures to be followed must be clearly understood by all.
4. Everyone must have an opportunity to qualify for higher salaries—no percentage restrictions.
5. Merit rating must be related to a larger plan of instructional improvement.
6. Administrators must devote more time to improving instruction and evaluating outcomes.
7. There must be periodic appraisal of the merit plan.¹⁹

¹⁵Debate Merit Pay," *Scholastic Teacher*, Vol. 70, No. 6, March 8, 1957.

¹⁶Margaret Stevenson, "Not Merit Rating but Sound Personnel Policies," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 46, April, 1957, pp. 242-243.

¹⁷Lindley Stiles, "Security Isn't Enough to Attract Teachers to the Profession," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 58, No. 6, December, 1956, p. 43.

¹⁸Calvin Grieder, "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," *Education*, Vol. 78, March, 1958, pp. 426-429.

¹⁹Howard R. Jones, "Workable Merit Rating," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, p. 178.

Hanson said that there is a possibility of frustrating teachers by ratings and thus impairing the instructional program of children. He believes that under merit programs high salaries go to "apple polishers and high pressure artists."²⁰

An analysis of 39 research studies by Barr revealed:

1. No satisfactory plan can be used by personnel offices to make judgments on teacher effectiveness.
2. Little has been done in evaluating in-classroom responsibilities of the teacher.
3. Concern chiefly has been for general merit, although we expect teachers to have special or differentiated abilities.
4. Teaching effectiveness has been treated as something apart from the situations giving rise to it.
5. Much of the research seems to proceed as if qualities of good teaching resided entirely in the teachers and not in relationships with others.²¹

²⁰Earl H. Hanson, "Are the Teachers in a Wilderness?" *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 133, September, 1956, p. 65.

²¹A. S. Barr, "Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Effectivity," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 22, June, 1952, pp. 169-174.

6

Research and Field Studies

Although there has been a great deal of trial and error experimentation with merit rating, there has been very little bona fide research on the subject. The basic research that has been done does not provide answers to the fundamental questions raised by those seeking a better way of remunerating teaching on the basis of quality of service. On the contrary, such studies have raised serious doubts about the possibility of evaluating teacher competence objectively or of assigning appropriate dollar values to such competency. On the other hand, experience has proven conclusively that it is possible for a district to develop a workable merit pay program that will not destroy its teachers' morale and that will avoid some of the acknowledged weaknesses of single salary schedules.

Research and study in the area of teacher evaluation and rating are abundant. Domas and Tiedeman's bibliography (1950) covered 118 pages and referred to 1,006 studies and articles on teacher competency.¹

Leading researchers in merit rating have included such educational pioneers as Thorndike, who did an early study of weighting factors attached to facts about a man in making judgments as to his fitness for a defined purpose. His findings supporting the attachment of such weights is basic to many current studies.² Following a detailed study,

¹Simeon J. Domas and David V. Tiedeman, "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 19, No. 2, December, 1950, pp. 101-218.

²Edward L. Thorndike, "Fundamental Theorems in Judging Men," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 2, March, 1918, pp. 67-76.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

Symonds concluded that ranking and rating methods gave nearly identical results, thus helping to demonstrate the reality of the halo effect.³ Butsch composed a summary of investigations on teacher rating prior to 1930. He found that most studies attempted to isolate and justify desirable teacher traits and that a few statistical studies tried to establish the reliability and validity of rating scales.⁴ Mahler prepared an annotated bibliography of merit rating in business and industry. The reference frequently registers notes of caution regarding overdependence on merit rating.⁵

Beacher has recorded a detailed description of merit rating in New York State, including the legal state-wide merit plan that was repealed because of its disruptive influence on educational functions.⁶

Redefer conducted a number of morale studies in New York State. "Salary or salary schedules, while important, do not determine the morale status of the individual teacher or the faculty group," he concluded. He implied that merit pay does not have the potential claimed by its advocates and emphasized the fact that morale is more dependent on human relations factors than on material factors.⁷

Reavis and Cooper made important studies of evaluation instruments for teacher rating. They concluded that cumulative ratings were reliable and not subject to the weaknesses inherent in typical rating schemes.⁸

McKeachie tried to validate student ratings of instructors. He concluded that although student ratings may be useful to instructors desiring to improve their teaching, little value was apparent for administrative purposes.⁹ Cynanon and Wedeen concluded that the emotional factors involved in two different sets of instructions given pupils rating instructors had little influence on results. Put another

³ Percival M. Symonds, "Notes on Rating," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 9, June, 1925, pp. 188-195.

⁴ Russell L. Butsch, "Teacher Rating," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 1, April, 1931, pp. 99-107, 156-157.

⁵ W. R. Mahler, *Twenty Years of Merit Rating, 1926-1946*. New York: Psychological Corp., 1947.

⁶ Dwight E. Beacher, *The Evaluation of Teaching in New York State*. New York: Univ. of the State of New York, 1950, p. 51.

⁷ Frederick L. Redefer, "Factors That Affect Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 63, No. 2, February, 1959, pp. 59-62.

⁸ W. C. Reavis and Dan Cooper, *Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1945.

⁹ W. J. McKeachie, "Student Ratings of Instructors: A Validity Study," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 51, January, 1958, pp. 379-381.

RESEARCH AND FIELD STUDIES

way, the student ratings were consistent even when new emotional factors were introduced.¹⁰

A study of successful merit pay programs was made by Coen. He determined that there was no evident and identifiable characteristic of districts that have success with merit rating.¹¹

McKinley conducted a nationwide survey of merit pay plans. He started with a list of 686 school districts whose answers to a National Education Association questionnaire gave indication that merit programs were in operation. Returns were received from 578 districts, but only 22 per cent indicated any use of merit pay. Forty-four schools used rating scales; 21 used guided comments; 19 used characterization reports, e.g., A, B, or C; 27 used descriptive reports; and 7 used ranking reports. Obviously, no uniform devices are in use in merit rating programs.¹²

The New England School Development Council made a nine-year study of merit rating, which is significant because of the way the study was made. Three subcommittees were organized, one for each phase of the problem. The first group set out to answer the question, "What is professional competence and how can it be measured and evaluated?" The second group explored the psychological aspects of relating compensation to professional competence. The third group determined the guidelines for making a salary schedule that would relate salary to professional competence. In the development of the salary schedule, the following assumptions were made: (a) teachers are paid to educate children, and (b) teachers differ with respect to the proficiency with which their job is performed. The council finally presented a schedule for determining teachers' salaries according to the three roles they play in education, that is, the classroom, the professional, and the community role.¹³

A study was made in North Carolina with funds appropriated by the legislature at the request of the governor. Three outstanding

¹⁰ Manuel Cynanon and Shirley U. Wedeen, "Emotional Factors in the Reliability of Student Rating of Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 51, April, 1958, pp. 629-632.

¹¹ Alban W. Coen, "An Analysis of Successful Merit Rating Programs," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 39, June, 1958, pp. 394-397.

¹² Don McKinley, *A Study of Merit Evaluation for Salary Purposes in the Public Schools of the United States*. Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, State College of Washington, 1958.

¹³ D. V. Tiedeman, ed., *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary*. Cambridge, Mass.: Spaulding House Council Publications, 1956, p. 272

specialists served as consultants during the study: A. S. Barr, University of Wisconsin; A. R. Mead, University of Florida; and William A. McCall, Columbia University. The plan of the study was to measure pupil achievement and relate it to a large number of teacher traits. It was determined that significant differences of pupil growth existed between one classroom and another. In other words, some teachers produced greater pupil achievement than others in situations and with pupils deemed to be comparable. A second conclusion was that there is little or no relationship between training and merit as measured by pupil growth. Another conclusion was that there is little or no relationship between experience and merit. A fourth conclusion was that there is a tendency on the part of every adult associated with teachers professionally to misjudge them. Inaccurate judgments of merit were made in significant quantity by other teachers as well as by principals. An individual teacher's self-evaluation was also found to be invalid. An interesting feature of this study was that the pupils could identify teacher merit more frequently than any other person. This research failed to find any system of rating teacher merit that could be recommended as a basis for salaries.¹⁴

At the instigation of the Utah Taxpayers Association, the state legislature appropriated funds for a school survey that later resulted in the continuing merit salary study. Edgar Morphet, of the University of California, served as a consultant in the early stages of study. After it was agreed that the principle of merit pay was sound enough to warrant further experimentation, the next step was to explore possibilities in three pilot districts. The districts represented a variety in size and wealth. These volunteer districts' first assignment was to reach agreement within their own staffs on an operational definition of teaching effectiveness and to implement an evaluation program oriented to the definition but unrelated to salaries. The next step was to relate appraisals of performance quality to salary distinctions.¹⁵

The significant facts coming out of the Utah study are: (a) a large sum of money is required to make an adequate study; (b) a great amount of teachers' time is involved in making a study; and (c) as yet, no significant merit salary plan is effectively operating in

¹⁴William A. McCall, "Measurement of Teacher Merit," *Bulletin No. 284*, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, April, 1952.

¹⁵Gale Rose, *et al.*, "Utah Teachers Study Merit," *Utah Educational Review*, Vol. 50, May, 1957, pp. 24, 40.

Utah. The study is continuing.¹⁶ In 1960, the committee submitted a favorable report on merit rating to a legislative committee.¹⁷

The state superintendent of public instruction in Washington appointed a merit pay study committee in 1957. The committee concluded:

1. Ideally, able teachers should receive monetary benefits above the regular salary schedule.
2. Additional incentives are desirable to keep superior teachers in teaching as a career.
3. A merit pay plan should not substitute for an adequate salary schedule.
4. Merit plans will not reduce a district's operating budget; in fact, such plans would require even larger salary budgets than those currently in effect.
5. Valid measurement of teachers' competence poses difficult problems; however, these qualities are now evaluated by school administrators for some purposes.
6. Success of any merit pay plan requires the participation of both teachers and administrators in development and implementation.
7. The administration of merit plans will require more personnel and more time on the part of administrators.
8. The adoption of a state-wide teacher merit pay salary system in Washington is not feasible.

The committee recommendations were that copies of the report be widely distributed, that merit pay study be encouraged, that local study groups receive consultative services from the state office, and that future use of this report be integrated with other problems facing education.¹⁸

Griffiths believes, "Reluctance to use the merit rating plan in teacher evaluation does not stem from lack of interest." He cites as evidence the fact that more than 1,300 studies have been conducted. The results of these studies are highly inconclusive because of the difficulty of validating the procedure. How various observers perceive a particular teacher will determine the rating. Since our perception

¹⁶Allen West, from notes of a personal conference held July, 1960.

¹⁷"Utah Committee Releases Merit Pay Plan," *Education U.S.A.*, October 27, 1960, p. 1.

¹⁸*Washington State Merit Pay for Teachers Study Committee Report*. Olympia, Wash.: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1958.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

is the sum total of our past experience plus the experience of the moment, objectivity is not likely.¹⁹

Research studies raise serious questions and doubts about the use of merit rating for salary purposes. Much additional research is needed.

¹⁹Daniel E. Griffiths, *Human Relations in School Administration*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956, p. 52.

7

The Position of Educators

A variety of opinions exists among professional educators on the topic of merit pay. The great majority are in favor of evaluation. Questions arise, however, when evaluation is tied to salary allotments. A majority of the states have, within the last year or two, published statements of their positions with regard to merit pay plans. The American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Classroom Teachers, and the National Education Association have official positions. These statements have in common an endorsement of the major responsibility of the teaching profession to evaluate the quality of its services. They favor continuing research and experimentation to find better ways for remunerating professional service. They all caution against hastily moving into a merit pay program. Many of them have listed certain criteria that must be met in order to assure a better chance of success if merit pay programs are adopted.

The statements that follow represent official policies of the American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association's Department of Classroom Teachers, and the National Education Association, on the basis of official action by their legislative bodies.

This Association [American Association of School Administrators] believes that teachers and other school personnel should be paid what they are worth. The science of teacher evaluation, however, has not yet developed a sufficiently valid instrument or procedure which justifies general adoption of salary schedules based on individual merit ratings. To attach merit pay to invalid and unreliable evaluations would deter by a generation progress toward true merit pay. The Association strongly urges accelerated

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

systematic experimentation in teacher evaluation to the end that professional pay can be attached to professional rating of merit.

The Association cautions those in the profession who adamantly oppose such experiments lest they place the supposed interests of the profession above those of the public. We also caution those lay groups who use a concept of merit pay as a subterfuge by which they oppose paying any teacher what he is worth.¹

The Department [Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association] believes that evaluation for the improvement of instruction is a major responsibility of the teaching profession. It defines evaluation as the "continuous process by which individuals or groups co-operatively make choices and come to decisions in planning for the improvement of instruction." The Department reiterates that such evaluation will be effective only when done as a co-operative endeavor by all concerned. It maintains that evaluation must be continuous; and it must be based upon all educational factors including type of community, building facilities, and administrative practices as well as classroom procedure.

The Department vigorously opposes subjective rating as a means of determining teachers' salaries. It defines subjective rating (commonly called merit rating) as "a subjective qualitative judgment of a teacher made administratively by one or more persons, with or without the preparation or the knowledge of the person rated, for purposes of determining salaries." It stresses that more than 40 years of experience has shown that basing salaries on subjective ratings destroys professional relationships and morale; creates strife and discord among teachers; impedes the co-operative improvement of education by teachers, supervisors, and administrators; and leads to deterioration in the quality of education of children. The Department urges continued research and experimentation in the search for valid measures of teacher competence.²

The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research and experimentation to develop means of objective evaluation of the performance of all professional personnel, including identification of (a) factors that determine professional competence; (b) factors that determine the effectiveness of competent professionals; (c) methods of evaluating effective professional service; and (d) methods of recognizing effective professional service through self-realization, personal status, and salary.

The Association further believes that use of subjective methods of evaluating professional performance for the purpose of setting salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process. Plans which require such subjective judgments (commonly known as merit ratings) should be

¹"The Superintendent as Instructional Leader," *35th Yearbook*, Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, NEA, 1957, pp. 71-72.

²*Official Report*, 1960-61, Washington, D.C.: NEA Department of Classroom Teachers, 1961, pp. 109-110.

THE POSITION OF EDUCATORS

avoided. American education will be better served by continued progress in developing better means of objective evaluation.³

In December, 1960, an *ad hoc* committee on merit or quality service pay was established by the Kentucky Education Association. In January, 1961, this Committee sent a questionnaire to each of the 49 other state education associations asking for information on official policies of these groups with regard to merit rating for teachers' salaries. Forty-three education associations reported, and 26 of the 43 returned official policy statements. These statements are representative of the kinds of stands educators have taken throughout the country with regard to merit pay plans. Responses to the question "What attitudes do you observe among the professionals?" ranged from negativism to a willingness to study and experiment.⁴ The essence of the statements from the 26 states follows.⁵

1. *Arizona*—Opposed as now constituted; lists seven basic items to be met before merit rating plans are to be considered for adoption.
2. *California*—Affirms special recognition for superior service; opposes all current merit pay plans.
3. *Connecticut*—Establishes principles as prerequisites to consideration of merit rating plans.
4. *Delaware*—As a result of a study, each merit rating plan is to be considered on its own merits.
5. *Florida*—Legislation passed in 1957; then profession published booklet, "Guideposts for Developing Career Increment Programs for Florida's Teachers." Legislation mandates merit rating in all districts in the 1960-1961 school year.
6. *Idaho*—Policy of opposition adopted.
7. *Illinois*—Opposes merit rating but approves superior service maximums and career increments; lists 11 points in opposition.
8. *Indiana*—Favors study.
9. *Maryland*—Recommends continuous study.
10. *Massachusetts*—Twenty-eight Massachusetts school systems are using merit rating; 20 per cent of teachers' salaries in these districts are affected.
11. *Michigan*—Strongly urge continued study.

³NEA resolution adopted at 1961 business session, Atlantic City, N.J.

⁴*Report to the Kentucky Committee on Merit or Quality of Service Pay*, Louisville, Ky.: Kentucky Education Association, 1961.

⁵*Ibid.*

12. *Mississippi*—Against until objective measures of teacher ability can be found.
13. *Nevada*—Policy to support National Education Association resolution on merit rating.
14. *New Hampshire*—Study by individual districts.
15. *New Mexico*—Salary schedules should be based on preparation, experience, and professional growth.
16. *New York*—Encourages continued study, but raises questions as to outcomes. Final test of any salary policy is "what it adds to the quality of service."
17. *North Carolina*—State legislature passed a resolution in 1959 to study merit rating, but it has not been carried out.
18. *Ohio*—Recommends more study; sees negative values in existing merit pay plans.
19. *Oregon*—Open-mindedness and continued research. Lists five conditions for workable merit pay plans.
20. *Pennsylvania*—Recommends immediate and intensive study.
21. *Utah*—Continued study since 1953. State committee recommended adoption to 1961 legislature, but money was not appropriated.
22. *Virginia*—Recommends pilot studies in ten school divisions and sets up procedure for study under Virginia Education Association.
23. *Washington*—Study.
24. *West Virginia*—Career service increment plan in case legislature receives merit pay bill.
25. *Wisconsin*—Favors single salary schedule.
26. *Wyoming*—Affirms belief in evaluation. No statement on merit pay.

8

New Developments and Trends in Merit Rating

Although there has been a trend away from traditional merit pay plans, there appears to be developing a trend in the direction of rewarding superior teachers and career teachers with additional salary by extending their contracts; by giving career increases after they have reached the maximum steps on regular salary schedules; and by assigning such titles as lecturing teacher, demonstration teacher, or teacher-consultant. Reports of experience along these lines indicate that many of the desirable goals of the advocates of merit pay programs may be achieved through one or a combination of these plans.

Most school administrators and school boards are interested in finding some acceptable method of rewarding financially those outstanding teachers who put in the extra time and effort to do a truly superior job in the classroom and in other professional services. These administrators would work with teachers who are below standard and try to bring them up to an acceptable level of performance. If, within a reasonable length of time, marginal teachers cannot improve their quality of service, they should be dropped from employment, not kept on the staff and merely paid less salary. Educators have no difficulty judging an acceptable level of professional service. Evaluation breaks down, however, when attempts are made to discriminate the finer degrees of teaching competence and assign dollar values to each degree of teaching success.

The extended contract is one of several new programs of merit rating for salary purposes emerging in districts throughout the country. This plan separates the teaching staffs of school districts into two general categories—one responsible only for classroom manage-

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

ment and related functions and the other available for professional assignments in addition to classroom duties.

Those in first group are employed under a nine-month contract, while the others are signed for twelve months, with a three- to four-week paid vacation. With a staff available during the summer months, districts can schedule in the summer many projects, such as curriculum development, in-service training programs, textbook review and selection, test analysis, and research, that now have to be handled during school hours, on weekends, and after school hours.

Proponents maintain that this permits all teachers to give their undivided attention to classroom management and related functions during the time classes are in session, with improvement in instruction resulting. It also permits better consideration of the nonclassroom aspects of education. Merit comes into the picture in the selection of teachers who apply for 12-month contract status. Only teachers who have demonstrated their superiority as classroom technicians and the ability and willingness to make a contribution in other professional areas are eligible for the longer contract.

San Rafael, California, schools use superior instructors as summer school teachers to do remedial work, to provide special educational opportunities for children, and to operate seminars and lecture series for students and adults.¹

Whittier Union High School of Whittier, California, adopted a policy of extending the contract of all teachers 20 days. This time was spent in preparation, orientation, counseling, group testing, and parent conferences.²

The Lakewood District in Ohio offers 11-month contracts to teachers on a voluntary basis. Teachers who are chosen for the extended contract teach in summer and participate in workshops and demonstration classes.³

Rochester, Minnesota, has a different salary schedule for teachers who are employed on an 11-month contract than for regular teachers working the 9-month regular school year.⁴

¹Frank Lucas, "Using Superior Teachers in Summer School," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, April, 1960, pp. 269-270.

²Heber H. Holloway, "All-Year Program at Whittier," *California Teachers Association Journal*, February, 1961, p. 7.

³Joseph P. Wilson, "Appropriate Education and Eleven-Month Contracts," *Ohio Schools*, March, 1961, p. 12.

⁴*Salary Schedules, Classroom Teachers, Urban Districts 30,000-99,999 in Population*. Research Report 1961-R2, Public School Salaries Series. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1961, p. 39.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS AND TRENDS IN MERIT RATING

With the expansion of team teaching programs, superior teachers have been given specific assignments. Such titles as lead teacher, TV teacher, or master teacher and an additional stipend go with this assignment. Such a program exists in the Norwalk, Connecticut, schools. In Norwalk, the team leader receives an addition of \$1,000 to her regular salary. The co-operating teacher on the team gets an additional \$500.⁵ A similar situation exists in Lexington, Massachusetts, where the leaders of team teaching receive \$1,000 more than called for on the regular teachers' salary schedule.⁶ Team teaching projects have been reported in Evanston Township High School, Illinois; Weber and Duchesne Counties, Utah; Jefferson County, Colorado; San Diego, California; Newton and Lexington, Massachusetts; Mattoon, Urbana, Taylorville, Northbrook, Cicero, Arlington Heights, and Chicago, Illinois; and Snyder, Texas.

Widespread are career increments given teachers after their tenure in a district has placed them on the top step of the regular teachers' salary schedule.⁷ They are usually called superior-service maximums.

⁵Robert H. Anderson, "Team Teaching in Action," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 65, No. 5, May, 1960, p. 62.

⁶"New Opportunity for Outstanding Teachers," *Grade Teacher*, January, 1961, p. 13.

⁷*Salary Schedules, Classroom Teachers, Urban Districts 30,000-99,999 in Population*. Loc. cit.

9

Summary

Merit pay programs have been in operation in a very few districts over a long period of time. Merit pay programs have been tried by several hundred districts that have later abandoned them. A strong case can be made either in favor of or in opposition to merit rating for salary purposes. Research and field study indicate that this is a complex problem to be approached with caution. Enough experience has been reported, however, to indicate certain conditions that should be met to increase chances of success of a merit pay plan. Experience gained from districts that have tried merit programs and abandoned them shows the pitfalls to be avoided. The position taken by the great majority of educators is one of study and experimentation. Outright opposition is widespread against subjective ratings and merit pay as practiced in districts where such programs have failed. New developments and trends in merit rating hold promise for breaking the solidarity of the single salary schedule supporters and providing a better means of relating salaries to quality of service.

Wide reading about merit pay plans and visitations to a number of school districts operating such plans raise some questions of interest. Why don't districts operating successful plans attempt to use objective measurements? Why are articles favoring merit pay found predominantly in *The Nation's Schools* and *The American School Board Journal*? Why have professional associations generally opposed merit pay? Why have so many educators and laymen taken vigorous positions without investigating current practices and research findings?

It is also interesting to note that:

1. The study of merit rating and evaluation requires a clear-cut definition of terms.

2. Research methods must be examined carefully to determine if comparison is made between like factors.
3. Merit salaries were paid to all teachers prior to the development of single salary schedules.
4. Slogans and clever phrases are widely used in the literature.

When considering merit rating programs, or any other problem related to education, evaluation must be made in terms of the potential contribution toward the achievement of the basic educational goals of the nation, the state, and the school district. Unless a particular proposal can help achieve more efficiently the purposes of public education, it is not worthy of adoption. Sufficient evidence is available to warrant the conclusion that the morale status of the faculty is the one most significant factor contributing toward improving the instructional program. Constructive staff morale, in turn, is dependent on good human relations practices. Available evidence indicates that, except in a few unusual situations, staff morale and human relations are not improved by merit rating for salary purposes. In many instances the staff has been demoralized. There is, therefore, sufficient reason to question the advisability of undertaking merit payment plans.

Personnel practices and the educational program are interrelated. Each change contemplated must be evaluated in terms of its effect on related aspects of the school program. The effect of merit ratings on the total program of a school, morale, community relations, personnel policies, and other factors must be weighed.

The worth or merit of teachers as a group has been increasing steadily during the past few years. Evidence of such improvement in quality is particularly apparent in higher standards and better instruction. These far-reaching advances have been—and are being—accomplished without formal merit pay programs.

There is sufficient reason for concern about the amount of time, money, and energy being devoted to pilot studies of merit rating for salary purposes. An equivalent devotion of resources to evaluation for the purpose of improving instruction may have far more beneficial results.

Forty years of research offer little hope of achieving objectivity in measuring fine degrees of teacher competency. In spite of evidence of the inherent problems in merit rating, pressures for merit rating continue to mount. The reason for this persistent increase—in diametric opposition to the logical view—is that many lay and edu-

cautional leaders are uninformed about merit rating. As a result, school board members, teachers, administrators, and other individuals in the community are not provided with background material when the subject is discussed. Educational leaders must help others examine the facts, reassess objectives, and draw conclusions. All individuals and groups must be encouraged to look at the problem dispassionately. Some of the problems growing out of the merit pay controversy focus attention on the need for democratic, intelligent concepts of school administration.

The teaching profession believes in supervision and evaluation designed to improve teaching as a public service but justifiably opposes subjective merit rating as a salary determinant. Some of the newer practices for rewarding outstanding service, however, hold promise of improving salary policies and overcoming many of the objections voiced against the single salary schedule.

Pressure from groups and individuals for the establishment of merit salary schedules can be expected to continue. All people interested in sound education and research practices will want to examine as many facets of the problem as possible before reaching conclusions.

Merit pay is, and will continue to be, controversial. It has been notably unsuccessful in the past. Its future is uncertain. The important point is that research and reason can avoid the danger of impairing educational programs by unwise haste and apparently expedient action.

Bibliography

- ACKERMAN, WALTER I., "Teacher Competence and Pupil Change," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 24, No. 4, Fall, 1954, pp. 273-289.
- ALEXANDER, VIRGINIA R., "Teacher Evaluation Program: La Due Public Schools," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 148-153.
- "A Merit Salary Schedule," *Clearing House*, Vol. 32, March, 1958, pp. 395-398.
- ANDERSON, HAROLD M., "Study of Certain Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 23, September, 1954, pp. 41-71.
- ANDERSON, ROBERT, H., "Team Teaching in Action," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 65, No. 5, May, 1960, pp. 62-65, 102, 104, 108, 110.
- ANDRE, R. G.; BURAU, R. C.; and SALYER, G., "Under What Conditions Does Merit Rating Succeed or Fail?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 45, April, 1961, pp. 23-28.
- "Any Merit in Merit Rating?" *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, pp. 173-174.
- ARNUCKLE, D. S., "A Merit Salary Schedule," *Clearing House*, Vol. 32, March, 1958, pp. 395-398.
- BANDERS, D. R., "Salary Increases Alone Won't Eliminate Poor Teaching," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 58, No. 5, November, 1956, p. 51.
- BARR, A. S., *et al.*, "Report of the Committee on the Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 22, No. 3, June, 1952, pp. 238-263.
- _____, "Second Report of the Committee on Criteria of Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Educational Research*, May, 1953, pp. 641-658.
- BARR, A. S.; BURTON, W. H.; and BRUECKNER, L. J.; *Supervision*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1938.

- BARR, A. S., "Measurement of Teacher Characteristics and Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 22, June, 1952, pp. 169-174.
- _____, "Measurement of Teaching Ability," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 10, June, 1940, pp. 182-184, 267-268.
- BEECHER, DWIGHT E., "Evaluation of the Attempts of Local School Systems in New York State to Include Competence Measures in Salary Schedules," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 22, Spring, 1952, pp. 132-140.
- _____, "Judging the Effectiveness of Teaching," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 34, December, 1950, pp. 270-281.
- _____, *The Evaluation of Teaching in New York State*, New York: University of the State of New York, 1950, 57 pp.
- BERMOCK, JAY, "Why Teachers Fear Merit Rating," *Clearing House*, No. 1, September, 1957, pp. 17-18.
- BENGE, EUGENE J., *Job Evaluation and Merit Rating*, New York: National Foremen's Institute, 1944, 93 pp.
- BENNE, KENNETH D., *A Conception of Authority*, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943.
- Better Than Rating*, Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, 1950, 83 pp.
- "Blueprint for Merit Rating," *The School Executive*, Vol. 77, June, 1958, pp. 52-55.
- BOUTWELL, W. D., "What's Happening in Education? Merit Pay," *National Parent-Teacher*, Vol. 53, June, 1959, pp. 13-14.
- BOYKIN, LEANDER L., "Let's Eliminate the Confusion: What Is Evaluation?" *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 43, February, 1957, pp. 115-118.
- BRACKMAN, B., "Rewarding the Superior Teacher," *School and Society*, Vol. 87, September 26, 1959, pp. 356-358.
- BROWNELL, S. M., "A Workable Plan for Recognition of Merit," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 40, November, 1947, pp. 20-22.
- BURKE, ARVID J., *Competent Teachers for America's Schools*, Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA, 1954, pp. 19-23.
- _____, "Some Dangers of Merit Measurement," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 41, January, 1948, pp. 27-28.
- BURNS, HOBERT W., "The Merit Plan: Boon or Bane?" *The Educational Forum*, Vol. 21, No. 4, May, 1957, pp. 443-451.
- BURTON, W. H., "Teacher's Morale as an Important Factor in Teaching Success," *California Journal of Elementary Education*, Vol. 6, May, 1938, pp. 218-226.
- BUSHONG, JAMES W., "Automatic Salary Increases Cannot Be Justified," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, February, 1958, pp. 43-45.
- _____, "The Story Behind Grose Pointe's Professional Growth Program," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 170-175.
- BUSSCH, RUSSELL L., "Teacher Rating," *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 1, April, 1931, pp. 99-107, 156-157.
- "Call It Anything, but Don't Say Merit Pay," *School Management*, Vol. 4, January, 1960, pp. 34-38, 77.
- CARR, EDWARD L., *School Reference and Rating Plan*, Wabasso, Fla.: Wabasso School, 1960 (mimeographed).
- CARTER, D. D., et al., *Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography*, Bulletin of the Institute of Educational Research, Indiana University, 1954.
- CHANDLER, B. J., and PERRY, PAUL V., *Personnel Management in School Administration*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1955, pp. 248-253.
- CHANDLER, B. J., "Study Shows That Merit Rating Is Not Detrimental to Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, April, 1958, pp. 58-59.
- _____, "Teacher Salary Policies and Research," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, p. 171.
- "Characteristics of Effective Teachers," *Educational Research Bulletin*, College of Education, Ohio State University, Vol. 39, April, 1960, pp. 92-100.
- Classroom Teachers Speak on Merit Rating*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1957, 14 pp.
- COEN, ALBAN W., II, "An Analysis of Successful Merit Rating Programs," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 39, June, 1958, pp. 394-397.
- COOK, WILLIAM A., "Merit Rating and Salary Increase," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 124, June, 1952, pp. 33-34.
- COOKE, DENNIS H., *Administering the Teaching Personnel*, Chicago: Sandborn and Co., 1939.
- COONS, E., "Value in Merit?" *Montana Education*, Vol. 37, No. 2, Fall, 1960, pp. 17-18.
- COSGROVE, D. J., "Diagnostic Rating of Teacher Performance," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 50, October, 1959, pp. 200-204.
- COUTLER, KENNETH C., "Paying for Merit," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 60, July, 1957, pp. 58-59.
- CUSHMAN, JACK, "The Glencoe Career-Teacher Plan," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 154-158.
- CYRANOW, MANUEL, and WEEDEN, SHIRLEY U., "Emotional Factors in the Reliability of Student Rating of Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 51, April, 1958, pp. 629-632.
- DAVIS, HAZEL, "Where We Stand on Merit Rating as Applied to Teachers' Salaries," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 46, November, 1957, pp. 535-536.
- "Debate Merit Pay," *Scholastic Teacher*, Vol. 70, No. 6, March 8, 1957, pp. 17-37.
- "Discussion Guide on Merit Rating," *CTA Journal*, Vol. 53, January, 1957, pp. 19-22.
- DIX, L. H., *The Economic Basis for the Teacher's Wage*, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931.
- DOMAS, SIMON J., and TIDDEMAN, DAVID V., "Teacher Competence: An Annotated Bibliography," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 19, No. 2, December, 1950, pp. 101-218.

- DUNKEL, HAROLD B., "Merit Rating," *The School Review*, Vol. 65, Winter, 1957, pp. 488-489.
- ELSBER, WILLARD S., and REUTTER, E. EDMUND, JR., *Staff Personnel in the Public Schools*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1954, pp. 151-154.
- ENGELMAN, FINIS E., "Problems of Merit Rating," *NEA Journal*, April, 1957, pp. 240-241.
- _____, "The Crux of the Merit Rating Question," *The Kansas Teacher*, November, 1958, pp. 26-27, 42.
- ERNST, MYRON S., *A Survey of Methods of Evaluating Teachers in Selected School Districts of the United States*, M. A. Thesis, University of Washington, 1959.
- ESSEX, MARVIN, "What About Merit Rating?" *Washington Education*, February, 1958, pp. 6-7.
- _____, "Factors in Teaching Competence," Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1954, 12 pp.
- _____, "Favor Merit Rating in Principle," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 57, May, 1956, pp. 92-94.
- _____, "Five Basic Steps to a Practical Merit Plan," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, November, 1957, pp. 26-28.
- FORBES, R., *et al.*, "Good and Bad Teachers," *Overview*, Vol. 2, March, 1961, pp. 53-55.
- FOSDICK, HARRY A., "Merit Rating—How and by Whom?" *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 57, January, 1956, pp. 58-62.
- FURSE, B. S., "Merit Pay Is Feasible and Sometimes Desirable," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 42, January, 1961, pp. 143-147.
- GAGE, N. L., and ORTEANS, JACOB S., "Guiding Principles in the Study of Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 3, December, 1952, pp. 294-298.
- GALLOR, A. L., "Merit Rating," *Minnesota Journal of Education*, Vol. 41, December, 1960, pp. 26-27.
- GANS, ROMA, "How Evaluate Teachers?" *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 8, November, 1950, pp. 77-81.
- GRISON, R. C., "Paying for Pedagogical Power," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 42, January, 1961, pp. 148-151.
- GLAZIER, LYLE, "Reward for Teachers," *The American School Board Journal*, May, 1956, pp. 43-44.
- _____, "Good Teaching Wears a Label," *Illinois Education*, Vol. 39, December, 1959, p. 159.
- GORES, HAROLD B., "Awards for Notable Service," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 165-169.
- GRACE, W. L., "Ithaca's Revised Teacher Rating Plan," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 125, October, 1952, pp. 41-42, 92.
- _____, "The Ithaca Merit Salary Program," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 159-164.
- _____, "The Logic of Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 61, February, 1958, p. 46.
- _____, "What They Say About Merit," *Michigan Education Journal*, Vol. 34, January, 1957, pp. 218-219.
- HERTZLER, JOHN R., "A Layman's Slant on Merit Rating," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, pp. 171-172.
- HINES, CLARENCE, "To Merit Pay or Not to Merit Pay," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 117, August, 1958, pp. 9-10.
- HOLLOWAY, GEORGE E., JR., "Objective Look at the Merit Pay Issue," *The School Executive*, Vol. 78, April, 1959, pp. 19-21.
- HOLLOWAY, HERB H., "All-Year Program at Whittier," *CTA Journal*, February, 1961, pp. 7-8, 23.
- HOOVER, C. P., and WINTER, S. S., "Salary Ratio of Career/New Teachers," *Overview*, Vol. 1, May, 1960, pp. 28-30.
- HUGGERT, ALBERT J., and SCRINNEY, T. M., *Professional Problems of Teachers*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1956, pp. 135-156.
- _____, "Information on Merit Rating of Teachers," *Research Bulletin No. 98*, California Teachers Association Research Department, December, 1956, 107 pp.
- _____, *Interim Report*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah School Merit Rating Study Committee, September 17, 1954.
- JACOUES, ELLIOTT, *Measurement of Responsibility, a Study of Work, Payment and Individual Capacity*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- JENSEN, ALFRED C., "Determining Critical Requirements for Teachers," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 20, No. 1, September, 1951, pp. 79-85.
- GREIDER, CALVIN, "A Practical Compromise on Merit Rating: Academic Ranks for Teachers," *Education*, Vol. 78, March, 1958, pp. 426-429.
- GURFITHS, DANIEL E., *Human Relations in School Administration*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.
- GRIM, PAUL R., and HOYT, CYRIL J., "Excerpts from Two Instruments for Appraising Teaching Competency," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 46, May, 1953, pp. 705-710.
- GROSS, E., "Sociological Aspects of Professional Salaries in Education," *Educational Record*, Vol. 41, April, 1960, pp. 130-137.
- GROTRIE, E. M., "A Study of Professional Distance Between Raters of Teachers and Teachers Rated," *Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 24, No. 1, September, 1955, pp. 1-41.
- GUNDENSON, WILFRED E., *Evaluation of Performance of Senior High School Teachers*, Ed. D. Thesis, University of Washington, 1959.
- HANAWALT, ELLA, "Shall We Rate or Evaluate Teaching?" *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, Vol. 89, May, 1957, pp. 5-7.
- HANSON, EARL H., "Are the Teachers in a Wilderness?" *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 133, September, 1956, pp. 65-66.
- HARRY, ROBERT V., "Merit Salary Plan in New Canaan," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, October, 1957, p. 34.
- HEARN, NORMAN, "What About Merit Rating?" *Michigan Education Journal*, Vol. 34, September, 1956, pp. 20-21.

- JESTIN, H. B., "Canton's Merit Plan Increases Teacher Salaries and Reduces Turnover," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 65, May, 1960, pp. 68-69.
- JONES, HOWARD R., "Workable Merit Rating," *School and Society*, Vol. 86, April 12, 1958, p. 178.
- KARAW, I. A., "Merit Rating Salary Plans in Public School Systems of the United States," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 53, December, 1959, pp. 144-148.
- KARIEL, H. G., "Merit Rating in New Zealand," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 46, October, 1957, pp. 473-474.
- KATZ, I., "Why I Oppose Selective Merit Pay: A Teacher Sounds Off," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 42, January, 1961, pp. 161-163.
- KELLY, MARCELA R., "Let Us Have None of It; Case Against Merit Rating," *The School Executive*, Vol. 78, March, 1949, pp. 56-57.
- KENNEDY, E. D., "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 41, April, 1957, pp. 120-122.
- KRAUSE, G. R., and MCCALL, W. A., "Measurement of Teacher Merit for Salary Purposes," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 53, October, 1959, pp. 53-55.
- LAWSON, D. E., "Society's Stake in Merit Rating of Teachers," *School and Society*, Vol. 85, April, 1957, pp. 140-142.
- Lay Professional Action Programs to Secure and Retain Qualified Teachers, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1954.
- LEWIS, W. P., "Merit Rating and the Single-Salary Schedule," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 45, September, 1959, pp. 297-299.
- LIEBERMAN, MYRON, "Foundation Approach to Merit Pay," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 41, December, 1959, pp. 118-122.
- LOBDELL, LAWRENCE O., "The Rewards of Merit," *The School Executive*, September, 1955, pp. 56-57.
- LONG, C. A., "For Teacher Evaluation: The Door is Open!" *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 43, December, 1957, pp. 499-504.
- LOOS, I. E., "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, April, 1958, pp. 259-261.
- LUCAS, FRANK, "Using Superior Teachers in Summer School," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, April, 1960, pp. 269-270.
- LYNCH, J. M., "Why Argue About Merit Rating?" *Clearing House*, Vol. 35, January, 1961, pp. 298-300.
- MCCALL, WILLIAM A., "Measurement of Teacher Merit," *Bulletin No. 284*, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, April, 1952, 40 pp.
- MCGRAW, E., and EAY, C. T., "Sound Off! Teachers' Salaries Should Be Based on Merit Ratings," *Instructor*, Vol. 70, January, 1961, pp. 8-9.
- McKEACHIE, W. J., "Student Ratings of Instructors: A Validity Study," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 51, January, 1958, pp. 379-381.
- McKINLEY, DON, *A Study of Merit Evaluation for Salary Purposes in the Public Schools of the United States*, Ed. D. Thesis, State College of Washington, 1958.
- McKINLEY, D. R., "Merit Pay Districts Reporting," *The School Executive*, Vol. 78, May, 1959, pp. 72-73.
- MOSWAIN, E. T., et al., "Should Teachers' Salaries Be Related to Merit Rating?" *Illinois Education*, Vol. 45, March, 1957, pp. 262-265.
- MATIER, W. R., *Twenty Years of Merit Rating, 1926-1946*, New York: Psychological Corp., 1947, 73 pp.
- MEAD, A. R., "Some Basic Considerations for Merit Rating of Teachers," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 44, September, 1958, pp. 272-277.
- MEDLEY, D. M., and MIRZEY, H. E., "Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 50, December, 1959, pp. 239-246.
- MELBY, E. O., "Role of Evaluation in Improving Teaching," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 15, January, 1958, pp. 218-220.
- MERCER, B. C., "Merit Rating Scale at Work," *Instructor*, Vol. 70, January, 1961, p. 21.
- "Merit Pay Debate," *Scholastic Teacher*, Vol. 68, No. 6, March 8, 1956, p. 61.
- "Merit Pay Seesaw," *Education U.S.A.*, September 29, 1960, p. 1.
- Merit Rating: A Guide for Study*, Harrisburg, Pa.: Pennsylvania State Education Association, 1957, 9 pp.
- Merit Rating, Facts and Issues*, St. Paul, Minn.: Minnesota Education Association, 1958, 47 pp.
- "Merit Rating on Trial," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, September, 1957, pp. 27-29.
- "Merit Rating, Points to Consider for a Pilot Test," *Clearing House*, Vol. 29, March, 1955, pp. 402-404.
- Merit Salary Programs for Teachers* (and Supplements 1 and 2), San Diego, Calif.: Board of Education, 1957.
- MURER, LEO R., "Let Those Who Teach Rate for Merit," *The School Executive*, Vol. 68, May, 1949, pp. 55-56.
- MULLER, VAN, "Paying for Quality in Teaching," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 118, April, 1949, pp. 21-22.
- MISNER, PAUL J., "Teacher Rating Is the Responsibility of the Entire Profession," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 51, February, 1953, pp. 45-46.
- MITCHELL, J. B., "Merit Rating: Past, Present and Perhaps," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 42, January, 1961, pp. 139-142.
- MOORE, S., "Administrative Problems Under a Merit Plan," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 10, March, 1959, pp. 28-34.
- MORRISON, J. CAYCE, and BURKE, ARVID J., "Basing Salaries on Quality of Teaching: Defense and a Criticism of New York's Merit Law," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 44, September, 1949, pp. 52-54.
- MORRISON, J. CAYCE, "It's Time to Adjust Salaries to Quality of Teaching," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 51, February, 1953, pp. 45-46.

- MYERS, SPENCER W., "There Is an Answer to the Teacher Shortage," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 59, April, 1957, pp. 43-46.
- NALLY, THOMAS P., "The Question of Merit Rating," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 134, February, 1957, pp. 35-36.
- "New Opportunity for Outstanding Teachers," *Grade Teacher*, January, 1961, pp. 13, 104.
- NICHOLS, IVAN C., "Salary Schedules Are Based on Effectiveness of Teaching," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 57, June, 1956, pp. 52-56.
- Official Report, 1960-61*, Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers, NEA, 1961, pp. 109-110.
- OLEMAN, RALPH H., "Identifying Effective Classroom Teachers," *31st Yearbook*, Washington, D. C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1952, pp. 130-138.
- ORRION, DON A., "Utah Committee Is Making a New Approach to Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 56, July, 1955, pp. 70-71.
- OVARD, G. F., "Teachers Merit Rating," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 139, October, 1959, pp. 35-37.
- PATRICK, T. L., "Can Merit Rating Be Long Delayed?" *School and Society*, Vol. 86, July 12, 1958, pp. 174-175.
- PETERSON, CARL, "Five Basic Steps to a Practical Merit Plan," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, No. 5, November, 1957, pp. 26-29.
- PETERSON, DEL, *Feasibility of Merit Pay*, Pullman, Wash.: School of Education, Washington State University, 1957, 23 pp.
- "Planning the Appraisal of Teaching Efficiency," *The School Executive*, Vol. 67, April, 1948, pp. 47-60.
- Policy on Relating Merit Ratings to Teachers' Salaries*, Massachusetts Teachers Association, April 27, 1957 (mimeographed).
- POPMAN, W. J., and STRANDLER, L. S., "Out-of-School Activities May Not Measure Teacher Competence," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 66, November, 1960, pp. 97-99.
- POWELL, VIVIAN, "Rating Not the Answer," *The Kansas Teacher*, October, 1958, pp. 16-17, 34.
- Proceedings*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1906, pp. 177-183.
- Proceedings*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1913, pp. 286-290.
- Proceedings*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1915, pp. 1165-1173.
- Proceedings*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1917, pp. 187-194.
- Proceedings*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1925, pp. 202-215.
- Progress Report of the Merit Study Committee of the Provo City Schools*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah School Merit Study Committee, August, 1958.
- Progress Report on Continuing Survey of Research on Teacher Evaluation*, Albany, N. Y.: New York State Teachers Association, 1959.
- Promotion and Appraisal Procedures in City School Systems, 1950-51*, Educational Research Service Circular No. 2, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1953, 28 pp.
- Quality of Service Provisions in Salary Schedules, 1958-59*, Research Report 1959-R24, Public School Salaries Series, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1959, pp. 39-43.
- Question, Who's a Good Teacher?* Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1961, 54 pp.
- RAAVIS, W. C., and COOPER, DAN, *Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- "Recent Studies in the Evaluation of Teaching," *Educational Research Bulletin*, College of Education, Ohio State University, Vol. 34, October, 1955, pp. 172-186.
- REDEFFER, FREDERICK L., "Factors That Affect Teacher Morale," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 63, No. 2, February, 1959, pp. 59-62.
- REED, ROBERTS, "Blueprint for Merit Rating," *The School Executive*, Vol. 77, June, 1958, pp. 52-55.
- RECAN, EUGENE E., *Survey of the Attitudes of Classroom Teachers, Administrators, Supervisors, and School Board Members in the State of Washington Relative to a Merit Rating System*, M.A. Thesis, Western Washington College of Education, 1958.
- Relation of Salaries to Efficiency*, Research Bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 4, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1928.
- Report of Committee on Merit Rating*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1954.
- Report of Teacher Evaluation Study in the Senior School District, Richfield, Utah*, Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah School Merit Study Committee, 1958.
- Report of the Jordan School District Merit Study*, Sandy, Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah School Merit Study Committee, 1958.
- Report to the Kentucky Committee on Merit or Quality Service Pay*, Louisville, Ky.: Kentucky Education Association, 1961.
- ROBERTS, DOUGLAS B., "Teaching Is a Profession in Lincoln," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, October, 1957, pp. 32-34.
- ROBERTS, VINCE M., ed., *Do We Want Merit Salary Schedules?* Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- _____, *Merit Rating for Teachers*, Report of Workshop on Merit Rating in Teachers' Salary Schedules, Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1958, 78 pp.
- _____, *Merit Rating or Effective Personnel Policies*, Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1961.
- ROSE, GALE, et al., "Utah Teachers Study Merit," *Utah Educational Review*, Vol. 50, May, 1957, pp. 24, 40.
- ROSE, GALE, "Preparation Unlocks the Door to Successful Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 64, October, 1959, pp. 51-53.
- ROYSTER, S., "Evaluating Classroom Instruction," *Clearing House*, Vol. 34, February, 1960, pp. 356-357.
- RYANS, DAVID G., "A Study of the Extent of Association of Certain Professional and Personal Data and Judged Effectiveness of Teacher Behavior," *Journal of Experimental Education*, September, 1951, pp. 67-77.
- _____, "Criteria of Teaching Effectiveness," *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 42, May, 1949, pp. 690-699.

- RYANS, DAVID C., "Notes on the Rating of Teacher Performance," *Journal of Educational Research*, May, 1954, pp. 695-703.
- _____, "The Investigation of Teacher Characteristics," *Educational Record*, October, 1953, pp. 371-396.
- Salary Schedules, Classroom Teachers, Urban Districts 30,000-99,999 in Population*, Research Report 1961-R2, Public School Salaries Series, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1961.
- "Salary Scheduling Developments," *Public Education Research Bulletin*, New York State Teachers Association, January, 1956.
- "Satisfactory Pay Should Precede Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 67, February, 1961, pp. 114-117.
- SCHINNEKER, MARK C., "Wanted: Objective Study and Rational Thinking on Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 59, June, 1957, pp. 47-48.
- SCRIBNER, H. B., "Differentiating Instruction in the Dedham Schools," *Journal of Education*, Vol. 142, December, 1959, pp. 11-21.
- SEAVEY, MORTON R., "Effect of Salaries on Teaching," *Education Digest*, Vol. 18, April, 1953, pp. 6-8.
- SHANE, HAROLD G., and TROYER, MAURICE E., "Should Teachers Be Rated?" *Childhood Education*, Vol. 25, February, 1949, pp. 274-275.
- SHANE, HAROLD G., "Seven Types of Teacher Appraisal," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 50, July, 1952, p. 58.
- SHANNON, J. R., "Elements of Excellence in Teaching," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, Vol. 27, No. 3, March, 1941, pp. 168-176.
- SHANNON, W. A., "Six Major Educational Organizations Study Their Roles Together," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 135, No. 1, July, 1957, pp. 14, 16.
- SHELLER, H. LYNN, "Merit Rating as a Basis for Teachers' Salary Schedules," *California Teachers Association Southern Section Report*, Los Angeles, September, 1948.
- "Should Teachers' Salaries Be Related to Merit Rating?" *Illinois Education*, Vol. 45, March, 1957, pp. 262-265.
- SHUMAN, W. L., "We Vote NO on Merit Rating," *Ohio Schools*, Vol. 34, May, 1956, pp. 12-13, 32-33.
- SKAIFE, R. A., "What Classroom Teachers Say About Merit Rating," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 59, February, 1957, pp. 83-85.
- SMITH, C. C., "Why Teachers Dislike Merit Rating," *Overview*, Vol. 1, February, 1960, pp. 41-44.
- SMITH, JOHN B., "Lexington Moves Toward Merit Rating," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 133, November, 1956, pp. 27-29.
- SMYTH, RICHARD C., and MURPHY, M. J., *Job Evaluation and Employee Rating*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1946.
- STAEHLE, J. F., "Merit and Responsibility Factors in Teachers' Salaries," *School Life*, Vol. 41, December, 1958, pp. 18-19.
- STRAUB, FRED, and SAVAGE, WILLIAM W., "Teachers' Salaries and Merit Rating," *Administrators' Notebook*, Vol. 14, May, 1956, pp. 1-4.
- STAUFEER, R. F., and WYNNES, C. M., "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 42, April, 1958, pp. 214-218.
- STEEGMAN, W. H., "Some Historical Comparisons of Merit Rating in Industry and Education," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, Vol. 34, April, 1959, pp. 205-212.
- STEVENSON, MARCARET, "Not Merit Rating but Sound Personnel Policies," *NEA Journal*, Vol. 46, April, 1957, pp. 242-243.
- STILES, LINDEY, "Security Isn't Enough to Attract Teachers to the Profession," *The Nation's Schools*, December, 1956, pp. 43-44.
- STINNETT, T. M., "Merit Rating for Teachers?" *Inspector*, Vol. 70, January, 1961, pp. 20, 93.
- STURLING, T., and WINGER, L., "What Is the Case For and Against Merit Rating for Teachers?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 44, April, 1960, pp. 92-95.
- SYMONDS, PERCIVAL M., "Notes on Rating," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 9, June, 1925, pp. 188-195.
- Teacher Merit and Teacher Salary*, Albany, N. Y.: New York State Teachers Association, 1957, 72 pp.
- "Teacher Merit Plans That Work," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 136, April, 1958, pp. 28-29.
- Teacher Rating*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1954.
- "Teachers in Summit, Say Merit Pay Works," *School Management*, Vol. 4, April, 1960, pp. 69-73.
- "The Superintendent as Instructional Leader," *35th Yearbook*, Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, NEA, 1957, pp. 71-72.
- THORNDIKE, EDWARD L., "Fundamental Theorems in Judging Men," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 2, March, 1918, pp. 67-76.
- THORNE, EDMUND H., "Career Salary Plan," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 55, March, 1952, pp. 51-52.
- _____, "Teacher Merit Rating Really Does Work: Here Are Sixteen Tested Requisites," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 64, November, 1959, pp. 70-71.
- _____, "West Hartford's Career Salary Plan," *Journal of Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, No. 2, June, 1957, pp. 143-147.
- TIEDMAN, D. V., ed., *Teacher Competence and Its Relation to Salary*, Cambridge, Mass.: Spaulding House Council Publications, 1956.
- TOMPKINS, ELLSWORTH, and ARMSTRONG, W. EARL, "Teacher Rating: Persistent Dilemma," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 35, May, 1951, pp. 25-31.
- TOMPKINS, ELLSWORTH, and ROE, VIRGINIA, "The Case For and Against Merit Rating," *Digest of Significant References 1951-1956*, *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Vol. 40, October, 1956, pp. 5-6.

MERIT PAY PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS

- TRUMP, J. LLOYD, "Merit Rating Puts the Cart Before the Horse," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 45, June, 1950, pp. 51-53.
- TURNBAUGH, ROY C., "Recognizing Merit in Setting Salaries," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 36, January, 1955, pp. 165-166.
- TYLER, F. T., "Teachers' Personalities and Teaching Competencies," *School Review*, Vol. 68, No. 4, Winter, 1960, pp. 429-449.
- "Using Tests to Judge a Teacher or a Program," *Education*, Vol. 81, October, 1960, pp. 88-91.
- "Utah Committee Releases Merit Pay Plan," *Education U. S. A.*, October 27, 1960, p. 1.
- VANDER WERF, LESTER S., "*How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching*," New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1958.
- _____, "Predicting Teacher Efficiency," *The Nation's Schools*, Vol. 51, June, 1953, pp. 79-81.
- _____, "Trouble with Merit Systems," *The American School Board Journal*, Vol. 125, August, 1952, pp. 17-18.
- WALLS, ROY, "A New Concept of Merit Rating," *Office Management Series No. 113*, New York: American Management Association, 1945, 34 pp.
- Washington State Merit Pay for Teachers Study Committee Report*, Olympia, Wash.: Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1958.
- WEST, ALLEN, "The Case For and Against Merit Rating," *The School Executive*, Vol. 69, July, 1950, pp. 48-50.
- We View with Alarm: Merit Rating and the Classroom Teacher*, Nassau County (New York) Classroom Teachers Association, Professional Advancement Committee, 1958, 16 pp.
- "What Is Merit Rating?" *NEA Journal*, November, 1956, pp. 509-511.
- WHITMAN, HOWARD, "A New Way to Pay Teachers," *Collier's*, Vol. 136, September 30, 1955, pp. 102-105.
- Why Have Merit Plans for Teachers' Salaries Been Abandoned?* Research Report 1961-R3, Public School Salaries Series, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1961.
- "Why the Winnetka Salary Committee Did Not Recommend a Merit Schedule," *For Your Information*, Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1958.
- WIGGINS, S. P., and JOHNSTON, S. P., "What Are the Advantages and Disadvantages of Teacher Merit Rating Plans?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, April, 1957, pp. 27-30.
- WILSON, JOSEPH P., "Appropriate Education and Eleven-Month Contracts," *Ohio Schools*, March, 1961, pp. 12-13, 40-41.
- WOLF, WILLIAM B., "*Merit Rating as a Managerial Tool*," Seattle, Wash.: Bureau of Business Research, University of Washington, 1958, 91 pp.
- WOLFE, JOSEPHINE B., "What Makes a Good Teacher?" *The School Executive*, Vol. 75, October, 1955, pp. 60-62.

Fearon Teacher-Aid Books

Available from your local bookstore or school supply distributor.

Ask them for a complete list of Fearon Teacher-Aids.

ARITHMETIC CHARTS HANDBOOK	\$1.50	LET'S MAKE A MURAL	\$1.50
ARITHMETIC GAMES	1.50	LETTER PATTERNS FROM A TO Z	1.50
ARITHMETIC LEARNING ACTIVITIES	1.50	LIBRARY SKILLS	2.00
BAITED BULLETIN BOARDS	1.50	MAKING AND PLAYING	
BETTER READING AND SPELLING THROUGH PHONICS	1.00	CLASSROOM INSTRUMENTS	1.00
BULLETIN BOARDS FOR HOLIDAYS AND SEASONS	1.50	MAKING AND USING CHARTS	1.50
CLASSROOM CRAFT MANUAL	1.75	MAP AND GLOBE ACTIVITIES FOR CHILDREN	1.00
CLASSROOM-TESTED BULLETIN BOARDS	1.50	MATTING AND DISPLAYING THE WORK OF CHILDREN	1.00
CREATIVE CORRUGATED CARDBOARD	1.00	MUSIC TIME IN THE PRIMARY GRADES	1.50
CURRICULUM AIDS FOR THE MIDDLE GRADES	1.50	100 ACTIVITIES FOR GIFTED CHILDREN	1.00
ELEMENTARY ART ACTIVITIES	1.00	100 BLACKBOARD GAMES	1.00
EXPLAINING "TEACHING MA- CHINES" AND PROGRAMMING	2.00	PAPER SCULPTURE IN THE CLASSROOM	1.00
E-Z BULLETIN BOARDS	1.50	PREPARING OBJECTIVES FOR PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION	1.75
FLANNEL BOARD TEACHING AIDS	2.00	READING SKILLS	1.00
FOR SPEECH SAKE	1.75	SEATWORK FOR PRIMARY GRADES	.50
4-D BULLETIN BOARDS THAT TEACH	1.50	SPEECH FUN FOR EVERYONE	1.50
GAMES MAKE SPELLING FUN	.50	TEACHING SCIENCE THROUGH HOLIDAYS AND SEASONS	1.50
HOW TO HELP A CHILD APPRECIATE POETRY	1.00	TIPS TO TEACHERS	1.00
HOW TO MAKE AND USE FLANNEL BOARDS	.50	UNDERSTANDING WORLD NEIGH- BORS IN THE CLASSROOM	1.50
HOW TO MEET INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN TEACHING ARITHMETIC	1.50	WELL-SEASONED HOLIDAY ART	1.00
HOW TO ORGANIZE AND TEACH UNITS OF WORK	2.00		
HOW TO PLAN TO TEACH THE FIRST YEAR	1.50		
HOW TO STIMULATE YOUR SCIENCE PROGRAM	1.00		
LET'S ACT THE STORY	1.50		
		Science Series	
		A TRIP TO THE MOON	.75
		HAWAII: Living Resources	.75
		HAWAII: Physical Aspects	.75
		INSECTS	.75
		SEEDS	.75
		TREES	.75

