

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring
1920 to Summer 2023

Graduate Studies

5-1955

Attitudes of Ogden City Teachers Toward Merit Rating

Russell W. Carruth
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carruth, Russell W., "Attitudes of Ogden City Teachers Toward Merit Rating" (1955). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring 1920 to Summer 2023*. 4788.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/4788>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations, Spring 1920 to Summer 2023 by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



ATTITUDES OF OGDEN CITY TEACHERS
TOWARD MERIT RATING

by

Russell W. Carruth

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Education

UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
Logan, Utah

1955

378.2
C237

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
The problem	1
Delimitations and definitions	4
Procedure	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
THE QUESTIONNAIRE	7
PRESENTATION OF DATA	16
Merit with salary	16
Merit without salary	18
Recognition of superiority	20
Equalizing professional status	22
Merit and tenure	24
Direction or trend	26
Merit and mediocrity	28
Merit and incentive	30
Evaluation and quality	32
Professional attraction	34
Parents and quality	36
Merit and bias	38
Poor teachers	40
Building and prestige	42
Personal popularity	44
Respect among faculties	46
Abuse of rating	48
Human judgment	50
Psychological effect	52
Lowered standards	54
FREE RESPONSE COMMENTS	60
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	63
LITERATURE CITED	67
APPENDIX A	69
Questionnaire	70
APPENDIX B	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and per cent of teachers in each classification . .	3
2. Comparison of opinions reported for merit with salary given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	17
3. Comparison of opinions reported for merit without salary. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	19
4. Comparison of opinions reported for recognition of superiority. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	21
5. Comparison of opinions reported for equalizing professional status. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	23
6. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and tenure. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . . .	25
7. Comparison of opinions reported for direction or trend. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	27
8. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and mediocrity. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	29
9. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and incentive. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	31
10. Comparison of opinions reported for evaluation quality. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	33
11. Comparison of opinions reported for professional attration. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	35
12. Comparison of opinions reported for parents and quality. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	37
13. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and bias. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	39
14. Comparison of opinions reported for poor teachers. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . . .	41
15. Comparison of opinions reported for building of prestige. Given according to various classifications--by per cent . .	43

Table	Page
16. Comparison of opinions reported for personal popularity. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	45
17. Comparison of opinions reported for respect among faculties. Given according to various classifications-- by per cent	47
18. Comparison of opinions reported for abuse of rating. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	49
19. Comparison of opinions reported for human judgment. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	51
20. Comparison of opinions reported for psychological effect. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	53
21. Comparison of opinions reported for lowered standards. Given according to various classifications--by per cent	55
22. Number and percentage of each degree and experience classification given various ratings	58
23. Percentage of each rating classification holding various degrees	59
24. Percentage of each rating classification above and below 15 years' experience. (Nearest point to maximum and below maximum salary)	59
25. Total tabulation of per cent of agreement for all state- ments and all classifications	74

INTRODUCTION

Many people have from time to time concerned themselves with the problem of the benefits and detriments that would accrue to the teaching profession if a merit rating system were to be adopted. One of the most notable is a two-part discussion presented by prominent educators in the field of public education in New York. This discussion is aimed at exposing the strengths and weaknesses of merit rating in general and, more specifically, as conducted in their own state (9, pp. 52-54).

In describing one phase of the overall problem of teacher evaluation one author has said, "No merit rating plan is any better and seldom any worse than the people affected by it believe it to be" (4, p. 21). This raised the interesting question of how teachers feel toward the concept of evaluation.

The appointment, by recent legislature (1951 and 1953 Special Session), of Committees to Study Utah's Schools and then more specifically to look into the matter of merit rating has made this a question of paramount concern to the teachers of the state. The Utah Public School Survey Commission, appointed by the 1951 legislature to study Utah's schools, made the following recommendation as a result of their study:

This Commission recommends that the Legislative Council should appoint a lay-professional committee to complete a comprehensive study of the companion problems of teacher appraisal and salary structure, directed to the end of correlating professional merit with financial compensation for Utah public school personnel (13, p. 86).

The problem

The evaluation of teaching is a broad and complex problem when the many implications are considered. However, certain pros and cons recur

throughout the literature and whenever the concept of rating is discussed. The problem involved in this study is to find what the attitudes of teachers are toward certain of these recurring opinions regarding the place and function of merit rating in general.

A sub-problem involved is to look for some relationship between the attitude expressed and a number of various factors. These include a rating given the respondent by his principal, the length of service, amount of training, age, sex, and type of certification of the respondent.

Table 1. Number and per cent of teachers in each classification

Classification	No.	%	Classification	No.	%
<u>Rating</u>			<u>Degree</u>		
Excellent	180	43.3	Non-degree	44	10.6
Good	181	43.6	Bachelor's	329	79.3
Fair	43	10.4	Master's	39	9.4
Failure	11	2.7	No response	3	0.7
Total	415	100.0	Total	415	100.0
<u>Sex</u>			<u>Certification</u>		
Male	128	30.8	Authorized	24	5.8
Female	283	68.2	Elementary	180	43.4
No response	4	1.0	Secondary	146	35.7
Total	415	100.0	Elem. & Sec.	61	14.7
<u>Experience</u>			<u>Age</u>		
0-4	89	21.4	20-9	77	18.6
5-9	67	16.1	30-9	78	18.7
10-4	43	10.5	40-9	88	21.2
15-9	67	16.1	50-9	78	18.7
20-4	40	9.6	60-9	28	6.9
25-9	33	8.0	No response	66	15.9
30-4	33	8.0	Total	415	100.0
35-9	18	4.3			
40-4	9	2.1			
No response	16	3.9			
Total	415	100.0			

4

These factors were chosen to indicate probable teaching efficiency, present salary considerations, possible factors affecting teaching efficiency, and a reflection of professional training and background.

Delimitations and definitions

The study is limited to the teachers of a single school district, Ogden City Schools, at the time the survey was made. A total of 451 questionnaires were sent out.

For the purposes of this study the terms merit, rating, merit rating, and evaluation all mean an inventory of teaching with some rank assigned to a teacher according to the results of the inventory. The term attitude refers to the scale reply of the questionnaire which runs from complete agreement, agreement with reservation, neutrality of opinion, disagreement with reservation to complete disagreement.

Procedure

Attitudes of the teachers were obtained through the use of an attitude questionnaire. This was distributed to the teachers by their principals. The principal was asked to explain the study and the filling out of the questionnaire. Each teacher, upon completing the questionnaire, was to seal it in an envelope that was provided. A tag had been placed upon the envelope and the respondent wrote his name on this tag. The sealed return was then handed to the principal who wrote on the envelope a rating, based on a four-point scale of excellent, good, fair, failure which had previously been agreed upon, for the teacher whose name appeared on the tag. He detached the name and the returns were thus returned to the writer with identification removed. In this manner neither the personal nature of any information on the questionnaire nor the rating on the envelope could be associated with any teacher who was kind enough to respond. Of the 451 questionnaires sent out there were 432 returned.

Only 415 of these were usable, however, which constituted a usable return of 92 per cent.

A written analysis of each statement and its responses has been made. It is assumed that the 92 per cent return is sufficient to give an accurate picture concerning the attitudes of the teachers in the Ogden school system relative to the items included in the questionnaire.

The basis of comparison throughout the study is the term "per cent of agreement". This is derived by subtracting the sum of disagreement from the sum of agreement and dividing by the total possible sum of agreement. A weight of +2 is assigned to the column marked A. Column AR equals a +1 while the neutral column is 0. Columns DR and D are weighted a -1 and -2 respectively. For example, on a single statement the number responding might appear like this: A 105; AR 118; N 56; DR 65; and D 67. This makes a total of 411 replies. To find the per cent of agreement, multiply 105 by 2 which equals 210, add this to 118 making 328, subtract the 65 leaving 263 and from this take 2 times 67 or 134 which summation is 129. This summation is then divided by two times the number of replies, in this case 2 x 411 or 822. The score thus derived (+ 16 per cent of agreement) indicates the extent to which the weight of opinion reaches. If this situation were reversed so that the summation resulted in a -129 the final score would have been a -16 per cent of agreement thus indicating the extend of disagreement according to the weighted opinions. To put this in a formula would be:

$$\frac{2x (a) + 1x (b) - 1x (d) - 2x (e)}{2 (a + b + c + d + e)} = X$$

From this formula a plus percentage indicates the extent of agreement while the minus percentage represents the extent of disagreement. A score of + 100 or - 100 would mean complete agreement or complete disagreement. A score of 0 would indicate that there is complete lack of

agreement or a neutrality of opinion among the group reporting on that statement. This formula has been applied successfully in other attitude studies (7, p. 59).

The data have also been provided for inspection in the form of tables which compare the responses of various groups with each other.

In presenting the data no recognition has been made as to the statistical significance of the difference between the scores reported. A subjective estimate has been made in some instances which is considered sufficient for this study. The possible trends of opinion are indicated simply by the per cent of agreement index.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The problem of teacher evaluation is an old one in American education. Reavis and Cooper, in the opening paragraph of their work, give some indication of the age of the problem in this country.

The merit of the teacher is a matter that the public from earliest colonial times has been unwilling to take for granted. The teacher is expected to meet the standards of the community which he serves. Disregard for these standards, whether they be right or wrong, reasonable or unreasonable, has invariably led to conflict between the teacher and the public. As a means of assuring the public of the merit of the teacher, the town selectmen or the school committee in the early New England community appointed an annual visitation committee to inspect the school and to report to the town meeting on the progress of the scholars under the tutelage of the schoolmasters. On the evaluation of the visiting committee rested very largely the status of the teacher in the New England town (10, p. 1)

From Colonial times the problem of making a valid evaluation of teaching service has increased with the placing of more and more emphasis upon good teaching. The task is greater today, as recognized by Barr, in "that the term 'teaching' has become increasingly inclusive" (1, p. 1446).

The public spotlight is also increasingly illuminating the field of education, and those who accept responsibility for its accomplishment are brought under the greater demands of increased scrutiny. Professional educators have not let this challenge go unheeded, but have long considered means by which a satisfactory solution to teacher evaluation could be achieved.

One of the earliest studies in this direction was undertaken by J. L. Merriam in 1905. It has been noted that this study is credited with "taking the problem of teaching efficiency from the field of opinion...and in placing it in the field of research and objective measurement" (2, p. 5).

Much of the early work done was aimed at why teachers fail. This appeared to be the negative approach, so attention became focused upon prediction of success based upon objective measurement of the qualities considered essential, or at least related, to good teaching. As has been indicated, what constitutes good teaching has not yet been singled out due to the fact that the definition of teaching is constantly undergoing change. Beecher points to the modern trend of "giving more attention to the pupil and pupil-teacher relationships in connection with teacher appraisal" (2, p. 30). This view is substantiated by Barr, who says:

There is no adequate explicit definition of teacher efficiency, but three approaches are apparent in measurement procedures:

- (a) definitions based upon estimates of traits (qualities) assumed to function in the teaching act such as drive, considerateness, emotional stability, objectivity, intelligence, and the like;
- (b) definitions based on appraisals of activities included in teaching such as discovering and defining pupil needs, setting goals, stimulating interest (pupil activity), choosing learning experiences, guiding learning activities, appraising results and the like;
- (c) definitions derived from measures of pupil growth (1, p. 1447).

The author further contends that the third approach is the best in that the other two are but means to an end, which end is the third criterion, pupil growth.

One type of instrument used in the evaluation of teachers was the Ohio Teaching Record which was diagnostic in form and was to be used with the teacher rather than on the teacher, which implies some sort of supervisory conference. In a discussion of this instrument the point is made that:

Especially characteristic of the Ohio Teaching Record is that no provision for final judgment of teaching ability is intended or provided. In fact, it is the claim of the authors that "no device can perform that function" (2, p. 21).

John Dewey
This opinion, that there is no way of determining the merit of a particular teacher, is widespread. Yet, many feel that this is necessary

if certain desirable conditions are to be obtained in the teaching profession.

In 1925 the Teachers' Union in the City of New York went on record through the voice of their legislative representative as follows:

. . . The returns received from sixty New York City schools representing the views of eight hundred teachers and of twelve other cities indicate that in New York City where the teachers are rated at the end of each term, 75 per cent of them are against the rating system, 20 per cent for a rating system, while about 5 per cent don't care whether they are rated or not. . . . In cities like Chicago, St. Paul and Washington the teachers are opposed to ratings because they believe ratings to be incapable of impartial and uniform application (10, p. 12).

The report further includes reasons for opposing merit systems. Among these are the ideas of the debasing of the profession by "holding up a petty end as an incentive," improper use of the ratings by supervisors, as well as suggesting that it forces teachers to alter their ratings of students in order to attain a "fictitious average desired by the principal..." (10, p. 13).

Others have raised serious questions concerning the evaluation programs. Among these are questions as to the ethical nature of such a plan, the qualification of anyone capable of rendering the necessary rating, the possible strain on the teacher to perform under pressure in an accepted pattern, and acceptance by the public. These are questions raised by an administrator in the public school system (5, pp. 56-7). Another writing upon the subject maintains that the rating of teachers is based upon four assumptions. These are: (1) that teaching can be accurately measured; (2) administrators can be objective in their judgments; (3) individual competitive situations encourage competence and high morale; and (4) that teaching staffs lie on the curve of normal distribution (15, pp. 17-18).

After the author has established these assumptions he puts them all

in a classification of probable false assumptions. This is to say that objections to merit plans are inherent in that the above criteria cannot be met.

Two more frequently appearing objections are raised by Seavey. These are perhaps the two most feared. They are: (1) the play for showmanship, and (2) the possible abuse of rating in the hands of administrators (11, pp. 6-8).

These statements seem fairly representative of the objections generally raised in the consideration of merit rating programs.

On the other hand, the proponents of merit rating find many reasons why application of a merit plan should be made. One writer contends, "The sole purpose of merit rating is to remove bias and prejudice from judgments which must be made anyway," and then defines formal merit rating as "only a common sense way of rendering a series of judgments internally consistent" (4, pp. 19-21). Morrison argues that amount of education and length of service are no longer sufficient in determining the financial returns to a teacher, but that quality must also be considered. Attention is then called to the fact that in many instances, probably more common than not, those who demonstrate outstanding teaching efficiency find themselves promoted into the administrative ranks. Thus, it is pointed out that there should be promotions for a teacher within the teaching ranks rather than to lose good teachers to the administrative field (9, pp. 45-46). *Carroll*

Further defense of merit systems is presented in the form of values deriving from such a plan. Values believed to attach to such a plan include growth of professional status through presenting evidence of the type of service rendered, the attraction of higher caliber people, improved services to pupils, and several others. At the same time, the question

of ability to evaluate service is met by recognizing that to question it is the easy way out, but insisting that it is time the teaching profession faced up to it (3, p. 21).

“The above expression concurs somewhat with the report of the Utah School Survey Commission already cited. The report expands to say:

All Utah school districts presently are using salary schedules which provide, as a rule, for automatic yearly increases from an established minimum until the established maximum is reached. Such a salary policy, in the opinion of the Commission, offers little inducement to attract and hold a sufficient number of outstanding teachers. It is the considered judgment of the Commission that a group of citizens, working with teachers and administrators, can develop a practical and equitable method of teacher appraisal and correlated salary schedules based upon merit, which would not only improve the quality of teaching in Utah's schools, but would also assist in achieving increased public recognition of and respect for the profession (13, p. 86).”

Do these

The foregoing discussion points up the problems most frequently voiced by the extremely large segment of those who have taken the occasion to make their voices heard through the many periodical avenues leading to the professional literature. After reviewing some of these problems that face both sides of the issue a warning is sounded of some dangers confronting any merit system. The warning lists these possible dangers:

1. Oversimplifying the teaching function
2. Grouping all teaching positions together
3. Rating by a single person
4. Evaluation based on superficial observation or contact
5. Failure to let teachers know and/or help to determine the bases for evaluation (14, p. 81).

Impressive are the great advances made in the area of teacher evaluation, and interesting are the commendations as well as the fears and anxieties that drape themselves about these accomplishments.

There has been very little done in the state of Utah concerning merit rating. Letters were sent to other institutions of higher learning in the State requesting information of any studies made concerning

attitudes toward merit rating. The reply from each of these institutions indicated there had been no work completed in this area.

Mr. Kay Allen, Research Assistant for the U. E. A., supplied news of three studies being undertaken presently. Information was not available on these, however.

Easily the most significant effort being made in this field in the State of Utah today is that of the Utah School Merit Rating Study Committee. This committee was appointed by the 1953 Special Session of the Legislature following the recommendation of the School Survey Committee already mentioned. Early efforts of this committee include hearings on the problem. From all over the state educators were called to present their views. Almost as many varying opinions were heard as there were people interviewed. These opinions, many of which claimed backing of other teachers and administrators, ranged from whole-hearted support to skepticism and distrust of any suggestion of implementation of merit rating. The significant concept that appeared to be emerging from these hearings, in the opinion of this writer, was that of an acceptance of the impending appearance of merit rating in Utah, but with it, from all sides, the caution of proceeding slowly and being very thorough in investigating all the complex ramifications of this many-sided problem (12).

In summary of the review herein presented, a statement by Allan M. West, Executive Secretary of U. E. A., seems appropriate:

No one can analyze the case for and against merit rating for salary purposes without recognizing that there is merit to both arguments. The question then becomes one of weighing relative values. One cannot escape the fact that the principle upon which merit rating is based is desirable; that is, rewarding efficiency, ability, and effort. However, the soundness of basic principle is not sufficient. Whether or not the principle can be successfully applied in practice without undesirable results which outweigh the purposes of merit rating is an important question for school boards and administrators to ponder (16, pp. 48-50).

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

One of the factors leading to this study was that many articles, pro and con, were written assuming that teachers held this or that opinion without giving any source of authority for such a statement. The writer couldn't find attitude studies on the subject. Thus, when this study was undertaken there arose the need of preparing some instrument for discovering the attitudes of teachers. It was, therefore, deemed wise to include a brief explanation as to the formulation of the questionnaire.

After a substantial amount of reading had been accomplished, twelve statements were formulated which covered the pros and cons encountered in the reading. These were then submitted to numerous teachers in the area for their suggestions as to further problems, thus expanding the list. Also, the initial list was presented to various faculty members at the Utah State Agricultural College at Logan, Utah, as well as some faculty members of Weber Junior College at Ogden, Utah. Valuable suggestions were received from these educators as to possible overlapping of certain statements, the deletion of some, and suggestions as to other possible items of concern. A compilation and abridgment of all these items was then undertaken resulting in the refinement of these suggestions to thirty statements.

A form was then devised in two parts. One section of sample statements as they were to appear later on the final instrument, and the other section where the statements were to be ranked according to importance. The purpose of this was to determine if the form used in the first

section would yield a measurable response, and which statements should be revised for, or excluded from, the final compilation.

This form was then distributed to the faculties of two schools in the Weber County School District, which surrounds Ogden City. The results of this survey were then compiled, and from this, along with other helpful suggestions from the college faculty members to whom reference has already been made, the final statements were put in the form in which they appear on the questionnaire. Admittedly the questionnaire used (See Appendix A) does not contain all the essential problems. However, those contained therein were selected as being representative of the problems about which the teachers in the area studied were most concerned. Further, it was feared that to extend the list would only serve to antagonize the respondent toward the questionnaire.

In the book, The Questionnaire in Education, it is pointed out that the two main criteria of a questionnaire are ability and willingness on the part of the recipient to respond (6). The fact of such a large percentage of return in this study is taken as justification of meeting the second criterion, willingness. This was due, perhaps, to the approach used as well as the assurance of anonymity.

Meeting of the other criterion, ability, poses a more serious problem that is here recognized. The fact that no one merit rating system was specified could have rendered the answering of certain of the items rather difficult. It must be remembered, however, that the concern of this study is not a specific merit rating plan, but, rather, the attitudes of teachers regarding some of the basic problems to be answered before any merit plan should be adopted. Thus, ability to answer becomes a matter of preconceived notions on the part of the respondent as to the place and function of any merit rating. That it is safe to assume that most

teachers in the state of Utah have given thought to the problem and thus formed some personal opinions seems justified in the light of recent emphasis given this question by the legislative body of the state, as previously mentioned. In view of this it appears that the criterion of ability is also satisfied.

Cognizance is also taken of the fact that the questionnaire has its inherent weaknesses. The use of it is justified in that the problem involved gathering of data for which there appeared no other feasible way of collecting. This utilizes a recognized function of the questionnaire "to secure opinions, judgments, preferences, or the expression of attitudes of the respondents along a variety of lines" (6, pp. 51-52). Also signified as a basic weakness is that "Usually, although not always, the aim is to secure evaluations admittedly not final, but presumably desirable in view of the lack, for the time being, of more fundamental procedures in evaluation" (6). This study claims no more than this, and further, recognizes the need for a more fundamental approach. The use of the results of this study in preparing a more fundamental approach to the problem would be the fulfillment of the hope inherent in the undertaking of the study.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

No attempt has been made to determine the relative value of the statements in regard to a total opinion concerning merit rating. It was felt that such an opinion would not be ascertainable unless a specific program were defined. An overall attitude was not the object of this study. The object of the study was to learn of the opinion of the teachers regarding the many claims made in behalf of and against merit rating. Further purpose in the study was to look for relationships between the assertion of the teachers and various professional and personal characteristics. Thus, each statement is considered separately in this light.

Most of the comparisons are made in terms of the per cent of agreement. However, the reader is cautioned that this is not the only basis for comparison and will find some interesting information by comparing the actual number who responded in each degree of opinion.

Merit with salary

Salary should be correlated with merit because training and length of service are not sufficient as the sole bases of salary determination.

Table 2. Comparison of opinions reported for merit with salary. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	58	162	25	77	87	409	+3
Rating							
Excellent	35	66	12	29	33	175	+12
Good	20	79	9	29	43	180	+ 1
Fair	2	12	2	17	10	43	-24
Failure	1	5	2	2	1	11	+14
Sex							
Male	25	59	11	20	12	127	+26
Female	36	99	14	56	75	277	- 6
Age							
20-29	6	38	4	8	21	77	0
30-39	12	30	8	12	14	76	+ 9
40-49	15	36	6	19	10	86	+16
50-59	15	28	3	18	14	78	+ 8
60-69	5	10	0	8	5	28	+ 4
Degree							
Non-degree	8	15	3	9	9	44	+ 5
Bachelor	41	130	17	64	7	323	+ 1
Master	8	16	5	3	7	39	+19
Certification							
Authorized	5	8	1	2	8	24	0
Elementary	20	60	11	33	52	176	-11
Secondary	28	73	11	20	16	148	+26
Elem. & Sec.	4	21	3	20	11	61	-11
Experience							
0-4	12	37	8	11	21	89	+ 4
5-9	8	32	3	7	14	64	+11
10-14	7	18	5	8	5	43	+16
15-19	7	28	5	11	14	65	+ 2
20-24	2	14	1	12	11	40	-20
25-29	5	10	7	7	10	32	-11
30-34	8	8	1	10	6	33	+ 3
35-39	6	7	0	5	0	18	+39
40-44	1	4	0	3	1	9	+ 6

Salary should be correlated with merit, because training and length of service are not sufficient as the sole bases of salary determination.

The total picture concerning this statement indicates an almost complete lack of agreement or neutrality among those responding (+3 per cent). Note, however, that in terms of number there are 220 who agree and 164 who disagree. Thus, those who are opposed are more vehement in their opinion. As the replies are broken down by groups some interesting implications are noted. The response according to the ratings given by the principal shows that those who are rated excellent agree (+12 per cent), those rated good show lack of agreement (+1 per cent), those rated fair tend to disagree (-24 per cent), and those reported as failures indicate agreement (+14 per cent). The pattern tends toward diminished agreement with diminished rating except for the obvious exception of the last group.

The men in the system emerge with an indication of agreement (+26 per cent) while the women tend to disagree (-6 per cent). Interestingly enough, the pattern in the certification group seems to follow that of the male and female response. Those with elementary certificates disagree (-11 per cent) and secondary certificate holders agree (+26 per cent).

In an area now considered in salary determination, experience, the results show increased agreement up to fifteen years (+16 per cent). For the next fifteen years there is a rather sharp drop into disagreement (-20 per cent) after which opinion seems to level off with some agreement (+6 per cent).

In point of age the highest agreement appears at the age group of 40-49 (+16 per cent) with general decline of agreement at both extremes.

Merit without salary

The use of merit rating to give a teacher added prestige is acceptable as long as it does not affect the salary schedule.

Table 3. Comparison of opinions reported for merit without salary.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	56	60	62	112	117	407	-22
Rating							
Excellent	23	24	29	44	53	173	-23
Good	26	24	23	58	49	180	-22
Fair	5	6	9	10	13	43	-23
Failure	2	6	1	0	2	11	+27
Sex							
Male	11	20	27	36	30	124	-26
Female	48	40	33	75	83	279	-19
Age							
20-29	5	5	19	28	20	77	-34
30-39	7	13	16	18	22	76	-23
40-49	14	20	10	19	24	87	-11
50-59	13	10	8	23	20	74	-18
60-69	8	3	6	4	7	28	+2
Degree							
Non-degree	12	3	7	8	14	44	-10
Bachelor	36	49	50	97	91	323	-25
Master	6	7	5	10	9	37	-12
Certification							
Authorized	5	2	5	5	7	24	-15
Elementary	25	23	28	47	54	177	-20
Secondary	19	22	22	47	36	146	-20
Elem. & Sec.	9	16	6	11	16	58	-8
Experience							
0-4	7	9	20	29	24	89	-31
5-9	9	10	13	17	16	65	-18
10-14	3	7	8	11	14	43	-30
15-19	12	12	5	21	15	65	-12
20-24	7	7	4	11	11	40	-15
25-29	3	2	3	13	10	31	-40
30-34	6	7	4	6	9	32	-8
35-39	5	3	2	4	4	18	+3
40-44	4	0	2	0	3	9	+11

The use of merit rating to give a teacher added prestige is acceptable as long as it does not affect the salary schedule.

X

It is interesting to note that in almost all classifications there appears a rather decided disagreement with this statement. Notable exceptions to this show up in the group rated as failure which evidences agreement (+27 per cent) and those of 40-44 years experience which tend also to agree (+11 per cent). The range of disagreement runs from a -8 per cent to a -40 per cent. The general consensus of opinion is a disagreement about in the middle of these extremes (-22 per cent).

Within the age group there is a pattern going from disagreement to agreement as the age increases. Those 20-29 years of age disagree as high as -34 per cent while on the opposite end a slight agreement of +2 per cent is noted.

Prestige in the field of education comes largely with advanced degrees. In this area it is noted that non-degree teachers and master's degree teachers are in less disagreement (-10 and -12 per cent) than those holding a bachelor's degree (-25 per cent).

Recognition of superiority

There is a need for the recognition and rewarding of superior teachers.

Table 4. Comparison of opinions reported for recognition of superiority. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	166	122	52	28	41	409	+42
Rating							
Excellent	72	53	23	14	15	177	+43
Good	70	56	23	9	22	180	+40
Fair	21	9	4	5	4	43	+44
Failure	3	4	2	0	0	9	+56
Sex							
Male	64	38	11	8	6	127	+57
Female	105	76	43	20	34	278	+36
Age							
20-29	29	24	10	4	10	77	+38
30-39	36	25	8	3	6	78	+53
40-49	36	29	8	8	3	87	+52
50-59	28	21	11	7	9	76	+34
60-69	15	6	3	1	3	28	+54
Degree							
Non-degree	21	10	6	3	3	43	+50
Bachelor	119	102	43	23	38	325	+37
Master	24	8	7	4	1	39	+64
Certification							
Authorized	13	3	4	1	3	24	+46
Elementary	49	56	30	13	27	175	+25
Secondary	84	42	10	6	5	147	+66
Elem. & Sec.	20	19	7	8	7	61	+30
Experience							
0-4	39	19	14	4	12	88	+39
5-9	30	24	6	3	4	67	+59
10-14	18	15	2	3	4	42	+48
15-19	21	28	6	6	4	65	+43
20-24	13	13	8	1	5	40	+35
25-29	15	2	5	6	4	32	+30
30-34	11	9	4	3	5	32	+28
35-39	9	5	2	2	0	18	+58
40-44	4	2	1	0	2	9	+33

There is a need for the recognition and rewarding of superior teachers. X-

While there were some individuals who disagreed with the statement there was not one group considered that showed either lack of agreement or disagreement. All groups registered a feeling of need for recognizing and rewarding superiority in the teaching field. The total opinion was a +42 per cent.

The widest divergence of opinion is between those holding elementary (+25 per cent) and secondary (+66 per cent) certificates. The pattern of semblance follows here again between male (+57 per cent) and female (36 per cent). Also, those with a master's degree (+64 per cent) are more in agreement than those only having a bachelor's degree (+37 per cent).

Those rated failure showed +56 per cent which is higher than those rated above them.

Equalizing professional status

Pay consistent with quality of service is necessary if teachers are to reach comparable financial status with other professions.

Table 5. Comparison of opinions reported for equalizing professional status. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	135	113	44	53	66	411	+24
Rating							
Excellent	62	45	20	24	27	178	+26
Good	60	51	15	21	32	179	+24
Fair	8	15	6	7	7	43	+12
Failure	5	2	3	1	0	11	+50
Sex							
Male	52	38	12	12	13	127	+45
Female	86	74	31	37	53	281	+18
Age							
20-29	20	24	8	10	15	77	+16
30-39	30	21	12	6	8	77	+38
40-49	15	26	12	16	8	87	+14
50-59	29	22	5	11	10	77	+32
60-69	15	7	1	2	3	28	+54
Degree							
Non-degree	18	7	5	6	8	44	+24
Bachelor	100	98	30	42	55	325	+24
Master	15	10	5	5	4	39	+28
Certification							
Authorized	7	5	4	3	4	23	+17
Elementary	49	40	18	30	42	179	+7
Secondary	62	48	16	7	13	146	+49
Elem. & Sec.	16	19	5	11	9	60	+18
Experience							
0-4	28	24	12	11	14	89	+23
5-9	23	16	9	7	9	64	+31
10-14	13	16	5	3	6	43	+31
15-19	21	19	6	11	10	67	+22
20-24	9	15	4	6	6	40	+19
25-29	10	5	3	7	8	33	+3
30-34	10	9	2	4	7	32	+17
35-39	11	3	1	2	1	18	+58
40-44	5	3	0	1	0	9	+67

Pay consistent with quality of service is necessary if teachers are to reach comparable financial status with other professions.

Although tending to be facetious, one respondent wrote in answer to this statement, "What a laugh." This expresses the opinion of many who feel that teaching will never reach equal status, financially or otherwise, with other professions. Regardless of this, the teachers felt that rating was necessary if this equality is to be achieved (+24 per cent).

The highest point of agreement comes from those who have taught the longest with a +67 per cent of agreement. Looking at a comparison by rating shows the trend of decreased agreement with a decrease in rating, except for the failure group. Also, the men more readily agree (+45 per cent) than the women (+18 per cent), which pattern again can be found in the certification group.

Merit and tenure

Evaluation of merit is necessary to a good tenure law, for without it the law affords the incompetent teacher the same protection it affords the competent teacher.

Table 6. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and tenure. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	105	118	56	65	67	411	+16
Rating							
Excellent	44	55	26	25	28	178	+17
Good	54	47	20	32	27	180	+19
Fair	5	11	8	7	11	42	-10
Failure	2	5	2	1	1	11	+27
Sex							
Male	36	50	14	15	13	128	+32
Female	72	63	41	51	52	279	+9
Age							
20-29	15	24	9	15	14	77	+7
30-39	20	26	11	11	10	78	+22
40-49	23	29	9	12	14	87	+20
50-59	24	15	11	13	13	76	+16
60-69	8	11	4	3	2	28	+37
Degree							
Non-degree	13	11	5	9	5	43	+20
Bachelor	80	91	46	54	55	326	+13
Master	14	11	5	3	6	39	+31
Certification							
Authorized	8	3	5	5	3	24	+17
Elementary	44	40	25	32	37	178	+6
Secondary	42	60	15	15	16	148	+33
Elem. & Sec.	13	12	11	14	10	60	+3
Experience							
0-4	22	29	7	19	12	89	+17
5-9	16	20	14	9	8	67	+22
10-14	12	11	8	7	5	43	+21
15-19	20	18	10	3	13	64	+23
20-24	7	10	4	13	6	40	-1
25-29	10	7	4	5	7	33	+12
30-34	9	9	5	3	6	32	+19
35-39	5	7	1	2	3	18	+25
40-44	3	3	1	2	0	9	+39

Evaluation of merit is necessary to a good tenure law, for without it the law allows the incompetent teacher the same protection it affords the competent teacher.

It would be expected that this statement involving tenure would find its most significant responses in the tabulation of replies according to experience. Beginning with a +17 per cent (0-4 years experience), the agreement climbs to a +23 per cent in the group 15-19 years experience, and then falls back to an almost neutral attitude (-1 per cent) at 20-24 years. The turn is then upward and increases to a +39 per cent with those having most experience. Also, agreement with added age is noted.

The group that disagreed with the statement is that faction rated fair, which scored a -10 per cent. Those advocating merit systems correlated with pay and tenure would expect disagreement to come from this area.

The total response indicated a +16 per cent.

Direction or trend

The trend in the teaching profession should be toward adopting a merit rating system of pay commensurate with quality of service.

Table 7. Comparison of opinions reported for direction or trend. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	59	123	44	66	119	411	- 8
Rating							
Excellent	31	48	25	24	50	178	- 4
Good	24	64	9	31	51	179	- 6
Fair	2	8	9	9	15	43	-29
Failure	2	3	1	2	3	11	- 5
Sex							
Male	23	54	11	19	20	127	+17
Female	33	72	33	46	97	281	-18
Age							
20-29	3	33	10	8	23	77	-10
30-39	12	32	6	15	12	77	+11
40-49	10	31	11	15	21	88	- 3
50-59	16	15	9	11	26	77	-10
60-69	7	6	1	6	7	27	0
Degree							
Non-degree	8	10	8	7	11	44	+ 3
Bachelor	38	102	35	51	100	326	-11
Master	9	13	3	7	6	38	+17
Certification							
Authorized	5	7	3	2	7	24	+ 2
Elementary	19	41	23	30	67	180	-24
Secondary	29	64	11	19	23	146	+19
Elem. & Sec.	3	15	8	13	21	60	-28
Experience							
0- 4	10	39	39	8	23	88	+ 3
5- 9	6	23	12	11	15	67	+ 5
10-14	9	14	5	11	4	43	+15
15-19	7	18	6	15	20	66	-17
20-24	3	8	4	8	16	39	-33
25-29	7	7	3	4	13	33	-13
30-34	7	5	4	3	13	33	-18
35-39	6	6	0	4	2	18	+28
40-44	2	2	0	1	3	8	- 6

The trend in the teaching profession should be toward adopting a merit rating system of pay commensurate with the quality of service.

General disagreement is the attitude of the teachers when it comes to suggesting this trend of associating their salary with an evaluation of their teaching. The reason why this is so can probably be deduced from the comments reviewed in the next chapter. The -8 per cent recorded by the total group on this question indicated an inclination to disagree. However, by referring to the actual number in agreement and disagreement a near balance is observed.

While recognizing the complete subjectiveness of the ratings made for this study, some significance must be attached to them. Herein lies an area of interesting comparison again. The disagreement with the suggested trend generally increases as the rating decreases. Exception is again noted in the group indicated to be failing (Excellent -4 per cent, good -6 per cent, fair -29 per cent, and failure -5 per cent).

Agreement builds up to +15 per cent in the experience group at 14 years of experience, thereafter taking a sharp drop as low as -33 per cent and generally remaining in disagreement. The total range is included in this grouping which is from a -33 per cent to a +28 per cent.

Amongst the age group there is wide and unrelated diversity of opinion, while the diversity between male and female becomes interesting. Male score is a +17 per cent and female score drops down to a -18 per cent. This can also be observed in the certification group.

Merit and mediocrity

A salary scale that fails to recognize merit tends to produce mediocrity.

Table 8. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and mediocrity. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	166	122	52	28	41	409	+42
Rating							
Excellent	72	53	23	14	15	177	+43
Good	70	56	23	9	22	180	+40
Fair	21	9	4	5	4	43	+44
Failure	3	4	2	0	0	9	+56
Sex							
Male	64	38	11	8	6	127	+57
Female	105	76	43	20	34	278	+36
Age							
20-29	29	24	10	4	10	77	+38
30-39	36	25	8	3	6	78	+53
40-49	36	29	8	8	3	84	+52
50-59	28	21	11	7	9	76	+34
60-69	15	6	3	1	3	28	+54
Degree							
Non-degree	21	10	6	3	3	43	+50
Bachelor	119	102	43	23	38	325	+37
Master	24	8	7	4	1	39	+64
Certification							
Authorized	13	3	4	1	3	24	+46
Elementary	49	56	30	13	27	175	+25
Secondary	84	42	10	6	5	147	+66
Elem. & Sec.	20	19	7	8	7	61	+30
Experience							
0-4	39	19	14	4	12	88	+39
5-9	30	24	6	3	4	67	+59
10-14	18	15	2	3	4	42	+48
15-19	21	28	6	6	4	65	+43
20-24	13	13	8	1	5	40	+35
25-29	15	2	5	6	4	32	+30
30-34	11	9	4	3	5	32	+28
35-39	9	5	2	2	0	18	+58
40-44	4	2	1	0	2	9	+33

Salary scale that fails to recognize merit tends to produce X- mediocrity.

This is pointed to by the proponents of merit rating as an inherent weakness in the presently accepted salary schedule of training and length of service. The teachers of Ogden have voiced disagreement with the statement (-14 per cent) not only by checking the questionnaire, but many took time to write an additional comment concerning this idea.

Disagreement with the statement follows the lines of rating pretty much with the group marked fair objecting most strenuously (-26 per cent). Age and experience show themselves as probable factors in opinion formulation on this point, for disagreement tends to rise as the teacher grows older (-19 per cent, 50-60 years old) and gains more experience (-26 per cent, 30-34 years experience).

The range on this question goes from +8 per cent to a -47 per cent.

Merit and incentive

Correlating salaries with merit will provide incentive to better one's teaching and will thus result in improved services to boys and girls.

Table 9. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and incentive. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	84	113	37	74	101	412	+ 1
Rating							
Excellent	47	44	18	28	42	179	+ 7
Good	31	54	13	36	45	179	- 3
Fair	5	12	6	9	11	43	-10
Failure	1	6	0	1	3	11	+ 5
Sex							
Male	34	45	7	26	16	128	+21
Female	44	76	29	48	83	280	- 9
Age							
20-29	17	21	11	13	15	77	+ 8
30-39	16	28	6	14	14	78	+12
40-49	23	31	8	11	15	88	+20
50-59	13	19	6	15	23	76	-11
60-69	6	8	0	7	7	28	- 2
Degree							
Non-degree	10	12	4	6	12	44	- 2
Bachelor	62	90	29	63	83	327	- 2
Master	8	19	1	5	6	39	+23
Certification							
Authorized	6	7	4	1	6	24	+13
Elementary	34	40	18	31	56	179	-10
Secondary	34	57	11	26	19	147	+21
Elem. & Sec.	6	16	4	16	19	61	-21
Experience							
0- 4	24	27	10	15	13	89	+19
5- 9	12	22	8	8	16	66	+ 5
10-14	10	13	3	11	6	43	+12
15-19	11	15	6	14	20	66	-13
20-24	6	11	1	10	11	39	-12
25-29	5	11	2	5	10	33	- 6
30-34	5	10	2	4	12	33	-12
35-39	3	7	1	6	1	18	+14
40-44	2	3	0	1	3	9	0

Correlating salaries with merit will provide incentive to better one's teaching and will thus result in improved services to boys and girls.

Any practice or policy in the educational program must find its justification in some service or benefit to the recipients of the program. This is a sound educational principle, and the backers of merit plans use it as justification for their programs. The teachers who responded indicated an almost complete lack of agreement or neutrality of opinion (+1 per cent) as to whether or not the result suggested would obtain. Here, again, is a case where those in disagreement are more vehement as is revealed by the number on each side.

Excellent and fair teachers showed some agreement (+7 and +5 per cent) while good and fair teachers registered disagreement (-3 and -10 per cent). Cleavage also appears between male (+21 per cent) and female (-9 per cent), non-degree and bachelor's degree (-2 per cent) and master's degree (+23 per cent), and elementary (-10 per cent) as against secondary (+23 per cent) certification.

New teachers indicate that they feel such a plan would create incentive by registering a +19 per cent, but as experience increases this opinion begins moving to the opposite side.

Evaluation and quality

Systematic evaluation of the quality of service is necessary if teachers are to provide the pupil with the best teaching possible.

Table 10. Comparison of opinions reported for evaluation and quality.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	96	143	44	61	67	411	+17
Rating							
Excellent	45	64	22	20	27	178	+22
Good	43	60	15	33	29	180	+15
Fair	7	14	7	7	8	43	+ 6
Failure	1	5	0	1	3	10	0
Sex							
Male	35	48	14	14	17	128	+27
Female	60	95	29	47	48	279	+13
Age							
20-29	14	30	11	9	12	76	+17
30-39	19	32	11	9	7	78	+30
40-49	31	24	9	11	13	88	+28
50-59	15	25	5	13	16	75	+ 8
60-69	8	10	1	5	4	28	+24
Degree							
Non-degree	14	15	3	6	5	43	+31
Bachelor	69	116	33	51	56	325	+14
Master	12	13	3	5	5	38	+29
Certification							
Authorized	5	11	5	1	2	24	+33
Elementary	32	59	19	31	36	177	+ 6
Secondary	35	61	17	16	17	146	+38
Elem. & Sec.	21	12	5	11	12	61	+16
Experience							
0- 4	23	32	10	10	13	88	+24
5- 9	9	30	8	12	7	66	+18
10-14	14	14	7	4	4	43	+35
15-19	13	17	7	14	14	65	+ 1
20-24	11	12	4	5	7	39	+19
25-29	10	9	1	6	7	33	+14
30-34	6	10	3	4	9	32	0
35-39	3	9	3	2	1	18	+31
40-44	3	3	0	2	1	9	+28

Systematic evaluation of the quality of service is necessary if teachers are to provide the pupil with the best teaching possible.

This is perhaps the most pedagogical statement on the whole questionnaire, and teachers tended to agree with it (+17 per cent). The opposition to rating would say that this is all right as long as it isn't used for salary purposes, and the other contingent would argue that if quality can be determined for betterment of the teaching process, it can be determined for use in salary arrangements as well. The interesting implication is that if teachers aren't evaluating quality, by the agreement shown with the statement, they aren't affording the best services they could.

Concurrence with the statement, this time without exception, decreases as the rating of teaching decreases. (Excellent +22 per cent, good +15 per cent, fair +6 per cent and failure 0). Men seemingly agree more fully than do women that such evaluation is necessary.

The factors of age and experience show the respondents concurring with three notable exceptions. The age group 50-59 drops to a +8 per cent while at 15-19 and 30-34 years of experience record a +1 and 0, respectively.

Professional attraction

The recognition of quality of service as a factor in salary determination will attract higher caliber people to the profession.

Table 11. Comparison of opinions reported for professional attraction.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	88	102	65	58	97	410	+ 3
Rating							
Excellent	42	52	25	18	40	178	+11
Good	40	39	30	29	41	179	+ 2
Fair	4	9	7	11	12	43	-21
Failure	2	2	3	0	4	11	- 9
Sex							
Male	29	45	21	16	17	128	+21
Female	56	63	44	43	74	280	- 3
Age							
20-29	16	21	15	10	15	77	+ 8
30-39	17	24	12	14	11	78	+14
40-49	18	25	13	14	18	88	+ 6
50-59	16	15	14	7	22	74	- 2
60-69	7	7	3	5	6	28	+ 7
Degree							
Non-degree	10	7	9	5	13	44	+ 5
Bachelor	67	83	50	51	72	323	+ 3
Master	6	14	6	2	10	38	+ 5
Certification							
Authorized	6	6	5	2	5	24	+13
Elementary	39	35	25	32	47	178	- 6
Secondary	34	51	27	13	23	148	+20
Elem. & Sec.	6	16	7	13	18	60	+18
Experience							
0- 4	24	24	15	10	15	98	+18
5- 9	10	21	11	14	9	65	+ 8
10-14	10	12	6	7	8	43	+10
15-19	10	16	9	12	19	66	-11
20-24	7	8	7	4	13	39	-10
25-29	7	4	7	4	9	31	- 6
30-34	7	6	5	3	12	33	-11
35-39	5	7	3	2	1	18	+36
40-44	3	2	2	0	2	9	+22

The recognition of quality of service as a factor in salary determination will attract higher caliber people to the profession.

It is recognized that this statement could place the respondent completely on the defensive, and some of the teachers so indicated. Said one, "We have high caliber people now." This may be true, but the problem involves maintaining a high level by attracting the best people possible into the profession. There is indication of agreement (+3 per cent) that associating salary with quality will produce this result. Note also that there are 35 more teachers who agree than there are who disagree. However, those who are new to the profession agree that this would be a factor by showing a +18 per cent of agreement. These novices in the schools find support from those having the most experience (+22 per cent), but almost all between tend to disagree with the statement.

The principal's rating has appeared significantly in several cases already. Here again, grouping accordingly, those rated high tend to agree, while those rated low show an opposite tendency. Sex also provides basis for distinction of opinion.

Parents and quality

Parents have a right to demand evidence of the quality of service being rendered by anyone on the teaching staff.

Table 12. Comparison of opinions reported for parents and quality.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	136	142	43	44	41	406	+35
Rating							
Excellent	65	64	16	16	14	175	+43
Good	59	63	19	20	16	177	+36
Fair	11	11	7	7	7	43	+14
Failure	1	4	1	1	4	11	-14
Sex							
Male	41	50	14	12	10	127	+39
Female	98	88	30	32	29	277	+37
Age							
20-29	26	34	9	3	5	77	+47
30-39	25	24	12	13	2	76	+38
40-49	29	28	7	9	14	87	+28
50-59	21	26	7	9	13	76	+22
60-69	10	6	4	4	3	27	+31
Degree							
Non-degree	19	10	4	4	6	43	+37
Bachelor	101	117	35	36	33	322	+34
Master	17	13	3	4	1	38	+54
Certification							
Authorized	6	8	4	3	2	23	+28
Elementary	65	52	22	18	20	177	+35
Secondary	45	56	16	18	11	146	+36
Elem. & Sec.	17	23	2	8	8	58	+28
Experience							
0-4	30	38	9	6	6	89	+45
5-9	19	22	11	8	3	63	+40
10-14	19	14	5	2	3	43	+51
15-19	21	22	7	8	8	66	+30
20-24	14	11	2	3	9	39	+23
25-29	11	10	3	5	2	31	+37
30-34	10	9	3	5	6	33	+18
35-39	6	5	3	4	0	18	+36
40-44	4	2	0	0	2	8	+35

Parents have a right to demand evidence of the quality of service being rendered by anyone on the teaching staff.

Although general agreement runs high on this statement (+35 per cent), youth (+47 per cent) and inexperience (+45 per cent) lead the parade with declining assent as age and experience increase. This is the exact pattern according to the ratings, going from an agreement among the excellent group of +43 per cent down to a -14 per cent among the failure group. The highest point of concurrence is reached by the holders of a master's degree with a +54 per cent of agreement.

Neither the certification nor the sex of the individual appears to play much of a role in what the teacher feels is the right of the parent to be informed as to the quality of instruction their children receive.

Merit and bias

A merit rating program will remove bias from judgments that are being made by administrators as well as lay people.

Table 13. Comparison of opinions reported for merit and bias. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	12	59	56	98	188	413	-47
Rating							
Excellent	8	32	25	34	79	178	-40
Good	3	23	26	50	79	181	-49
Fair	1	3	5	13	21	43	-58
Failure	0	1	0	1	9	11	-82
Sex							
Male	7	27	18	30	42	124	-30
Female	7	32	37	70	136	282	-52
Age							
20-29	2	9	19	17	30	77	-42
30-39	4	14	11	15	33	77	-38
40-49	1	13	11	23	34	87	-41
50-59	1	9	9	23	33	76	-52
60-69	1	4	4	7	12	28	-46
Degree							
Non-degree	4	4	4	9	23	44	-49
Bachelor	9	44	50	78	145	326	-24
Master	1	10	1	12	13	37	-35
Certification							
Authorized	2	2	4	4	12	24	-45
Elementary	4	19	25	46	83	177	-52
Secondary	5	30	23	32	54	144	-35
Elem. & Sec.	1	7	5	16	32	61	-58
Experience							
0-4	9	8	11	21	10	89	-8
5-9	2	7	10	16	30	65	-54
10-14	3	8	6	11	15	43	-26
15-19	0	10	6	20	30	66	-53
20-24	2	7	2	10	19	40	-46
25-29	0	6	3	9	14	32	-48
30-34	2	1	2	8	19	32	-64
35-39	1	2	6	4	5	18	-38
40-44	0	3	0	2	4	9	-39

A merit rating program will remove bias from judgments that are being made by administrators as well as lay people.

It is recognized that judgments of teachers and teaching are being made regularly, and much of the time without the knowledge of the teacher. Those who advocate merit use this as a basis for showing the need of developing a system of evaluation. The teachers in Ogden don't support this position as shown by the disagreement of -47 per cent. Many mentioned this as the sore spot in their thinking about the problem in general.

Probably the most significant group to observe in this regard is the group having a showing of an administrator's rating. Those rated excellent scored a -40 per cent, good indicates a -49 per cent, those with fair ratings record a -58 per cent, while those classified as failure extend toward a nearing of complete disagreement with a -82 per cent.

Similarity of response is again cited between men and women as well as elementary and secondary certificate holders.

Poor teachers

Merit rating will provide for defensible elimination of poor teachers.

Table 14. Comparison of opinions reported for poor teachers. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	49	110	66	93	89	407	- 8
Rating							
Excellent	23	52	31	31	37	176	- 3
Good	21	48	20	48	41	178	-11
Fair	4	7	12	11	8	42	-14
Failure	1	3	3	3	1	11	0
Sex							
Male	15	46	23	26	17	127	+ 6
Female	31	68	42	66	69	276	-13
Age							
20-29	5	27	17	16	12	77	- 2
30-39	8	26	15	16	13	78	0
40-49	14	29	13	13	15	84	+ 8
50-59	9	15	10	26	16	77	-17
60-69	2	7	6	7	5	27	-12
Degree							
Non-degree	9	6	6	10	13	44	+14
Bachelor	31	91	52	79	69	322	-10
Master	6	15	6	5	7	39	+10
Certification							
Authorized	5	8	4	3	4	24	+15
Elementary	21	39	25	49	40	174	-14
Secondary	17	55	26	26	22	146	+ 7
Elem. & Sec.	3	12	9	13	23	60	-34
Experience							
0- 4	9	8	11	21	10	89	- 8
5- 9	6	16	17	13	12	64	+ 8
10-14	7	14	8	9	7	42	+ 2
15-19	12	14	7	15	17	65	-10
20-24	5	7	4	13	11	40	-23
25-29	1	10	4	6	11	32	-25
30-34	3	7	5	11	5	31	-13
35-39	2	3	4	4	5	18	-19
40-44	1	1	2	3	2	9	-11

Merit rating will provide for defensible elimination of poor teachers.

This statement does not imply that poor teachers are never eliminated, and opponents of merit quickly suggest this. They point out that teachers are eliminated where no rating program exists. The argument is raised that where teachers are eliminated there of necessity had to be some type of evaluation. The question involves whether or not some established plan of evaluating teachers can provide a defensible basis for the determination of tenure.

Opinions are quite divergent although a tendency to disagree comes to light. The total response measures to a -8 per cent. After fifteen years experience there is no agreement with the statement at all. Male response shows an agreement of +6 per cent while the female response swings the opinion pendulum to the opposite side with a -13 per cent.

Response according to rating tends to follow the pattern observed many times previously.

Building and prestige

Merit rating will build the prestige of the teaching profession by providing objective evidence that professional service is being rendered.

Table 15. Comparison of opinions reported for building of prestige.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	47	100	58	92	111	408	-15
Rating							
Excellent	26	44	27	30	52	179	-11
Good	18	48	21	44	45	176	-14
Fair	2	4	8	15	12	42	-37
Failure	1	4	1	3	2	11	+ 5
Sex							
Male	14	48	19	27	13	126	+ 5
Female	31	54	39	66	83	278	-23
Age							
20-29	9	18	11	15	24	77	-18
30-39	10	24	13	15	13	75	+ 2
40-49	11	25	16	16	20	88	+ 5
50-59	6	16	9	26	20	77	-25
60-69	6	7	4	7	4	28	+ 7
Degree							
Non-degree	7	7	4	13	12	43	-19
Bachelor	29	80	48	69	95	321	-19
Master	10	12	4	8	5	39	+18
Certification							
Authorized	6	4	4	2	8	24	- 4
Elementary	21	35	22	39	59	175	-11
Secondary	16	49	19	34	27	145	- 2
Elem. & Sec.	4	16	11	15	15	61	-17
Experience							
0- 4	12	26	15	14	21	89	- 3
5- 9	8	16	12	14	14	64	- 8
10-14	10	10	5	10	3	43	+ 4
15-19	4	15	9	14	24	66	-30
20-24	2	8	4	13	13	40	-34
25-29	3	10	3	7	10	33	-17
30-34	3	7	3	9	10	33	-25
35-39	1	9	2	3	2	17	+12
40-44	2	0	2	3	2	9	-17

Merit rating will build the prestige of the teaching profession by providing objective evidence that professional service is being rendered.

Almost all teachers would agree that building professional prestige in the field of education is desirable, but those who replied to this statement indicate that they have question as to whether or not merit rating will accomplish the job. The consensus of opinion is a -15 per cent. This doesn't hold true for all categories for the men agree with a +5 per cent while the women disagree -23 per cent.

Holders of an advanced degree show the highest point of agreement that merit rating would be a prestige builder for the profession with a score of +18 per cent. Teachers not holding a degree and those with a bachelor's degree coincide in their -19 per cent score. With the exception of the few rated failure the rating group follows the pattern of increasing disagreement with decreasing rating.

Personal popularity

Merit rating will resolve itself into a play for personal popularity with the person(s) responsible for the rating.

Table 16. Comparison of opinions reported for personal popularity.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	234	92	41	28	17	412	+61
Rating							
Excellent	95	47	17	13	7	179	+59
Good	105	35	16	15	9	180	+59
Fair	28	7	6	0	1	43	+73
Failure	6	3	2	0	0	11	+68
Sex							
Male	52	40	17	13	5	127	+48
Female	179	51	24	14	12	280	+66
Age							
20-29	39	17	9	7	4	76	+53
30-39	43	16	12	4	2	77	+61
40-49	52	22	5	4	4	87	+66
50-59	37	15	9	10	5	78	+44
60-69	14	3	3	2	0	28	+65
Degree							
Non-degree	26	8	5	2	2	43	+63
Bachelor	184	75	29	21	13	327	+59
Master	17	10	6	6	0	39	+49
Certification							
Authorized	16	3	3	2	0	24	+69
Elementary	109	34	15	11	9	178	+91
Secondary	63	42	21	14	7	147	+48
Elem. & Sec.	42	14	3	1	1	61	+78
Experience							
0-4	41	23	15	6	4	88	+51
5-9	36	15	6	6	2	65	+64
10-14	26	7	5	3	2	43	+60
15-19	39	13	3	3	3	66	+66
20-24	25	7	4	1	3	40	+71
25-29	21	5	2	5	0	33	+64
30-34	16	8	4	3	2	33	+50
35-39	8	6	1	1	1	17	+56
40-44	6	3	0	0	0	9	+83

Merit rating will resolve itself into a play for personal popularity with the person(s) responsible for the rating.

X-

Extremely high agreement characterizes the response to this statement, which is reflected by the overall attitude of the respondents in recording a +⁶16 per cent of agreement. The highest score recorded comes very close to complete unanimity of opinion among the teachers holding elementary certificates as their response shows a +91 per cent of agreement. The lowest score of +44 per cent is recorded by the 50-59 years of age category.

Although agreement remains high throughout, it should be noted that there is some tendency to increase agreement with increased age and experience.

There is an inclination among those who oppose merit rating to lean heavily upon this argument, and apparently they have excellent grounds for so doing.

Respect among faculties

Rating teachers will destroy feelings of mutual respect among faculties.

Table 17. Comparison of opinions reported for respect among faculties.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	169	119	51	48	21	408	+45
Rating							
Excellent	70	47	29	22	9	177	+42
Good	72	55	16	23	11	177	+44
Fair	23	14	4	2	0	43	+67
Failure	4	3	2	1	1	11	+36
Sex							
Male	26	49	20	25	2	126	+25
Female	140	68	29	24	16	277	+53
Age							
20-29	27	25	6	12	6	76	+36
30-39	30	21	16	8	3	78	+43
40-49	36	24	14	9	3	86	+47
50-59	27	15	8	11	5	76	+32
60-69	12	9	1	2	4	28	+43
Degree							
Non-degree	25	9	5	4	1	44	+60
Bachelor	134	97	35	40	18	324	+45
Master	10	11	8	6	3	38	+25
Certification							
Authorized	11	8	3	2	0	24	+53
Elementary	93	42	17	13	11	176	+55
Secondary	31	49	27	26	13	146	+20
Elem. & Sec.	31	21	3	6	0	61	+63
Experience							
0-4	27	28	11	16	7	88	+30
5-9	27	20	15	4	0	66	+57
10-14	17	15	6	3	1	42	+51
15-19	29	21	6	4	4	64	+52
20-24	18	12	5	2	3	40	+50
25-29	17	6	0	7	2	32	+45
30-34	14	7	3	5	4	33	+33
35-39	6	4	2	5	0	17	+32
40-44	6	1	0	1	1	9	+56

Rating teachers will destroy feelings of mutual respect among
faculties.

X-

Again, in the problem of faculty relationships, teachers voice agreement with the idea that rating would be an upsetting factor (+45 per cent). Female teachers (+53 per cent) voice more agreement than male teachers (+25 per cent). Comparison of age shows a rather stable opinion. The same can be said for the experience range.

The area of degrees provides an interesting comparison. Those with a master's degree scored a +25 per cent, holders of a bachelor's degree recorded a +45 per cent, and non-degree teachers went as high as a +60 per cent of agreement.

Those who reach highest agreement in the concern of maintaining faculty relationships under an evaluation system seem to be those who have received a rating of fair from their principal (+67 per cent).

Abuse of rating

Granting power to classify teachers according to merit will lead to abuse.

Table 13. Comparison of opinions reported for abuse of rating. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	193	104	59	42	14	412	+51
Rating							
Excellent	77	44	30	18	9	130	+46
Good	83	42	22	21	4	179	+53
Fair	23	13	4	2	0	42	+68
Failure	3	5	1	1	1	11	+36
Sex							
Male	37	44	23	20	4	123	+35
Female	156	53	35	22	10	281	+58
Age							
20-29	19	24	11	9	4	77	+29
30-39	30	21	16	10	1	78	+44
40-49	41	22	14	9	1	87	+53
50-59	39	18	9	8	4	78	+51
60-69	14	5	3	3	3	28	+44
Degree							
Non-degree	23	6	7	5	2	43	+50
Bachelor	154	89	43	30	11	327	+53
Master	14	10	9	6	0	39	+41
Certification							
Authorized	10	7	3	3	1	24	+46
Elementary	97	36	21	15	9	178	+55
Secondary	51	47	23	22	5	148	+39
Elem. & Sec.	35	14	7	3	1	60	+66
Experience							
0-4	27	30	15	11	6	89	+34
5-9	29	16	14	7	0	66	+55
10-14	19	14	6	3	1	42	+56
15-19	37	14	9	5	1	66	+61
20-24	22	9	6	2	1	40	+61
25-29	20	6	3	4	0	33	+64
30-34	14	6	3	7	3	33	+32
35-39	8	5	1	2	2	18	+42
40-44	5	1	1	1	1	9	+44

Granting power to classify teachers according to merit will lead to abuse.

Ogden City teachers agree that abuses would result from the establishment of ratings for teachers. The total response was a +51 per cent. Some further indicated by free response that this would be especially true if the rating were to affect the salary. Some see in it the possibility of an autocratic administrator forcing his ideals and philosophy on others who may not concur. This is the least of the abuses described.

Of all groups set apart for comparison the highest consensus of opinion rests with those labeled fair. Their score is a +68 per cent of agreement. Female teachers' +58 per cent is somewhat higher than the male response of +35 per cent. Also, agreement increases with age through the group 40-49 years of age and then drops back again. Correspondingly, agreement rises as experience is added up to twenty-nine years, after which the tide of agreement recedes.

Human judgment

No person or group of persons is capable of determining the quality of one's teaching service.

Table 19. Comparison of opinions reported for human judgment. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	153	131	34	69	21	408	+40
Rating							
Excellent	62	54	16	33	9	174	+39
Good	63	66	11	31	10	181	+39
Fair	24	9	6	3	0	42	+64
Failure	4	2	1	2	2	11	+18
Sex							
Male	27	41	16	36	5	125	+20
Female	122	86	20	36	14	278	+48
Age							
20-29	27	24	8	14	3	76	+38
30-39	19	29	10	15	4	77	+29
40-49	29	26	9	20	2	86	+35
50-59	29	22	5	12	8	76	+34
60-69	13	8	0	4	3	28	+44
Degrees							
Non-degree	23	9	1	6	3	42	+51
Bachelor	118	107	30	52	17	324	+40
Master	10	9	3	13	3	38	+13
Certification							
Authorized	8	6	0	7	2	23	+24
Elementary	82	56	6	23	10	177	+50
Secondary	34	51	22	33	6	146	+24
Elem. & Sec.	27	16	5	9	3	60	+46
Experience							
0-4	26	26	11	20	4	87	+29
5-9	24	22	7	9	3	65	+46
10-14	12	13	1	9	3	43	+31
15-19	31	17	3	13	1	65	+49
20-24	17	10	8	4	1	40	+48
25-29	12	13	1	5	2	33	+42
30-34	11	10	0	7	4	32	+27
35-39	7	5	1	3	2	18	+33
40-44	4	4	0	0	1	9	+56

No person or group of persons is capable of determining the quality of one's teaching service.

X-4

Another strong point is scored by merit opposition when they introduce this argument for the pedagogues agree (+40 per cent). It seems almost ironical that teachers who periodically concern themselves with evaluating pupils in terms of classroom experiences agree that no person or group of persons is capable of determining the quality of teaching service. Moreover, those who have had the most teaching experience show higher agreement (+56 per cent) than do any of their less experienced colleagues.

High agreement that no one can evaluate the quality of teaching is held by those rated fair (+64 per cent). The men (+20 per cent) are less certain this is the case than women (+48 per cent). Those in the master's degree category (+13 per cent) are less agreed than any other classification on this problem.

Psychological effect

To attempt a rating of teaching merit would be frustrating to the teacher and result in impaired efficiency.

Table 20. Comparison of opinions reported for psychological effect.
Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	127	111	52	86	35	411	+25
Rating							
Excellent	47	50	24	33	19	173	+19
Good	50	47	20	41	15	173	+25
Fair	22	10	7	4	0	43	+58
Failure	2	4	1	3	1	11	+14
Sex							
Male	21	30	22	42	12	127	+ 2
Female	105	80	30	43	23	211	+36
Age							
20-29	21	13	13	18	7	77	+18
30-39	21	21	13	16	7	78	+21
40-49	22	35	7	13	5	87	+29
50-59	24	33	10	19	7	77	+34
60-69	11	5	2	3	6	28	+22
Degree							
Non-degree	17	10	5	9	3	44	+33
Bachelor	102	96	41	63	25	327	+29
Master	7	6	4	16	5	38	- 8
Certification							
Authorized	7	6	2	5	4	24	+15
Elementary	75	49	18	24	13	179	+41
Secondary	19	42	25	47	14	147	+ 2
Flem. & Sec.	27	16	6	8	4	61	+44
Experience							
0- 4	20	20	14	35	10	89	+ 8
5- 9	23	15	12	12	4	66	+34
10-14	6	19	7	6	5	43	+17
15-19	22	22	6	9	6	65	+35
20-24	16	11	5	7	1	40	+43
25-29	10	11	2	7	3	33	+27
30-34	9	7	5	9	3	33	+15
35-39	7	1	3	5	2	18	+17
40-44	4	3	0	1	1	9	+44

To attempt a rating of teaching merit would be frustrating to the teacher and result in impaired efficiency.

X

The only group tending to disagree with this statement is the group holding a master's degree (-8 per cent). All others tend to agree so that the total picture is a +25 per cent of agreement. However, men (+2 per cent) and secondary certificated people (+2 per cent) approach a lack of agreement or neutrality of opinion. The counterpart of each of these, women (+36 per cent) and elementary certificated people (+41 per cent), indicate noticeable agreement.

The general pattern among the age and experience groups is one of increased agreement as the indicator of age and experience also rises.

The category of rating is uniform in its pattern until it comes to the last group (excellent +19 per cent, good +25 per cent, fair +58 per cent, and failure +14 per cent). This exception has been noted several times previous to this item.

Lowered standards

Merit rating will result in lowered standards to create the impression that the teacher is reaching a higher achievement.

Table 21. Comparison of opinions reported for lowered standards. Given according to various classifications--by per cent.

Classification	A	AR	N	DR	D	Total	Per Cent of Agreement
Total Returns	73	59	103	36	36	407	- 7
Rating							
Excellent	24	23	47	36	47	177	-17
Good	38	25	42	39	33	177	+ 1
Fair	10	9	13	7	3	42	+19
Failure	1	2	1	4	3	11	-27
Sex							
Male	12	16	36	43	20	127	-17
Female	63	41	68	41	65	278	- 1
Age							
20-29	10	10	19	27	11	77	- 5
30-39	13	11	25	16	13	78	- 3
40-49	10	14	21	16	25	86	-19
50-59	15	12	13	15	20	75	- 9
60-69	7	5	5	2	8	27	+ 2
Degree							
Non-degree	9	7	11	7	9	43	0
Bachelor	56	51	84	60	66	323	- 5
Master	7	3	8	11	9	38	-16
Certification							
Authorized	5	4	4	5	6	24	- 6
Elementary	40	30	39	34	37	180	+ 1
Secondary	10	17	43	42	35	147	-26
Elem. & Sec.	16	10	16	11	6	59	+16
Experience							
0- 4	10	11	23	28	17	89	-12
5- 9	11	9	17	13	11	66	- 7
10-14	6	6	10	12	9	43	-14
15-19	16	8	13	5	16	63	+ 2
20-24	9	6	12	5	8	40	+ 5
25-29	5	4	9	6	8	32	-13
30-34	5	6	8	5	8	32	- 8
35-39	4	1	4	4	5	18	-14
40-44	3	2	1	0	3	9	+11

Merit rating will result in lowered standards to create the impression that the teacher is reaching a higher achievement.

The full response on this item registers a -7 per cent. Those holding both elementary and secondary certificates (+16 per cent) and those rated as fair (+19 per cent) are inclined toward agreement. Variance of agreement is noted in both the age and experience groupings. The ladies show almost complete neutrality (-1 per cent) concerning this item while the men register some disagreement (-17 per cent). Similar patterns exist between elementary (+1 per cent) and secondary (-26 per cent) certification as well as those having a bachelor's degree (-5 per cent) and those with a master's degree (-16 per cent).

The response to this statement was less than on any other single questionnaire item.

Inasmuch as the most impending concern with merit rating is in regard to its effect upon salary, some consideration as to the present system compared with merit principles should be included. Taking the two factors now considered in salary determination, degree and experience, comparisons have been made with the rating given teachers by their principal.

It is noteworthy that as the rating goes from excellent to failure the percentage of non-degree teachers increases. Conversely, the percentage of degree teachers in each lowered rating group tends to decrease. This same pattern appears operative when experience is considered. A higher percentage of fair and failing teachers comes from the lower experience bracket, that group with 0-4 years experience contributing the most in terms of numbers. On the other hand, those with fifteen years experience or more tend to have a larger percentage of their number rated excellent and good than do those of less experience. As a matter of fact, many of the groups above the fifteen year experience mark have the total group rated either good or excellent. This would

tend to suggest that the present system of salary based upon training and experience approaches the ideal of pay according to merit.

Another consideration taken from the same data (tables 22-24) is that 43 per cent of the teachers who were rated excellent are receiving something less than a maximum salary, and 18 per cent of those rated failure are at present receiving top salary. Thus, proponents of merit rating would argue, there is a need for recognizing those excellent teachers who are not given equal remuneration with others so rated, and at the same time do something to remedy the situation of failing teachers being retained at all, let alone receiving the highest salary possible.

Table 22. Number and percentage of each degree and experience classification given various ratings

	Excellent		Good		Fair		Failure		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Degree</u>										
Non-degree	10	22.7	25	58.8	6	13.7	3	6.8	44	100
Bachelor's	148	45.1	141	43.0	34	10.2	6	1.7	329	100
Master's	19	43.7	15	38.7	3	8.6	2	5.0	39	100
No Response	3		0		0		0		3	
<u>Experience</u>										
0-4	24	27.0	48	53.9	13	14.6	4	4.5	89	100
5-9	28	41.8	28	41.8	8	11.9	3	4.5	67	100
10-14	25	58.1	15	34.9	2	4.7	1	2.3	43	100
15-19	36	53.7	24	35.8	7	10.5	0	0.0	67	100
20-24	22	55.0	17	42.5	1	2.5	0	0.0	40	100
25-29	15	45.6	18	54.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	33	100
30-34	15	45.6	14	42.4	2	6.0	2	6.0	33	100
35-39	12	66.7	4	22.2	2	11.1	0	0.0	18	100
40-44	3	33.3	6	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100
No Response	0		7		8		1		16	

Table 23. Percentage of each rating classification holding various degrees

Rating	No.	Degree			No Response	Total
		Non	B	M		
Excellent	130	.05	.32	.11	.02	1.00
Good	181	.14	.78	.03	.00	1.00
Fair	43	.14	.79	.07	.00	1.00
Failure	11	.27	.55	.18	.00	1.00

Table 24. Percentage of each rating classification above and below 15 years' experience. (Nearest point to maximum and below maximum salary)

Rating	No.	Above 15 yr.	Below 15 yr.	No Response	Total
Excellent	180	.57	.43	.00	1.00
Good	181	.46	.50	.04	1.00
Fair	43	.28	.53	.19	1.00
Failure	11	.18	.73	.09	1.00

FREE RESPONSE COMMENTS

The selection of items to be placed on the questionnaire in itself implies a limitation of response. Herein lies one weakness of the questionnaire method of gathering data. Thus, provision was made for any who felt so inclined to contribute their own thinking on the problem. This does not eliminate the criticism entirely, but does tend to lessen it. However, no value results unless some consideration is given to this aspect of the data gathered. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to attempt a brief summary of these free response comments.

The time taken by busy teachers to add their own comments is, once again, indicative of the interest surrounding this topic, and the response was very gratifying. From the 415 returns used there were 126 with additional remarks. This means that of the 92 per cent of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire 30 per cent took time enough to include additional information. The following excerpts are typical of the comments received:

Although I recognize many teachers are better than others, the merit rating is a very "touchy" subject. It will be a case of who is the best politician—who is the best back-slapper and hand-shaker, and what church you attend. . . .

Some method of evaluation is absolutely necessary. Numerous cases can be cited where effective and quality teachers are seriously underpaid, and an equal number of cases are in evidence where untalented teachers (though sometimes well trained) are entirely ineffective in their chosen profession. Though we may be sympathetic with such cases, it is not fair nor equitable to equally award their ineptness with another's skill and effectiveness.

In my opinion, any system that would create resentment, ill feelings, apple-polishing, and jealousy among teachers and administrators is not a good system.

Teachers have to keep their eye on the ball instead of on the gallery or the judge's stand to play this game right.

If any teacher can do twice as good a job if you double his salary, he should never have been hired in the first place.

Will parents accept an inferior teacher for their child, or will they demand that they have the superior teacher? Who will the inferior teacher teach?

I am sure that merit rating at this time is a serious mistake and would result in more problems than we now have.

An adequate living salary is necessary to mental health, but money goes no further in creating grades of teachers.

...seems to be a general fear among teachers, supervisors, and administrators that, because of involved situations, the entrance of emotion into the problem, and the high training requirements to carry out such a program, it cannot be done.

A system of merit rating is a pernicious system.

I heartily approve of a merit rating of teachers when a practical method can be found. . . .

The theory of merit rating is defensible, but the inability of establishing concrete criteria by which to measure the value of teaching and the factors of personalities that enter into ratings due to prejudices make ratings undesirable.

I do not understand as much as I should about merit systems. I think these questions get teachers to thinking about the problem.

I do not believe in the merit system as correlated with salary even though I realize that some teachers have more teaching ability than others. Probably there would not be a need for rating if there were more careful screening in our teacher training institutions, and during practice teaching and probation periods.

This rating system would be a step in the wrong direction. No satisfactory rating system can be developed.

Teachers could lose past gains in the matter of salaries and could conceivably return to individual bargaining. Refer to the days when teachers were told by administrators it was "unethical" and unprofessional" to discuss salaries with fellow teachers. Reason--to conceal inequalities due to individual bargaining.

A rating system should be used to determine hiring and retention only. A rating system open to the teacher's and administrator's inspection then might be used for teacher selection and self improvement. /

These comments were selected to demonstrate what appeared to be representative of the group's opinion. Three ideas are recognized as these quotations are scrutinized. First, recognition of the necessity for some evaluation; second, general apprehension of merit rating due to (a) involved emotions, (b) incompetent judges, (c) ineffective criteria, and (d) possible ill effects; and third, some alternative suggestions.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

From the teachers surveyed the following attitudes rise to view. There is some agreement that salary should be correlated with quality of service, but opposition is registered at the suggestion of the teaching profession moving in that direction. The reason for this seems to be the general concern as to who should, or who is qualified, to determine the merit of any teacher, and upon what criteria the judgment is to be made. A very dim view is taken of the possibility of settling upon some objective criteria. Further, there is quite a strong feeling that no one person or group is capable of making the necessary evaluation. Neither do these teachers feel that a merit program will eliminate bias from judgments that are being made. Nevertheless, opinion concurs that parents have a right to demand evidence of the quality of teaching services, which suggests a question as to the type of evidence a parent might expect or receive.

These teachers also feel that rating should not be used to provide prestige even though not affecting the salary schedule. Notwithstanding, the attitude expressed by the group is that some recognition of the principle of pay commensurate with quality of service is necessary if education is to reach comparable status with other professions. At the same time they disagree that merit rating, as they conceive it, will build this desired professional prestige.

They agreed that evaluation is necessary to a good tenure law, but fail to agree that merit rating will provide for the defensible elimination of poor teachers.

There is almost complete lack of agreement as to whether merit rating, correlated with salary, would provide incentive to better one's teaching, but agree that systematic evaluation is necessary to the provision of the best teaching possible. Yet, as noted above, they do not wish to move in this direction. That failure to recognize merit tends to produce mediocrity is not accepted. At the same time it is agreed that a rating could be frustrating and thus result in teacher inefficiency, but they don't consider it will result in lowered standards so that the teacher might appear to be achieving highly.

Concern is registered over the probable results of a merit program by general acceptance that such a program will become nothing but a "popularity contest," that it will destroy respect among faculties, and lead to some abuses in the administration of it.

In looking at the profession itself, a need for the recognizing and rewarding of the superior teacher is agreed upon by these pedagogues. As has been previously pointed out, skepticism reigns in regard to the capability of any merit system to justly identify the superior teacher. Some feel this has implications for the recruitment aspect. It has been noted that in business and other professions the ability to rise to the top financially is limited only by the person himself. In the teaching field this is not so; a limit of time is imposed. Thus, a question arises as to the significance this plays in whether or not capable young people choose teaching as their profession. There is some agreement among the teachers that recognition of quality of service in salary determination would attract these higher caliber people to the profession.

Certain patterns of response showed themselves several times throughout the study. More acceptance and less apprehension appeared among those rated excellent, with the converse applying as the rating graduated

downward. It must be noted also that these teachers are not entirely consistent in their attitudes toward merit rating.

Male teachers tended to be more favorable toward merit rating principles than the women teachers. This holds true for secondary as against elementary certificate holders. This is understandable as the large proportion of elementary teachers are women. Interestingly enough, this same pattern of liberalistic tendencies applies to those holding master's degree, while conservatism attaches to holders of bachelor's degree.

Highest approval generally came from those teachers having 10-20 years experience and between the ages of 30-40 years.

From the data provided it seems justifiable to conclude that the teachers of Ogden generally agree with the principles upon which merit rating rests, but are quite apprehensive as to the results of its practical application. This apprehension is due in the main to two unanswered questions, "Who will do the rating?", and "What will be the bases for rating?" Tremendous strides have been made in these areas since the turn of the century, which is to say that because the task is difficult does not render it impossible.

Apparently, there is some relationship between the opinion expressed and the status of the group considered, as noted above. Further, the general pattern of variance of opinion between the rating groups suggests that perhaps the teachers have a fairly accurate idea as to where they stand. In a recent class the professor remarked, "Teachers are sensitive to good teaching, they know it when they see it." It is this very personal nature of evaluation that constitutes the major objection.

Probably the most significant observation arises from a generalized statement that older, better trained, more experienced teachers receive

higher ratings in greater proportion than their counterparts.] This may be because those considered to be failures don't stay with the profession very long, or because principals rate best those they have known the longest, or both. Obviously, there are many notable exceptions, and it is with these exceptions that the proponents of merit rating concern themselves. Nevertheless, the suggestion that present salary schedules have the principles of merit rating operative within them poses the crucial question, "Can a merit rating program function more effectively?"

LITERATURE CITED

- ✓ (1) Barr, Arvil S. "Teaching Competencies." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Revised Edition. New York: MacMillan Co., 1950. Pp. 1446-7.
- ✓ (2) Beecher, Dwight E. Evaluation of Teaching. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1949. 105 pp. *purpose books relationship*
- ✓ (3) Beecher, Dwight E. "Merit Rating is Defensible." American School Board Journal 117:21. Aug. 1948.
- ✓ (4) *Cornell* Hamstra, R. H. "Merit Rating of School Personnel." American School Board Journal 117:21. Dec. 1948.
- ✓ (5) Kelly, Marcella R. "Let Us Have None of It; Case Against Merit Rating." School Executive 68:56-7. Mar. 1949.
- (6) Koos, Leonard V. The Questionnaire in Education. New York: MacMillan Co., 1928.
- (7) Miller, William P. Utah School Board Members; Their Status and Opinions. (MS Thesis, College of Education) Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah, 1942. 149 pp.
- ✓ (8) Morrison, J. Cayce, and Burke, Arvid J. "Basing Salaries on Quality of Teaching." Nation's Schools 44:52-4. Sept. 1949. *p. 43-4*
- ✓ (9) Morrison, J. Cayce. "It's Time to Adjust Salaries to Quality of Teaching." Nation's Schools 51:45-6. Feb. 1953.
- ✓ (10) Reavis, Wm. C., and Cooper, Dan H. Evaluation of Teacher Merit in City School Systems. University of Chicago Press, Educational Monograph #59. 1945. 138 pp.
- ✓ (11) Seavy, Morton R. "Effects of Salary Upon Teaching." Educational Digest 18:6-8. June 1953.
- ✓ (12) Utah Merit Rating Study Committee. Minutes of Hearings. State Capitol, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 4 and 5, 1954.
- ✓ (13) Utah Public School Survey Commission. A Survey of the Utah Elementary and Secondary Public School System. Interim Report to the Governor, Legislature, and Legislative Council. 1953.
- ✓ (14) VanderWerf, Lester S. "Predicting Teacher Efficiency." Nation's Schools 51:81. June 1953.
- ✓ (15) VanderWerf, Lester S. "Trouble with Merit Systems." American School Board Journal 125:17-8. Aug. 1952.

(16) West, Allan M. "The Case For and Against Merit Rating." School
Executive 69:48-50. June 1950.

APPENDIX A

Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

Section A.

Male () Female () Age ____ Grade(s) Teaching _____

Teaching Experience: Total Experience ____ In present assignment _____

In the previous assignment _____

Educational Training: Please circle the highest grade you completed in each of these schools.

High School

College

1st 2nd 3rd 4th

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th

What college degree(s) do you hold? _____

Date Received _____

Teaching Certification: Elementary () Secondary ()

Letter of Authorization ()

Section B.

Please indicate how you feel toward the following statements by checking () the appropriate column. The columns are marked so as to correspond with these attitudes:

- A--Complete agreement
- AR--General agreement with some reservation
- N--Neutral, shows neither agreement nor disagreement
- DR--General disagreement with some reservation
- D--Complete disagreement

1. Salary should be correlated with merit, because training and length of service are not sufficient as the sole bases of salary determination
2. The use of merit rating to give a teacher added prestige is acceptable as long as it does not affect the salary schedule

A	AR	N	DR	D

	A	AR	N	DR	D
17. Granting power to classify teachers according to merit will lead to abuse					
18. No person or group of persons is capable of determining the quality of one's teaching service					
19. To attempt a rating of teaching merit would be frustrating to the teacher and result in impaired efficiency					
20. Merit rating will result in lowered standards to create the impression that the teacher is reaching a higher achievement.					

Please use the back for any further comment you would care to make concerning this problem of merit rating.

APPENDIX B

Table 25. Total tabulation of per cent of agreement for all statements and all classifications

	Total	Rating				Age				
		Ex.	Gd.	Fr.	Fe.	20-9	30-9	40-9	50-9	60-9
1	+ 3	+12	+ 1	-24	+14	0	+ 9	+16	+ 8	+ 4
2	-22	-23	-22	-23	+27	-34	-23	-11	-18	+ 2
3	+42	+43	+40	+44	+56	+38	+53	+52	+34	+54
4	+24	+26	+24	+12	+50	+16	+38	+14	+32	+54
5	+16	+17	+19	-10	+27	+ 7	+22	+20	+16	+37
6	- 8	- 4	- 6	-29	- 5	-10	+11	-3	-10	0
7	-14	-11	-13	-26	-18	- 8	- 6	- 6	-19	-17
8	+ 1	+ 7	- 3	-10	+ 5	+ 8	+12	+20	-11	- 2
9	+17	+22	+15	+ 6	0	+17	+30	+28	+ 8	+24
10	+ 3	+11	+ 2	-21	- 9	+ 8	+14	+ 6	- 2	+ 7
11	+35	+43	+36	+14	-14	+47	+38	+28	+22	+31
12	-47	-40	-49	-58	-82	-42	-38	-41	-52	-46
13	- 8	- 3	-11	-14	0	- 2	0	+ 8	-17	-12
14	-15	-11	-14	-37	+ 5	-18	+ 2	+ 5	-25	+ 7
15	+61	+59	+59	+73	+68	+53	+61	+66	+44	+65
16	+45	+42	+44	+67	+36	+36	+43	+47	+32	+43
17	+51	+46	+53	+68	+36	+29	+44	+53	+51	+44
18	+40	+39	+39	+64	+18	+38	+29	+35	+34	+44
19	+25	+19	+25	+58	+14	+18	+21	+29	+34	+22
20	- 7	-17	+ 1	+19	-27	- 5	- 3	-19	- 9	+ 2

Table 25 (cont.)

	Degree			Certification				Sex	
	Non	B.	M.	A.	E.	S.	E-S	M.	F.
1	+ 5	+ 1	+ 9	0	-11	+26	-11	+26	- 6
2	-10	-25	-12	-15	-20	-20	- 8	-26	-19
3	+50	+37	+64	+46	+25	+66	+30	+57	+36
4	+24	+24	+28	+17	+ 7	+49	+18	+46	+18
5	+20	+13	+31	+17	+ 6	+33	+ 3	+32	+ 9
6	+ 3	-11	+17	+ 2	-24	+19	-28	+17	-18
7	-16	-17	+ 5	- 2	-26	+ 3	-47	+ 8	-24
8	- 2	- 2	+23	+13	-10	+21	-21	+21	- 9
9	+31	+14	+29	+33	+ 6	+38	+16	+27	+13
10	+ 5	+ 3	+ 5	+13	- 6	+20	+18	+21	- 3
11	+37	+34	+54	+28	+35	+36	+28	+39	+37
12	-49	-24	-35	-45	-52	-35	-58	-30	-52
13	+14	-10	+10	+15	-14	+ 7	-34	+ 6	-13
14	-19	-19	+18	- 4	-11	- 2	-17	+ 5	-23
15	+63	+59	+49	+69	+91	+48	+78	+48	+66
16	+60	+45	+25	+58	+55	+20	+63	+25	+53
17	+50	+53	+41	+46	+55	+39	+66	+35	+58
18	+51	+40	+13	+24	+50	+22	+46	+20	+48
19	+33	+29	- 8	+15	+41	+ 2	+44	+ 2	+36
20	0	- 5	-16	- 6	+ 1	-26	+16	-17	- 1

Table 25 (cont.)

	Experience								
	0-4	5-9	10-4	15-9	20-4	25-9	30-4	35-9	40-4
1	+ 4	+11	+16	+ 2	-20	-11	+ 3	+39	+ 6
2	-31	-18	-30	-12	-15	-40	-8	+ 3	+11
3	+39	+58	+48	+43	+35	+30	+28	+58	+33
4	+23	+31	+31	+22	+19	+ 3	+17	+58	+67
5	+17	+22	+21	+23	-1	+12	+19	+25	+39
6	+ 3	+ 5	+15	-17	-33	-13	-18	+28	- 6
7	- 1	- 8	- 5	-26	-31	-23	-26	0	-12
8	+19	+ 5	+12	-13	-12	- 6	-12	+14	0
9	+24	+18	+35	+ 1	+19	+14	0	+31	+28
10	+18	+ 8	+10	-11	-10	- 6	-11	+36	+22
11	+45	+40	+51	+30	+23	+37	+18	+36	+35
12	- 8	-54	-26	-53	-46	-48	-64	-38	-39
13	- 8	+ 8	+ 2	-10	-23	-25	-13	-19	-11
14	- 3	- 8	+ 4	-30	-34	-17	-25	+12	-17
15	+51	+64	+60	+66	+71	+64	+50	+56	+83
16	+30	+57	+51	+52	+50	+45	+33	+32	+56
17	+34	+55	+56	+61	+61	+64	+32	+42	+44
18	+29	+46	+31	+49	+48	+42	+27	+33	+56
19	+ 8	+34	+17	+35	+43	+27	+15	+17	+44
20	-12	- 7	-14	+ 2	+ 5	-13	- 8	-14	+11