


1968

# A Study of the Attitudes of Public School Teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties Regarding Teacher Evaluation for Merit Pay Purposes

Gerald Stewart Robertson  
*Central Washington University*

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

 Part of the [Other Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Robertson, Gerald Stewart, "A Study of the Attitudes of Public School Teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties Regarding Teacher Evaluation for Merit Pay Purposes" (1968). *All Master's Theses*. 971.  
<https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/etd/971>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact [pingfu@cwu.edu](mailto:pingfu@cwu.edu).

93

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS IN  
CHELAN AND DOUGLAS COUNTIES REGARDING TEACHER  
EVALUATION FOR MERIT PAY PURPOSES

---

A Thesis

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

Central Washington State College

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education

---

by

Gerald Stewart Robertson

August, 1968

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY  
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS

LD  
5771.3

R6495

SPECIAL  
COLLECTION

1964

1964

The University of Chicago

Chicago, Illinois

1964

1964

1964

170888

1964

1964

APPROVED FOR THE GRADUATE FACULTY

---

Roy F. Ruebel, COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

---

George C. Grossman

---

Franklin P. Carlson

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED . . . . .	1
The Problem . . . . .	2
Statement of the problem . . . . .	2
Hypothesis . . . . .	2
Importance of the study . . . . .	3
Definitions of Terms Used . . . . .	3
Merit rating . . . . .	3
Single Salary Schedule . . . . .	4
Teacher Evaluation . . . . .	4
General Method of Dealing With the Problem . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Authoritative Statements on the Importance of the Problem . . . . .	9
Utah Study of Teacher Evaluation . . . . .	12
Positive Attitude Studies Related to Evaluation . . . . .	14
Georgia Study . . . . .	14
Ability Recognition Study . . . . .	15
Conflict of Interest Study . . . . .	17
Merit Rating Study . . . . .	18
Negative Attitude Studies Related to Evaluation . . . . .	21

CHAPTER	PAGE
Operational Merit Pay Study . . . . .	22
Teacher Dissatisfaction Study . . . . .	24
Glasgow Study . . . . .	24
Michigan Study . . . . .	25
New York Study . . . . .	26
Teacher Evaluation in Practice . . . . .	27
Ithaca, New York . . . . .	28
Lincoln, Massachusetts . . . . .	30
Marblehead Study . . . . .	32
Limitation of the Studies. . . . .	35
III. METHODS OF RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	36
Methods of Research . . . . .	36
The Questionnaire . . . . .	36
Cover Letter . . . . .	37
The Follow-Up Procedure . . . . .	37
List of the Schools Contacted . . . . .	37
Results of the Questionnaire . . . . .	37
Level of Confidence . . . . .	38
Teacher Recognition . . . . .	38
Evaluative Criteria . . . . .	40

CHAPTER	PAGE
Evaluative Personnel . . . . .	44
General Comments by the Respondents . . . . .	46
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	48
Conclusions . . . . .	48
Teacher Recognition . . . . .	48
Criteria to be Used in Teacher Evaluation . . . . .	49
Personnel to be Used as Evaluators . . . . .	49
General Conclusions . . . . .	50
Recommendations . . . . .	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	52
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire . . . . .	56
APPENDIX B. Cover Letter . . . . .	58
APPENDIX C. Participating Schools . . . . .	59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Ranks Assigned to Criteria for Evaluating Teacher	
Effectiveness . . . . .	16
II. Teacher Attitudes on Merit Rating . . . . .	20
III. Responses to Questions Regarding Operational Merit Pay .	23
IV. Responses to General Statements Regarding Ability	
Recognition . . . . .	39
V. Criteria to be Used in Teacher Evaluation . . . . .	41
VI. Excellence in Teaching Criteria . . . . .	43
VII. Evaluative Personnel . . . . .	45



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The improvement of teaching will require significant changes in the attitudes of teachers toward themselves. They must assume much greater responsibility for improving the quality of instruction than they thus have been willing to accept. Instead of resisting attempts to evaluate their effectiveness of teaching, teachers should be in the vanguard to such efforts, resolving the complex problems of education and establishing more precise means of identifying superior performance (37:321).

The practice of rating teachers did not become common until the 1930-40 decade. Teaching positions with even modest pay were scarce and rating programs thus became part of almost every school system. The rating instruments were usually subjective and presumably measured characteristics of teachers believed to be important in the teaching-learning process. The aftermath of World War II found teachers of high quality moving into high paying industrial jobs which left the classrooms to thousands of unprepared "teachers" (31:54).

During the 1950's teaching salaries increased substantially and the single salary schedule became common. This schedule was based on the concept that all teachers who had similar training and experience should receive the same salary regardless of difference in ability. The public, however, being sensitive to the increasing costs of education, have constantly expressed concern about paying good and not-so-good

teachers the same salary. In many parts of the country, various pressure groups have forced legislative action designed to correct this weakness. Much of this forced legislation has resulted in failure and has thus caused classroom teachers to violently oppose attempts to evaluate their performance for the purpose of monetary compensation (31:55).

## I. THE PROBLEM

### Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this research were: (1) to determine the attitude of public school teachers toward teacher evaluation for the purposes of merit pay; and (2) to determine the feasibility of a merit pay program based on these attitudes.

### Hypothesis

It was believed that the results of this study would show that public school teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington, would agree that differences in teaching ability do exist and that outstanding teachers can be identified. The respondents would also reach agreement as to what criteria should be included in teacher evaluation but would not agree on the personnel to be used in the evaluation process.

### Importance of the Study

Much of the present discontent in the teaching profession stems from an unrealistic salary schedule, one that provides for the equal payment of unequals. The single salary schedule found in most public school districts makes no attempt to reward outstanding teachers. For this reason many people are not entering the profession while others are leaving it for the monetary benefits of industry.

It has long been believed that any attempt to improve the quality of education by recognizing and compensating teacher ability would result in setting the profession back a generation or more. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that it is impossible to objectively evaluate professionals, and that teachers for this reason strongly object to programs designed to reward outstanding teachers. Research studies, however, completely refute the preceding statements and clearly show that it is not only possible but feasible to detect various degrees of teacher competency. Such studies also concur that realistic teacher evaluation for the purposes of merit pay has resulted in a definite improvement in the quality of education.

## II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

### Merit Rating

The recent interest in the relationship between teacher

performance and salary compensation has led to a variety of definitions commonly used in explaining merit pay, merit rating, or performance compensation. Those favoring salary differentiation will define merit rating as a systematic method of evaluation of teacher performance to help determine promotions, advancements, and salaries as well as to provide an analysis of strong and weak points of individual teaching practices. Those opposed to merit pay, on the other hand, regard it as a subjective, qualitative judgment of a teacher made administratively by one or more persons, with or without the participation or knowledge of the person rated, for purposes of determining salary only (29:48). Throughout this paper merit pay or merit rating will be defined as a plan by which promotion, increase in pay, and general advancement are determined by the degree of efficiency with which teachers perform their duties.

### Single Salary Schedule

The single salary schedule, which in principle is completely contrasted to that of merit pay, is defined as a plan by which the same salary is paid to all teachers who have the same amount of experience and preparation.

### Teacher Evaluation

Teacher evaluation has long been considered something

unpleasant which causes more trouble than good and should be avoided at all costs. The teaching profession has a long tradition of not facing squarely and realistically the issues involved in the evaluation of competence. It has also failed to attend sufficiently to one of the major means by which good teaching and good teachers may be sought: the complex and important matter of teacher evaluation (33:28). Merit rating has required the classroom teacher to face the fact that teaching can be and is being evaluated. For the purposes of this study, teacher evaluation has been defined as an estimate or measure of the quality of a person's teaching based on such criteria as achievement of pupils, knowledge of subject matter, participation in professional activities, training and experience, and the judgment of school officials, parents, pupils, and the teacher himself.

### III. GENERAL METHOD OF DEALING WITH THE PROBLEM

The general method of dealing with the problem of teacher evaluation for the purposes of merit pay was to first review the current literature related to teacher evaluation and merit pay. This research included (1) authoritative statements as to the importance of the problem, (2) the Utah Study of teacher evaluation, (3) positive attitude studies related to teacher evaluation, (4) negative attitude studies related to teacher evaluation, and (5) studies of teacher evaluation in practice. With the

above information it was possible to construct a questionnaire consisting of items relating to: (1) general statements as to recognition of teaching ability; (2) criteria to be used in teacher evaluation; and (3) personnel to be used as evaluators.

The questionnaire was presented to the principals of the public schools in Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington. The principals, in turn, distributed the questionnaires to the members of their staff with an explanation as to the purpose of the study. The responses were returned in approximately four weeks in pre-paid self-addressed envelopes.

The data received were tabulated and analyzed as follows:

1. Percentage of the total. The percentages of each item on the questionnaire was determined by (1) adding the total responses, (2) dividing the individual responses by the total responses, and (3) multiplying the quotient by 100.
2. Index of agreement. The index or mean response was based on the following point value:
  - a. strongly agree            5
  - b. agree                        4
  - c. undecided                 3
  - d. disagree                    2
  - e. strongly disagree        1

The index of agreement was computed by (1) multiplying the

number of responses in each of the above areas by its point value, (2) adding the total point values, and (3) dividing the total values by the total number of responses.

3. Chi-square. The chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was used to compare the experimental results with those to be expected theoretically. The .01 level of confidence was used as the basis for accepting the hypothesis.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written during the Twentieth Century concerning teacher evaluation as a means of improving the present quality of education. Teachers in general, however, have opposed programs which have attempted to establish evaluative criteria for the purpose of determining various levels of teacher competency. By opposing the evaluation process, the teacher refutes the very thing he stands for in the classroom--the ideal of individual differences (20:6). Recent studies have shown that whether teachers like it or not, teacher evaluation is a pervasive fact of educational life that cannot be ignored.

Since the early 1900's, attempts have been made to evaluate teaching ability for the purpose of merit pay. In the 1920's, it was believed that teacher effectiveness could be scientifically measured. Many attempts, however, resulted in failure, and educators began to question the desirability of attempting to identify "good and bad" teachers (42:302). Since World War II, plans designed to depict individual teacher ability have been widely opposed, and for this reason teaching is one of the few occupations in which there are large numbers of well-trained, relatively highly educated people of both sexes who are locked into their occupations with little chance of egress (42:302).



## I. AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

Most present literature on merit rating agrees with the principle of recognizing teacher competence, but disagrees with the means of evaluation being used. Professor Arthur Combs, of the University of Florida, believes that since good teaching is not always a mechanical matter, it is futile to attempt to tie good teaching with any specific objective criteria. He believes that the teaching profession must embark on a program of research designed to explore the "inner self" (30:34).

In 1960, at its Representative Assembly, the National Education Association spoke out regarding teacher evaluation and merit pay. The Association stated that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession to evaluate the quality of its services. The NEA went on to say that continued research and experimentation will be necessary to develop means of objective evaluation of the performances of all professional personnel, including identification of (a) factors that determine professional competence, (b) factors that determine the effectiveness of competencies, (c) methods of evaluating effective teaching, and (d) methods of evaluating effectiveness through self-realization, personal status, etc. . . . (10:138). The Association concluded that subjective evaluation for the purpose of setting salaries has a negative effect on the educational process, and therefore all plans which require subjective judgment should be avoided (10:138).

The American Association of School Administrators took a similar stand when it officially stated the need for recognizing differences in teacher competencies, and at the same time stated that the science of teacher evaluation has not yet developed a sufficiently valid instrument which justifies adoption of a salary schedule based on individual merit ratings (10:138). The Association went on to say that by attaching merit pay to invalid and unreliable evaluation procedures, education would be set back a generation. In concluding, the Administrators urged systematic experimentation in order that salary could be attached to professional rating of merit (10:138).

The AFL-CIO has taken a more radical stand than the professional education associations and opposes merit pay in theory as well as practice. It believes that paying differential rates is educationally, as well as professionally, unsound (27:154-155). The organization further feels that evaluation of teacher effectiveness would be highly subjective and would lead to a great number of teacher problems. It concludes its argument against merit rating by stating that the net result of such a plan would be teacher insecurity and competition, which would only deter future educational progress (27:155).

The negative viewpoint illustrated in the above statement is also prevalent among those who believe that outstanding teacher ability is rewarded through the voices of the children as they speak of stimulating

classes. This group usually conclude their discussions of the noble teacher by stating that the outstanding teacher receives his merit recognition from the community's acknowledgment of work well done and from his own inner voice which speaks out to him of his dedication and imagination (32:53).

Although much current literature opposes merit rating as a means of rewarding teacher competencies, many progressive educators believe that if the teaching profession is ever going to gain status and prestige, some form of merit payment will have to be adopted. They further believe that the day will come when the public will refuse to support budgets which grant teachers general increments (40:75).

It is the basic premise of those who favor merit rating that it is possible to evaluate the competencies by breaking teaching ability down into general categories. Harold E. Mitzel believes that during the last fifteen years educational research has, by intensively studying classroom behavior, laid the foundation for visible systems for objective evaluation of teaching (30:35). The following Utah study of teacher evaluation indicates that effective programs designed to determine teacher competencies are feasible.

## II. UTAH STUDY OF TEACHER EVALUATION

In 1955, as a result of action by the state legislature, Utah undertook an extensive study of the feasibility of detecting qualitative differences in teaching for the purpose of merit rating. Three school districts were selected for the study and were initially asked to arrive at answers to the following questions. Can teaching be defined and described? Can teaching be evaluated with objectivity and validity? And if these two are answered positively, can evaluation be related to salary (31:54)?

One of the districts that developed an experimental program to identify teaching differences was Provo City. The research called for the development of a code which could be used to analyze all verbal and non-verbal interaction between the teacher and the pupils. Some 973 samples of teaching were accumulated and analytical studies of the samples showed that individual teachers develop their own patterns of behavior. For the purposes of classifying teacher behavior, these patterns were broken down into small segments of behavior, and these segments were codified. The code was eventually refined and broken down into six major divisions called "functions." These functions described how the teacher behaves and are labeled: (1) functions to control, (2) functions that facilitate, (3) functions that develop content

by purpose, (4) functions that serve as personal response, (5) functions of positive affectivity, and (6) functions of negative affectivity (31:56).

The results of the study illustrate that records of teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom, when categorized by adequately trained personnel using the Provo Code, show differences in patterns of effective and ineffective teaching. It was concluded by the research staff that such a code which classifies teacher behavior could be used with the acceptance of teachers, administrators, and school board members, to portray differences in quality of teaching that will merit differences in salary.

After six years of study and an expenditure of more than \$500,000, the Utah Study concluded that the classroom teacher performance could be evaluated and that merit rating would be feasible for districts which established the following conditions:

1. Acceptance by the local professional staff of objective evaluative standards and evaluative procedures.
2. Acknowledgment that the major purpose of a local merit program would be improvement of teaching.
3. Provision of sufficient personnel with adequate training to implement an evaluation program properly.
4. Establishment of a generally accepted basic salary program before merit payments are added to those who qualify.
5. Acceptance of a regular appraisal program for all staff members for improvement purposes, permitting teachers to apply for merit pay if desired.

6. Recognition that, to be effective, merit pay must represent a substantial reward for excellence.
7. Establishment of a merit standard to determine the number who may qualify for merit salaries, with no fixed limits or percentages being imposed.
8. Determination of meritorious teachers on the district level from the analysis of the evaluative data gathered at the school level (13:143).

From the results of the Utah Study, it can be postulated that teaching can be defined, described, and evaluated objectively for the purposes of pay. Many educators, however, still question whether the American teacher would accept evaluation based solely on such a device as the Provo Code. To determine the overall attitudes of the teaching profession toward merit rating and evaluation, many research studies have been conducted by various school systems. The following surveys show general teacher attitude regarding teacher evaluation for the purpose of merit pay.

### III. POSITIVE ATTITUDE STUDIES RELATED TO EVALUATION

#### Georgia Study

The state of Georgia conducted a survey to determine the criteria teachers believed should be evaluated in merit pay. A list of seventeen criteria was developed as a result of an intensive survey of the literature relating to merit pay. The criteria selected reflected characteristics and

standards generally deemed significant in determining teacher effectiveness. The list was sent to 2,637 classroom teachers who were instructed to indicate three of the criteria which they believed should be evaluated in teacher effectiveness (23:338).

The results shown in Table I indicate that teachers involved in the study ranked knowledge of subject matter, achievement of pupils, co-operation, and teacher personality and character as criteria which should be employed in judging teacher effectiveness. It should also be recognized that they rejected such criteria as relationships with the principal, professional activities, type of subjects taught, and extra time. It can also be concluded that as a group, the teachers viewed certain aspects of teaching as being more significant than others.

#### Ability Recognition Study

A study to determine the classroom teacher's attitude toward ability recognition was conducted by asking a group of 151 teachers, residing in twenty states, the following questions:

1. In your opinion do differences exist in teaching ability?
2. Have you been able to identify what, in your opinion, was a difference in teaching ability among teachers with whom you have taught?
3. Do you believe that excellent or outstanding teachers can be identified?

TABLE I

"RANKS ASSIGNED TO CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS"

Criteria	Rank
1. Achievement of pupils	2
3. Teacher personality and character	4
5. Cooperation	3
8. Relationship with the principal	17
10. Knowledge of subject matter	1
12. Participation in professional activities	16
15. Type of subject taught	15
17. Extra time spent daily or weekly	14



4. Do you believe that a group of teachers, if they had the opportunity to work together, could identify outstanding teachers?
5. Do you believe that administrators are capable of identifying outstanding teachers?
6. Do you believe that administrators and teachers working together could identify outstanding teachers?
7. Do you feel that lay people could aid in the identifying of outstanding teachers? (34:78)

The results of the above questions revealed that over ninety-seven per cent of the respondents believed that a difference in teaching ability exists and that it is possible to identify these differences. A majority felt that they were capable of identifying these differences, and that teachers as a group, and teachers and administrators cooperatively, could identify this difference in teaching ability. The majority also believed that outstanding teachers should be rewarded, and that the most acceptable form of reward was not salary, but promotion. Only a small number felt that lay people could aid in the identification process (34:80).

### Conflict of Interest Study

Many educators believe that one of the reasons for the negative teacher attitude toward merit pay is a basic conflict of interests between the teacher and administrator. An attempt to verify this hypothesis was undertaken in a study in which twenty-eight basic assumptions about

merit pay were sent to 196 classroom teachers of which 96 were elementary and 101 secondary. Of the twenty-eight items, fourteen favored merit pay and fourteen were opposed. To test the basic hypothesis, the items authored by administrators were also authored by teachers. The results of the study showed that (1) the attitudes of teachers toward specific statements regarding merit rating were not influenced by who made the statement, whether administrator or teacher, (2) no significant difference in attitude between elementary and secondary teachers, (3) teachers generally accept merit pay in principle but not in implementation, (4) teachers will agree more strongly with statements antagonistic to merit rating than they will disagree with supportive statements, and (5) attitudes of teachers toward merit rating specifically will be influenced by their acceptance or rejection of the general philosophy, and by their belief or disbelief in implementary possibilities of the system (28:217-218). The fact that the above results disproved the hypothesis is of significance since a common interest between the teacher and administrator is essential if any form of ability recognition is to take place.

### Merit Rating Study

A study that illustrates various attitudes toward merit rating was conducted by a Philadelphia steering committee. A questionnaire containing twenty-eight statements concerning merit rating was sent to teachers

in suburban Philadelphia. The statements that appear in Table II were selected from the overall list because they are representative of the basic underlying questions of merit pay and also indicate attitudes of significant importance.

The responses of the Philadelphia teachers show that: (1) poor teachers should not be paid as much as good teachers, (2) ratings by other teachers and administrators tend to be a popularity contest, (3) the basic purpose of merit pay is not that of holding down total salaries of teachers, (4) ways must be found to rate and pay teachers according to their ability, (5) there would be little objection to merit pay if a good competitive basic single salary schedule exists, (6) by not recognizing outstanding teachers, superior teachers are handicapped, (7) preparation and experience should be included in the rating process, and (8) teachers shouldn't be expected to rate their colleagues (38:48).

Several important conclusions can be drawn from the Philadelphia Study. The fact that over seventy-five per cent of the teachers surveyed believed that there is no justification for paying poor teachers the same as good teachers, and that over sixty-three per cent felt a way must be found to rate and pay teachers accordingly, illustrates a significantly positive attitude toward merit pay in principle.

The study also shows that while a definite acceptance of the principle of merit rating exists, a rejection of the program's implementation

TABLE II

TEACHER ATTITUDES ON MERIT RATING  
Based on Percentile Ranking

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. There is no justification for paying poor teachers the same as good teachers	29	47	13	9	2
2. Merit rating by committees of teachers and/or administrators tends to be a popularity contest	24	37	19	18	2
3. The hidden purpose of merit pay is to hold down total salaries paid to teachers	4	10	21	51	14
4. As teaching is a genuine profession, ways must be found to rate and pay teachers accordingly	17	47	15	13	4
5. If basic salary schedules are satisfactory, provisions for merit ratings are not objectionable	13	58	15	13	2
6. Superior teachers are handicapped under schedules that do not recognize their competencies	13	45	13	25	4
7. Since teachers, whatever their merit rating, must assume responsibilities in line with preparation and experience, they should be paid according to these	8	49	22	20	1
8. Administrators shouldn't expect teachers to serve on committees that must rate teachers	32	40	14	11	3

is evident by the fact that sixty-one per cent of the teachers completing the questionnaire believed that ratings by administrators and other teachers leads to a popularity contest. Seventy-two per cent of the teachers also objected to serving on committees whose purpose is to rate other teachers. This negative attitude regarding the rating of colleagues, and of implementation in general, clearly shows that a majority of teachers have little or no confidence in the evaluative process which determines degrees of teaching competence.

The preceding attitude studies indicate that although positive attitudes exist, there is little consensus among classroom teachers as to acceptable evaluative processes. This diversity has resulted in a variety of studies designed to determine, "Why merit plans have been abandoned?"

#### IV. NEGATIVE ATTITUDE STUDIES RELATED TO EVALUATION

The research division of the National Education Association has long tried to obtain information as to the reasons merit pay plans have been abandoned. The research personnel have stated that such information is not only difficult to obtain but has also led to mystifying denials of the prior existence of such plans (41:5). For this reason the studies relating negative teacher attitude toward merit rating plans are of a limited nature.

### Operational Merit Pay Study

A questionnaire study designed to determine the attitudes of teachers in thirty-three major cities having merit pay plans was conducted by a doctoral candidate at Northwestern University. The questionnaire, consisting of questions related to various aspects of merit pay plans, was sent to the superintendents of each of the districts to be surveyed. The superintendents were to distribute the questionnaires to a random sampling of their teachers (41:26). Table III shows the responses of the teachers to five selected questions.

Fifty-three per cent of the teachers surveyed were willing to see the merit rating provision dropped from their present salary schedule. The reason for this opposition can be traced to item two, in which only forty-two per cent of the respondents felt that the administrative staff could fairly and accurately judge outstanding teachers, and item three, where thirty-seven per cent believed that the evaluative ratings were made without prejudice and personal bias. The results of such invalid evaluation has caused a majority of the responding teachers to be of the opinion that merit pay has caused jealousies among the teachers participating in the merit programs. Item five further illustrates the effects of merit rating as only fourteen per cent believed that the merit plan had resulted in professional growth of the staff.

TABLE III

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS REGARDING OPERATIONAL MERIT PAY  
Based on Percentage

Question	Yes	No	No Opinion
1. Would you like to see the merit rating provision dropped from your schedule?	53	41	6
2. Do you find that the administrative staff of your school can fairly and accurately judge above average or outstanding teaching ability?	42	46	12
3. Do you feel that ratings are made without prejudice of personal bias of the rater entering into the rating?	37	54	9
4. Does the operation of your merit plan cause jealousies among your teachers?	65	12	23
5. Does the staff in general feel that the merit plan has stimulated professional growth among the staff?	14	72	14

### Teacher Dissatisfaction Study

In the Spring of 1960, the Arizona TEPS commission surveyed the teachers in the Arizona schools which had merit rating systems. Questions as to whether the teachers were satisfied or not with their existing merit salary schedules were asked. The responses were 5 to 1 against the existing programs (9:16). The dissatisfaction centered around the failure of the procedure to identify and accurately measure true professional merit. It was further believed that this failure to accurately identify outstanding teachers resulted in merit pay plans which lacked the flexibility needed to function in the sensitive area of human relationships (9:17).

Dr. Roy Doyle, past vice-president of the Arizona Education Association illustrated this need for accuracy with a cartoon depicting William Tell's son with the feathered tip of an arrow protruding from his forehead scarcely an inch below the apple. The caption to the cartoon read, "Isn't that close enough?" (9:17). Dr. Doyle thus reasoned that there is no room for error when evaluating teachers who have labels placed on their professional heads indicating degrees of competence.

### Glasgow Study

In January, 1963, the school board of Glasgow, Montana, invited the teachers in the district to study merit rating with a view of



possibly initiating such a program within the district. A teachers' committee, with the help of the state chairman of the merit rating committee, reached the following conclusions after extensive study (21:21-22).

1. Merit rating appears in many forms and is quite hard to define. It is said to be any method of modifying a regular salary schedule in order to pay more to teachers rated superior, and often, to pay less to those rated inferior.
2. The origin of merit pay can be traced to the early 1900's and the chief cause of early failures was a lack of money.
3. The failure rate over the last ten-year period was between 80-90 per cent.
4. There is no proof that students learn more in the merit pay situation.
5. Attaching money to merit as a rating is unsound psychologically.

As a result of the above study, the teachers of Glasgow, Montana, recommended against the adoption of a merit pay plan (21:22). This recommendation, from the basis of conclusion number five above, would seem to indicate a rejection of the basic principle of merit pay.

### Michigan Study

The Michigan Education Association sent questionnaires to thirty-five districts within their state that had some form of merit pay. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the reasons why teachers in the districts opposed their merit schedules. The results of the study showed that the opposition to merit pay in general was directly

related to the definition accepted by the teachers and administrators and that in practice, it is impossible to institute an objective plan for evaluating teacher ability without opening the door to favoritism and injustice (1:558). These results appear to be closely related to the Michigan Education Association's official position on merit pay, one that states:

. . . even though merit rating--the evaluation of individual performance in terms of the duties and responsibilities inherent in a particular position--is essential to quality education, its extension into salary differentiation will not only fail to achieve its purpose, but it will pose a serious threat to the human relationship upon which the proper functioning of a school staff depends for a satisfactory educational program (1:558).

### New York Study

In 1947 the New York legislature passed into law a state merit promotion plan. After several revisions, the last of the merit rating features of the law were rescinded in 1956 (41:41). It is believed that the failure of the overall program can be related to the attitude of New York teachers toward legislated merit pay. A summation of these attitudes are as follows:

1. Teachers know how unsatisfactory are the known means of evaluation.
2. Teachers know that those who would have to do the evaluation, administrators and supervisors, had had little experience and practice in evaluation.
3. They knew that it would be hard to find one set of criteria to apply to all categories of teaching.

4. Teachers of certain subjects doubted the ability of principals and supervisors to rate their work.
5. Teachers knew that however objective the evidence, it must be interpreted by a skilled interpreter of evidence, and thus to some degree subjective.
6. Teachers had been fairly well used to working cooperatively for the good of pupils now realized that a competitive spirit would be developed (41:42-43).

The results of the New York study indicate that the teachers completely opposed the state merit pay plan because they did not believe that teachers could be objectively evaluated. This negativism toward teacher evaluation does not mean, however, that it is not possible to institute workable merit rating systems.

#### V. TEACHER EVALUATION IN PRACTICE

The following merit pay plans illustrate various methods of teacher evaluation, all of which have proved satisfactory. In each case the program set specific goals to further insure the success of the evaluative processes. These goals include:

1. The establishment of an administrative climate which will allow for the sound and equitable appraisal of teaching performance. This will mean that the school administrators and supervisors are so organized that they can devote a major portion of time and thought to evaluation and the improvement of instruction.
2. The development of appraisal procedures with the collaboration of the school system's teaching staff.

3. The assurance that observations connected with performance appraisal are sufficient in number and perceptive enough in depth to assure a sound factual base for sound appraisal.
4. The development and use of counseling techniques between the teacher and appraiser that will be constructively oriented toward teacher growth and improvement.
5. The rewarding of extraordinary performance with extraordinary compensation (42:304).

### Ithaca, New York

The teachers of Ithaca, New York, had been operating under what they believed to be a merit pay plan for nine years before human relationships between the school board and teachers reached the breaking point. The program that had finally broken down was one in which only those who had reached the top of the salary bracket were eligible for merit consideration. To obtain the monetary merit, the teacher must have reached a subjective rating of "1" by their building principal. Since every teacher eligible received the necessary "1" rating, the school board began to question the validity of merit rating. Had it not been for the conviction of several board members that teachers should and could be paid according to their ability, another merit pay plan could have been placed in the "failed" file (25:61).

Extensive research showed that the teachers opposed extensive "good and bad" teacher ratings. They felt that if such areas as training, experience, professional growth, and extra duties were considered, the

award wouldn't be subject to the bias of the person doing the rating. The plan finally arrived at was completely voluntary and was based on the concept that merit pay was a reward not just a right.

Forty per cent of the merit reward was based on the rating of the principal who made periodic visits to the classroom. This rating was based on a criteria check list which the principal discussed with the teacher being observed before arriving at a final decision. A teacher would thus receive a rating of "1" or outstanding, a "1.5" or excellent, a "2" or very good, or a "3" which meant an average rating. The monetary amount of the award was proportional to the rating received, except that a rating below "2" received no additional compensation above his regular salary.

Another forty per cent of the reward was based on what was termed "Professional Credits." These credits were earned by taking college courses, by participating in in-service training, by serving on various school and civic committees, or by travel or other experiences that would increase teaching efficiency. The final twenty per cent of the merit reward was based on total educational training and experience.

To implement the plan, three-year adjustment periods were established. To be eligible for the maximum \$300 reward at the three-year period, a candidate must have had three successful teaching years at Ithaca, a B. A. degree, have earned 21 professional growth credits,

and have received a rating of "2" or higher from the principal. At the six-year level, a teacher must have six years of successful teaching of which three were at Ithaca, must have a Masters or equivalent degree, received a "2" rating, and have obtained 21 professional growth credits during the fourth, fifth, and sixth years. To be eligible for the \$300 award at the nine-year level, each candidate must have had nine years of successful teaching, of which three years must have been at Ithaca, a Master's degree plus six graduate credits, a "2" rating, and 21 professional growth credits during the seventh, eighth, and ninth years. After the eleventh year of teaching, a career level could be obtained, after which time yearly merit awards of \$400 were earned. After fourteen years of teaching, a teacher could be receiving as much as \$2,500 above his regular base salary (25:63-64).

The Ithaca merit rating program has provided an outstanding example of evaluating teacher performance by a variety of means. By including credit for professional growth, training, and experience, in addition to principal evaluation, they have assured a completeness in their evaluative process, one that is unmatched by most rating systems.

#### Lincoln, Massachusetts

Another school system that has worked out a successful plan of teacher evaluation for the purpose of merit pay is the Lincoln School

District in Massachusetts. It is their belief that to upgrade the teaching profession, differences in teaching abilities must be recognized and compensated.

In 1957, Lincoln designed a teacher evaluation program which provided for evaluation of each teacher by December 1 and again after February 15. Each of the evaluation periods required a fixed number of classroom observations followed by evaluator-teacher conferences.

Upon entering the system, the teacher is evaluated by the superintendent, principal, and others with supervisory responsibilities. This evaluation process continues during the first two years after which time an "ad hoc" committee consisting of the principal and three staff members is established. The selection of the three staff members is actually made by the candidate himself. Every teacher submits the names of four staff members that he would like to have on his evaluation committee. The administration will then choose at least three of the four names on the list, two of which will be in the same subject matter area as the candidate being evaluated.

After three successful years of teaching, a teacher in the Lincoln schools is eligible for Associate Career Teacher status and merit compensation. A final status of Career Teacher may be recommended by one's evaluation committee. This status is earned by those whose

evaluation report illustrates exceptional teaching ability, leadership, professional qualities, etc. (12:11-12).

Eight years of rewarding outstanding teachers in Lincoln has resulted in raising the overall quality of education. Longer hours are spent on education by the individual teachers. A greater degree of staff satisfaction is evident, and there appears to be a mutual confidence between individual teachers and between teachers and administrators. The curriculum is constantly undergoing revision, and through additional training many teachers have become qualified to teach more specific courses. The overall effects of recognizing individual differences in teachers has raised professional standards to a new high (12:12).

#### Marblehead Study

"Good teaching is hard to define and under our plan, the teachers have agreed that this is best accomplished by trusting to the evaluator's good judgment" (6:87). This was the attitude of the teachers in the Marblehead School District when it was decided that differences in teaching should be recognized and rewarded. The process of evaluation was proposed by the teaching staff and involved announced and unannounced classroom visits by the building principal. The principal based his ratings of the individual teacher on the following criteria:



1. Personal Fitness: well groomed, good general health, personality, emotional stability, setting good examples of social emotional behavior, respect, discipline, etc. . .
2. Classroom Management: overall organization, class work and individual work, good use of equipment and materials, prompt to check and correct student work, keeps students busy with purposeful work, etc. . . .
3. General Teaching: knowledge of subject, new teaching ideas, critical thinking, individual help to students, conducts profitable class discussions, makes clear assignments, long range plans.
4. Personal Growth: keeps abreast latest developments, studies research, new ideas in curriculum, attends workshops, etc. . . .
5. Professional Attitude: Cooperates in the development of new ideas, follows professional policies, helps create good morale.
6. Other Services: extracurricular activities, good relationships with parents, overall respect (6:86-87).

The Marblehead teachers added their merit pay plan to their already competitive single salary schedule. To compensate those of different ability, the following steps were added to their basic salary schedule: (1) Instructor, (2) Teacher, (3) Associate Master Teacher, and (4) Master Teacher. Although this plan has had a great deal of success in the Marblehead District, evaluation under such a system is more susceptible to subjectivity since only one person is doing the evaluating. The degree to which the principal is professionally competent will determine the value of such a system.

Although the three merit rating plans reviewed used different methods for evaluating the performances of their teachers, they all included characteristics basic to a good merit salary plan. Their characteristics are as follows:

1. A merit pay plan must be understood by all people concerned. This is essential if fair evaluations are to be made and morale is to be maintained.
2. A merit pay plan must be the result of a co-operative effort of the board of education, administration, and teaching staff.
3. A merit pay plan must provide increments only for those teachers who are evaluated as being outstanding. A merit salary plan should not be used as justification for paying lower, inadequate salaries.
4. A merit pay plan must pay meritorious increments which are large enough to reward superior professional service. Less than four hundred dollars or ten per cent of one's salary cannot be considered an adequate distinction for merit work.
5. A merit pay plan should be designed to reward career teachers who plan to remain in the teaching profession. Plans which award inadequate salaries, or which do not take teaching effectiveness into account, violate the basic objectives of merit rating.
6. A merit pay plan must pay merit increments to those teachers judged worthy in terms of predetermined criteria. An individual's evaluations should be available at all times for his review and study.
7. A merit pay plan must have continuity throughout the years. Continual changes create insecurities and doubts.
8. A merit pay plan must be administered by competent personnel who possess the confidences of those being evaluated and who are sufficient in number to do the evaluation job well.

9. A merit pay plan must be explicit and firm in its evaluative criteria. Teachers should have the right to appeal, but the board of education and administration must be consistent and firm in all cases to avoid petty politics or loss of respect for the salary program (35:14).

## VI. LIMITATION OF THE STUDIES

Although the subject of teacher evaluation and merit pay have received widespread coverage in current literature, most of the material is of an opinionated nature. Articles based on research findings are limited, and for this reason the attitude studies appearing in this paper might not be a representative sample of the teaching population. It should also be noted that most research studies on teacher evaluation are often incomplete and immature. This incompleteness makes it almost impossible to reach conclusions regarding the validity of teacher evaluation for the purposes of merit pay. Additional studies presently being conducted by such organizations as the National Education Association and National Association of Secondary School Principals may well determine the future use of merit pay schedules in our public school systems.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS OF RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Many research studies have been conducted to determine teacher attitude toward the various aspects of merit pay. The majority of these studies, however, have not gone into the necessary depth in the basic area of teacher recognition and evaluation. In this study, the questionnaire method was used to collect the data relevant not only to general statements related to teacher recognition but also to the criteria and personnel to be used in the evaluation process.

#### I. METHODS OF RESEARCH

##### The Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information regarding teacher attitude toward teacher evaluation for merit pay purposes in Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington. The questionnaires were presented to the principals of the schools on February 19-22, 1968. Each principal was asked to distribute the questionnaires to the members of his staff with an explanation as to the purpose of the study.

Each set of questionnaires was accompanied by a pre-paid self-addressed envelope.

### Cover Letter

A letter to the principal was attached to each set of questionnaires explaining the purpose of the questionnaire, the controversial nature of the subject under study, and an expression of appreciation for his interest in the matter. A copy of this letter has been included as Appendix B.

### The Follow-up Procedure

Approximately four weeks after the questionnaires had been distributed, the three schools that had not replied were contacted by telephone. They were thanked for their co-operation and asked if they had any further questions pertaining to the filling out and returning of the questionnaires.

### List of the Schools Contacted

The schools and building principals that responded to the questionnaire are listed in Appendix C.

## II. RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Of the 550 questionnaire distributed, 334 or 61 per cent were returned. Of the questionnaires returned, 19 or 6 per cent, were not filled out but contained comments from the respondents. In most cases, these teachers stated that they disagreed with merit pay and would not

complete the questionnaires. Some, however, were more explicit in their comments. Their statements were as follows:

(Respondent Z) Where has merit pay been successful as a method of pay without lowering teacher morale?

(Respondent Y) I am against merit pay and feel that this questionnaire does not present an opportunity to show this.

(Respondent X) I strongly feel that merit pay as such would be about the worst thing that could happen to the teaching profession.

(Respondent W) I do not believe in merit pay and cannot express my feelings by using this form. Every answer needs to be qualified.

(Respondent V) All you're doing is asking for trouble. Who wants to be watched like a kid all the time.

### Level of Confidence

By computing "chi-square," the responses to all items on the questionnaire proved reliable to the .01 level of confidence.

### Teacher Recognition

The first five items on the questionnaire consisted of statements related to teacher recognition and evaluation for merit pay purposes. The statements found in Table IV were selected from a study that had surveyed teachers in some twenty states and were designed to determine teacher attitude toward ability recognition.

Table IV shows that 98 per cent of the respondents believed that differences in teaching ability do exist; 74 per cent also agreed that

TABLE IV

RESPONSES TO GENERAL STATEMENTS REGARDING ABILITY RECOGNITION  
Based on Percentage

Statement	Strongly		Undecided	Strongly		Index of	Level of
	Agree	Agree		Disagree	Disagree		
	5	4	3	2	1		$\chi^2$
1. Differences do exist in teaching ability.	60	38	2	0	0	4.6	.01
2. Excellent or outstanding teachers can be identified.	18	56	19	5	2	3.8	.01
3. Ways must be found to rate and pay teachers according to teaching ability	7	22	39	18	14	2.9	.01
4. Administrators are capable of identifying outstanding teachers.	4	33	33	18	12	3.0	.01
5. A group of teachers, if they had a chance to work together, could identify outstanding teachers.	4	40	30	14	12	3.2	.01

outstanding teachers can be identified. Only 29 per cent of the respondents, however, agreed that ways must be found to rate and pay teachers according to ability. The large "undecided" response to this statement seems to indicate that the teachers surveyed are not ready to accept merit pay in its present form. Items four and five, which provide for evaluation by administrators and teachers, further show that the respondents were not able to reach agreement. Only 30 per cent disagreed with item four and 26 per cent with item five. As in item three, the "undecided" respondents outnumbered those who disagreed. The index of agreement to items three, four, and five illustrates an indecisiveness that could greatly affect the success of future merit pay plans.

### Evaluative Criteria

The uncertainty of the respondents to general statements on teacher recognition was not evident on items relating to criteria to be used. Table V shows teacher response to factors that should be included in the evaluation process.

Since teaching experience and professional training have long been the basis for the single salary schedule, it was not surprising that a majority of the respondents agreed that both should be included in a merit pay plan. Seventy-two per cent of the teachers surveyed also agreed that personality and character should be part of the evaluation process. Items four and five caused some doubt in the minds of those



TABLE V

CRITERIA TO BE USED IN TEACHER EVALUATION  
Based on Percentage

Criteria	Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly	Index of	Level of
	Agree				Disagree		
	5	4	3	2	1		$\chi^2$
1. Teaching experience	21	55	10	10	4	3.8	.01
2. Professional training	20	61	11	5	3	3.9	.01
3. Personality and character	26	46	17	7	4	3.8	.01
4. Participation in professional activities	8	41	22	21	8	3.2	.01
5. Extra time spent without compensation	13	35	23	18	11	3.2	.01
6. Relationships with other teachers	17	47	18	12	6	3.6	.01
7. Ability to supervise teacher aids, etc. . . .	9	44	25	16	6	3.4	.01

responding. Only 49 per cent felt that participation in professional activities should be included when evaluating teacher performance. Extra time spent without compensation was agreed to by but 48 per cent. The undecided response in these two items is illustrated by an index of agreement of only 3.2. Item six, relationships with other teachers, and item seven, ability to supervise teacher aids, etc. . . were both agreed upon by a majority of the respondents.

The results of Table V indicate that there was a general acceptance of the criteria to be used in the overall evaluation process. Table VI shows further that there is also agreement as to what should be included when evaluating teacher classroom performance.

The index of agreement in Table VI, which ranged from 3.6 to 4.3, shows that the teachers involved in the study were able to reach agreement on all five items relating to classroom teaching excellence. Ninety-two per cent of the respondents agreed that knowledge of subject matter should be included in the evaluation process. The area of student discipline also received a positive response as 83 per cent of the teachers agreed as to its importance in evaluating classroom performance. Item three, achievement of pupils, received a majority response although many of the respondents were in doubt as to how this achievement would be measured. Item four, instructional methods, and item five, classroom management, were agreed upon by 75 and 83 per cent respectively, which

TABLE VI  
EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING CRITERIA  
Based on Percentage

Criteria	Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly	Index of	Level of
	Agree				Disagree		
	5	4	3	2	1		$\chi^2$
1. Knowledge of subject matter	43	49	6	1	1	4.3	.01
2. Student discipline	31	52	12	3	2	4.1	.01
3. Achievement of pupils	22	40	18	14	6	3.6	.01
4. Instructional methods	25	50	13	8	4	3.8	.01
5. Classroom management	31	52	11	3	3	4.1	.01

further illustrates that the teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties hold similar views as to what factors should be included when evaluating classroom teaching performance.

### Evaluative Personnel

Although the participating teachers were able to reach agreement on the criteria to be used in the evaluation process, they were not able to agree as to the personnel to do the evaluating. Table VII shows the feelings of the responding teachers toward selected evaluative personnel.

Seventy-one per cent of those responding agreed that the building principal should act as an evaluator when determining teaching performance for merit pay purposes. A majority of the respondents also agreed that the department head should take part in the evaluative process. Item three, evaluation by a committee of colleagues, and item eight, self-evaluation, were not agreed to by a majority, although in both cases the undecided response was 25 per cent or greater. The nature of the response to these two items is related to a general resistance among teachers to become evaluators. Evaluation by the superintendent and school board members was widely opposed whereas evaluation by a school district evaluator left 30 per cent of the respondents undecided. Item seven, student evaluation, was opposed by 56 per cent of the teachers. This negative attitude toward students taking part in the evaluation process can be

TABLE VII  
EVALUATIVE PERSONNEL  
Based on Percentage

Personnel	Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly	Index of	Level of
	Agree				Disagree		
	5	4	3	2	1		2
1. Building principal	21	50	17	4	8	3.7	.01
2. Department head	17	46	20	7	10	3.5	.01
3. Committee of colleagues	10	30	26	17	17	3.0	.01
4. Superintendent or central office staff	4	20	23	27	26	2.5	.01
5. School board members	1	5	15	35	44	1.8	.01
6. School district evaluator	5	20	30	20	25	2.6	.01
7. Students	5	18	21	20	36	2.4	.01
8. Self	11	38	25	11	15	3.2	.01

related to a fear held by most teachers that the evaluation would be nothing but a popularity contest.

The index of agreement in Table VII indicates that the responding teachers at present would readily accept only the building principal and department head as evaluators. It appears, however, that with a little understanding they would also accept evaluation by a committee of colleagues and self-evaluation.

### General Comments by the Respondents

Although no space was allotted on the questionnaire for personal comments, many of the teachers surveyed voiced their opinions rather freely. In most cases the comments were of a negative nature. The following are a few of the more select comments.

(Respondent A) I do not believe teachers can be evaluated properly because of the differences in administration and other evaluating people.

(Respondent B) I believe the whole idea of merit pay is a good one . . . . except that where it has been instituted, it more often serves to depress salaries than to pay for real merit.

(Respondent C) I believe that teachers know what they are doing. There is no place where it is easier to mislead parents and administrators than in teaching. Good teachers will produce in any case. Those who do not will use lower pay as an excuse for doing even less.

(Respondent D) I do believe that there are outstanding teachers and poor teachers and that some distinction should be made. However ideally good merit pay might be, I don't think it can be worked out effectively.

(Respondent E) All this should come in college and if you can't cut the mustard you should be washed out then; not later because you disagree with someone.

(Respondent F) Some teachers make louder "noise" and attract more attention and thus get more credit while others more modest may be just as efficient.

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study was undertaken because of interest in merit pay, a term which has long been viewed with distrust and suspicion by members of the teaching profession. Research showed that this negative attitude was not necessarily the result of a religious opposition to the principle of merit rating, but was more closely associated with implementation. For this reason it was believed that the teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington, would agree to (1) merit pay in principle; (2) criteria to be used in the evaluation process; but would not agree as to who should do the evaluating.

#### I. CONCLUSIONS

##### Teacher Recognition

The study showed that the teachers being surveyed believed that differences in teaching do exist and that outstanding teachers can be identified. They did not, however, agree that ways must be found to rate and pay teachers according to ability or that administrators and teachers could identify outstanding teachers. This lack of agreement was not because of an opposition to the items but because of a large percentage of undecided responses. It is thus believed that these



responses not only reflect the doubts of the respondents toward merit pay implementation, but will also determine the future status of such programs.

### Criteria to be Used in Teacher Evaluation

Of the twelve criteria listed in the questionnaire, only participation in professional activities and extra time spent without compensation failed to receive a majority response from the teachers who responded. The fact that such factors as (1) teaching experience, (2) professional training, (3) personality and character, (4) relationships with other teachers, and (5) supervising teacher aids were so widely accepted illustrates the feasibility of selecting evaluative criteria. Agreement to items relating to classroom excellence ranged from 62 per cent on achievement of pupils to 92 per cent on a knowledge of subject matter. Such responses indicate that the teachers being surveyed would readily accept a variety of criteria that could be used in the evaluation process.

### Personnel to be Used as Evaluators

The responding teachers agreed that the principal and department head should be utilized in the evaluator role. They also completely disagreed to the use of the superintendent, school board members, and students in the evaluation process. Some agreement was indicated on such items as evaluation by a committee of colleagues, by a school

district evaluator, and by self-evaluation. In each of these cases the percentage of undecided response had a significant effect on the achieved results.

### General Conclusion

The study showed that the attitudes of teachers responding to the questionnaire were ones of uncertainty rather than negativism. It is therefore the belief of this writer that it would be feasible to establish merit pay programs in Chelan and Douglas Counties, Washington.

## II. RECOMMENDATIONS

Before any attempt is made to institute merit pay plans in Chelan and Douglas Counties, every teacher should be required to read extensively so as to dispell the many doubts that were so evident throughout the study. It is further recommended that the merit pay plan be the result of a cooperative effort of the teachers and administrators working together and should consist of the following evaluative criteria: (1) teaching experience, (2) professional training, (3) personality and character, (4) participation in professional activities, (5) extra time spent without compensation, (6) relationships with other teachers, and (7) ability to supervise teacher aids. Evaluation within the classroom should include the following factors: (1) knowledge of subject matter, (2) student discipline, (3) achievement

of pupils, (4) instructional methods, and (5) classroom management.

Since competent evaluative personnel are a prerequisite to the evaluation process, it is recommended that the following be included:

(1) building principal, (2) department head, (3) committee of colleagues, (4) self-evaluation. All evaluation should be followed up by a conference in which the teacher being evaluated can appeal his case.

Once the program has been established, it is suggested that there be continuous evaluation to insure that the objectives and purposes are being met. If and when the participating teachers lose confidence in the overall program, it should be immediately abandoned.

Finally, it is hoped that this report has added some insight into various aspects of merit pay and will encourage its readers to further research the subject.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Auld, Ute. "Education's Longest Running Controversy," Michigan Education Journal, 40:558, April, 1963.
2. Beehler, Elwood. "A Voluntary Merit Pay Plan," Clearing House, 40:23-26, September, 1965.
3. Bell, Tarrel H. "Twenty Keys to Successful Merit Rating," American School Board Journal, 144:14-15, March, 1962.
4. Bennet, Margaret. "A Matter of Merit," Phi Delta Kappan, 46:225-6, January, 1965.
5. Brain, G. "Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness," NEA Journal, 54:35-6, February, 1965.
6. Coleman, Aura W. "Teacher Pay--How and Why Merit Came to Marblehead," School Management, 8:84-87, April, 1964.
7. Davis, H. "What Teachers Say About Evaluation of Teachers," NEA Journal, 54:37-39, February, 1965.
8. Davis, Larry. "A Merit Pay Plan for a Small School District," School Management, 5:86-88, October, 1961.
9. Doyle, Roy P. "Upgrading Professional Competence--Is Merit Rating the Answer?" Arizona Teacher, 49:16-17, November, 1960.
10. "Do You Know the Score on Merit Rating? It's Changing," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:138, January, 1961.
11. Engelhardt, N. L. "A Break-Through in Teacher Pay," School Management, 5:38-41, July, 1961.
12. Filbin, Robert L. "Merit Salary--A Realistic Approach to Upgrading the Teaching Profession," American School Board Journal, 150:11-12, April, 1965.
13. Furse, Bernarr. "Merit Pay is Feasible and Sometimes Desirable," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:143-47, January, 1961.

14. Geissinger, John B. "How They Handle Merit Pay," School Management, 5:54-57, June, 1961.
15. Gerber, Irving, "In Defense of a Merit System," High Points, 46:62-63, March, 1964.
16. Gibson, Robert C. "Paying for Pedagogical Power," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:148, January, 1961.
17. Hanson, Earl H. "More Merit Salary Schedules are Coming," Education, 86:382, February, 1966.
18. Hartsook, El A. "Merit Rating--Key to Better Pay and Better Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:157-60, January, 1961.
19. Himmelberger, William. "A New Approach to Merit," National Association of Secondary School Principals, 45:12-15, October, 1961.
20. Howsam, Robert B. "Teacher Evaluation: Facts and Folklore," The National Elementary Principal, 43:6, November, 1963.
21. Isaacs, Urban. "Merit Rating Study in Glasgow--A Report," Montana Education, 39:21-22, April 20, 1963.
22. Karam, Irvin A. "Merit-Rating Salary Plans in Public School Systems of the United States, 1955-56," Journal of Educational Research, 53:144-48, December, 1959.
23. Kingston, Albert. "Criteria which Teachers Believe Should be Evaluated in Merit Rating," Peabody Journal of Education, 41:338-42, May, 1964.
24. Kleinmann, Jack H. "Merit Pay--The Big Question," National Education Association Journal, 52:42-44, May, 1963.
25. Mason, James I. "How to Rescue a Merit Pay Plan," School Management, 8:61-64, October, 1964.
26. McKeawn, L. W. "On Merit Rating," Phi Delta Kappan, 48:77, October, 1966.

27. Megel, Carl J. "Merit Rating is Unsound," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:154-157, January, 1961.
28. Michael, Dr. "Attitudes Toward Merit Rating as a Function of Conflict of Interest," Journal of Teacher Education, 15:210-218, June, 1964.
29. Mitchell, Jerry B. "Merit Rating--Past, Present, and Perhaps," Phi Delta Kappan, 43:139-142, January, 1961.
30. Mitzel, Harold E. "Can We Measure Good Teaching Objectively?" National Education Association Journal, 53:34-36, January, 1964.
31. Moffitt, J. C. "Differences in Teaching: Can They Be Recognized and Compensated?" The National Elementary Principal, 43:54-56, November, 1963.
32. Olsen, James. "The Case Against Merit Pay," High Points, 45:48-53, April, 1963.
33. Openshaw, Karl. "Teacher Evaluation: A Point of View," The National Elementary Principal, 43:28-31, November, 1963.
34. Ralston, Mack A. "Classroom Teachers and Merit Rating," National Association of Secondary School Principals, 41:78-80, October, 1957.
35. Reiels, Dr. "An Approach to Merit Rating," American School Board Journal, 144:14-15, March, 1962.
36. Rigdon, Keith. "That Ugly Ogre, Merit Pay," Clearing House, 39:117, October, 1964.
37. Snow, Robert H. "Anxieties and Discontents in Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan, 44:318-321, April, 1963.
38. Tate, Merle, and Charles Haughey. "Teachers Rate Merit Rating," Nation's Schools, 62:48-50, September, 1958.
39. Thompson, Michael L. "The Development of a Scale to Rate the Relative Significance of Secondary School Teaching Practices," Journal of Educational Research, 57:72-76, October, 1962.

40. Tompkins, Virgil E. "Let's Stop All This Fuss About Merit Rating," Clearing House, 37:72-76, October, 1962.
41. "Why Have Merit Plans for Teachers' Salaries Been Abandoned?" NEA Research Division, 1961, p. 51.
42. Wilking, Vincent S. "Merit Pay and Better Teaching," Teacher College Record, 63:297-304, January, 1962.



## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

Questionnaire to Determine the Attitudes of Public School Teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties Toward Teacher Evaluation for the Purpose of Merit Pay.

## I. Background teaching experience

Present School District \_\_\_\_\_  
 Grade Level \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of Years Experience (total) \_\_\_\_\_ (in present district) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Age: \_\_\_\_\_  
       up to 30        31-40        41-50        over 50  
 Sex: Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_

II. Directions: Please circle the appropriate number at the right on the basis of the following:

- 5 - Strongly Agree
- 4 - Agree
- 3 - Undecided
- 2 - Disagree
- 1 - Strongly Disagree

A. The following statements are related to teacher evaluation for merit pay purposes.

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Differences do exist in teaching ability.  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2. Excellent or outstanding teachers can be identified.   | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. Ways must be found to rate and pay teachers according to teaching ability.                       | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 4. Administrators are capable of identifying outstanding teachers.                                  | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 5. A group of teachers, if they had a chance to work together, could identify outstanding teachers. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

B. If merit pay should be instituted, the following factors should be used.

1. Teaching experience	5	4	3	2	1
2. Professional training	5	4	3	2	1
3. Personality and character	5	4	3	2	1
4. Participation in professional activities	5	4	3	2	1
5. Extra time spent without compensation	5	4	3	2	1
6. Relationship with other teachers	5	4	3	2	1
7. Ability to supervise teacher aids, etc.	5	4	3	2	1
8. Excellence in teaching					
a. knowledge of subject matter	5	4	3	2	1
b. student discipline	5	4	3	2	1
c. achievement of pupils	5	4	3	2	1
d. instructional methods	5	4	3	2	1
e. classroom management	5	4	3	2	1

C. The following personnel, using such means as scheduled and unscheduled classroom observation, conferences, and reports, should act as evaluators when determining teacher performance for merit pay purposes.

1. Building principal	5	4	3	2	1
2. Department head	5	4	3	2	1
3. Committee of colleagues	5	4	3	2	1
4. Superintendent or central office staff	5	4	3	2	1
5. School board members	5	4	3	2	1
6. School district evaluator	5	4	3	2	1
7. Students	5	4	3	2	1
8. Self	5	4	3	2	1

## APPENDIX B

February 19, 1968

Dear Principal:

The recent interest in the relationship between teacher performance and salary compensation has resulted in various attempts at establishing systems of "merit pay." These programs, which have included a variety of measures designed to evaluate individual teacher performance, have met with very limited success.

It is my belief that this lack of success can be directly related to the public school teacher's present attitude toward various aspects of merit pay.

The enclosed questionnaire is designed to determine the attitudes of the public school teachers in Chelan and Douglas Counties toward teacher evaluation for merit pay purposes.

I'd appreciate it very much if you would distribute these questionnaires to the members of your staff and return them to me at your earliest possible convenience.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and if you would like a copy of the results of this study, check the appropriate box below.

send

do not send

Sincerely yours,

Jerry Robertson

## APPENDIX C

The following is a list of schools in Chelan and Douglas Counties that took part in the study.

School	Building Principal
1. Cashmere High School	Mr. Glenn Fleming
2. Cashmere Vale Elementary	Mr. Con Lautensleger
3. Chelan High School	Mr. Vernon Risley
4. Eastmont High School	Mr. Lynn Easton
5. Eastmont Sterling Junior High	Mr. Beale Galey
6. Eastmont East Wenatchee Elementary	Mr. Richard Allstot
7. Eastmont Grant Elementary	Mr. James Buchanan
8. Eastmont Kenroy Elementary	Mr. Gene Anderson
9. Eastmont Robert E. Lee Elementary	Mr. Clair Boys
10. Eastmont Rock Island Elementary	Mr. James Malloy
11. Entiat High School	Mr. Ray Smith
12. Entiat Paul Rumberg Elementary	Mr. Ray Smith
13. Leavenworth High School	Mr. Carleton Rice
14. Manson High School	Mr. Leon Horton
15. Manson Elementary	Mr. William Yacinich
16. Peshastin-Dryden High School	Mr. Lawrence Kerns
17. Waterville Junior-Senior High	Mr. Walter Roys
18. Wenatchee High School	Mr. Tom Byrne
19. Wenatchee Orchard Junior High	Mr. Paul Pugh
20. Wenatchee Pioneer Junior High	Mr. Dan Wile
21. Wenatchee Columbia Elementary	Mr. Wilbur Brown
22. Wenatchee Lewis and Clark Elementary	Mr. Charles Best
23. Wenatchee Lincoln Elementary	Mr. Keith Haskins
24. Wenatchee Sunnyslope Elementary	Mr. Bud Sears
25. Wenatchee Washington Elementary	Mr. Kenneth Shamberger
26. Wenatchee Whitman Elementary	Mr. Bud Sears