

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACULTY
SALARY SCHEDULES IN RELATION TO JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

by

ARCHIE CHARLES RINGGENBERG

B. S. Kansas State College, Pittsburg, 1962

9984

A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirement for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Physical Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Approved by:

T. M. Evans CRK
Major Professor

LD
2668
R4
1972
R55
copy 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Thomas M. Evans of the Physical Education Department for his time and professional advice in the development of this report.

My deepest appreciation goes to my wife, Verlene, for her encouragement and understanding during the accumulation of data, writing, and oral examination of this report, without which this paper could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Statement of the Purpose	1
Rationale of the Problem	2
Delimitations of the Problem	2
Limitations of the Problem	3
II. TREATMENT OF DATA	4
Selection of Questions	4
Coding Procedures	4
Statistical Methods	6
III. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	7
Survey Results	7
Response by Institutions	8
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	28
Conclusions of Correlations	28
Conclusions of Means	29
Conclusions of Salary Increases and Promotions	33
Implications of the Problem	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	35
APPENDIX	36
ABSTRACT	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In our capitalistic society, individuals are concerned about financial incomes to support the material, physical, and emotional needs of himself and his family. Individuals seek work opportunities which provide income to meet the needs of the family. The type of work, pay, hours, and such become of interest to the family provider.

Statement of the Problem

The teaching profession has voiced concern that salaries are inadequate but responsibility and hours excessive. To scientifically gather information related to this opinion and validate this long heard statement, this report was undertaken.

The salary of teachers in higher education institutions in relation to professional qualifications, teaching hours, other hours, faculty rank held, and cost of living in a specific geographic location is considered essential in pursuit of support or denial of this statement. In addition, the methods used by institutions for granting salary increases, awarding such increases, and awarding professional promotions is essential. The physical education faculty was selected as the resource group to provide facts in support or denial of the claim of inadequate pay and excessive responsibilities.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this report is to collect and analyze general

information of physical education staff members concerning their faculty rank, degree, teaching credit hours, and clock hours as these factors pertain to salaries. Additional information collected includes bases for professional promotion, bases for salary increases, and methods of awarding such increases. All data was secured from physical education department personnel in colleges and universities having populations of 10,000 or more students.

Rationale of the Problem

Administrators of physical education have few facts to aid them in determining what salaries should be paid to their staff members. There is little concrete evidence to point out how professional promotions and awards are given. It is hoped that the materials gathered in this problem may aid an administrator in the decisions of salary bases, increases, and job promotions according to his particular location.

Delimitations of the Problem

One hundred eight colleges and universities were identified from The Blue Book of College Athletics, 1970-71 with students populations of over 10,000 populations. Both state supported and privately endowed institutions were included.

A three-part questionnaire was constructed designed to provide that specific information necessary to analyze the methods by which institutions determine basic salary schedules, salary increases, and faculty promotions.

Copies of the questionnaire as well as stamped, self addressed

envelopes were mailed to the Physical Education Department Chairman of each college and university included in the survey. A copy of the questionnaire plus the list of colleges and universities polled and their student populations is provided in the Appendix.

Limitations of the Problem

This study is limited by several factors. The number of questionnaires returned could have been substantially improved possibly by the use of a shorter questionnaire. A second limiting factor was the failure of department chairmen to provide information on both male and female staff members. Sections D and E of the questionnaire tended to be confusing to some persons answering the sections and should be explained differently if used in some future research.

CHAPTER II

TREATMENT OF DATA

Selection of Questions

Questions to be placed in the questionnaire were selected in anticipation of the factors which might influence the salaries physical education staffmembers receive. An interview with T. M. Evans, the chairman of Kansas State University Department of Physical Education, 1971, aided the author greatly in selecting questions concerning the bases for staff promotions and salary increases as well as the methods of awarding such increases.

Coding Procedures

The data in the following pages has been carefully coded to prevent lengthy explanations of each item in the body of this report. The codes were also used for the computer analysis of the results. Explanations of the coding procedures are as follows:

A. Each school is coded by three numbers, two numbers followed by a decimal point and a third number. A school designated by the first number one (1) indicates a school with 10,000 to 15,000 student population. A school designated by the first number two (2) indicates a school with a population of more than 15,000 students. The second number of the school code is an arbitrary number used only to differentiate between schools. The third number designates male or female staff. Male staff is

shown by decimal point one (.1); female staff, by decimal point two (.2).

B. The vertical and horizontal columns found on the correlation tabulations are referred to as A, B, C, etc. The letters' definitions are as follows:

- A. faculty rank
- B. highest degree held
- C. major field credit hours taught
- D. required credit hours taught
- E. total clock hours per week
- F. nine months salary
- G. adjusted salary (nine month's salary adjusted by the cost of living index based on high, middle, or low income bracket and geographical location¹).

C. Faculty ranks were designated the following numerical values because of computerized computations:

- 1 Professor
- 2 Associate Professor
- 3 Assistant Professor
- 4 Instructor
- 5 Assistant Instructor
- 6 Graduate Assistant

D. The highest degree held by physical educators was designated by the following numerical values:

¹See Appendix B.

- 1 Bachelor of Arts
- 2 Bachelor of Education
- 3 Bachelor of Science
- 4 Master of Science
- 5 Master of Arts
- 6 Master of Education
- 7 Doctor of Education
- 8 Doctor of Philosophy
- 9 Physical Therapist

E. The actual numerical value was used for the remaining columns C through G.

(Note that because of the way numerical values have been assigned, a negative high correlation between rank and salary, for example, still shows that the higher ranking staff member would receive higher pay.)

Statistical Methods

Using the above coding procedures, Pearson's Product Moment correlations were used on all the appropriate data. Arithmetic means were also computed. All statistical work was done by computer at the Kansas State University Computer Science Department.

CHAPTER III

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Survey Results

One hundred eight institutions received questionnaires. Sixteen institutions returned completed questionnaires. Seven institutions returned incomplete questionnaires and could not be used. Eighty institutions did not respond. Five institutions returned unanswered questionnaires with reasons why it was not completed.

Table 1 shows the survey results by response and percentage.

Table 1
Survey Results

Schools Contacted	<u>Number</u> 108	<u>Percent</u> 100%
Returned Completed	16	15%
Returned Incomplete	7	6%
Returned with Regrets	5	5%
Not Returned	80	74%

The poor response could have been reduced by a shorter questionnaire requiring only 30 minutes answering time. The sensitive information requested could have limited the number of responses itself. Sections of the questionnaire may have been confusing and should be clearly

explained in future research. The failure of department chairman to respond in student academic requirements limited the amount of data available.

Response by Institutions

The information received from the returned questionnaires was analyzed and recorded. Correlations of the six previously identified columns concerning rank, degree, etc. were computed using the Pearson Product Moment correlation formula. Means of the six columns were computed by institution and will be included with the correlations.

Significant correlations or means will be mentioned with the institution response. Response concerning bases for salary increases, methods of awarding salary increases, and bases for professional promotion will be discussed for each institution.

Institution identification, code data, and definitions may be referred to in previous pages of the report. The coded * identifies significant correlation of .05, and the coded ** identifies significant correlations of .01.

INSTITUTION 11.1

Correlations reveal that among the eighteen faculty members the higher the faculty rank, the higher the salary.

Mean figure indicate the average teaching load involves one hour of major course instruction and four hours of required course instruction.

The average faculty rank among the eighteen faculty members is Assistant Professor. The average degree held is the Master of Arts.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.17
B	-0.491*	-					4.89
C	-0.217	0.199	-				.72
D	-0.170	-0.351	-0.127	-			3.50
E	-0.593*	0.573*	0.040	-0.196	-		44.8
F	-0.932**	0.499*	0.188	0.121	0.555*	-	13,175
G	-0.932**	0.501*	0.188	0.115*	0.553*	0.999**	12,354
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 11.2

Correlations reveal that among the eleven faculty members the more total hours expended the higher the salary, and lower ranking teachers instruct more of the required physical education courses.

Mean figures indicate the average faculty member teaches only one hour of physical education major courses.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.55
B	-0.316	-					3.73
C	0.286	0.112	-				.36
D	0.776**	-0.316	-0.144	-			4.55
E	-0.278	0.259	0.417	-0.174	-		20.73
F	-0.249	0.154	0.078	0.124	0.842**	-	9,875
G	-0.270	0.167	0.070	0.107	0.840**	0.999**	9,249
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are seniority for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. All other faculty ranks salary increases are negotiated annually.

Methods of awarding salary increases are automatic increases for service in various amounts by rank and negotiated increases up to 6% in addition to the automatic raise.

Rank	Yearly Amount
1	\$500
2	400
3	350
4	200

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research, and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 12.1

Correlations reveal among the seven faculty members the salary is related directly to faculty rank.

Mean figures indicate the typical rank is Associate Professor, required courses taught amount to less than one hour, ten hours are taught in the major course classes, and the typical degree is a Doctor of Education. The mean figures indicate a very high faculty rank and high professional degree attainment. This institution was high quality individuals instructing the major physical education courses.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.00
B	-0.123	-					6.86
C	0.525	0.297	-				9.86
D	0.0	0.0	0.0	-			0.00
E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-		40.0
F	-0.921**	-0.114	-0.755	0.0	0.0	-	13,257
G	-0.921**	-0.114	-0.755	0.0	0.0	-	14,185
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 12.2

No correlations of significance.

Mean figures indicate the four faculty members teach no required courses.

Bases for salary increases are merit as interpreted by the department head.

Methods of awarding salary increases are automatic 5% annual increases for all full time faculty members.

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees research, teaching efficiency, or publications.

INSTITUTION 13.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty-one faculty members higher faculty rank results in higher salary.

Average degree is a Master of Science.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.52
B	-0.417	-					4.95
C	-0.307	0.644	-				2.95
D	0.115	-0.555**	-0.693**	-			5.10
E	0.650**	-0.608**	-0.635**	0.458*	-		18.5
F	-0.870**	0.438*	0.235	-0.007	-0.527*	-	10,100
G	-0.897**	0.655**	0.472*	-0.289	-0.688**	0.842**	11,498
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

INSTITUTION 13.2

No correlations of significance.

Only two teachers, both Associate Professors, one has a Master of Science degree, the other a Bachelor of Science degree.

Bases for salary increases is a merit rating system for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other salaries are negotiated.

Salary increases are awarded in set amounts by rank.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	\$1,000
2	750
3	500
4	250

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research, and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 14.1

Correlations reveal among the thirty-seven faculty members rank is related to salary.

No significant mean data

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.65
B	-0.447**	-					5.41
C	-0.532**	0.305	-				4.87
D	0.466**	-0.187	-0.693**	-			5.08
E	-0.426**	0.008	0.470**	0.000	-		13.6
F	-0.951**	0.366*	0.513**	-0.496**	0.430**	-	10,941
G	-0.939**	0.352*	0.498**	-0.460**	0.427**	0.992**	11,119
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Bases for salary increases is a Union controlled % increase.

Increases are awarded at 6.5% for all ranks annually.

Bases for professional promotion is high degree, or teaching efficiency for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. All other ranks depend on contributions to the institution for any increase.

INSTITUTION 15.1

Correlations of the fifteen faculty members reveal higher salaries result from higher rank achievement.

No significant mean data, as the institution balances the required course instruction time with major course instruction. The eighteen total class clock hours, if valid, are lower than the normal institution.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.80
B	-0.385	-					5.40
C	0.661**	-0.025	-				2.80
D	-0.460	0.443	-0.523	-			3.53
E	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-		18.0
F	-0.885**	0.326	-0.674**	0.484	0.0	-	12,151
G	-0.883**	0.322	-0.671**	0.486	0.0	0.999**	13,372
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Bases for salary increases for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 is merit and an annual scheduled increase.

Salary increases are awarded from \$100 to \$700 per individual.

Professional promotions are awarded for degree attainment and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 16.1

No significant data of correlations or means.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.52
B	-0.443*	-					5.52
C	0.0	0.0	-				0.00
D	-0.302	0.337	0.0	-			19.0
E	-0.458*	0.538*	0.0	0.559**	-		23.1
F	-0.643**	0.198	0.0	0.007	0.078	-	13,372
G	-0.648**	0.196	0.0	0.001	0.072	0.999**	13,133
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Salary increases are based on merit for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4.
Other ranks based on evaluation and merit.

Salary increases are awarded by legislation.

Professional promotions are based on research, teaching efficiency, and service to institution.

INSTITUTION 17.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty three faculty members higher faculty ranks result in higher salary, the higher faculty rank results in teaching more major courses, the higher the rank the less required courses taught, and the more major courses any teacher instructs, the fewer required courses the instructor must teach.

Mean figures reveal a balanced teaching load carried by all teaching personnel.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.664**	-					5.44
C	-0.774**	0.666**	-				4.74
D	0.764**	-0.449*	-0.853**	-			4.61
E	0.235	-0.362	0.008	-0.079	-		12.2
F	-0.717**	0.499*	0.428*	-0.582**	-0.269	-	13,403
G	-0.717**	0.499*	0.428*	-0.582**	-0.269	-	13,135
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases is a merit system controlled by the State College Board for all faculty ranks.

Method of awarding salary increases were not answered in the survey.

Bases for professional promotion is attainment of higher degrees, research for rank 1 and 2, and teaching efficiency for all faculty ranks.

INSTITUTION 21.1

Correlation data reveals among the sixteen faculty members the higher faculty rank teaches most major courses, the more major courses taught the higher the salary, and the more major courses taught the less the total hours per week. The more major courses taught the less time is spent teaching required courses, higher ranking teachers teach fewer required courses, and the more required hours taught the salary will be lower. Finally, the higher in rank the lower the number of total hours per week, higher the rank, the higher salary, and the more total hours per week the lower the salary.

Mean figures reveal no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.56
B	-0.539*	-					6.19
C	-0.947**	0.611*	-				5.25
D	0.848**	-0.643**	-0.934**	-			12.2
E	0.919**	-0.589*	-0.939**	0.919**	-		18.2
F	-0.809**	0.733**	0.847**	-0.818**	-0.793**	-	10,817
G	-0.821**	0.731**	0.860**	-0.824**	-0.806**	0.999**	12,554
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 21.2

Correlations reveal among the eight faculty members the higher in rank, the higher the salary, higher ranking teachers instruct more major courses, and teach fewer required courses.

The more major course hours instructed the fewer required courses were taught, and the salary was higher. Finally, the more required courses instructed the more total hours were required weekly.

Means figures demonstrated the average faculty rank is an Assistant Professor

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.13
B	-0.487	-					6.00
C	-0.931**	0.427	-				4.88
D	0.867**	-0.330	-0.854*	-			12.5
E	0.603	0.115	-0.487	0.809*	-		15.9
F	-0.763*	0.666	0.823*	-0.721*	-0.269	-	9,639
G	-0.765*	0.678	0.819*	-0.721*	-0.272	0.999**	11,060
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are merit evaluations for faculty rank 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other ranks were not mentioned.

Methods of awarding salary increases varies in relation to existing funding. No breakdown figures are available.

Bases for professional promotion is degree attainment, research,

teaching efficiency, and professional attitude.

INSTITUTION 22.1

Correlation figures reveal among the twelve faculty members the higher the faculty rank, the higher the salary. Also, the more total hours expended per week the larger the salary.

Mean figure provided no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.83
B	-0.107	-					5.25
C	-0.196	0.173	-				6.68
D	0.381	-0.498	-0.403	-			3.17
E	-0.503	-0.186	0.447	-0.128	-		39.8
F	-0.786**	-0.290	0.327	-0.052	0.723**	-	11,119
G	-0.790**	-0.282	0.323	-0.057	0.720**	0.999**	12,052
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 22.2

Correlation figures reveal among the six faculty members the higher faculty rank instructors receive higher salaries.

Mean figures provided no significant data, as the average faculty rank is Assistant Professor, average degree attained is Master of Arts, and total clock hours amounts to thirty two hours per week.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.136	-					5.17
C	-0.532	-0.285	-				6.67
D	0.479	-0.521	-0.584	-			2.83
E	-0.595	-0.561	0.554	0.075	-		32.8
F	-0.938*	0.231	0.365	-0.458	0.595	-	9,145
G	-0.935*	0.239	0.349	-0.451	0.588	0.999**	9.923
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increase are teaching, research, service to department, and publications for rank 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Salary increases are awarded, but no set amount annually.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency and service to institution.

INSTITUTION 23.1

Correlations reveal that among the twenty-five faculty members the higher rank teachers receive higher salaries, and the more major courses instructed the fewer required courses are taught by one individual.

Mean figures provided no significant data, except this institution has the highest mean figure for total hours expended per week. Forty eight hours is more than any other institution answering the questionnaire.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.96
B	-0.173	-					5.00
C	-0.218	0.535**	-				8.24
D	0.316	-0.525**	-0.823**	-			2.88
E	0.075	0.505*	0.343	-0.061	-		48.8
F	-0.751**	0.059	0.173	-0.115	0.038	-	12,594
G	-0.744**	0.057	0.174	-0.115	0.041	0.999**	13,715
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 23.2

Correlations reveal that among the 10 faculty members higher rank results in higher salary, and the more required hours taught the fewer major courses would be instructed by one individual.

Mean figures provided no significant data.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.10
B	-0.066	-					4.70
C	0.167	0.464	-				7.30
D	-0.142	-0.479	-0.997**	-			4.80
E	-0.277	-0.417	0.237	-0.236	-		48.0
F	-0.857**	-0.052	-0.315	0.288	0.065	-	10,642
G	-0.850**	-0.040	-0.296	0.267	0.068	0.999**	11,654
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases is merit controlled, or equivalent to the annual cost of living increase.

Method of awarding salary increases is annually for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4. Other faculty no higher than 8% annually.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency and service.

INSTITUTION 24.1

Correlations among the thirty four faculty members reveal higher rank results in: higher degrees, fewer required courses, more total hours, and higher salary. Higher degree individuals receive higher salaries and teach fewer required courses. The more required courses an individual teaches the fewer total hours spent per week, and the lower the salary.

Means figures reveal assistant professor is the average faculty rank.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						4.38
B	-0.894**	-					4.32
C	-0.101	0.128	-				8.84
D	0.958**	-0.907**	-0.060	-			3.35
E	-0.896**	0.741**	0.005	-0.880**	-		32.5
F	-0.976**	0.859**	0.001	-0.966**	0.932**	-	7,279
G	-0.976**	0.859**	0.017	-0.966**	0.931**	0.999**	7,977
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 24.2

Correlation figures reveal among the twelve faculty members the higher rank individuals receive the higher salary.

Mean data reveals teachers have less than two hours of required course instruction per individual.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.25
B	-0.293	-					4.33
C	-0.322	-0.025	-				8.75
D	0.546	-0.151	-0.550	-			1.83
E	-0.651*	0.042	0.286	-0.614*	-		38.0
F	-0.897**	0.333	0.189	-0.368	0.657*	-	11,375
G	-0.884**	0.344	0.195	-0.360	0.631*	0.998**	12,331
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are seniority for faculty ranks 1 and 2, merit for ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4, and duties versus teaching load for 1, 2, 3, and 4 faculty ranks.

Methods for awarding salary increases were not conclusive.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency, and professionalism of the individual.

INSTITUTION 25.1

Correlations reveal among the twenty two faculty members faculty rank results in higher salary.

No significant mean data.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.14
B	-0.696**	-					4.77
C	0.415	-0.464*	-				3.50
D	-0.484*	0.555**	-0.238	-			5.50
E	-0.290	0.154	-0.213	-0.089	-		28.8
F	-0.827**	0.706**	-0.666**	0.498*	0.372	-	11,294
G	-0.830**	0.700**	-0.671**	0.494*	0.370	0.999**	12,039
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 25.2

Correlation among the 16 faculty members reveal rank relates to higher salary, higher the degree the fewer major courses are taught, the more major courses taught the less required courses are assigned, the more major courses taught the less the salary, and the more total hours expended the higher the salary.

No significant mean data.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.18
B	-0.585*	-					4.88
C	0.792**	-0.779**	-				8.50
D	-0.319	0.616*	-0.751**	-			7.44
E	-0.699**	0.357	-0.483	-0.148	-		27.8
F	-0.923**	0.644**	-0.781**	0.269	0.795**	-	10,245
G	-0.930**	0.645**	-0.784**	0.281	0.779**	0.999**	10,882
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are merit for all faculty ranks.

Methods of awarding salary increases are:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1	5%
2	3%
3	2%
4	2%

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment and teaching efficiency for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4.

INSTITUTION 26.1

Correlations reveal among the fourteen faculty members the more total hours spent per week the more salary received by the individual.

Mean figures indicate the average degree is a Master of Education.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						3.00
B	-0.516	-					6.29
C	-0.407	0.214	-				3.29
D	0.524	-0.074	-0.672**	-			1.71
E	-0.632*	0.410	0.059	-0.096	-		23.9
F	-0.737**	0.543*	0.406	-0.373	0.829**	-	10,600
G	-0.738**	0.545*	0.406	-0.373	0.827**	-	10,643
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

Bases for salary increases for all faculty rank is merit evaluation.

Method of awarding salary increases for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 are annual amounts of 9% per rank salary.

Bases for professional promotions are degree attainment and teaching efficiency.

INSTITUTION 27.1

Correlations reveal among the fourteen faculty members the higher faculty rank receives the higher salary, and the higher faculty rank teaches more major courses.

Mean figures indicate required courses are taught less than one hour a week per individual.

	<u>Correlation</u>						<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.14
B	-0.775**	-					6.79
C	0.806**	-0.659*	-				10.2
D	0.457	-0.508	0.292	-			0.29
E	0.251	-0.290	-0.191	0.075	-		22.2
F	-0.514	0.015	-0.330	-0.176	-0.023	-	18,057
G	-0.513	0.019	-0.330	-0.178	-0.024	0.999**	17,532
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

INSTITUTION 27.2

Correlation reveal among the eight faculty members the more major course hours of instruction the more total hours will be spent per

week.

Mean figures indicate required courses are taught less than one hour per week.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.63
B	-0.672	-					6.75
C	0.631	-0.587	-				12.0
D	0.0	0.0	0.0	-			0.00
E	0.452	-0.510	0.892**	0.0	-		22.3
F	-0.397	-0.048	-0.491	0.0	-0.205	-	14,875
G	-0.403	-0.035	-0.476	0.0	-0.184	0.999**	14,459
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

Bases for salary increases are faculty rank seniority. Other factors are research, publication, teaching efficiency, service, professionalism. Salaries are retained at the same rate three years at a time.

Method of awarding salary increases vary from \$500 to \$1,800, effective when the 3 year salary schedules are validated.

Bases for professional promotion are degree attainment, research, teaching efficiency, publication, institution and public service, and professionalism.

INSTITUTION 28.1

Significant correlations reveal higher faculty rank results in higher salary, higher degrees receive higher rank promotions, and

higher degree holders receive higher pay.

Mean figures of interest among the twelve faculty members show the average degree is Doctor of Education, average rank Associate Professor, and average teaching load in required courses is less than one hour per week.

<u>Correlation</u>							<u>Mean</u>
A	-						2.08
B	-0.698*	-					7.33
C	0.157	-0.045	-				7.33
D	-0.234	0.269	-0.674*	-			0.67
E	-0.363	0.157	0.518	-0.167	-		13.4
F	-0.949**	0.664*	-0.196	0.170	0.233	-	14,041
G	-0.948**	0.657*	-0.195	0.164	0.232	0.999**	13,677
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions Based on Correlations

Twenty two institutions replied with adequate information for correlations to be run. This resulted in a total of three hundred eight correlations which could provide significant data for positive statements of relationship of salary to rank, etc.

Fifty correlations were of high significance to establish positive proof relations of staff characteristics. Significant correlations are:

<u>Staff Characteristic</u>	<u>Number of Institution</u>	<u>Possible Number of Institution</u>
Higher Faculty Rank to Higher Salary	17	22
More Total Hrs. to Higher Salary	4	22
Higher Faculty Rank to Major Course Teaching	4	22
Higher Faculty Rank to Less Required Teaching	5	22
More Major Courses to Less Required Courses	6	22

Higher faculty rank results in higher salaries. Of interest, degrees did not correlate to higher salary in any significant correlation. Rank regardless of degree is the prime consideration of

salary an individual will receive.

Higher salaries are received by individual who contribute more total hours per week. It is worthy of note that several higher rank teachers recorded heavy total hour figures, but few teaching hours in major or required course instruction.

Higher ranking faculty members tend to teach major field courses as opposed to required courses and tend to teach few required courses. The lower ranking faculty teach the majority of the required courses. Fifteen correlation relate to the major course versus required courses instructed by higher faculty, the better paid faculty member, and the faculty member who teaches almost exclusively major courses. If similar research is conducted, interpretation of correlations could provide a complete report itself. A larger survey return would have provided too much correlation data to be handled in such a limited document.

Conclusions of Means

The coded tables provide a comparison by institution and category of the means figures of faculty rank, degree, teaching credit hours in major and required courses, total hours weekly, nine months salary, and adjusted salary.

In institutions under 10,000 population men are associate professors with a Master of Arts degree, teach 3 credit hours per semester in major course and 5 credit hours in required courses, spend 20 hours weekly other than teaching, receive a nine months salary of \$12,000+, and have a national adjusted income of \$12,800, CAT I MEN.

		Category I Men					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11.1	3.167	4.889	.722	3.500	44.778	13,175.94	12,354.44
12.1	2.000	6.857	9.857	0.000	40.000	13,257.14	14,185.14
13.1	2.524	4.952	2.952	5.095	18.571	10,100.62	11,498.43
14.1	3.649	5.405	4.865	5.081	13.595	10,941.59	11,119.19
15.1	2.800	5.400	2.800	3.533	18.000	12,151.20	12,232.66
16.1	2.524	5.524	0.000	19.000	23.048	13,372.52	13,133.76
17.1	3.000	5.435	4.740	4.609	12.217	13,403.04	13,135.21

At institutions under 10,000 population women are Assistant Professors, with a Master of Science Degree, teach 6 credit hours per semester in major courses and 3 credit hours in required courses, spend 30 hours weekly other than teaching, receive a nine months salary of \$9,800, and have a national adjusted salary of \$10,000, CAT I WOMEN.

		Category I Women					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11.2	3.545	3.727	.364	4.545	20.727	9,875.36	9,249.73
12.2	3.000	4.500	10.500	1.500	40.000	10,125.00	10,833.75
13.2	2.000	3.500	5.000	4.000	17.500	9,475.00	11,180.50

At institutions over 10,000 population men are Associate Professors, with a Master of Education degree, teach 7 credit hours in major courses and 5 hours in required courses, spend 25 hours other than teaching, receive a nine months salary of \$12,000+, and have a national adjusted salary of \$13,000, CAT II MEN.

		Category II Men					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21.1	2.562	6.188	5.250	12.187	18.187	10,817.81	12,554.69
22.1	2.833	5.250	6.683	3.167	39.750	11,119.08	12,052.25
23.1	2.960	5.000	8.240	2.880	48.760	12,594.00	13,715.12
24.1	4.382	4.324	8.842	3.353	32.471	7,279.26	7,977.62
25.1	3.136	4.773	3.500	5.500	28.773	11,294.82	12,039.77
26.1	3.000	6.286	3.286	1.714	23.857	10,600.00	10,643.50
27.1	2.143	6.786	10.214	0.286	22.214	18,057.14	17,532.86
28.1	2.083	7.333	7.333	0.667	13.417	14,041.66	13,677.08

At institutions over 10,000 population women are Assistant Professors, with a Master of Science Degree, teach 8 hours in major courses and 4 hours in required courses, spend 24 hours other than teaching, receive a nine months salary of \$9,000+ and a national adjusted salary of \$10,000+, CAT II WOMEN.

		Category II Women					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
21.2	3.125	6.000	4.875	12.500	15.875	9,639.38	11,060.75
22.2	3.000	5.167	6.667	2.833	32.833	9,145.83	9,923.50
23.2	2.100	4.700	7.300	4.800	48.100	10,642.00	11,654.20
24.2	3.250	4.333	8.750	1.833	38.000	11,375.00	12,331.00
25.2	3.187	4.875	8.500	7.438	27.813	10,245.38	10,882.75
27.2	2.625	6.750	12.000	0.000	22.250	14,875.00	14,459.00

In general, men physical education staff members have higher rank status than their women counterparts (Associate Professor vs.

Assistant Professors). Men have higher degrees than women counterparts (M.A. vs. M.S.). Men teach less hours in major courses than women counterparts ($4\frac{1}{2}$ vs. $7\frac{1}{2}$). Men teach similar amounts of required courses (8 vs. 9). Men spend less hours other than teaching in a week (45 vs. 54). Men receive a higher nine months salary than women (\$12,000+ vs. \$9,500). Men receive a higher national adjusted salary (\$12,000+ vs. \$10,000).

In institutions under 10,000 population faculty ranks are equal to institutions over 10,000 population, teaching hours in major courses are less, teaching hours in required courses are less, degree achievements are lower, hours other than teaching are equivalent, and salaries are lower for nine months, but equivalent by a national adjusted salary. Physical education staff members at institutions of less than 10,000 population have equal pay to their larger institution counterparts, but less requirements on their time, and lack the prestige of the larger institution.

Of special interest the mean salaries for all faculty ranks at all institutions computes as follows:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Number of Rank</u>	<u>Mean Salary</u>
Professor	47	\$17,253
Associate Professor	57	14,255
Assistant Professor	135	12,976
Instructor	88	10,132
Assistant Instructor	6	6,470
Graduate Assistant	48	2,320

Conclusions of Salary Increases and Promotions

The bases for salary increases is merit for faculty ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 at eleven of the fifteen institutions. This method is the overwhelming favorite of contacted department chairmen. The bases for determining meritorious salary increases would be the subject of research in the future. The evaluation of the faculty member by institution administrators appears to be the sole pay check factor.

Methods of awarding salary increases are fixed amounts at yearly intervals in ten of the fifteen institutions. Pay increases are awarded for all full time faculty.

Bases for professional promotion tends to depend on research, degree attainment, and teaching efficiency in fourteen of the fifteen responding institutions. Professional conduct, and service to institutions were mentioned several times. Methods of determining teaching efficiency would be a subject for a future research problem.

Implications of the Problem

The results of this study seem to indicate that physical educators are not overworked nor are they underpaid. The maximum time per week spent on teaching or teaching related activities was 48 hours with the average teaching load 28 hours. The average salaries for professor, associate professor and assistant professor all ranked above the \$12,643 which is considered the annual minimum salary for the high income bracket by the U. S. Department of Labor. Those physical educators with the rank of instructor are considered middle class and only assistant instructors and graduate assistants, normally part-time employees, are considered within the low income bracket. Another

factor administrators should notice is that the average salaries in this report have been salaries based on a 9-month school term whereas the salaries used as the bases for determining the income brackets by the Department of Labor are yearly salaries.

Though the results of this problem may not be to the liking of some physical educators, it is hoped that they will use the information found here to increase salaries if their institutions are below average and to reduce work loads if the loads are excessive.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmann, J. and Glock, Marvin D. Evaluating Pupil Growth, 4th edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. Research Methods in Health, Physical Education, Recreation, 2nd edition, Washington, D. C., 1959.
- Arkin, Herbert and Colton, Raymond R. Statistical Methods, 5th edition, Barnes and Noble, Inc., New York, New York, 1970.
- Kansas State University. Faculty Handbook, University Press, 1971.
- LaPorte, Wm. Ralph, and revised by Cooper, John M. The Physical Education Curriculum, 7th edition, College Book Store, Los Angeles, California, 1968.
- The Blue Book of College Athletics for 1970-1971. The Rohrich Corporation, Cleveland, Ohio.
- U. S. Department of Labor. Handbook of Labor Statistics, Bulletin Number 1705, Washington, D. C., 1971.

APPENDIX A

Table 2
Institutions Survey Data

Men	CATEGORY I, BELOW 15,000			CATEGORY II, ABOVE 15,000		
	Institution	Population	Women	Men	Institution	Population
11.1	Buffalo University	11,000	11.2	21.1	Auburn University	15,300
12.1	U. of Texas, El Paso	11,000	12.2	22.1	Kansas University	16,000
13.1	S. W. Louisiana	12,000	13.2	23.1	Wayne State	16,000
14.1	Central Michigan	13,000		24.1	Colorado State	17,200
15.1	Northern Iowa	13,000		25.1	North Texas State	15,000
16.1	Washington State, Pullman	13,000		26.1	U. of Nebraska	19,000
17.1	Mankato State	13,300		27.1	U.C.L.A.	28,000
				28.1	Southern California	30,000

APPENDIX B

Table 3

TABLE 126. Annual Costs of a Lower Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Cost of Family Consumption													
Area	Total Budget	Total	Food	Hous- ing	Trans- porta- tion	Cloth- ing and Per- sonal Care	Medi- cal Care	Other Family Con- sump- tion	Other Costs	Social Security and Dis- ability In- come Taxes	Per- sonal In- come Taxes		
Urban United States	\$6,960	\$5,553	\$1,905	\$1,429	\$505	\$807	\$562	\$345	\$343	\$345	\$	719	
Metropolitan Areas	7,061	5,626	1,933	1,453	481	820	580	359	345	352		738	
Nonmetropolitan Areas	6,512	5,226	1,780	1,322	610	753	480	281	334	316		636	
Northeast:													
Boston, Mass.	7,351	5,891	1,999	1,633	505	825	556	373	353	336		771	
Nonmetropolitan Areas	6,709	5,366	1,901	1,283	646	758	502	276	338	336		669	
North Central:													
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	6,873	5,456	1,802	1,498	444	850	516	346	340	330		747	
Nonmetropolitan Areas	6,783	5,402	1,809	1,477	599	764	469	284	339	328		714	
South:													
Atlanta, Ga.	6,424	5,207	1,749	1,344	457	777	517	363	333	308		576	
Nonmetropolitan Areas	6,150	4,989	1,702	1,224	594	723	463	283	327	296		538	
West:													
Bakersfield, Calif.	6,910	5,520	1,878	1,335	505	830	649	323	342	401		647	
Nonmetropolitan Areas	6,978	5,513	1,828	1,436	622	836	513	278	342	335		788	
Anchorage, Alaska	10,783	8,280	2,314	2,929	868	958	884	327	424	417		1,661	

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Table 4

TABLE 127. Annual Costs of an Intermediate Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Area	Total Budget	Cost of Family Consumption							Social Security Per- and Dis-sonal ability In- come Taxes
		Total	Food	Hous- ing	Trans- porta- tion	Medi- cal Care	Other Family Con- sump- tion	Other Costs	
Urban United States	\$10,664	\$8,205	\$2,452	\$2,501	\$912	\$1,137	\$564	\$539	\$387
Metropolitan Areas	10,933	8,382	2,491	2,579	916	1,153	582	576	389
Nonmetropolitan Areas	9,600	7,421	2,281	2,158	894	1,065	483	509	377
Northeast:									
Boston, Mass.	12,037	9,128	2,653	3,120	937	1,166	562	571	374
Nonmetropolitan Areas	10,419	8,028	2,478	2,508	931	1,056	504	533	388
North Central:									
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	10,614	8,126	2,268	2,561	945	1,191	521	536	374
Nonmetropolitan Areas	9,862	7,607	2,266	2,347	900	1,075	473	518	374
South:									
Atlanta, Ga.	9,523	7,415	2,283	1,977	883	1,099	522	512	374
Nonmetropolitan Areas	9,041	7,035	2,214	1,904	881	1,034	466	498	375
West:									
Bakersfield, Calif.	10,040	7,785	2,331	2,127	942	1,128	651	524	448
Nonmetropolitan Areas	9,885	7,555	2,245	2,227	867	1,170	516	496	374
Anchorage, Alaska	14,535	10,826	2,833	3,992	1,163	1,347	885	606	417

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Table 5

TABLE 128. Annual Costs of a Higher Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Cost of Family Consumption											
Area	Total Budget	Total	Food	Hous- ing	Cloth- ing and			Other Family Con- sump- tion	Other Costs	Social Security Per- and Dis- ability In- come Taxes	
					Trans- porta- tion	Per- sonal Care	Medi- cal Care				
Urban United States	\$15,511	\$11,346	\$3,092	\$3,772	\$1,183	\$1,655	\$688	\$1,056	\$903	\$387	\$2,876
Metropolitan Areas	15,971	11,658	3,162	3,915	1,204	1,676	606	1,096	919	389	3,006
Nonmetropolitan Areas	13,459	9,949	2,785	3,133	1,091	1,555	505	880	833	377	2,300
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass.	17,819	12,797	3,303	4,761	1,308	1,710	588	1,127	976	374	3,672
Nonmetropolitan Areas	14,479	10,647	3,007	3,535	1,445	1,515	525	889	868	888	2,576
North Central:											
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	15,390	11,243	2,891	3,857	1,452	1,715	540	1,057	897	374	2,006
Nonmetropolitan Areas	13,935	10,273	2,800	3,437	1,074	1,590	495	877	850	374	2,833
South:											
Atlanta, Ga.	13,765	10,177	2,908	2,953	1,113	1,615	543	1,045	845	374	2,360
Nonmetropolitan Areas	12,643	9,442	2,701	2,782	1,088	1,544	488	809	808	375	2,018
West:											
Bakersfield, Calif.	14,283	10,557	2,912	3,185	1,174	1,597	676	1,013	864	448	2,414
Nonmetropolitan Areas	13,982	10,134	2,722	3,282	1,039	1,647	537	907	838	374	2,638
Anchorage, Alaska	20,301	14,275	3,496	5,575	1,374	1,896	915	1,019	1,050	417	4,550

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Table 6

TABLE 129. Indexes of Comparative Costs Based on a Lower Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Area	Cost of Family Consumption							
	Total Budget	Total	Food	Housing	Trans- porta- tion	Clothing and Per- sonal Care	Medical Care	Other Family Con- sump- tion
Urban United States	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Metropolitan Areas	101	101	101	102	95	102	103	104
Nonmetropolitan Areas	94	94	93	93	121	93	85	81
Northeast:								
Boston, Mass.	106	106	105	111	100	102	99	108
Nonmetropolitan Areas	96	97	100	90	128	94	89	80
North Central:								
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	99	98	95	105	88	105	92	100
Nonmetropolitan Areas	97	97	95	103	149	95	83	82
South:								
Atlanta, Ga.	92	94	92	94	90	96	92	105
Nonmetropolitan Areas	88	90	89	86	118	90	82	82
West:								
Bakersfield, Calif.	99	99	99	93	100	103	115	94
Nonmetropolitan Areas	100	99	96	100	123	104	91	81
Anchorage, Alaska	155	149	121	205	172	119	157	95
								231

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Table 7

TABLE 130. Indexes of Comparative Costs Based on an Intermediate Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Area	Total Budget	Cost of Family Consumption						Other Family Consumption	Personal Income Taxes
		Total	Food	Housing	Transportation	Clothing and Personal Care	Medical Care		
Urban United States	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Metropolitan Areas	103	102	102	103	100	101	103	103	103
Nonmetropolitan Areas	90	90	93	86	98	94	86	85	84
Northeast:									
Boston, Mass.	113	111	108	125	103	103	100	108	128
Nonmetropolitan Areas	98	98	101	100	102	93	89	86	96
North Central:									
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	100	99	92	102	104	105	92	100	103
Nonmetropolitan Areas	92	93	92	94	99	95	84	85	80
South:									
Atlanta, Ga.	89	90	93	79	97	97	93	102	80
Nonmetropolitan Areas	85	86	90	76	97	91	83	84	74
West:									
Bakersfield, Calif.	94	95	95	85	103	99	115	95	84
Nonmetropolitan Areas	93	92	92	89	95	103	91	83	95
Anchorage, Alaska	136	132	116	160	128	118	157	95	175

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Table 8

TABLE 131. Indexes of Comparative Costs Based on a Higher Budget for a 4-Person Family, Spring 1970

Area	Cost of Family Consumption									
	Total Budget	Total	Food	Housing	Trans- porta- tion	Clothing and Per- sonal Care	Medical Care	Other Family Con- sump- tion	Personal Income Taxes	
Urban United States	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Metropolitan Areas	103	103	102	104	102	101	103	104	105	105
Nonmetropolitan Areas	87	88	90	83	92	94	86	83	80	80
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	115	113	107	126	111	103	100	107	128	128
Nonmetropolitan Areas	93	94	97	94	97	93	89	84	90	90
North Central:										
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	99	99	93	102	97	104	92	100	101	101
Nonmetropolitan Areas	90	91	91	91	91	96	84	83	85	85
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	89	90	94	78	94	98	92	99	82	82
Nonmetropolitan Areas	82	83	87	74	92	91	83	82	70	70
West:										
Bakersfield, Calif.	92	93	94	84	99	96	115	96	84	84
Nonmetropolitan Areas	90	89	88	107	88	100	91	86	92	92
Anchorage, Alaska	131	126	113	148	116	115	156	96	159	159

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1705. 1971.

APPENDIX C

Table 9

Cost of Living Index

	Lower Income	Inter- mediate Income	Higher Income		Lower Income	Inter- mediate Income	Higher Income
11	-1	-7	-6	21	+18	+15	+12
12	+4	+7	+7	22	+10	+8	+3
13	+12	+15	+18	23	+3	+8	+10
14	+0	+1	+0	24	+12	+7	+10
15	+1	0	+1	25	+4	+7	+7
16	0	-3	-1	26	+1	0	+1
17	-2	-2	-2	27	-8	-1	-3
				28	-8	-1	-3

Handbook of Labor Statistics, 1971, U. S. Department of Labor,
Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin No. 1705.

APPENDIX D

Dear Sir:

In cooperation with the Physical Education Department, Kansas State University, I am in the process of compiling information for a Master's Report.

I have constructed a five part questionnaire under the guidance of Professor Thomas M. Evans, and with the approval of Doctor Charles B. Corbin. The questionnaire will provide administrative information necessary to compile a list of staff assignments, salaries, faculty rank, etc. of 108 four-year institutions in the United States having enrollments over 10,000 students.

Inclosed you will find:

- A. Five part questionnaire
- B. Instruction Sheet
- C. Self-addressed return envelope

If the consolidated information would be of assistance to your institution, copies of the report will be available after 1 May 1972.

Please return the questionnaire prior to 20 February to facilitate timely completion of my report.

I appreciate your participation in my research efforts and thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

ARCHIE C. RINGGENBERG

APPENDIX D (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTION SHEET

Part I and II General Information, (Men) and (Women)

A. Faculty Rank - no names, complete categories A through F as it pertains to each member of the staff in the listed faculty ranks.

B. List Degree

C. Break down individual instructors teaching load.

D. Enter number of hours, Example: 15 Physical Ed. - 3 Golf

E. Enter hours per week considered professional assignments other than Physical Ed. for salary purposes.

F. Enter amount of annual salary for 9 month contract or 12 month contract.

NOTE:

Under Faculty Rank list the total number of graduate assistants in the Men and Women's Physical Education Department. Categories B through E are not desired. In Column F include average salary schedule for 9 months pay period of graduate assistants.

Part III - Check appropriate block or blocks for each faculty rank.

Part IV - Check appropriate block or list amount in Other column for each faculty rank.

Part V - Check appropriate block or blocks for each faculty rank. Use Other Column, if remarks are included.

APPENDIX D (continued)

I. General Information of Men's Physical Education Staff Members. Complete the spaces for all faculty without using names.

A	B	C			D	E	F
Faculty Rank	Highest Degree Held	Teaching Majors	Credit Hours Required	Hours	Total Class Clock Hours per week for Phys. Ed assignment	Total Class Clock Hours for other assignments per week	Salary Amount 9 mos or 12 mos.
		Lab	Rec	Lec	Lab	Rec	Lec

Prof.
(1-6)

Assoc. Prof.
(1-6)

Asst. Prof.
(1-10)

Instr.
(1-10)

Asst. Ins.
(1-6)

No. of grad.
Assts.

APPENDIX D (continued)

II. General Information of Women's Physical Education Staff Members. Complete the spaces for all faculty without using names.

A	B	C			D	E	F
Faculty Rank	Highest Degree Held	Teaching Majors	Credit Hours Required	Hours per week for Phys, Ed assignment	Total Class Clock Hours for other assignments per week	Salary Amount	9 mos or 12 mos.
		Lab	Rec	Lec			

Prof.
(1-6)

Assoc. Prof.
(1-6)

Asst. Prof.
(1-10)

Instr.
(1-10)

Asst. Ins.
(1-6)

No. of Grad.
Assts.
Total

APPENDIX D (continued)

III. Bases for Salary Increases. (Check appropriate answer in rank blocks)

Rank	1. Seniority	2. Merit	3. Annual salary Schedule	4. No definite Plan	5. Other - (List)
Prof					
Assoc.					
Prof					
Asst					
Prof					
Instr					
Asst					
Instr					
Grad					

REMARKS:

IV. Method of Awarding Salary Increases. (Check the appropriate block or list amount, if other is appropriate)

Faculty Rank	Increase by yearly amount					Increase by percentage										
	\$100	\$200	\$300	\$400	\$500	\$600	\$700	Other	2%	3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	8%	Other
Prof																
Assoc Prof																
Asst Prof																
Instr																
Asst Instr																
Grad Asst																
All Ranks Equal																
REMARKS:																

REMARKS:

APPENDIX D (continued)

V. Bases for Professional Promotion, to each faculty rank. (Check appropriate block)

Faculty Rank	Ph.D.	Degree M.S. or M.A.	Research	Teaching Efficiency	Other (Explain)
Professor					
Assoc. Prof					
Asst. Prof					
Instr					
Asst. Instr					

REMARKS:

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE PHYSICAL EDUCATION FACULTY
SALARY SCHEDULES IN RELATION TO JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

by

ARCHIE CHARLES RINGGENBERG

B. S. Kansas State College, Pittsburg, 1962

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S REPORT

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Physical Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1972

Data obtained from the twenty two institutions represent only a sample of the one hundred eight institutions contacted.

General staff information figures from the answered questionnaires were correlated using the Pearson Product Moment Method to determine the relationship between salaries and other faculty administrative requirements. Data was investigated at the 0.05 level of significance. All correlations are included in the report and correlations above 0.75 were discussed.

Results of salary schedules, methods of awarding salary increases and bases for professional promotion were tabulated to determine general trends only.

The statistical analysis revealed that (1) higher faculty rank correlates to higher salaries, (2) higher salaries are received by individuals who spend high total hours weekly in the performance of their duties, (3) higher faculty rank individuals teach major courses, (4) lower faculty rank individuals teach required courses, (5) physical education staff members at institutions of less than 10,000 student population have equal pay, but less requirements of time than their larger institution counterparts, (6) bases for salary increases relate directly to meritorious achievement, (7) salary increases are awarded by fixed amounts annually and (8) professional promotion depends on research, teaching efficiency, and higher degree attainment.

It is concluded that physical educators represented in this report are not overworked nor are they underpaid. Average working hours per week in connection with teaching duties is only twenty

eight hours. According to the Department of Labor, only faculty ranks of assistant instructors and graduate assistants are in the low income bracket of the U. S. population. Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors are in the high income bracket.

Though the results of this report may not be to the liking of some physical educators, it is hoped they will use the information found here in comparison to their own staff conditions. Consideration of staff adjustments may be influenced by these figures.