AN EVALUATION OF THE STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS AND LUNCHROOM MANAGERS IN THE MICHIGAN AND OHIO SCHOOLS

Thesis for the Degree of M. S.

MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

M. Marie Harris

1945

AN EVALUATION OF THE STATUS OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS AND LUNCHROOM MANAGERS IN THE MICHIGAN AND OHIO SCHOOLS

by

M.Marie Harris

A THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate School of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Institution Administration
School of Home Economics

1945

THESIS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness and express her gratitude to all those who have assisted in the preparation of the study,especially to Mrs.Mabelle S.Ehlers for her encouragement,her patience,and her guidance. To Dr. Marie Dye for her helpful suggestions and final review of the subject;to Dr.W.D.Baten for his generous assistance in the statistical interpretation;to Miss Sylvia M.Hartt for information on the history of school feeding;to Dr.L.J.Luker for his suggestions on important items in the data sheet; to Dr.C.H.Hill for his efforts in distribution of the 'guinea pig' samples to the schools;to Dr.Hazel M.Hatcher for her advice in setting up the data sheet and review of the paper,and to the public school staff of the high schools of Ohio and Michigan,without whose aid the completion of this study would have been impossible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The primary purpose of the study is to make a comparative evaluation of Junior and Senior High School Home Economics teachers, teacher-managers, and full-time cafeteria managers with a view to determining whether public school staff members have equal status as regards salaries, rights, benefits, privileges, etc.

The secondary purpose of the study is to compare the status of each group in the states of Ohio and Michigan.

HOME ECONOMICS TRAINED WOMEN IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The public schools are increasingly using more and more Home Economics trained women to participate in the educational objectives set up by their boards of education. The once so-called domestic science or cooking teacher is now our modern Home Economics teacher with a well-rounded college education and capable of teaching a very complete course in any or all phases of homemaking.

The second type of Home Economics trained person is found in many schools supervising and managing a school lunchroom in addition to her teaching responsibilities; she may be termed the teacher-manager.

In an increasing number of the larger cities especially, the homemaking teacher is relieved of lunchroom responsibilities and there is a full time cafeteria manager who is especially trained in her field of work. There has been a tendency to employ untrained women as working managers, especially for elementary schools in order to avoid paying the higher salary necessary for a trained person, but women trained in food service are without doubt the most logical persons for such positions. Their training fits them for the work required of a cafeteria dietitian. A food conscious public is more and more demanding in its realization of the need for control by persons trained in nutrition, skilled in the preparation of palatable and attractive food and experienced in business management (5).

TYPES OF SCHOOL LUNCHROOM FEEDING

A. The simplest form of school lunch is found in rural schools where the teacher in charge of all school activities directs preparation of one hot dish for the entire group (5). While the number of such schools is decreasing, there are still many of them, especially in the more isolated areas.

B. Community organizations and parents are responsible for full charge of the preparation and serving of the noon meal in localities where school authorities have not assumed responsibility. These groups, too, are in the minority in most areas.

C. The concessionaire type of school feeding has been existent for many years. There are two types of concessionaire management (5):

1. The commercial plan in which the cafeteria is operated as a profit-making business for the benefit of the concessionaire. There are no valid reasons for any school cafeteria to be operated by a commercial concessionaire (5). In the main it is difficult to regulate and maintain proper standards of kind and quality of food served and to set low selling prices since the nature of the organization demands that a profit be made (5). Since the cafeteria is built by

public funds as a part of the school plant, no individual should capitalize on the cafeteria for his own profit. If the concessionaire pays a small rent fee he is using public property for private business without fair return for services; if he pays rent in comparison to the value of the space he occupies plus the utilities used, he will probably be forced to charge prices high enough that they will defeat the purpose of operation of the cafeteria (5).

2. The service type of operation is directed by some welfare organization such as the Parent-Teachers Association, et al. It is the type of concessionaire which has deserved credit in many school lunch programs for demonstrating to the community and even perhaps more necessarily to the school officials, the need for noon lunch feeding and the benefits derived from nourishing food (5). In many larger towns and in cities results have been so successful that the boards of education have assumed full responsibility for the cafeteria and it has been given equal consideration with other activities. In some small rural communities school feeding is still dependent upon the efforts of groups outside the school authorities.

D. Central control through a board of education or other school authority may assume different degrees of supervision as follows:

1. Responsibility assumed through employment of a director of cafeterias.

Mary deGarmo Bryan says, 'From every point of view this is the most desirable.'(5) The method of control will vary with the number of cafeterias included in the plan. If there is one cafeteria, the manager will probably be responsible to the superintendent or principal for management of the entire service (5).

2. A community with two or three cafeterias may form a cooperative scheme for buying all food, establish uniform policies, menus and prices. Funds may be pooled and deposited to a cafeteria account from which equipment is purchased. The plan is usually not too efficient for a large school system (5).

3. Central management and control for all cafeterias of the entire school system.

This type of management varies widely in different cities, from one in which the centralization is limited to a few items, so that it is largely supervisory, to one in which the system is fully established and the cafeteria operates as a unitary part of the system. Between either extreme are many organizations determined by the local situations. The trend in large cities has been toward complete central control (5).

CHAPTER II HISTORY AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

HISTORY OF SCHOOL LUNCHROOM FEEDING

School feeding is the result of a desire among conscientious and philanthropic people to provide food for hungry children. Public school administrators have long realized that monies spent on educational machinery are too frequently wasted when used for those children who are 'bogged-down' by an empty stomach or a malnourished and poor-health ridden body.

The school feeding program has been an educational movement, a problem of all countries dating back into the eighteenth century. The original object of the movement was to make it possible for every child to have access to an adequate noon meal even when in school, and the interest has assumed widespread developments in America and Europe.

EARLY BEGINNINGS IN EUROPE

Organized school feeding in Europe was an outgrowth of the Industrial Revolution. The first record of provision of school meals was in the city of Munich in 1790 (6) (8) when municipal soup kitchens were established by Count Rumford, a pioneer social worker, for the purpose of feeding vagrants. The kitchens were intended to meet the needs of all ages, and not only were vagrants fed, but the schools were encouraged to send hungry school children for a warm noon meal.

Bryant (8) says, "This work was long unorganized but never discontinued, and in the seventies the obligation of providing meals was put on the school authorities. From this ancient beginning the school feeding movement spread throughout the German Empire until now it is national in scope. . ." (8).

In 1849 a battalion of French National Guard (5) (6) (8) with a surplus in its treasury at the end of the year, presented the surplus to the school with the request that it be used for a public and general good as the nucleus of future appropriations for food and clothing. This was the beginning of the Caisses des Ecoles or school funds and in 1882 (8) the national compulsory school law contained one section requiring the establishment of a school fund throughout France to maintain universal school restaurants and children who could not pay were given free meals (5) (6).

School feeding programs in England were founded by Victor Hugo in 1865 (5) when he furnished warm meals in his home in the Isle of Guernsey, to children of the nearby school. London established The Destitute Childrens' Dinner Society in 1886 for feeding indigent school children (5). Little official notice was taken of the Hugo work until about the time of the Boer War when, in 1902, Maurice, surgeon general, reported (7) that only two out of five men were physically fit for military service. This aroused the country to a high pitch of excitement and for four years

England was the scene of a most searching self analysis. In 1906 Parliament passed the Provision of Meals Act (5) which gave local educational authorities permission to install restaurants as part of the regular school equipment and to serve lunches for children attending elementary schools (5).

Holland was the first country to have national legislation with provision for school meals (8). The compulsory education law of 1900 authorized "municipalities to provide food and clothing for all school children, whether in public or private schools, who were unable, because of lack of food and clothes, to go regularly to school or to those who probably would not continue to attend school regularly unless food and clothes were provided." (8) Most of the aid was given by supporting voluntary societies. Amsterdam and other towns were providing meals both summer and winter (8).

Switzerland was the second country (8) to make national provision for school meals. Its federal ruling of 1903 made it obligatory to supply food and clothing to children in need. In several cities and districts provision was also made for children to be given breakfast (8).

Italian municipal school feeding began in 1896 (8) when the San Remo council reorganized the previously privately supported institution as a regular city project. In 1894 Milan carried out a system of feeding by the Committee of Patronage (8). A large proportion of Italian children

was furnished meals with resulting definite increases in attendance. The work at Padua is distinguished for being the first (8) in the world where attempts were made to have school meals planned scientifically to meet requirements of the children. Dr. Tonsig, the director of medical inspection, planned the meals to provide one-half of the day's total requirements, and in proper relation that 75 per cent of the necessary fat and protein were provided (8).

Austria accepted a small share of the national school feeding ideas. In the early 1900's the service was reaching few who were in need and the meals were served for only four winter months (8).

A majority of the Swedish cities maintained well organized meal systems administered by subsidized societies with school authorities cooperating. Breakfast was often served in addition to the noon meal. Much attention was given to feeding in the rural districts because the schools were so very far apart (8).

Belgium, with no compulsory school law, provided food especially in the kindergartens and guardian schools, for the very poor children and for those children whose parents worked away from home. City subsidies were granted to provide for the poorest children (8).

Similar types of school feeding spread rapidly through all European countries. Holland, England, Denmark, Switzerland, Italy, Finland, Austria, Belgium, and France provided

for school meals by national act (5); Germany, Norway, and Sweden made provision through extensive municipal legislation. Russia fed all children in its schools and Spain moved toward a similar provision. In all countries arrangements were made for feeding the indigent children without discrimination (5).

Latin American participation in the school lunch program was also significant. Although school feeding was not undertaken on a national scale in any of the countries of Central or South America until late in the 1920's, rapid development of lunch programs in the past few years indicates that state and school authorities have started action on a broad scale to meet the serious problem of malnutrition in those countries. Free breakfast, lunch, and milk projects, supported in part or wholly by government funds are now maintained in Nicaragua, Argentina, Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Cuba, Costa Rica, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Venezuela, and Paraguay (10).

UNITED STATES INTEREST AND EARLY PARTICIPATION

The United States has been slow in adopting any plan of school feeding. Long after the experimental stage had been passed in Europe (8), school feeding was regarded with skepticism here. In rural communities the great distances from school have made it necessary for the majority of school children to eat one meal a day away from home.

Convenience of remaining at school in towns and cities has increased the lunch problem. The lunch box brought from home was the first source of school lunch and is very common still in many communities and cities (5). "It may contain white bread and fried pork in rural sections in New England, or cornbread and fried pork in some rural sections of the South; its contents are determined primarily by the contents of the family larder. It may be a nourishing meal, adequate for the needs of the growing child, or pitifully insufficient sustenance; it may be planned as a whole meal, or as a part which is to be supplemented by food purchased elsewhere. In any case it illustrates the first type of school feeding in this country, a type in which the school assumes no obligation for providing food."(5).

The first record in this country of meal service to school children is that of the Childrens' Aid Society of New York City when in 1853 (5), they gave food to all children in their first Industrial Schools; responsibility for the project was later assumed by the public school system. The purpose was two fold: first, the hungry children were fed, and secondly, it acted as an inducement to the vagrant children of the city slums to study industrial training (5).

Louise Bryant reported (6) with the creditable authority of Robert Hunter, author of "Poverty", that in the 1890's 60,000 to 70,000 children in New York alone arrived at school hungry and unfitted to do well the work required, and by another authority (6) that in the same city 175,000 children failed in their studies because they did not get

the right kind of food. Dr. Maxwell, superintendent of the city schools, urged the installation of lunches in all the elementary schools, where a warm nourishing meal could be bought at cost (8).

Little progress was reported for several years, but with the beginnings of the science of nutrition, many people, especially those in the cities, became aware of the need for proper feeding of school children. Surveys reported amazing conditions of malnutrition with accompanying behavior problems and mental sluggishness (5). Opposed to this picture and the malnutrition in New York City, the Americans were told that "they do things better in Europe"; that there, in most of the large cities, at the noon period children file in line for a meal ticket regardless of whether they can pay or not. The children progressed in school better and there was none of the starvation as pointed to on our side of the water (6). It was evident that the lunch box could not be relied upon as the sole source of adequate food. Penny lunches were opened in a number of cities to provide low cost meals to children already definitely undernourished or to those destined to become so due to poverty or poor home feeding (5).

The first of these penny lunches was that started by the Starr Center Association, a benevolent organization of Philadelphia, in 1894 in one school in a poor district of that city; the plan was very soon extended to another

school (5). Out of this work developed a Lunch Committee of the School and Home League which gradually enlarged the experiment of school feeding in Philadelphia (25).

In 1909, with the completion of the William Penn High School, one of the largest schools in the city of Philadelphia, Dr. Herrick, the principal, protested against the old form of concession to janitor or caterer (25), and was eventually granted operation of a type of lunchroom which is keynoted in many of our present schools. The plan was to have a Home Economics graduate as the director and lunches were to be served on sound food principles, the project to be self-sustaining. Miss Emma Smedley, a pioneer in the field of Institution Administration, was the person chosen for this position. Within a year the cornerstone of Philadelphia school lunches was laid and by 1912 the Board of Education established a department of High School Lunches (25). In 1915 similar types of organization were extended to the elementary schools (25). Philadelphia was thus the first large city to establish a system of central control for all school cafeterias (5).

In 1894 the Boston School Committee passed upon an order that only such food as was approved by them could be sold in the city school houses (5). Mrs. Ellen H. Richards, pioneer in the field of Home Economics, instigated the resolution after her interest was aroused at the menace to health that lay in the snacks which children purchased at

the corner stores or at the janitors' lunch counter (20). All food was prepared at the central kitchen and distributed to the schools; menus were carefully worked out under Mrs. Richards' supervision (20) (5). In 1907 the Womens' Educational and Industrial Union assumed responsibility for the school lunch service (5). The central type of service was a definite feature of the Boston school system; modifications of the plan have been adopted under more recent developments of the organization. The board of education now operates most of the school lunchrooms in Boston.*

As early as 1893, Cleveland had arrangements made with concessionaires (5) to provide basket lunches to pupils and in 1909 feeding centers were established in many elementary schools by the Women's Federation of Clubs. In 1918 a trained dietitian was appointed for centralization of the system (5).

Chicago began school feeding in 1902 (5), serving one nourishing dish each day enabling the children to purchase food with the money they had been spending on undesirables. Previous to this penny lunches had been penny pieces of candy or gum bought across the hazardous street at the too often dirty school store. With a glass of milk and a cookie

---

* Mrs. Mabelle S. Ehlers, Professor, Institution Administration, Michigan State College.

now sold the children for the same penny, the school took over the sale of candy, the profit from which paid for the glasses and napkins (14). After two years of this type of penny lunch progress, the school board gave assistance which made it possible to serve one nourishing dish at noon. Womens' clubs were responsible for the establishment of the early lunchrooms in high schools. They were later taken over by the board of education which now maintains a centralized system (5).

The Board of Education in Rochester had direct control of lunches as early as 1903 (5). This city was one of the first to move lunchrooms from the dark basements and to put as much stress upon the planning and equipping of the lunchrooms and kitchens as upon any other part of the building. The resulting cafeterias were well ventilated, well lighted, and almost always located on the first floor. The present organized central system operates as a department in itself (5).

Until 1903 St. Louis fed its school pupils by a concessionaire arrangement and since 1912 a supply commissioner has been in charge of lunchroom administration (5).

Louisville was one of the first cities in the South to establish a school lunch, which it did in 1913 (5). Food was served both in the morning and at noon; the workers were volunteers. A self supporting centralized department was established in 1916 (5).

Rural school lunch service has developed more slowly than in the cities. In the main it has consisted of one hot dish daily at school as a supplement to lunches brought from home. Granges, Parent Teachers Associations, 4-H Clubs, Red Cross nutritionists, home demonstration agents, and church societies have organized some type of school feeding in many communities (5). Township trustees, churches, school boards, and clubs have given support in securing equipment and supplies. State college extension services have been especially active in the supplying of information and suggestions. Likewise, State Departments of Public Health and Education have cooperated in organizational materials (5).

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROVIDES ASSISTANCE

Agencies of the Federal Government, especially the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics and the Department of Agriculture had been interested in school lunchroom work for many years prior to 1930 (10). However, it was not until the great depression of the 1930's with its paradox of hunger and large crop surpluses that the school lunch really gained momentum. It was during these years that the apparent danger of malnutrition became a matter of national concern. Local funds in many instances were inadequate even where the need was greatest and active Federal aid was necessary. Closely related to this need was the problem of farmers who were struggling with agricultural surpluses. Disposal

of these surpluses was necessary to support farm prices (10).

The Department of Agriculture instituted a direct purchase and distribution program as a part of the plans developed under the Federal Emergency Relief Act subsequent to 1933* (17), to help farmers in their problem of surplus disposal by distribution through state welfare agencies in the school lunch program. The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation became the principal agency for the disposal of the agricultural surpluses* (17). The program was relatively small and was followed by the inception of the Works Progress Administration in 1933 (19). Many school programs became joint projects with the National Youth Administration in cooperation with local educational, civic, and welfare organizations (10).

With the Presidents' Reorganization Plan No. III, the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation was consolidated with the Division of Marketing and Marketing Agreements of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration into the Surplus Marketing Administration effective June 30, 1940 (7). The latter became the Agricultural Marketing Administration by Executive Order of February 23, 1942; this agency was made a part of the Food Distribution Administration the following December and effective as of January 21, 1944, the Food Distribution Administration became the Office of Distribution of the War Food Administration (10).

---

* Miss Sylvia Hartt, formerly State Supervisor Works Progress Administration (Michigan) School Lunchrooms.

Through the decades from these beginnings have come our school lunchrooms and cafeterias as they exist today. Originally for the purpose of serving undernourished and poor children at low cost, school feeding has gradually assumed the status of an indispensable feature of the health and teaching programs in the majority of schools. According to Bryan (5), it was estimated that there were approximately 64,500 cafeterias in addition to 11,500 schools serving single hot dishes in 1931, and that cafeterias were opening at the rate of about 7,500 annually (5).

More recent figures were obtained from a survey made in 1943, by the Federal Security Agency, U. S. Office of Education. This survey (22) indicates that from a total of 215,715 schools reported, 59,390 schools or 28 per cent were serving lunches. It is estimated by the above office that 30,000 schools and 4,233,000 children are benefited through milk and lunch programs supported by the Food Distribution Adminstration. This means that about one in four of the public schools in the U. S. serve lunches to the children attending them; for all the schools located in urban areas the percentage is 36 and for the rural schools it is 26 (22).

The report further indicates that the larger the city the larger is the proportion of schools serving school lunches, the percentages decreasing from 42 in cities of 100,000 population to 26 in the rural schools (22). Also,

the larger the city, the larger is the proportion of children who obtain their noon lunches at school; the percentage decreases from 35 in the largest cities to 22 in schools of rural communities (22).

Generally speaking, it is the larger schools and not the small ones in any given group which have school lunch services. This tendency becomes more pronounced as the population center grows smaller; it may be seen from the fact that in the largest cities 42 per cent of the schools have lunch service, but they enroll 55 per cent of the children; in the rural communities 26 per cent of the schools have lunch service and enroll 41 percent of the rural children (22).

W. H. Gaumnitz, Senior Specialist in Rural Education Problems, in a letter to the writer says, "While we have no complete data it is our guess that school lunches are definitely on the increase." The rate of increase continues due to the trend of shorter noon hours and the requirement that children remain in the building during lunch periods. It has been augmented by the necessity for feeding indigent children.

The general welfare of children has been of foremost consideration. Methods of establishment and management have varied with each communities' resources. Educators have recognized the opportunities for integrating knowledge and experience in the lunchroom with classroom teaching, health, and living.

PRESENT CIRCUMSTANCES OF GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION

Both houses of Congress have again authorized through the Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1945, the use of $50,000,000 for community school lunch programs during the year 1944 - 1945. The same amount was allocated for use in 1943 - 1944 (10). The allocation provides food for consumption by children in non-profit lunchrooms of high school grade or under and for child care centers. It was recognized that, with the United States at war, the problem of providing a nourishing noonday meal for millions of school youngsters was complicated by extraordinary conditions--millions of mothers were working at war jobs and the stress and strain of all-out war were endangering the health of America's youth. Congress, too, was aware of the fact that the school lunch program continues to be a good outlet for seasonal abundances of agricultural commodities, thus lending aid to its price support program (10).

The program for the year 1944 - 1945 uses the authorization to supplement locally available funds for carrying on feeding programs, Some of the money will go to reimburse sponsors already working with the War Food Administration and will be used to purchase food surpluses (10).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To the knowledge of the writer there are no published materials available on the subject of the status of lunchroom managers and Home Economics teachers who are working in the same community or school. In 1942, a joint committee on School Lunches of the American Home Economics Association and the American Dietetics Association conducted a limited survey in fifty-eight cities ranging in size from 50,000 to 1,000,000, to study the qualifications of lunchroom managers and to compare their rights, salaries, and benefits with the privileges of teachers. Miss Pendergast, Assistant Supervisor, Detroit City Lunchrooms, conducted the study and reported it at the American Dietetics Association convention in 1943 at Pittsburgh. The study has not been published but the writer has had access to a brief summarization of the results obtained.

The survey indicates that the public schools do not offer lunchroom managers status comparable to teachers. Briefly stated there were differences in the following respects (26):

In most high schools Home Economics teachers were expected to have a bachelor's degree. A degree is rarely required of lunchroom managers but such training is recognized. Teachers are usually employed by the Board of Education; 50 per cent of the managers are similarly employed with the remaining 50 per cent employed by the lunchroom

director, business manager, or principal. Few of the managers have a contract with the employer but all of the teachers are employed under contract.

No cases were reported where teachers had to pass Civil Service examinations but three cities reported managers under Civil Service. Teachers were benefited with tenure but not the managers.

Teachers' salaries are paid from tax funds. In most cities managers' salaries are paid from lunchroom receipts, based directly or indirectly upon volume of business. Most schools financially reward teachers for advanced degrees but there were few instances of such provision for managers.

In 1942 - 1943 the salary range for teachers in the cities reported was $1,200 - 3,300; for managers it was $800 - 3,000 with more managers than teachers at the low level.

With some exceptions, teachers have sick leave allowance ranging from five to ten days with an additional three to five day allowance for death in the immediate family. Managers had either none or the same amount as teachers. The summarization indicates that this was the one item in which there was a comparable relationship between contract and non-contract employees.

Almost all teachers have access to a retirement fund but only half of the managers belong to a city or state retirement fund.

The report concludes that in as much as school lunch-room management is a field not yet seriously considered by Home Economics trained women, if graduates are to be encouraged to enter it as a career, the above inequalities of status must be corrected and the position must be as interesting and challenging an occupation as teaching, financially and socially attractive to the qualified person.

CHAPTER III. SELECTION OF TECHNIQUE AND PROCEDURES

SELECTION OF THE TECHNIQUE

The total number of high schools in Michigan as listed by the United States Office of Education Bulletin (28) was 853 in 1940 and the number in Ohio listed in the same bulletin was 1268. The total number of both states was so great as to eliminate the possibility of individual study or interview in each school to determine qualifying status and information of its Home Economics teachers and lunchroom managers. As a result, and in order to acquire the most accurate information from the field, the questionnaire method was selected.

PLAN AND PREPARATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In constructing the questionnaire, there were two groups of information which needed to be included. First, the general information such as, high school census, the number of high schools with lunchrooms, the number of students the lunchrooms served, and the type of management under which the lunchrooms were operated; secondly, the still more important and related details of the status of the Home Economics and lunchroom management staff of the public schools. The questionnaire was principally constructed in check list form to facilitate the ease of response so as to stimulate a high percentage of returns, and to simplify tabulation and

interpretation of replies. It was an attempt to eliminate generalized statements.

Following the general information as specified above, the questionnaire proper consisted of forty specific questions on status, simply stated, and in most cases requiring only a checked 'Yes' or 'No' reply or a single word answer, for the Home Economics teacher, and/or the teacher manager, and/or the full-time cafeteria manager.

The questionnaire was then checked by the Head of the Institution Administration Department and suggestions were made by her and two of the staff of the Education Department. In addition opinions on form and content were given by four graduate students who had been public school staff members. The sheet was then sent to ten schools for inspection and trial. These schools were also the 'guinea pigs' on the required time, the average of which was used later in the introductory letter. The principals and superintendents were requested to make suggestions for improvement and after slight revision the questionnaire was ready for large scale production and distribution.

METHOD OF SAMPLING

It was suggested that the value of the study would be increased if comparative evaluations could be made of two states. Therefore, Michigan and Ohio were chosen, the former because some previous acquaintance had been made with a few

lunchrooms in the state, and the latter because it was the writer's home state in which she had both taught Home Economics and managed a lunchroom. It was still not feasible to mail questionnaires to the more than 2,000 schools in both states. Cities of 10,000 population and above (16) (27) were chosen for the study and it was decided to use only junior and senior high schools due to the fact that many elementary schools have a wider range in type of noon feeding than do the advanced grades. The final list included fifty-nine Ohio cities and forty-two Michigan cities (see appendix).

The question arose as to whether a school superintendent would be able to furnish all the requested information without extra work in his office and upon suggestion, the mailing list was made up of the names of superintendents in those cities of six schools and less, and names of principals in those cities with more than six schools (15) (19). This made a total of 254 questionnaires; one hundred eleven or 43.6 per cent were Michigan schools and 143 or 56.4 per cent were Ohio schools.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The questionnaires were accompanied by a letter of introduction and explanation from the investigator, in addition to a self-addressed stamped envelope. The total returns were 151 from the 254 distributed or a reply total

of 59.4 per cent, with seventy-five or 49.6 per cent from Michigan and 50.3 per cent or seventy-six returns from Ohio. There were twenty-two replies or 8.6 per cent which furnished no useful information; from this number there were eleven or 4.3 per cent who replied by letter or note on the questionnaire that they were unwilling or unable to furnish any information and eleven or 4.3 per cent indicated that they had no cafeteria and/or Home Economics department. This made a total of 129 or 50.7 per cent with data. Four of the number checked the general information and made no explanation of omission of the specific questions; the remaining total of 125 or 49.2 per cent gave data on both the general and specific questions, upon which the tabulations and interpretations are based. The number used includes sixty from Michigan and sixty-five from Ohio. Let it here be noted that numerous questionnaires were checked for Home Economics teachers, teacher managers, and full-time cafeteria managers; many schools had both Home Economics teachers and lunchroom managers, and some schools had Home Economics teachers as well as teacher-managers.

TABULATION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

Numerical tabulations were made on the general questions in order to get figures on the range of school census, the range of lunchroom census, and the type and training of lunchroom managers.

Accordingly, numerical tabulations were made on the specific questions for 1) the Home Economics teachers, the teacher-managers, and the cafeteria managers, 2) the Ohio and Michigan Home Economics teachers, 3) the Ohio and Michigan cafeteria managers, both trained and untrained, and 4) the Ohio and Michigan teacher-managers. The tabulations were set up in tables on a percentage basis of number of useful returns, in order to evaluate the status of each group and to compare the two states.

CHAPTER IV. GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF HIGH SCHOOL CENSUS, LUNCHROOM CENSUS, SCHOOL AUTHORITY OPERATION OF LUNCHROOMS, AND TRAINING OF LUNCHROOM MANAGERS

An examination of Table I discloses the distribution of the range in title of persons making replies to the questionnaires. In as much as the data sheets were mailed to superintendents and principals, it is rather interesting to note the wide variation in the titles of the persons in whose hands the sheets finally fell and those people who were responsible for the information. It will be noted from the table that ninety-five or 62.9 per cent of the total replies came from superintendents and principals; fifty-eight or 38.4 per cent from superintendents and thirty-seven or 24.5 per cent from principals. The original mailing list included 65.0 per cent principals.

The third highest percentage of returns is from the cafeteria manager, followed by five returns from persons acting both as Home Economics teachers and lunchroom managers. Although the number is almost negligible, it is interesting to note that two cases indicated the person making the reply was Counselor or Director of Pupil Personnel and Research.

Table II shows that twenty-nine reports indicated that from one to ten schools in a city or system have enrollments up to 500. Sixty-eight replies, thirty-eight of which were from Ohio, shows one to five schools per city or school system with a range of enrollment of 500 to 1500 students.

TABLE I. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TITLES OF PERSONS MAKING REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRES

Title reply signatures	Total replies		Ohio		Mich.	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Superintendent of Schools	58	38.4	28	37.3	30	39.5
Principal	37	24.5	19	25.3	18	23.6
No signature or title	15	9.9	7	9.3	8	10.5
Cafeteria/Lunchroom Manager	7	4.6	3	4.0	4	5.3
Home Economics Teacher and Cafeteria/*Lunchroom Mgr.	5	3.3	4	5.3	1	1.3
Director/Supervisor School Cafeteria	4	2.6	3	4.0	1	1.3
Home Economics Teacher	4	2.6	2	2.6	2	2.6
Assistant Supt. of Schools	3	2.0	2	2.6	1	1.3
Supervisor of Home Economics	3	2.0	1	1.3	2	2.6
Secretary	2	1.3	1	1.3	1	1.3
Assistant Principal	2	1.3	2	2.6	-	-
Head Homemaking Dept. and Lunchroom Manager	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Foods Teacher	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Director Pupil Personnel and Research	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Foods Teacher and Cafeteria Manager	1	.7	1	1.3	0	-
Domestic Science Teacher	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Clerk	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Head Vocational Dept.	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Counselor	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Head of Home Economics	1	.7	0	-	1	1.3
Secretary to Principal	1	.7	1	1.3	0	-
Clerk to Supt.	1	.7	1	1.3	0	-

/*indicates or

TABLE II. DISTRIBUTION OF HIGH SCHOOL CENSUS

Census in school/* schools	Total No.	Ohio No.	Mich. No.
1. less than 500			
1 school	19	9	10
2 " s	8	6	2
4 "	1	1	0
10 "	1	1	0
2. 501 - 1500			
1 school	43	24	19
2 " s	18	10	8
3 "	5	4	1
5 "	2	0	2
3. 1501 - 2500			
1 school	24	15	9
2 " s	1	1	0
4. 2501 - 3000			
1 school	2	0	2
5. 3001 and up			
1 school	2	1	1
Number of reports made on an entire school system	40	22	18
No reply on census question	27	14	13

/* indicates or

It is significant that the greater number of schools reported in this study have enrollments somewhere in this range.

In the 1,500 to 2,000 enrollment range there are twenty-five reports of one or two schools in the city or system. There is a rapid decline in both the number of replies and the number of schools when the enrollment figure reaches above 2,500 students.

The board of education and the lunchroom manager or director share twenty-three to twenty-two respectively in the operation of the lunchroom by school authorities. There were thirty-eight additional replies which specified school authority operation but gave no specific title. It will be noted in Table III that there were only two reports, each in Michigan, of outside agencies operating the lunchroom and these were the Parent Teachers Association and another type of community organization.

Table IV indicates that there were four instances of one to twelve schools in a city or system which were serving less than 100 students. Twenty-nine replies, with twenty of the number from Michigan, showed one to thirty-four schools serving between 100 and 250 students, and thirty-six cases, with nineteen from Michigan, had one to five schools serving between 250 and 500 students.

There were thirty-three replies with schools serving up to 1,000 pupils. As the number of students served in the lunchroom increased, there were fewer replies noted and fewer

TABLE III. DISTRIBUTION OF AUTHORITY OF LUNCHROOM OPERATIONS

Authority Title of Operation	Total	Ohio	Mich.
	No.	No.	No.
1. By school authorities	97	59	38
School authorities, no specific title	38	21	17
Board of Education	23	19	4
Lunchroom/*Cafeteria Manager/ Director	22	15	7
Lunchroom Dept.	4	1	3
Home Economics Teacher	2	2	0
Superintendent	2	0	2
Board of Education and Cafeteria Manager	1	0	1
Junior High School Principal	1	0	1
Manager-Cook	1	0	1
Home Economics Dept.	1	1	0
High School Student Assn.	1	0	1
Board of Education and Director of Home Economics	1	0	1
2. By outside agency	2	0	2
P.T.A.	1	0	1
P.S.T.O. (community organization)	1	0	1

/*indicates or

TABLE IV. DISTRIBUTION OF LUNCHROOM CENSUS

Census in school/* schools of the system	Total No.	Ohio No.	Mich. No.
a. less than 100 served			
1 school	2	0	2
2 " s	1	1	0
12 "	1	1	0
b. 101-250 served			
1 school	22	8	14
2 " s	5	1	4
3 "	1	0	1
34 "	1	0	1
c. 251-500 served			
1 school	30	12	18
2 " s	2	1	1
3 "	2	2	0
4 "	1	0	1
5 "	1	0	1
d. 501-1000 served			
1 school	27	16	11
2 " s	3	2	1
3 "	1	1	0
4 "	2	1	1
e. 1001-1500 served			
1 school	15	8	7
2 " s	2	2	0
f. 1501-2000 served			
1 school	12	5	7
2 " s	2	0	2
g. 2001 and up served			
1 school	4	4	0
3 " s	1	1	0
No lunchroom and/or Home Econ.	22	10	12
No reply to question	7	4	3

/* indicates or

schools. There were five replies of one to three Ohio schools serving more than 2,000 students.

The evidence in Table V shows that the greatest number of schools or school systems have one manager regardless of her training and other duties. There are thirty-one instances of a Home Economics trained teacher-manager being the one manager of the school lunch. Twenty-nine replies indicated one Home Economics trained full time manager per school or school system. Thirty cases pointed out the fact that they had one untrained manager. There were forty-seven untrained cook-managers reported for one Ohio city.

TABLE V. DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER AND TRAINING OF LUNCH-ROOM MANAGERS IN SCHOOLS

Number of lunchroom managers according to training	Total No.	Ohio No.	Mich. No.
Home Economics trained teacher-manager			
1 mgr. per school/* school system	31	19	12
2 " " " " "	4	2	2
3 " " " " "	2	1	1
4 " " " " "	3	1	2
5 " " " " "	2	0	2
Home Econ. trained-full-time manager			
1 mgr. per school/* school system	29	17	12
2 mgrs. " " " "	1	1	0
4 " " " " "	1	1	0
Non-Home Econ. trained teacher-mgr.	0	0	0
Non-Home Econ. trained, full-time managers			
1 mgr. per school/* school system	30	16	14
2 mgrs. " " " "	1	0	1
3 " " " " "	3	2	1
9 " " " " "	1	1	0
12 " " " " "	1	0	1
47 Cook mgrs.	1	1	0
Other types of management indicated			
P.T.A. select own director	1	0	1
Mother has responsibility--parents do all	1	0	1
Hospital dietitians	1	1	0
No reply to question	10	3	7
No lunchroom	22	10	12

/* indicates or

CHAPTER V. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

In the majority of the junior and senior high schools studied Home Economics teachers and teacher-managers are expected to have a bachelor's degree. The value of such training is recognized in slightly more than one out of three schools for the cafeteria managers. A Food and Nutrition or an Institution Administration major is expected of more teachers and teacher-managers than of the regular cafeteria managers. According to results in Table VI A, 61.0 per cent of the cafeteria managers are required to have experience in their field of work but only 19.0 per cent that are required to have apprentice training. A smaller number of teachers than teacher-managers is expected to have experience and only a few in either position serve an apprenticeship.

A minor share of the cafeteria managers have any type of certification for their positions. Both state and Smith-Hughes certificates are required of the Home Economics teachers and teacher-managers with 11.0 per cent of each of the latter being required to have life teaching certificates. Any additional requirements are negligible for either group, though there were indications that successful experience was regarded as important.

Seventy-five to 80.0 per cent of all the schools operate on a salary schedule for staff members. There are

TABLE VI A. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Educational requirements and experience-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is a bachelor's degree required?	Yes	60	95.2	33	94.3	28	38.9
	No	3	4.8	2	5.6	44	61.1
	No reply	0	-	0	-	0	-
Is an Institution Administration or a Food and Nutrition major required?	Yes	34	54.0	17	48.6	23	31.9
	No	21	33.3	17	48.6	38	52.8
	No reply	8	12.7	1	2.8	11	15.3
If the custom varies in the system, indicate approximate %	50%	1	1.6	0	-	1	1.4
Is post graduate apprentice training required?	Yes	4	6.3	3	8.6	14	19.4
	No	45	71.4	28	80.0	43	59.7
	No reply	14	22.2	4	11.4	15	20.8
Is experience required?	Yes	27	42.9	19	54.3	44	61.1
	No	23	36.5	12	34.3	13	18.1
	No reply	13	20.6	4	11.4	15	20.8

TABLE VI B. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Certification and other requirements-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What certification is required?	Health	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Life	7	11.1	4	11.4	0	-
	State	34	54.0	9	25.7	6	8.3
	State + Smith-Hughes	8	12.7	4	11.4	2	2.8
	Food Handlers	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Sec. Prov.	4	6.3	1	2.8	0	-
	Standard High School	1	1.6	1	2.8	0	-
	Masters	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	No certification	0	-	1	2.8	21	29.2
	No reply	8	12.7	15	42.8	41	56.9
What are the other requirements?	Good character	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Civil Service	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Health examination	0	-	0	-	2	2.8
	Masters in Institution	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Health	2	3.2	0	-	2	2.8
	Continuous study	1	1.6	1	2.8	0	-
	Successful experience	2	3.2	1	2.8	3	4.2
	Specialty courses	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Tuberculosis test	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	High school Home Econ.	0	-	2	5.6	0	-
	No other requirements	4	6.3	1	2.8	5	6.9

TABLE VI C. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Salary schedules and sources of salaries-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	Yes	55	87.3	28	80.0	55	76.4
	No	4	6.3	5	14.3	13	18.1
	No reply	4	6.3	2	5.6	4	5.6
Are salaries paid from tax funds?	Yes	57	90.5	23	65.7	15	20.8
	No	2	3.2	4	11.4	44	61.1
	No reply	4	6.3	8	22.8	13	18.1
Are salaries paid from lunch-room profits?	Yes	3	4.8	11	31.4	55	76.4
	No	38	60.2	18	51.4	13	18.1
	No reply	22	35.0	6	17.1	4	5.6
If salary is divided, indicate percent from a. taxes	33%	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	50%	0	-	0	-	2	2.8
	94%	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	75%	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
b. profits	67%	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	50%	0	-	0	-	2	2.8
	6%	0	-	1	2.8		
	25%	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
Are salaries based on volume of business?	Yes	0	-	0	-	8	11.1
	No	43	68.3	32	91.4	57	79.2
	No reply	20	31.7	3	8.6	7	9.7
If salary is derived from other source, name source.	Smith-Hughes	1	1.6	2	5.6	0	-

more cafeteria managers who are not on a salary schedule than reports indicate to be true for the teachers and teacher-managers. Teachers' salaries are paid from tax funds; in two out of three instances teacher-managers salaries are also paid from tax funds. In 75.0 per cent of the cities, cafeteria managers' salaries are paid from lunchroom receipts with 11.0 per cent based directly or indirectly on the volume of business in the lunchroom. Smith-Hughes funds were used for salaries of teachers and teacher-managers in scattered instances.

Monthly and bi-weekly salary payments are made in almost all cities. A few school systems pay their cafeteria managers weekly.

The minimum salary range for teachers is $1,100 - 3,000 with an average of $1,715. The maximum salary range for teachers is $1,750 - 3,600 with an average of $2,650. The average salary is $2,170. According to Table VI D, teacher-managers' salaries are not as high as teachers' salaries. Statistically, the teacher-managers' average salary is not significantly less than the teachers' average salary*. The minimum salary range for the teacher-managers is $1,000 - 2,800

---

* The method of determining this significance is Baten, W. D. Elementary Statistics, p. 220:

$$t = \text{significance} = \frac{\text{actual difference of means - zero}}{\text{standard error of difference of means}}$$

It is considered that the t value must be equal to or greater than 2.6.

TABLE VI D. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Salaries and salary increases-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How often are salaries paid?	10 payments per yr.	1	1.6	1	2.8	1	1.4
	12 " " "	2	3.2	2	5.6	1	1.4
	Every 19 school days	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Weekly	0	-	0	-	3	4.2
	Bi-Weekly	37	58.7	19	54.3	51	70.8
	Monthly	14	22.2	10	28.6	15	20.8
	Every six weeks	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	No replies	8	12.7	3	8.6	2	2.8
What is the average minimum salary?	Range in salary	$1100-$3000		$1000-$2800		$340-$2850	
	Average	$1715		$1625		$1395	
	No reply	5	7.9	8	22.8	18	25.0
What is the average maximum salary?	Range in salary	$1750-$3600		$1200-$3500		$750-$4500	
	Average	$2650		$2595		$2200	
	No reply	8	12.7	10	28.6	23	31.9
What are the average annual increases?	Range in increase	0 - $250		$25 - 150		0 - $150	
	Average	$82		$90		$80	
	No reply	11	17.5	9	25.7	29	40.3

with an average of $1,625; the maximum salary range is $1,200 - 3,500 with an average of $2,595. The average salary of teacher-managers is $2,080.

Cafeteria managers' average salary is significantly less than the average salary of the other groups*. The minimum salary range for cafeteria managers is $340 - 2,850 with an average of $1,395. The maximum salary range is $750 - 4,500 with an average of $2,200. The average is $1,790.

Most cities give annual salary increases of an average of $90 to their teachers and teacher-managers. About 60.0 per cent of the cafeteria managers are included in the annual increases with an average of $80 per year.

Teachers and teacher-managers are generally financially rewarded for advanced degrees and special work. A wide range in rewards will be noted in Table VI E. Recognition for special work was rewarded in two out of ten instances for the cafeteria managers; it was more probable that she would receive a promotion if she had additional training.

The superintendent or the board of education employ the teachers and teacher-managers. The board of education employs one in three cafeteria managers with the superintendent and the cafeteria or lunchroom supervisor employing

---

*Baten. op. cit.

TABLE VI E. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Rewards -

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	Promotion	1	1.6	0	-	3	4.2
	Salary increase	10	15.9	6	17.1	8	11.1
	" " for masters	3	4.8	1	2.8	1	1.4
	Salary schedule advance	10	15.9	1	2.8	2	2.8
	Greater maximum	4	6.3	0	-	1	1.4
	No reward	3	4.8	3	8.6	22	30.6
	$5 per semester hr.	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	$5 per mo.for 1 yrs.work	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	$100 - 125 per yr.	8	12.7	5	14.3	1	1.4
	$250 per yr.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	$100 for masters	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	$125 " "	0	-	3	8.6	0	-
	$150 " "	4	6.3	0	-	0	-
	$200 " "	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	$250 " "	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	$300 " "	1	1.6	0	-	1	1.4
	No reply	15	23.8	18	23.8	32	44.4

TABLE VI F 1. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
To whom is application made?	Superintendent	39	61.9	22	66.9	23	31.9
	Personnel office/* committee	2	3.2	0	-	6	8.3
	Board of education	7	11.1	5	14.3	12	16.7
	Principal and supt.	1	1.6	0	-	2	2.8
	Board of Ed. & supt.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Cafeteria director/* supervisor	0	-	1	2.8	13	18.1
	Assistant supt.	0	-	0	-	2	2.8
	Clerk-treasurer	0	-	1	2.8	1	1.4
	No reply	13	20.6	6	17.1	13	18.1
Who does the employing?	Clerk-treasurer	0	-	1	2.8	1	1.4
	Supt. & board of ed.	10	15.9	2	5.6	2	2.8
	Superintendent	26	41.3	15	42.9	13	18.1
	Board of education	13	20.6	9	25.7	25	34.7
	Cafeteria supervisor/* lunchroom "	0	-	1	2.8	12	16.7
	Personnel office/* committee/director	4	6.3	0	-	4	5.6
	Assistant supt.	1	1.6	0	-	1	1.4
	Principal & supt.	1	1.6	0	-	2	2.8
	No reply	8	12.7	7	20.0	12	16.7

/* indicates or

TABLE VI F 2. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is a contract drawn up and signed?	Yes	52	82.5	30	85.7	28	38.9
	No	2	3.2	2	5.6	28	38.9
	No reply	9	14.3	3	8.6	16	22.2
Is there tenure?	Yes	35	55.5	19	54.3	23	31.9
	No	16	25.4	6	17.1	27	37.5
	No reply	12	19.1	10	28.6	22	30.6
What is the probationary period?	Not voted	1	1.6	1	2.8	0	-
	No probationary period	3	4.8	3	8.6	4	5.6
	3 to 6 mo.	1	1.6	1	2.8	11	15.2
	1 year	8	12.7	1	2.8	6	8.3
	2 "	12	19.1	1	2.8	2	2.8
	3 "	10	15.9	7	20.0	3	4.2
	4 "	3	4.8	0	-	0	-
	5 "	4	6.3	1	2.8	1	1.4
	No reply	21	33.3	20	57.1	45	62.5
Is a civil service examination required?	Yes	1	1.6	0	-	4	5.6
	No	55	87.3	31	88.6	62	86.1
	No reply	7	11.1	4	11.4	6	8.3
Is a state or local examination required?	Yes	14	22.1	2	5.6	7	9.7
	No	38	60.2	27	77.1	55	76.4
	No reply	11	17.5	6	17.1	10	13.9

about another one in three. Applications for employment are most often made with the superintendent, the board of education or the cafeteria supervisor.

Teachers and teacher-managers are employed by contract; 50.0 per cent of the cafeteria managers are employed under contract. Fifty-six and 55.0 per cent respectively of the teachers and teacher-managers have tenure with a probationary period of six months to five years. The largest number of replies to this question shows in Table VI F2, a two or three year probationary period. Less than one half of the cafeteria managers have tenure and their probationary period is generally three to six months if any time at all is required.

One city school system expected its Home Economics teachers to pass Civil Service examinations. In four school systems reporting, the cafeteria managers were under Civil Service. State or local examinations were required of teachers in fourteen instances and seven school systems expected their cafeteria managers to pass a state or local examination.

There are practically no restrictions on living or conduct activities of the teachers, teacher-managers, or cafeteria managers. Scattered comments of interest will be noted in Table VI F3.

Almost all teachers and teacher-managers have access to a retirement fund. About 65.0 per cent of the cafeteria managers benefit from a city or state retirement fund. A

TABLE VI F 3. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What are the restrictions on living?	Very liberal	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Those required of any good teacher	2	3.2	3	8.6	0	-
	Pay bills	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Lady	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Within salary	1	1.6	1	2.8	2	2.8
	No formal or written	1	1.6	1	2.8	1	1.4
	Civil service	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Within city limits	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	" the city	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	" " county	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Resident of the state	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Discretion	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	Respectability	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	No restrictions	40	63.5	20	57.1	35	48.6
	No reply	16	25.4	9	25.7	28	38.8
What are the restrictions on conduct?	No restrictions	25	39.7	11	31.4	19	26.4
	Good moral conduct	4	6.3	2	5.6	7	9.7
	Same as any good citizen	1	1.6	0	-	3	4.2
	Normal	6	9.5	1	2.8	6	8.3
	Usual teacher conduct	5	7.9	2	5.6	0	-
	Very liberal	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	No reply	21	33.3	19	54.3	37	51.4

TABLE VI G 1. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHERS-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Response	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is there a retirement plan?	Yes	52	82.5	28	80.0	47	65.3
	No	0	-	1	2.8	11	15.3
	No reply	11	17.5	6	17.1	14	19.4
Is vacation with salary allowed?	Yes	5	7.9	8	22.9	14	19.4
	No	47	74.6	21	60.0	47	65.3
	No reply	11	17.5	6	17.1	11	15.3
How many days vacation with salary is allowed?	Range	0 - 15 da.		0-30 or more da.		0-30 or more da.	
	Average	10 da.		1-15 da.		15-20 da.	
What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave? a. full salary	Full salary	28	44.4	15	42.9	24	33.3
	Range	5-50da.		3-15 da.		5-50 da.	
	Average	11 da.		7 da.		12 da.	
b. half salary	20 da. after 10 da. full	1	1.6	0	-	1	1.4
	7 " " 7 " "	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	One half of accum. days	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
c. full salary, less pay of sub.	For 15 da.	1	1.6	2	5.6	0	-
	" 10 da.	2	3.2	0	-	0	-
	" indefinite	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
d. some other fraction	20% up to 60 accum. da.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	80% " " 80 " "	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
e. no salary	After 5 da.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	" 10 "	2	3.2	0	-	0	-
	" accum. da.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-

TABLE VI G 2. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
If sick leave is allowed, a. How many days in one year?	Range	5-60 da.		0-30 da.		5-40 da.	
	Average	10 da.		10 da.		10 da.	
b. Is the allowance cumulative?	Yes	48	72.6	25	72.6	43	59.7
	No	9	14.3	6	17.1	10	13.9
	No reply	6	9.5	4	11.4	19	26.4
c. How many yrs. can it accumulate?	Range	0-indefinite		2 yr.indef.		limited	
	Average	3-4 yr.		4-5 yr.		negligible	
What other allowances are given?	Time for visitation and conference	1	1.6	1	2.8	0	-
	Death immediate family	3	4.8	2	5.6	5	6.9
	Professional meetings	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	20 day differential	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	As need arises	1	1.6	2	5.6	0	-
	$60 per extra-curricular activity	1	1.6	1	2.8	0	-
	Dif.between salary + sub.salary for 8 wks.	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	No other allowances	23	36.5	5	14.3	14	19.4
	No reply	31	49.2	23	65.7	53	73.6

higher percentage of cafeteria managers than teachers is allowed vacation with salary; the average range is fifteen to twenty days. Teachers and teacher-managers average ten to fifteen days vacation with salary.

Teachers and cafeteria managers earn sick leave allowance of five to fifty days per year with a greater number of teachers than cafeteria managers being paid full salary. Teacher-managers earn three to thirty days with 42.0 percent paid at full salary. There is a negligible number of either group which obtains no salary with sick leave.

Benefits of accumulated sick leave days are more often in evidence for the teachers and teacher-managers. The cafeteria managers are very limited in the possible length of time sick leave may accumulate but the former are permitted to accumulate allowances of from three to five years.

Additional benefits of visitation and conference time, attendance at professional meetings, and three to five days for death in the immediate family are evidenced for each position.

The salary supposedly covers expense of attendance at conventions and similar expenses such as travel, of the public school staffs in most instances. Table VI C3 indicates occasional allowances for such expenses as mileage, uniforms, etc.

The average work week for the three positions is five days; one cafeteria manager worked a five and one-half day

TABLE VI G 3. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How much convention or meetings expenses are allowed?	No expenses	32	50.8	19	54.3	34	47.2
	All expenses	4	6.3	2	5.6	3	4.2
	When sent by electors	1	1.6	2	5.6	0	-
	Authorized as needed	5	7.9	1	2.8	4	5.6
	$25	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	No reply	20	31.7	11	31.4	31	43.1
What other expenses are granted?	$10 per mo. travel expense	1	1.4	0	-	0	-
	Salary covers all	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Certain vacation with full pay	1	1.6	0	-	0	-
	Uniforms	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	Lunches	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	Mileage	0	-	1	2.8	0	-
	No other expenses	28	44.4	18	51.4	23	31.9
	No reply	33	52.3	15	42.9	47	65.3

week. Teachers supervise very few employees; teacher-managers average about ten employees to supervise and cafeteria managers from ten to thirty or more. Teachers are expected to take part in extra-curricular activities ranging from occasionally to one hour per week for banquets, teas, clubs, etc. Cafeteria managers are less often expected to supervise activities as is evidenced in Table VI H.

TABLE VI H. COMPARISON OF HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS, TEACHER-MANAGERS, AND CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-School duties and extra-curricular activities-

Questions	Responses	Home Econ. Teacher		Teacher-Manager		Cafeteria Manager	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What is the average work week?	5 days	50	79.4	24	68.6	59	81.9
	5½ days	0	-	0	-	1	1.4
	No reply	13	20.6	11	31.4	12	16.7
How many employees do they supervise?	None	9	14.3	1	2.8	0	-
	Number varies	2	3.2	3	8.6	2	2.8
	1 - 10	7	11.1	20	57.1	16	22.2
	11 - 20	0	-	1	2.8	7	9.7
	21 - 30	0	-	1	2.8	9	12.5
	31 and up	4	6.3	0	-	6	8.3
	No reply	41	65.1	9	25.7	32	44.4
Are extra-curricular activities required?	Yes	30	47.6	17	48.6	11	15.3
	No	17	27.0	14	40.0	44	61.1
	No reply	16	25.4	4	11.4	17	23.6
Approximate hours per week for							
a. banquets	Range	0 - 2 hr.		0 - 1 hr.		0 - 1 hr.	
	Average	Occ.*		1 hr.		Occ.	
b. teas	Range	0 - 1 hr.		0 - 1 hr.		0 - 1 hr.	
	Average	½ hr.		Occ.		Occ.	
c. clubs	Range	0 - 2 hr.		0 - 2 hr.		0 - 2 hr.	
	Average	1 hr.		1 hr.		Occ.	
d. other activities	Range	0		0 - 1 hr.		0	
	All checked varies	5	7.9	3	8.4	2	2.8
	All checked none	9	14.3	5	14.3	24	33.3
	Banquets with extra pay	1	1.6	0	-	0	-

* indicates occasionally

CHAPTER VI. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

Junior and senior high schools of Michigan and Ohio almost unanimously expect their Home Economics teachers to have a bachelor's degree. In addition many of the schools specify that the degree be obtained in the field of Food and Nutrition or Institution Administration; Ohio leads in the latter requirement with 61.8 percent and Michigan follows with 44.8 percent. As noted in Table VII A, few schools in either state demand any apprentice training. Experience is expected of 52.9 percent of the Ohio teachers and Michigan asks for experience in 31.0 percent of the cases.

Life certification was a "must have" in seven Michigan schools. Both states require a state teaching certificate in almost all instances and in addition some cities specify a Smith-Hughes certificate. Good health, successful experience, and continuous study were listed as additional requirements more often in the Michigan replies.

The reports were 87.0 percent to 86.0 percent respectively for Ohio and Michigan operation on a salary schedule. Only four Michigan cities recorded a negative response. Almost all teachers' salaries in both states are paid from tax funds. Smith-Hughes funds were used to supplement local tax funds in one Ohio city. Salaries are paid bi-weekly and monthly.

TABLE VII A. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Educational requirements and experience-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Is a bachelor's degree required?	Yes	32	94.1	28	96.6
	No	2	5.9	1	3.4
	No reply	0	-	0	-
Is an Institution Administration or a Food and Nutrition major required?	Yes	21	61.8	13	44.8
	No	8	23.5	13	44.8
	No reply	5	14.7	3	10.4
Is post graduate apprentice training required?	Yes	3	8.8	1	3.4
	No	24	70.6	21	72.4
	No reply	7	20.6	7	24.2
Is experience required?	Yes	18	52.9	9	31.0
	No	7	20.6	16	55.2
	No reply	9	26.5	4	13.8

TABLE VII B. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Certification and other requirements-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What certification is required?	Life	0	-	7	24.2
	State	24	70.6	10	34.5
	State + Smith-Hughes	6	17.6	2	6.9
	Sec. Provisional	0	-	4	13.8
	Standard High School	1	2.9	0	-
	Masters	0	-	1	3.4
	No reply	3	8.8	5	17.2
What are the other requirements?	Good character	1	2.9	0	-
	Health	1	2.9	1	3.4
	Continuous study	0	-	1	3.4
	Successful experience	1	2.9	1	3.4
	Specialty courses	1	2.9	0	-
	No other requirements	2	5.9	2	6.9
	No reply	28	82.4	24	82.9

TABLE VII C. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Salary schedules and sources of salary-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	Yes	30	88.2	25	86.2
	No	0	-	4	13.8
	No reply	4	11.8	0	-
Are salaries paid from tax funds?	Yes	30	88.2	27	93.1
	No	2	5.9	0	-
	No reply	2	5.9	2	6.9
Are salaries paid from lunchroom profits?	Yes	1	2.9	2	6.9
	No	20	58.8	18	62.1
	No reply	13	38.2	9	31.0
Are salaries based on volume of business?	Yes	0	-	0	-
	No	22	64.7	21	72.4
	No reply	12	35.3	8	27.6
If salary is derived from other source, name source.	Smith-Hughes	1	2.9	0	-

The minimum salary range of Ohio Home Economics teachers is $1,100 - 2,000 with an average of $1,440; the maximum salary range is $1,950 - 3600 with an average of $2,760. The average salary is $2,045. The minimum salary range of Michigan Home Economics teachers is $1,300 - 3,000 with an average of $1,798; the maximum salary range is $1,750 - 3,400 with an average of $2,580. The average salary is $2,175. Despite the fact that the averages of the two states appear to vary in Table VII D, the average salary of the Ohio Home Economics teacher does not differ significantly from the average salary of the Michigan Home Economics teacher*.

Michigan city schools give average annual increases of $110 compared to $85 for Ohio cities. Advanced degrees and special work are recognized in practically all cities of both states with the range specifying salary increase or salary schedule advance to $100 - 125 per year. Rewards of $100 - 300 are recognized for completion of a master's degree, with Ohio teachers in the upper bracket of the range.

Ohio superintendents assume more responsibility for receiving applications and employing teachers than do superintendents in Michigan. The board of education is second in number of instances receiving applications and employing teachers in the former state. Michigan boards of education,

---

*Baten. Op. cit.

TABLE VII D. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Salaries and salary increases-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
How often are salaries paid?	10 payments per year	1	2.9	0	-
	12 " " "	2	5.9	0	-
	Every 19 school days	1	2.9	0	-
	Bi-weekly	13	38.2	24	82.8
	Monthly	11	32.3	3	10.4
	No reply	6	17.6	2	6.9
What is the average minimum salary?	Range	$1100-2000		$1300-3000	
	Average	$1440		$1798	
	No reply	2	5.9	3	10.4
What is the average maximum salary?	Range	$1950-3600		$1750-3400	
	Average	$2665		$2580	
	" with masters	$2760		-	
	No reply	3	8.8	5	17.2
What are the average annual increases?	Range	$ 10 - 150		$ 0 - 250	
	Average	$85		$110	
	No reply	4	11.8	7	24.1

TABLE VII E. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Rewards-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	Promotion	0	-	1	3.4
	Salary increase	7	20.6	3	10.4
	" " for masters	2	5.9	1	3.4
	Salary schedule advance	5	14.7	5	17.2
	Greater maximum	3	8.8	1	3.4
	No reward	2	5.9	1	3.4
	$5 per mo. for 1 yrs. work	1	2.9	0	-
	$100 - 125 per yr.	3	8.8	5	17.2
	$250 per yr.	0	-	1	3.4
	$100 for masters	1	2.9	0	-
	$150 " "	0	-	4	13.8
	$250 " "	1	2.9	0	-
	$300 " "	1	2.9	0	-
	No reply	8	23.6	7	24.1

superintendents, and boards of education with the recommendation of the superintendent assume responsibility for employment in respective order. There were indications that Michigan teachers are sometimes employed by a personnel committee or director. The superintendent receives the majority of the applications.

According to this study a larger number of Ohio than Michigan teachers are under contract. Also a greater number of Ohio teachers has tenure. It is significant to note in Table VII F1, that 51.7 percent of the Michigan Home Economics teachers reported do not have tenure.

The probationary period in Ohio averages three years with a range of none to five years. Michigan's average is slightly less than two years with a range of none to three years.

One Ohio school city was found where teachers are expected to pass Civil Service examinations and eleven Ohio cities gave state or local examinations to their teachers. Three Michigan cities gave state or local examinations.

More than 60.0 percent of both the Michigan and Ohio cities reported no restrictions on living and conduct, but it is interesting to note in Table VII F2 the various other comments that were made.

All of the schools that made replies specified that the Home Economics teachers were on a retirement plan. Ohio has an average of ten days vacation allowed with salary for

TABLE VII F 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
To whom is application made?	Superintendent	23	67.6	16	55.2
	Personnel office/* committee	2	5.9	0	-
	Board of education	1	2.9	6	20.7
	Principal + superintendent	1	2.9	0	-
	Board of Ed. + supervisor	1	2.9	0	-
	No reply	6	17.6	7	24.2
Who does the employing?	Supt. + Board of Ed.	7	20.6	3	10.4
	Superintendent	12	35.3	14	14.8
	Board of Education	8	23.5	5	17.2
	Personnel committee/office/ Director	1	2.9	3	10.4
	Assist. supt. + supt.	1	2.9	0	-
	Principal + supt.	1	2.9	0	-
	No reply	4	11.8	4	13.8
Is a contract drawn up and signed?	Yes	30	88.2	22	75.9
	No	1	2.9	1	3.4
	No reply	3	8.8	6	20.7
Is there tenure?	Yes	27	79.4	8	27.6
	No	1	2.9	15	51.7
	No reply	6	17.6	6	20.7

/* indicates or

TABLE VII F 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the probationary period?	Not voted	0	-	1	3.4
	No probationary period	1	2.9	2	6.9
	3 to 6 mo.	0	-	1	3.4
	1 year	4	11.8	4	13.8
	2 "	5	14.7	7	24.2
	3 "	8	23.5	2	6.9
	4 "	3	8.8	0	-
	5 "	4	11.8	0	-
	No reply	9	26.5	12	41.4
Is a civil service examination required?	Yes	1	2.9	0	-
	No	29	85.3	26	89.6
	No reply	4	11.8	3	10.4
Is a state or local examination required?	Yes	11	32.3	3	10.4
	No	17	50.0	21	72.4
	No reply	6	17.6	5	17.2
What are the restrictions on living?	No restrictions	21	61.8	19	65.5
	Very liberal	1	2.9	0	-
	Those for any good teacher	1	2.9	1	3.4
	Pay bills	1	2.9	0	-
	Lady	1	2.9	0	-
	Within salary	1	2.9	0	-
	No formal or written	0	-	1	3.4
	No reply	8	23.5	8	27.6
What are the restrictions on conduct?	No restrictions	12	35.3	13	44.8
	Good moral conduct	3	8.8	1	3.4
	Same as any citizen	1	2.9	0	-
	Normal	3	8.8	3	10.4
	Usual teacher conduct	3	8.8	2	6.9
	Very liberal	1	2.9	0	-
	No reply	11	32.3	10	34.5

those who were given any allowance. The Michigan average was slightly less with eight days and a similarly small number given the allowance.

Full salary for five to sixty days of sick leave allowance with an average of fifteen days is granted for 47.0 percent of the Ohio teachers, Michigan teachers are granted five to fifteen days of full salary with an average of nine days for 41.4 percent. There were four cities which reported no salary after five to ten accumulated days. More than seven out of ten Michigan and Ohio schools permit sick leave allowance to accumulate for their Home Economics teachers. In Ohio sick leave can accumulate an average of four years; Michigan permits an average of five years. There were a few cases in which sick leave might accumulate indefinitely.

Other allowances to the Home Economics teachers in either state were at a minimum. Upon referring to Table VII G2 it is noted that there are instances of conference allowances, professional meetings, death in the immediate family, etc. One Ohio school city pays $60 per extra-curricular activity.

Almost all cities extend no expense allowances for meetings or general expenditures. Michigan seems to pay more convention expenses than does Ohio. There were cases in Michigan of authorization as needed.

The average work week is five days for the Home Economics teachers. She supervises few employees in either state. Approximately an equal percentage of teachers participate in

TABLE VII G 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Is there a retirement plan?	Yes	28	82.4	24	82.9
	No	0	-	0	-
	No reply	6	17.6	5	17.2
Is vacation with salary allowed?	Yes	3	8.8	2	6.9
	No	24	70.6	23	79.3
	No reply	7	20.6	4	13.8
How many days vacation with salary is allowed?	Range	0 - 15 and summer recess		0 - 15 and summer recess	
	Average	10 da.		8 da.	
What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave?					
a. full salary	Full salary	16	47.1	12	41.4
	Range	5 - 50 da.		5 - 15 da.	
	Average	13 da.		10 da.	
b. half salary	For 20 da.after 10 full	1	2.9	0	-
c. full salary, less pay of sub.	For 10 da.	0	-	1	3.4
	20 da. differential	0	-	1	3.4
	For 15 da.	0	-	1	3.4
d. some other fraction	20% up to 60 accum.da.	0	-	1	3.4
	80% " " 80 days	0	-	1	3.4
e. no salary	After 5 da.	1	2.9	0	-
	" 10 "	0	-	2	6.9
	" accum. days	0	-	1	3.4

TABLE VII G 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
If sick leave is allowed					
a. how many days in one year?	Range	5-60 da.		5-10 da.	
	Average	18 da.		8 da.	
b. is the allowance cumulative?	Yes	25	73.5	23	79.3
	No	5	14.7	4	13.8
	No reply	4	11.8	2	6.9
c. how many years can it accumulate?	Range	1 yr.- indef.*		2 yr.- indef.	
	Average	4 yr.		5 yr.	
What other allowances are given?	Time for visitation and conference	1	2.9	0	-
	Death immediate family	2	5.9	1	3.4
	Professional meetings	1	2.9	0	-
	20 da. differential	0	-	1	3.4
	$60 per extra-curricular activity	1	2.9	0	-
	Dif. between salary and sub. salary for 8 wks.	0	-	1	3.4
	No other allowances	14	41.2	9	31.0
	No reply	15	44.1	16	55.2

* indef. indicates indefinite

TABLE VII G 3. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
How much conventions or meetings expenses are allowed?	No expenses	23	67.6	9	31.0
	All expenses	1	2.9	3	10.4
	When sent by electors	1	2.9	0	-
	Authorized as needed	0	-	5	17.2
	$25	0	-	1	3.4
	No reply	9	26.5	11	37.9
What other expenses are granted?	No other expenses	17	50.0	11	37.9
	Salary includes all	0	-	1	3.4
	Certain vacation with full pay	0	-	1	3.4
	No reply	17	50.0	13	44.9

TABLE VII H. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

-School duties and extra-curricular activities-

Questions	Responses	Home Economics Teachers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the average work week?	5 da.	27	79.4	23	79.3
	No reply	7	20.6	6	20.7
How many employees do they supervise?	Range	0-30 or more		0-30 or more	
	Average	10		15-18	
Are extra-curricular activities required?	Yes	16	47.1	14	48.3
	No	8	23.5	9	31.0
	No reply	10	29.4	6	20.7
Approximate hours per week for a. banquets	Range	0 - 2 hr.		0 - 1 hr.	
	Average	1 hr.		1 hr.	
b. teas	Range	0 - 1 hr.		occ.-1 hr.	
	Average	occ.*		occ.	
c. clubs	Range	occ.-2 hr.		0 - 1 hr.	
	Average	occ.		occ.	
d. other activities	Range	occ.-2 hr.		0 - 2 hr.	
	Average	1 hr.		occ.	
	All checked varies	1	2.9	3	10.4
	" " none	4	11.8	5	17.2

* occ. indicates occasionally

extra-curricular activities in each state. The range in the length of time spent on activities is likewise very similar.

CHAPTER VII. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

A bachelor's degree is required of trained cafeteria managers in Michigan and Ohio. Seventy-five and 84.0 percent respectively require that the manager be a Food and Nutrition or an Institution Administration major. Michigan advocates apprentice training for 84.6 percent of its trained managers. Experience, as specified in Table VIII A, is expected of an average of 76.7 percent of the untrained managers in both states. Slightly more than one in three trained managers are expected to have experience.

Ohio requires more state and Smith-Hughes certification from its trained managers than does Michigan. Two Ohio cities require an untrained manager to have a health certificate and one Michigan city requires a Food Handlers' certificate. One Michigan city specifies that a master's degree in Institution Administration is required.

Both states authorize salary schedules for their cafeteria managers but a smaller percentage of untrained managers are on salary schedule. Ohio reports all untrained managers' salaries paid from lunchroom receipts; Michigan reports 50.0 percent from a similar source with little dependence upon the volume of business. About 72.0 percent of the trained managers in each state are paid from lunchroom receipts with Michigan having slightly less than Ohio thus paid.

TABLE VIII A. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Educational requirements and experience-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is a bachelor's degree required?	Yes	15	93.8	13	100.	0	-	0	-
	No	1	6.2	0	-	23	100.	20	100.
	No reply	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Is an Institution Administration or a Food and Nutrition major required?	Yes	12	75.	11	84.6	0	-	0	-
	No	2	12.5	2	15.3	19	82.6	15	75.0
	No reply	2	12.5	0	-	4	17.3	5	25.0
Is post graduate apprentice training required?	Yes	2	12.5	11	84.6	0	-	1	25.0
	No	11	68.8	1	7.7	17	73.9	15	75.0
	No reply	3	18.7	1	7.7	6	26.1	4	20.0
Is experience required?	Yes	6	37.5	5	38.5	18	78.4	15	75.0
	No	4	25.0	7	53.8	1	4.3	1	5.0
	No reply	6	37.5	1	7.7	4	17.3	4	20.0

TABLE VIII B. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Certification and other requirements-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What certification is required?	State	6	37.5	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Health	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	State + Smith-Hughes	2	12.5	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Food Handlers'	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	0	-
	No certification	1	6.2	2	15.3	9	39.2	9	45.0
	No reply	7	43.7	10	76.9	14	60.8	11	47.8
What are the other requirements?	Successful exp.	0	-	0	-	0	-	3	15.0
	Health exam.	0	-	1	7.7	1	4.3	0	-
	Health	1	6.2	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	Civil service	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	Masters in Institution	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	0	-
	No other requirements	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	4	20.0

TABLE VIII C. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Salary schedules and source of salaries-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	Yes	14	87.5	12	92.3	14	60.8	15	75.0
	No	0	-	1	7.7	9	39.2	3	15.0
	No reply	2	12.5	0	-	0	-	2	10.0
Are salaries paid from tax funds?	Yes	4	25.0	4	30.6	1	4.3	6	30.0
	No	11	68.8	7	53.8	20	86.8	6	30.0
	No reply	1	6.2	2	15.3	2	8.7	8	40.0
Are salaries paid from lunch profits?	Yes	12	75.0	9	69.2	23	100.	10	50.0
	No	3	18.8	4	30.6	0	-	6	30.0
	No reply	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	4	20.0
If salary is divided, indicate percent from									
a. taxes	50%	1	6.2	1	7.7	1	4.3	0	-
b. profits	50%	1	6.2	1	7.7	1	4.3		
Are salaries based on volume of business?	Yes	0	-	0	-	5	21.7	3	15.0
	No	12	75.0	13	100.	18	78.4	13	56.5
	No reply	4	25.0	0	-	0	-	0	-
If salary is derived from other source, name source.	Federal Food Subsidy	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0

Salaries are paid bi-weekly and monthly. Both states indicated instances of salaries paid weekly, too.

The minimum salary range for Ohio trained cafeteria managers is $1,050- 1,500 with an average of $1,425; the maximum salary range is $1,665- 4,500 with an average of $2,800. The average salary is $2,050. The minimum salary range of Michigan trained managers is $1,000- 1,850 with an average of $1,645; the maximum salary range is $1,500- 3,250 with an average of $2,330. The average salary is $2,235. Although the Ohio average appears to be less than the Michigan average, the average salary of the Ohio trained cafeteria manager does not vary significantly from the average of the Michigan trained manager.*

The minimum salary range of the Michigan untrained cafeteria managers is $685- 2,100 with an average of $1,400; the maximum salary range is $800- 2,800 with an average of $2,070. The average salary is $1,735. The minimum salary range of the Ohio untrained cafeteria managers is $300- 2,950 with an average of $1,150; the maximum salary range is $750- 2,850 with an average of $1,810. The average salary is $1,305. Although there are differences in the average salaries of the Michigan and Ohio untrained managers the salary in Ohio does not differ significantly from the average salary in Michigan.*

---

* Baten. Op. cit.

TABLE VIII D. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Salaries and salary increases-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How often are salaries paid?	10 payments per yr.	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	12 " " "	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Weekly	1	6.2			1	4.3	1	5.0
	Every 6 wks.	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	Bi-weekly	4	25.0	12	92.3	18	78.4	17	62.9
	Monthly	11	68.8	0	-	4	17.3	0	-
	No reply	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	1	5.0
What is the average minimum salary?	Range	$1050-1800		$1000-1850		$300-2850		$685-2100	
	Average	$1425		$1645		$1180		$1400	
	No reply	3	18.7	4	30.6	5	21.7	9	45.0
What is the average maximum salary?	Range	$1665-4500		$1300-3250		$750-2850		$800-2600	
	Average	$2800		$2830		$1610		$2070	
	No reply	7	43.7	1	7.7	4	17.3	10	50.0
What are the average annual increases?	Range	$75-150		$10-125		$ 0-100		$10-125	
	Average	$115		$90		$40		$70	
	No reply	4	25.0	1	7.7	10	43.5	11	55.0

TABLE VIII E. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Rewards-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	Promotion	0	-	3	23.1	0	-	0	-
	Salary increase	3	18.8	1	7.7	2	8.7	2	10.0
	" " for masters	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Salary schedule advance	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	$100-125 per yr.	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	$125 for masters	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	$250 " "	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	No reward	0	-	3	23.1	8	34.8	8	40.0
	No reply	5	31.3	6	46.2	13	56.5	9	45.0

TABLE VIII F 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
To whom is application made?	Clerk-treasurer	1	6.2	3	23.1	1	4.3	0	-
	Personnel office/* Committee	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	Superintendent	6	37.5	3	23.1	7	30.4	7	35.0
	Board of education	0	-	6	46.2	3	13.0	3	15.0
	Principal + supt.	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	1	5.0
	Cafeteria director/ supervisor	5	31.3	1	7.7	6	26.1	1	5.0
	Assistant supt.	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	No reply	3	18.8	0	-	5	21.7	6	30.0
Who does the employing?	Clerk-treasurer	0	-	3	23.1	1	4.3	0	-
	Principal + supt.	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	1	5.0
	Supt. + board of Ed.	1	6.2	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	Superintendent	2	12.5	2	15.3	4	17.3	5	25.0
	Assist.supt. + supt.	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	Board of education	4	25.0	5	38.5	8	34.8	8	40.0
	Cafeteria / lunchroom supervisor	6	37.5	0	-	5	21.7	1	5.0
	Personnel office/ director / committee	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	No reply	3	18.8	3	23.1	3	13.0	3	15.0

/* indicates or

The average annual increases are greater in Michigan than in Ohio for the untrained managers with $70 and $40, respectively.

Advanced degrees and special work are given recognition for trained managers in the form of promotions or salary increases in both states. There is a negligible number of untrained managers given any recognition for extra training.

The cafeteria supervisor and the board of education employ a large proportion of the Ohio trained managers. The latter employs the majority of Michigan trained managers. Applications for the former are most often received by the superintendent and cafeteria supervisor in respective order, with the board of education and the superintendent receiving applications in Michigan for the trained managers.

The board of education and the cafeteria supervisor employ the greater percentage of untrained Ohio managers with applications taken by the superintendent and the cafeteria director. Michigan untrained managers are more often employed by the board of education with applications received at the superintendent's office.

Eighty-seven and one-half percent of the Ohio managers with training are working under contract while less than one in three Michigan managers are under contract. Approximately one in four managers without training in each state are under contract.

TABLE VIII F 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is a contract drawn up and signed?	Yes	14	87.5	4	30.6	5	21.7	5	25.0
	No	1	6.2	7	53.8	11	47.8	9	45.0
	No reply	1	6.2	2	15.3	7	30.4	6	30.0
Is there tenure?	Yes	12	75.0	6	46.2	3	13.0	2	10.0
	No	2	12.5	2	15.3	13	56.5	10	50.0
	No reply	2	12.5	5	38.5	7	30.4	8	40.0
What is the probationary period?	Not voted	0	-	3	23.1	0	-	0	-
	No probationary period	0	-	0	-	3	13.0	1	5.0
	3 - 6 mo.	2	12.5	1	7.7	3	13.0	2	10.0
	1 year	2	12.5	3	23.1	1	4.3	0	-
	2 "	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	1	5.0
	3 "	2	12.5	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	5 "	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	No reply	9	56.3	5	38.4	15	65.2	16	80.0
Is a civil service examination required?	Yes	2	12.5	0	-	2	8.7	0	-
	No	13	81.3	13	100.	19	82.6	17	62.9
	No reply	1	6.2	0	-	2	8.7	3	15.0
Is a state or local examination required?	Yes	5	31.3	1	7.7	1	4.3	0	-
	No	8	50.0	12	92.3	18	78.2	17	62.9
	No reply	3	18.7	0	-	4	17.3	3	15.0

Tenure is granted to 75.0 percent of the Ohio trained managers but slightly less than 50.0 percent of those in Michigan. A small number of the managers without training has tenure in either state. The probationary period for the former ranges from three months to five years in Ohio and from three months to two years in Michigan; the latter group ranges from three months to three years for Ohio and three months to two years for Michigan. There are instances of no probationary period for the latter group.

Four Ohio cities require Civil Service examinations for their cafeteria managers. A still greater number of Ohio cities require a state or local examination. There is but one city in Michigan which cited either type of examination for its managers.

It will be seen in Table VIII F3 that there are few restrictions on living or conduct among cafeteria managers regardless of training.

A retirement plan functions in both states for their cafeteria managers with Michigan having the greater percentage. One in four of the trained managers is granted vacation with salary in Michigan which is twice that in Ohio. The latter's untrained managers are allowed more days of vacation but only one in six receives any salary with vacation.

Full salary for sick leave is paid an average of ten to fourteen days, respectively, for trained and untrained Ohio managers. Michigan allows eight and ten days in the same order. Sick leave allowances for trained managers are

TABLE VIII F 3. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What are the restrictions on living?	No restrictions	7	43.7	6	46.2	13	56.5	9	45.0
	Respectability	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	0	-
	Civil Service	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	In city limits	0	-	1	7.7	1	4.3	0	-
	In school district	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	Within salary	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Resident of state	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	Within county	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	No formal or written	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
	No reply	6	37.5	5	38.5	8	34.8	9	45.0
What are the restrictions on conduct?	No restrictions	6	37.5	3	23.1	8	34.8	2	10.0
	Good moral conduct	1	6.2	2	15.3	3	13.0	1	5.0
	Normal	1	6.2	1	7.7	2	8.7	2	10.0
	Same as any citizen	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	2	10.0
	No reply	7	43.7	6	46.2	10	43.4	13	56.5

TABLE VIII G 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is there a retirment plan?	Yes	12	75.0	12	92.3	11	47.8	12	60.0
	No	0	-	0	-	6	26.1	5	25.0
	No reply	4	25.0	1	7.7	6	26.1	3	15.0
Is vacation with salary allowed?	Yes	4	25.0	3	23.1	4	17.3	3	15.0
	No	9	56.3	10	76.9	15	65.2	12	60.0
	No reply	3	18.7	0	-	4	17.3	5	25.0
How many days vacation with salary is allowed?	Range	0-30 or more		0-30 or more		0-30 or more		0-30 or more	
	Average	5 da.		10 da.		10 da.		5 da.	
What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave?									
a. full salary	Full salary	5	31.3	3	23.1	6	26.1	10	50.0
	Range	5-15 da.		5-10 da.		10-50 da.		5-15 da.	
	Average	11 da.		8 da.		15 da.		10 da.	
b. half salary	20 da. after 10 da. full	0	-	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	½ of accum. days	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0
c. full salary, less pay of sub.	For 15 da.	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	0	-
	20 da. differential	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
e. no salary		1	6.2	0	-	1	4.3	0	-
	After 10 da.	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	5.0

cumulative up to an average of five years in Ohio for 62.5 percent of the reported schools; the Michigan average is four years for 84.6 percent of the reported schools. Generally speaking, the percentage of those who may accumulate sick leave, is lower for untrained managers. Each state averages four years, with 43.6 percent reported for Ohio and 60.0 percent for Michigan.

Other allowances to cafeteria managers are of minor significance. The few instances where expenses are granted will be noted in Table VIII G2.

The work week is comparable for all managers. There is evidence in Table VIII H that Ohio managers supervise more employees than Michigan managers. Ohio managers participate more often in extra-curricular activities than do Michigan managers.

TABLE VIII G 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
If sick leave is allowed a. how many days in one year?	Range	5-10 da.		5-10 da.		5-40 da.		5-10 da.	
	Average	9 da.		9 da.		13 da.		7 da.	
b. is the allowance cumulative?	Yes	10	62.5	11	84.6	10	43.4	12	60.0
	No	2	12.5	2	15.3	3	13.0	3	15.0
	No reply	4	25.0	0	-	10	43.4	5	25.0
c. how many yrs. can it accumulate?	Range	2 yr. indef.*		2-9 yr.		1 yr. indef.*		1-10 yr.	
	Average	5 yr.		4 yr.		4 yr.		4 yr.	
What other allowances are given?	Death immediate family	0	-	3	23.1	1	4.3	1	5.0
	No other allowances	6	37.5	3	23.1	0	-	5	25.0
	No reply	10	62.5	7	53.8	22	95.7	15	70.0
How much conventions or meetings expenses are allowed?	No expenses	8	50.0	6	46.2	11	47.8	9	45.0
	All expenses	1	6.2	1	7.7	0	-	1	5.0
	Authorized as needed	2	12.5	1	7.7	0	-	1	5.0
	No reply	5	31.5	5	38.5	12	52.2	9	45.0
What other expenses are granted?	$10 per month travel	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	Uniforms	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	0	-
	No other expenses	7	43.7	3	23.1	7	30.4	6	30.0
*indef. indicates indefinite	No reply	8	50.0	9	69.2	16	69.0	14	70.0

TABLE VIII H. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TRAINED AND UNTRAINED CAFETERIA MANAGERS

-School duties and extra-curricular activities-

Questions	Responses	Cafeteria Managers							
		Trained				Untrained			
		Ohio		Mich.		Ohio		Mich.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
What is the average work week?	5 da.	13	81.3	11	84.6	19	82.6	16	80.0
	5½ da.	1	6.2	0	-	0	-	0	-
	No reply	2	12.5	2	15.3	4	17.3	4	20.0
How many employees do they supervise?	Number varies	0	-	1	7.7	0	-	1	5.0
	1-10	1	6.2	1	7.7	7	30.4	8	40.0
	11-20	2	12.5	2	15.3	3	13.0	0	-
	20-30	6	37.5	2	15.3	0	-	0	-
	30 and up	2	12.5	2	15.3	2	8.7	0	-
	No reply	5	31.3	5	38.5	11	47.8	11	47.8
Are extra-curricular activities required?	Yes	4	25.0	0	-	3	13.0	4	20.0
	No	8	50.0	10	76.9	16	69.0	10	50.0
	No reply	4	25.0	3	23.1	4	17.3	6	30.0
Approximate hrs. per week for									
a. banquets	Range	0-1 hr.		0	-	occ.* 8 hr.		occ.* 8 hr.	
	Average	occ.		0	-	occ.		occ.	
b. teas	Range	0-1 hr.		0	-	0 - occ.		occ. -1hr.	
	Average	occ.		0	-	occ.		occ.	
c. clubs	Range	0-2 hr.		0	-	0 - occ.		0-1 hr.	
	Average	occ.		0	-	occ.		occ.	
d. other activities	Range	0-2 hr.		0	-	0 -occ.		0-2 hr.	
	Average	occ.		0	-	occ.		occ.	
	All checked varies	1	6.2	1	7.7	1	4.3	1	5.0
	" " none	3	18.8	7	53.8	9	39.2	5	25.0

occ.* indicates occasionally

CHAPTER VIII. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

There is almost one hundred percent agreement in the schools of Ohio and Michigan that teacher-managers should have a bachelor's degree. Fifty percent of the Ohio cities agree that the teacher-manager should be a Food and Nutrition or an Institution Administration major and 47.1 percent in Michigan expect the same.

Apprenticeships are specified in 11.1 percent of the Ohio cases but only 5.9 percent of the Michigan cities expect in-service training. Both states prefer experienced teacher-managers with 66.7 percent of the returns from Ohio and 41.2 percent of those from Michigan favoring the requirement.

State and Smith-Hughes certificates are necessary in approximately equal ratios in most of the schools studied. Other requirements are almost negligible but health, continuous study, and tuberculosis examinations are mentioned in Table IX B of the Michigan reports.

A larger number of Ohio than Michigan schools favor salary schedules for their teacher-managers; only 70.6 percent favor such schedules in the latter state. Salaries are paid both from tax funds and lunchroom receipts. Michigan tends more definitely toward the use of tax funds for teacher-managers' salaries. Two Ohio cities indicate that salaries are derived from both sources, one on a half-and-half basis, the other with 75.0 percent from taxes and 25.0

TABLE IX A. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Educational requirements and experience-

Questions	Response	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Is a bachelor's degree required?	Yes	16	88.9	17	100.
	No	2	11.1	0	-
Is an Institution Administration or a Food and Nutrition major required?	Yes	9	50.0	8	47.1
	No	8	44.4	9	52.9
	No reply	1	5.6	0	-
Is post graduate apprentice training required?	Yes	2	11.1	1	5.9
	No	14	77.8	14	82.4
	No reply	2	11.1	2	11.8
Is experience required?	Yes	12	66.7	7	41.2
	No	5	27.7	7	41.2
	No reply	1	5.6	3	17.6

TABLE IX B. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Certification and other requirements-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What certification is required?	Life	0	-	4	23.6
	State	5	27.7	4	23.6
	State+Smith-Hughes	2	11.1	2	11.8
	Sec.Provisional	0	-	1	5.9
	Standard High School	1	5.6	0	-
	No certification	1	5.6	0	-
	No reply	9	50.0	6	35.3
What are the other requirements?	High School Home Economics	2	11.1	0	-
	Health	0	-	1	5.9
	Continuous study	0	-	1	5.9
	Tuberculosis test	0	-	1	5.9
	No other requirements	1	5.6	1	5.9
	No reply	15	83.3	13	76.5

percent from lunchroom receipts; in no case did the volume of business affect the salary. Smith-Hughes funds supplement local funds in two Michigan cities.

An equal percentage of Ohio teacher-managers receive their salaries bi-weekly and monthly with decidely more in Michigan being paid bi-weekly.

The minimum salary range of Ohio teacher-managers is $1,000 - 2,800 with an average of $1,535; the maximum salary range is $1,200 - 3,500 with an average of $2,665. The average salary is $2,060. The minimum salary range of Michigan teacher-managers is $1,450 - 2,150 with an average of $1,725; the maximum salary range is $1,950 - 3,350 with an average of $2,525. The average salary is $2,110. The average salary of the Ohio teacher-manager is not significantly less than the average of the Michigan teacher-manager*.

The annual increases average $93 in Ohio and $84 in Michigan. It will be noted in Table IX E that some Ohio cities reimburse teacher-managers up to $250 for a master's degree. Additional rewards in increases will be seen, too, in each state. Several Michigan schools made no reply to the question.

Ohio superintendents receive 50.0 percent of the applications and employ 22.0 percent of the teacher-managers.

---

*Baten. Op. cit.

TABLE IX C. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Salary schedules and sources of salaries-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	Yes	16	88.9	12	70.6
	No	1	5.6	4	23.6
	No reply	1	5.6	1	5.9
Are salaries paid from tax funds?	Yes	10	55.6	13	76.5
	No	3	16.7	1	5.9
	No reply	5	27.7	3	17.6
Are salaries paid from lunchroom profits?	Yes	6	33.3	5	29.4
	No	9	50.0	9	52.9
	No reply	3	16.7	3	17.6
If salary is divided, indicate percent from					
a. taxes	94%	1	5.6	0	-
	75%	1	5.6	0	-
b. profits	6%	1	5.6	0	-
	25%	1	5.6	0	-
Are salaries based on volume of business?	Yes	0	-	0	-
	No	16	88.9	16	94.1
	No reply	2	11.1	1	5.9
If salary is derived from other source, name source.	Smith-Hughes	0	-	2	11.8

TABLE IX D. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Salaries and salary increases-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Manager			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
How often are salaries paid?	10 payments per yr.	1	5.6	0	-
	12 " " "	1	5.6	1	5.9
	Bi-weekly	8	44.4	11	64.7
	Monthly	8	44.4	2	11.8
	No reply	0	-	3	17.6
What is the average minimum salary?	Range	$1000-$2800		$1450-$2150	
	Average	$1535		$1725	
	" with masters	-		$1760	
	No reply	4	22.2	4	23.6
What is the average maximum salary?	Range	$1200-$3500		$1950-$3350	
	Average	$2665		$2525	
	" with masters	-		$2560	
	No reply	6	33.3	4	23.6
What are the average annual increases?	Range	$25-150		$25-150	
	Average	$93		$84	
	No reply	4	22.2	5	29.4

TABLE IX E. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Rewards-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	Salary increase	2	11.1	4	23.6
	" " for masters	1	5.6	0	-
	Salary schedule advance	1	5.6	0	-
	$100-125 per yr.	4	22.2	1	5.9
	$125 for masters	3	16.7	0	-
	$250 " "	1	5.6	0	-
	No reward	1	5.6	2	11.8
	No reply	6	33.3	12	70.6

TABLE IX F 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
To whom is application made?	Clerk-treasurer	1	5.5	0	-
	Superintendent	9	50.0	13	76.5
	Board of education	4	22.2	1	5.9
	Cafeteria supervisor/* director	0	-	1	5.9
	No reply	4	22.2	2	11.8
Who does the employing?	Clerk-treasurer	1	5.6	0	-
	Superintendent and board of education	2	11.1	0	-
	Superintendent	4	22.2	11	64.7
	Board of education	6	33.3	3	17.6
	Cafeteria supervisor/ lunchroom supervisor	0	-	1	5.9
	No reply	5	27.7	2	11.8
Is a contract drawn up and signed?	Yes	16	88.9	14	82.3
	No	1	5.6	1	5.9
	No reply	1	5.6	2	11.8
Is there tenure?	Yes	13	72.3	6	35.3
	No	1	5.6	5	29.4
	No reply	4	22.2	6	35.3

/* indicates or

Boards of education receive proportionately fewer applications but make more appointments. Michigan superintendents make the majority of appointments and receive more than 75.0 percent of the applications. More than eight out of ten of the teachers who also manage lunchrooms, are employed by contract.

City schools of Ohio offer tenure to 72.3 percent of their teacher-managers but less than one-half of this percentage in Michigan have tenure. The former expects an average three year probationary period; the latter has a wider range with from no probationary period in 17.6 percent of the cases to about three years in as many cases.

No teacher-managers are expected to pass a Civil Service examination and in only two instances in Ohio are state or local examinations given. Few restrictions on living and conduct will be noted for either state in Table IX F2, but from these instances cited in the table the requirements are comparable to those for any teacher.

With one exception, both states have retirement plans which include their teachers who manage lunchrooms. A minority of the group in either state is given vacation with salary; those who are given such time in Michigan are allowed ten days with one half that amount of time for the Ohio people.

More than four out of ten teacher-managers receive sick leave allowances with full salary. More Ohio than Michigan schools offer a greater number of days for the allowance.

TABLE IX F 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Employment-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the probationary period?	Not voted	0	-	1	5.9
	No probationary period	0	-	3	17.6
	3 to 6 mo.	1	5.6	0	-
	1 year	0	-	1	5.9
	2 "	0	-	1	5.9
	3 "	6	33.3	1	5.9
	5 "	1	5.6	0	-
	No reply	10	55.6	10	58.8
Is a civil service examination required?	Yes	0	-	0	-
	No	16	88.9	15	88.2
	No reply	2	11.1	22	11.8
Is a state or local examination required?	Yes	2	11.1	0	-
	No	12	66.7	15	88.2
	No reply	4	22.2	2	11.8
What are the restrictions on living?	No restrictions	11	61.1	9	52.9
	Requirements of any teacher	2	11.1	1	5.9
	Discretion	0	-	1	5.9
	Within salary	1	5.6	0	-
	No formal or written	0	-	1	5.9
	No reply	4	22.2	5	29.4
What are the restrictions on conduct?	No restrictions	6	33.3	5	29.4
	Good moral conduct	1	5.6	1	5.9
	Normal	0	-	1	5.9
	Usual teacher conduct	2	11.1	0	-
	No reply	9	50.0	10	58.8

TABLE IX G 1. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
Is there a retirement plan?	Yes	15	83.3	13	76.5
	No	1	5.6	0	-
	No reply	2	11.1	4	23.6
Is vacation with salary allowed?	Yes	3	16.7	5	29.4
	No	12	66.7	9	52.9
	No reply	3	16.7	3	17.9
How many days vacation with salary is allowed?	Range	0-30 da.		holidays-30 da.	
	Average	5 da.		10 da.	
What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave? a. full salary	Full salary	8	44.4	7	41.2
	Range	5-15 da.		3-15 da.	
	Average	8 da.		5 da.	
b. half salary	7 da. after 7 da. full	1	5.6	0	-
c. full salary, less pay of sub.	For 15 da.	1	5.6	1	5.9
If sick leave is allowed a. how many days in one year?	Range	0-30 da.		3-10 da.	
	Average	8 da.		6 da.	
b. is the allowance cumulative?	Yes	14	77.7	11	64.7
	No	3	16.7	3	17.6
	No reply	1	5.6	3	17.6

Ohio grants permission for the allowance to accumulate in 77.7 percent of the cases with the Michigan percentage at 64.7. The average time of accumulation is approximately the same in each state at four to five years.

Almost no other allowances are granted and few expenses are allowed the teacher-managers as noted in Table IX G2.

The average work week is five days and Ohio managers supervise more employees in their schools than do the Michigan managers. Extra-curricular activities are expected almost three times as often by the Ohio staff as in the Michigan schools. The range on the types of activities is similar in both states but Ohio teacher-managers who supervise activities spend more time on the activities than do the managers in the Michigan cities.

TABLE IX G 2. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-Benefits-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Manager			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
c. how many yrs. can it accumulate(sick leave allowance)	Range	2 yr.-indef.		2-9 yr.	
	Average	4-5 yr.		5 yr.	
What other allowances are given?	Time for conf.& visitation	1	5.6	0	-
	Death immediate family	1	5.6	1	5.9
	As need arises	0	-	2	11.8
	$60 per extra curricular activity	1	5.6	0	-
	No other allowances	3	16.7	2	11.8
	No reply	11	61.1	12	70.6
How much conventions or meetings expenses are allowed?	No expenses	12	66.7	7	41.2
	All expenses	1	5.6	1	5.9
	When sent by electors	0	-	2	11.8
	Authorized as needed	1	5.6	0	-
	No reply	4	22.2	7	41.2
What other expenses are granted?	Lunches	0	-	1	5.9
	Mileage	0	-	1	5.9
	No other expenses	11	61.1	7	41.2
	No reply	7	38.9	8	47.1

TABLE IX H. COMPARISON OF OHIO AND MICHIGAN TEACHER-MANAGERS

-School duties and extra-curricular activities-

Questions	Responses	Teacher-Managers			
		Ohio		Michigan	
		No.	%	No.	%
What is the average work week?	5 days	14	77.8	10	58.8
	No reply	4	22.2	7	41.2
How many employees do they supervise?	None	1	5.6	0	-
	Number varies	1	5.6	2	11.8
	1-10	11	61.1	9	52.9
	11-20	1	5.6	0	-
	21-30	0	-	1	5.9
	No reply	4	22.2	5	29.4
Are extra-curricular activities required?	Yes	12	66.7	5	29.4
	No	5	27.7	9	52.9
	No reply	1	5.6	3	17.6
Approximate hours per week for					
a. banquets	Range	0- 1 hr.		occ.*	
	Average	½ hr.		occ.	
b. teas	Range	0-1 hr.		0-1 hr.	
	Average	occ.		occ.	
c. clubs	Range	0-2 hr.		0-occ.	
	Average	1 hr.		occ.	
c. other activities	Range	occ.-1 hr.		0-occ.	
	Average	1 hr.		occ.	
	All checked varies	1	5.6	2	11.8
	" " none	3	16.7	2	11.8

*occ. indicates occasionally

CHAPTER IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In general summary, it seems in order to point out the limitations upon which conclusions may be drawn. The results are dependent for their value upon the interest and thought exercised by those individuals who participated in filling out the questionnaires. These results are applicable to the Home Economics teachers, the teacher-managers, and the cafeteria managers in Ohio and Michigan public schools, only insofar as there is evidence of random sampling from the scatter of the returns.

We assume that the returns are representative. If questionnaires had not been used, far fewer cases could have been visited or studied. The results are interpreted through numerical tabulations from these results in the two states.

Subject to these limitations and facing the lack of other studies for comparison, the following conclusions may be drawn:

Cafeteria managers are not on the same educational level with teachers and teacher-managers. Far too great a number of practical cook-managers are "making the grade" by the trial and error method.

Salaries for full-time cafeteria managers are not comparable to Home Economics teachers. The average salary of the teacher-manager does not differ significantly from that of the Home Economics teacher. Also, the average

salary of the teacher-manager does not vary significantly from the average salary of the cafeteria manager. Teacher-managers are not proportionately reimbursed in several respects for their additional responsibilities in the lunch-room.

School systems do not give sufficient encouragement financially or through promotion for individuals to give very serious consideration to expenditures for advanced degrees and special work.

School systems should eliminate the inequalities for benefits from a retirement fund, vacation salary, and sick leave allowances if they hope to attract trained managers into their schools.

As far as a comparison of the states is concerned, the average salary of teachers in Michigan is not significantly greater than the average salary of Ohio teachers. Cities in the latter state expect greater specialization and experience in the field. A majority of the Ohio teachers is employed by contract and has tenure; sick leave benefits are more evident for that state but Michigan schools provide reimbursement for more expenses incurred.

Ohio schools expect more experience and apprentice training from their teacher-managers than do the Michigan schools, which less frequently operate on a salary schedule. The average salary of teacher-managers in Ohio is not

significantly less than the average salary for teacher-managers in Michigan. Ohio shows higher annual increases and increments due to advanced degrees. Extra-curricular activities take on more importance in Ohio but the state provides greater benefits and more tenure.

Specialization requirements and apprenticeship instruction are more often expected of the trained cafeteria managers in Michigan than in Ohio with experience unanimously preferred. Both states favor extensive experience for the untrained manager who is seldom on a salary schedule. The average Michigan salaries are not significantly higher than the average Ohio salaries for either trained or untrained managers. The most differentiation is among the latter in the two states. Michigan includes a larger percentage of both groups in its retirement plan but sick leave allowances are more liberal in Ohio, and more managers are under contract and have tenure.

School cafeteria management as a career is a field still in its infancy. The possibilities are many and varied. The field must be made both interesting and challenging for Home Economics trained women. The comparative status of the various groups involved in this study might well be investigated on a national scale.

LITERATURE CITED

1. The Administration of School Lunch Programs. Federal Security Agency, U.S.Office of Education. Circular #211, (June 1942), 42 pages.

2. Baker,Katherine L. School Cafeterias. Practical Home Economics 7 (June 1929), pp. 182-185.

3. Boughton,Alice C. Report on the Penny Lunches Served by The Starr Center Association,Philadelphia. Journal of Home Economics 2 (April 1910), pp. 178-180.

4. Briggs,Howard L. and Constance C.Hart. The Business of Running a Modern School Lunchroom. The Nation's Schools 8 (Dec.1931), pp. 60-64.

5. Bryan,Mary deGarmo. The School Cafeteria. New York: Crofts, 1936.

6. Bryant,Louise Stevens. School Feeding in Europe. Journal of Home Economics 2 (April 1910), pp. 149-159.

7. Ibid. General Development and Present Status of the School Feeding Movement. Journal of Home Economics 4 (Dec.1912), pp. 472-477.

8. Ibid. School Feeding,Its History and Practice at Home and Abroad. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1913.

9. Carpenter,Rowena Schmidt. Federal Aid to School Lunches. War Food Administration,Food Distribution Administration. Reproduced from The Nation's Schools (Sept.1943), 6 pages.

10. The Community School Lunch Program. War Food Administration,Office of Distribution (Sept.1944), 19 pages.

11. Craig,Hazel T. The History of Home Economics. Practical Home Economics 22 (Oct.1944), pp. 408,430.

12. Kittredge,Mabel Hyde. School Lunches in the Large Cities of the United States. Journal of Home Economics 18 (Sept.1926), pp. 500-512.

13. Lunch at School. U.S.Department of Agriculture,War Food Administration,Office of Distribution NFC-9 Revised August 1944.

14. Masslich,George. The Beginnings of a Penny Lunch. Journal of Home Economics 11 (May 1919), pp. 210-213.

15. Michigan Education Directory and Buyers Guide. Grand Haven,Mich.: The Michigan Education Directory, 1943-1944, pp. 51-63.

16. Michigan,Official Directory and Legislative Manual. The State of Michigan: 1943-1944, pp. 131-144.

17. Michigan Works Progress Administration of the Federal Works Agency. Final Report of School Lunch,Food Production,and Food Preversation. Sylvia M.Hartt and others. March 1943.

18. Nichols,George A. The How of the Lunchroom. American School Board Journal 64 (Jan.1922) pp.63-64.

19. Ohio,Education Department of. Educational Directory. Columbus: Heer, 1944.

20. Pulsifer,Julia. History and Development of Lunches in High Schools. Fourth International Congress on School Hygiene 5 Session 32 (1913), pp. 324-328.

21. School Lunches as a Wartime Measure. The Cooperating Committee on School Lunches. (Jan.1943) 5 pages.

22. School Lunch Developments in the Public School System, October 1,1943 with Generalizations From School Lunch Statistics in the Public Schools,October 1, 1943 (carbon copies) Federal Security Agency, U.S.Office of Education.

23. School Lunch Management. U.S.Office of Education, Nutrition Education Series #3.

24. Smedley,Emma. High School Lunches Under School Board Control. Fourth International Congress on School Hygiene 5 (1913), pp. 329-333.

25. Ibid. The School Lunch-Its Organization and Management in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: Innes, 1930.

26. A Study of Administrative and Teaching Schedules of Managers of School Lunchrooms and Cafeterias,With a View to Promoting the Establishment of Academic Status for Them. Joint Committee on School Lunches American Home Economics Association and American Dietetics Association (Survey by Miss Pendergast, Assistant Supervisor,Detroit City School Lunchrooms) 1942, (data unpublished).

27. U.S.Bureau of the Census. Sixteenth Census,1940. Akron,Ohio: Banner Press, 1941.

28. U.S.Office of Education Bulletin 1940,no.2 Biennial Survey of Education, 1936-1938, Chapter V, pp. 2.

29. Washam,F.O. Centralized Control of School Lunchrooms. American Restaurant Magazine 18 (May 1935), pp. 46,83-84.

30. West,Bessie Brooks and LeVelle Wood. Food Service in Institutions. New York: Wiley, 1938.

APPENDIX

Introductory letter

Samples of questionnaires

Follow-up card

Names of schools included in the study

Introductory letter

November 30, 1944

Dear superintendent/principal:

There are an increasing number of women training for Home Economics teaching and Institution Management, including school lunchroom feeding. Home Economics women are doing three types of jobs in the public schools, namely: 1) teaching Home Economics, 2) teaching Home Economics and managing a lunchroom, and 3) managing a lunchroom on a full-time basis. Are you employing Home Economics teachers and cafeteria managers from whom you require an equal amount of education and experience, and from whom you expect the same quality and quantity of work? Are they on equal or varying status as regards tenure, vacation, retirement, salaries, etc?

Having once been a Home Economics teacher and lunchroom manager, I am especially interested in people doing such types of jobs. I am a graduate student in Institution Administration, and have set up the enclosed data sheet, sponsored by the department, to determine the status of Home Economics teachers in Michigan and Ohio compared with that of the lunchroom managers.

Will you as the superintendent/principal of your school system, kindly supply answers for your high school Home Economics teachers and lunchroom managers (include junior high schools, but not elementary schools). Please check replies as indicated and any items which require further explanation may be starred and referred to the reverse side of the letter along with additional comments.

I shall appreciate your cooperation in the information and will be grateful for a reply by Dec. 12. Will you please do it now! From the 'samplings' taken, the time required is only about 20 minutes.

If you are interested in the results of the study, please indicate by a check mark in the upper left corner, page 1 of the data sheet.

Very sincerely yours,

Graduate student
Institution Administration
Michigan State College

Form to principals.

Michigan State College — November 1944

High School Cafeteria Management Data Sheet

Name of the city .....

Name of the school .....

1. City population ..... Census date .....
2. Total high school census(include junior high) 2 .....
3. Does your school have a lunchroom? (Check) 3 Yes( ) No( )
4. Is the lunchroom operated by 4
   a. school authorities a| Yes( ) No( )
      title .....
   b. outside agency, as P.T.A. b| .....
      name of agency .....
5. Check the approximate number served in the lunchroom.
   a. ..... less than 100 c. ..... 251 to 500 e. ..... 1001 to 1500
   b. ..... 101 to 250 d. ..... 501 to 1000 f. ..... 1501 to 2000
   g. ..... 2001 and up
6. Check the qualifications of your lunchroom manager. 6
   a. Home Economics trained, teacher manager a| .....
   b. Home Economics trained, full-time manager b| .....
   c. Non-Home Economics trained, teacher manager c| .....
   d. Non-Home Economics trained, full-time manager d| .....

		Home Econ. Teacher	Teacher-Manager	Lunchroom Manager
1. Is a bachelor's degree required?	1	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
2. If the custom varies, indicate approximate %.	2	%Yes( )%No( )	%Yes( )%No( )	%Yes( )%No( )
3. Is an Institution Administration or Foods and Nutrition major required?	3	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
4. If the custom varies, indicate approximate %.	4	%Yes( )%No( )	%Yes( )%No( )	%Yes( )%No( )
5. Is post graduate apprentice training required?	5	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
6. Is experience required?	6	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
7. What certification is required?	7	.....	.....	.....
8. What are the other requirements?	8	.....	.....	.....
		.....	.....	.....
9. Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	9	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
10. Are salaries paid from tax funds?	10	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
11. Are salaries paid from lunchroom profits?	11	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
12. If source of salary is divided, indicate % from	12			
a. taxes		a| ..... % taxes	..... % taxes	..... % taxes
b. profits		b| ..... %profits	..... %profits	..... %profits
13. Are salaries based on volume of business?	13	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )	Yes( ) No( )
14. If salary is derived from other source, name.	14	.....	.....	.....
15. How often are salaries paid?	15	.....	.....	.....
16. What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	16	.....	.....	.....
17. What is the average minimum salary?	17	$	$	$ .....

		Home Econ. Teacher	Teacher-Manager	Lunchroom Manager
18. What is the average maximum salary?	18	$	$	$
19. What are the average annual increases?	19	$	$	$
20. Is there tenure?	20	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No( )
21. What is the probationary period?	21			
22. Is a civil service examination required?	22	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
23. Is a state or local examination required?	23	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
24. Is vacation with salary allowed?	24	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
25. How many days vacation with salary allowed?	25	days	days	days
26. What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave?	26			
a. full salary	a			
b. half salary	b			
c. full salary, less pay of sub	c			
d. some other fraction of pay	d			
e. no salary	e			
27. If sick leave is allowed	27			
a. how many days in one year	a	days	days	days
b. is the allowance cumulative	b	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
c. how many years may it accumulate?	c	yrs	yrs	yrs
28. What other allowances are given?	28			
29. How much 'conventions' or 'meetings' expenses are allowed		$	$	$
30. What other expenses are granted?	30			
31. Is there a retirement plan?	31	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
32. What are the restrictions on living?	32			
33. What are the restrictions on conduct?	33			
34. To whom is application made?	34			
35. Who does the employing?	35			
36 Is a contract drawn up and signed?	36	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
37. How many employees do they supervise?	37			
38. What is the average work week?	38	days	days	days
39. Are extra-curricular activites required?	39	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
40. Approximate hours per week for	40			
a. banquets	a	hrs	hrs	hrs
b. teas	b	hrs	hrs	hrs
c. clubs	c	hrs	hrs	hrs
d. other activities	d	hrs	hrs	hrs

Name of person making reply .....

Title .....

Form to superintendents.

Michigan State College

November 1944

High School Cafeteria Management Data Sheet

City .....

1. City population ..... Census date ..... 2 .....
2. Total high school census (include junior high) 3 .....
3. Number of high schools in the city (include jr. high) 4
4. How many of the high schools have a census
   - a. less than 500 — a .....
   - b. 501 to 1500 — b .....
   - c. 1501 to 2500 — c .....
   - d. 2501 to 3000 — d .....
   - e. 3001 and up — e .....
5. How many of the high schools have lunchrooms? 5 .....
6. How many of the lunchrooms are operated by 6
   - a. school authorities — a .....
     - title .....
   - b. outside agency, as P.T.A. — b .....
     - name the agency .....
7. How many of the lunchrooms serve 7
   - a. less than 100 — a .....
   - b. 101 to 250 — b .....
   - c. 251 to 500 — c .....
   - d. 501 to 1000 — d .....
   - e. 1001 to 1500 — e .....
   - f. 1501 to 2000 — f .....
   - g. 2001 and up — g .....
8. Total number of lunchroom managers 8 .....
9. How many of the total lunchroom managers are 9
   - a. Home Economics trained, teacher managers — a .....
   - b. Home Economics trained, full-time managers — b .....
   - c. Non-Home Economics trained, teacher managers — c .....
   - d. Non-Home Economics trained, full-time managers — d .....

		Home Econ. Teacher	Teacher-Manager	Lunchroom Manager
1. Is a bachelor's degree required?	1	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
2. If the custom varies, indicate approximate %.	2	%Yes ( ) %No ( )	%Yes ( ) %No ( )	%Yes ( ) %No ( )
3. Is an Institution Administration or Foods and Nutrition major required?	3	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
4. If the custom varies, indicate approximate %.	4	%Yes ( ) %No ( )	%Yes ( ) %No ( )	%Yes ( ) %No ( )
5. Is post graduate apprentice training required?	5	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
6. Is experience required?	6	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
7. What certification is required?	7	.....	.....	.....
9. What are the other requirements?	8	.....	.....	.....
9. Does the system operate on a salary schedule?	9	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
10. Are salaries paid from tax funds?	10	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
11. Are salaries paid from lunchroom profits?	11	YYes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
12 If source of salary is divided, indicate % from a. taxes b. profits	12	a .....% taxes b .....% profits	.....% taxes .....%profits	.....% taxes .....%profits
13. Are salaries based on volume of business?	13	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
14. If salary is derived from other source, name.	14	.....	.....	.....
15. How often are salaries paid?	15	.....	.....	.....
16. What is the reward for special work and advanced degrees?	16	.....	.....	.....
17. What is the average minimum salary?	17	$	$	$ .....

		Home Econ. Teacher	Teacher-Manager	Lunchroom Manager
18. What is the average maximum salary?	18	$	$	$
19. What are the average annual increases?	19	$	$	$
20. Is there tenure?	20	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No( )
21. What is the probationary period?	21			
22. Is a civil service examination required?	22	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
23. Is a state or local examination required?	23	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
24. Is vacation with salary allowed?	24	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
25. How many days vacation with salary allowed?	25	days	days	days
26. What part of the regular salary is paid those taking sick leave?	26			
a. full salary	a			
b. half salary	b			
c. full salary, less pay of sub	c			
d. some other fraction of pay	d			
e. no salary	e			
27. If sick leave is allowed	27			
a. how many days in one year	a	days	days	days
b. is the allowance cumulative	b	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
c. how many years may it accumulate?	c	yrs	yrs	yrs
28. What other allowances are given?	28			
29. How much 'conventions' or 'meetings' expenses are allowed		$	$	$
30. What other expenses are granted?	30			
31. Is there a retirement plan?	31	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
32. What are the restrictions on living?	32			
33. What are the restrictions on conduct?	33			
34. To whom is application made?	34			
35. Who does the employing?	35			
36 Is a contract drawn up and signed?	36	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
37. How many employees do they supervise?	37			
38. What is the average work week?	38	days	days	days
39. Are extra-curricular activites required?	39	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )	Yes ( ) No ( )
40. Approximate hours per week for	40			
a. banquets	a	hrs	hrs	hrs
b. teas	b	hrs	hrs	hrs
c. clubs	c	hrs	hrs	hrs
d. other activities	d	hrs	hrs	hrs

Name of person making reply .....

Title .....

FOLLOW-UP CARD

Michigan State College December 13,1944

Dear superintendent/principal:

Under date of November 30, you were mailed a High School Cafeteria Management Data Sheet for an evaluation of the status of Home Economics teachers and full-time cafeteria managers. I have not received your reply to date.

It is most important that I have the information on your school/schools in order to make figures complete for my thesis. Will you please pick the data sheet from your file of'I'll-do-those-tomorrow' items,check it,and drop it into the mail today? Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Marie Harris

Marie Harris

SCHOOLS AND CITIES TO WHICH QUESTIONNAIRES WERE MAILED

MICHIGAN

* Adrian
* Alpena
* Ann Arbor

Battle Creek
- * Lakeview Sr.High
- * Ann J.Kellogg
- Northwestern
- * Southeastern
- * Southwestern
- * W.K.Kellogg
- * Lakeview Jr.

* Bay City
Benton Harbor
* Birmingham

* Dearborn
Detroit (sr.high)
- * Cass
- Central
- Chadsey
- * Commerce-East Commerce
- Cooley
- * Denby
- Eastern
- * Mackenzie
- Miller
- Northeastern
- * Northern
- * Northwestern
- Pershing
- Redford
- Southeastern
- * Southwestern
- Western
- * Redford Union
- * Barbour (jr.high)
- * Burroughs
- * Cleveland
- * Condon
- Durfee
- Foch
- * Garfield
- * Greusel
- * Hutchins
- Jackson
- Jefferson

* indicates schools/cities from which replies were received

Detroit (cont'd)
McMichael
Neinas
* Nolan
* Post
Sherrard
Tappan
* Wilson

* Ecorse
* Escanaba

* Ferndale
Flint (sr.high)
* Beecher
* Bendle
Bentley
* Carman
Dye
* Kearsley
Utley
* Emerson (jr.high)
* Longfellow
* Lowell
* McKinley
* Whittier
Zimmerman

Grand Rapids
Cemtral (sr.high)
* Creston
Davis Tech.
Ottawa Hills
* South
* Union
* Godwin Hts.
* Burton
* Harrison Park
* Vocational

* Hamtramck
* Hazel Park
* Highland Park
* Holland

* Iron Mountain
* Ironwood

* Jackson

Kalamazoo
* Milwood (sr.high)
* Oakwood
* Western State

Kalamazoo (cont'd)
Lincoln (jr.high)
* Roosevelt
* Vine
Washington
Woodward

* Lansing
* Lincoln Park

* Marquette
* Menominee
Midland
* Monroe
* Mt.Clemens
* Muskegeon
Muskegeon Hts.

* Niles

Owosso

* Pontiac
* Port Huron

* River Rouge
* Royal Oak

* Saginaw
Sault Ste.Marie

* Traverse City

* Wyandotte

Ypsilanti

OHIO

Akron
John R.Buchtel
Central
* East
* Garfield
* Jennings
Kenmore
North
South
West
* Alliance
Ashland
* Ashtabula

* Barberton
  Bellaire

* Cambridge
  Campbell
  Canton
  Chillicothe
* Cincinnati (reply made for entire system)
    Hartwell
    Hughes
    Walnut Hills
    Western Hills
    Withrow
    Woodward
    Bloom
    Douglas
    Oyler
    Rothenberg
    Stowe
    Washington
  Cleveland
    * Central
      Collinwood
    * East
      East Tech.
    * Glenville
    * James Ford Rhodes
      John Adams
    * John Hay
      John Marshall
      Lincoln
      South
    * West
    * West Tech.
      Addison
      Albert Bushnell Hart.
      Alexander Hamilton
      Audubon
      Central
      Empire
      Fairmont
      Kennard
      Myron T.Herrick
      Nathan Hale
      Patrick Henry
      Rawlings
      Thomas E.Edison Occupational
      Thomas Jefferson
      Wilbur Wright
    * Wm.Dean Howells
      Willson
* Cleveland Hts.

Columbus
- Central
- East
- * North
- * South
- West
- Barrett
- * Champion
- * Crestview
- * Everett
- * Franklin
- Indianola
- * McKinley
- * Mound
- Roosevelt
- * Starling
- West

Coshocton
Cuyahoga Falls

Dayton
- Dunbar
- Fairview
- White
- * Kiser
- Roosevelt
- Stivers
- * Wright

* East Cleveland
East Liverpool
Elyria
* Euclid

* Findlay
* Fostoria
* Fremont

Garfield Hts.

* Hamilton

Ironton

* Lakewood
* Lancaster
* Lima
* Lorain

Mansfield
* Marietta
* Marion
* Martins Ferry

* Massillion
  Middletown
* Mt.Vernon

* Newark
* New Philadelphia
* Niles
  Norwood

* Painesville
  Parma
  Piqua
* Portsmouth

* Salem
  Sandusky
* Shaker Hts.
  Springfield
* Steubenville
* Struthers

* Tiffin
  Toledo
    * DeVilbiss
    * Libbey
      Scott
    * Waite
    * Woodward
    * Jones
    * Point Place
    * Robinson

* Warren
* Wooster

* Xenia

  Youngstown
    Chaney
  * East
  * Rayen
  * Scienceville
  * South
  * Woodrow Wilson
    Hayes
    Hillman
  * Princeton

* Zanesville