

THE STATUS OF JANITORIAL SERVICE IN THE SMALLER  
OREGON SCHOOL SYSTEMS

by

MARVIN LEROY SCHEPMAN

A Thesis

Presented to the School of Education  
and the Graduate Division of the University of Oregon  
in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Education

June 1938

APPROVED:

C. L. Huffaker

Major Adviser

F. L. Stetson

For the Graduate Committee

of the School of Education

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the problem.....	3
Method of obtaining data and response to questionnaire.....	7
Method of analysis and presentation of data.....	10
Validity of the study.....	11
II. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF JANITORIAL EMPLOYMENT AND PERSONNEL.....	13
Types of janitorships.....	13
Sex of janitors.....	14
Age of janitors.....	15
Marital status and dependents.....	16
Salaries and term of employment.....	17
Previous occupational status.....	19
Community status of janitor.....	23
Summary.....	24
III. RATING OF JANITORS FOR SERVICE QUALITIES...	26
Health.....	27
Personal appearance and presentation.....	29
Cooperation with principal, teachers, and pupils.....	30
Responsibility in attitude and per- formance of work.....	31
Industry and initiative.....	33
Skill and intelligence in performance of work.....	34
Trade skills.....	35
Cleanliness and neatness in performance of work.....	38
Summary.....	39

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. ELECTION AND TENURE OF JANITOR.....	42
Method of selection.....	43
Consideration of service qualities in selection.....	46
Solicitation of principal's advice in re-election of janitor.....	51
Nature of employment relationship.....	52
Years served by janitors.....	55
Summary.....	56
V. ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF JANITORIAL REGULATIONS.....	60
Authority for organization and administration of service.....	60
Method of administering regulations.....	65
Instructions concerning duties and control.....	67
Summary.....	71
VI. CONCLUSION.....	74
The three major problems.....	74
Findings.....	74
Factors of increased efficiency.....	77
Recommendations.....	79
APPENDIX.....	82
A. Questionnaire sent to administrators	82
B. Letter sent to administrators.....	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	88

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Number of School Systems Replying to Questionnaire.....	9
II. Type of Janitorships in 369 Small Oregon School Systems.....	14
III. Sex of Janitors.....	14
IV. Percentage of Janitors in Cumulative Age Groups.....	16
V. Salaries of Janitors.....	18
VI. Term of Employment for Janitors.....	19
VII. Nominal or Professed Occupations of Janitors.....	20
VIII. Principals' Ratings of Janitors' Health...	28
IX. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Personal Appearance and Presentation....	30
X. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Cooperation with Principal, Teachers, and Pupils.....	31
XI. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Responsibility in Attitude and Performance of Work.....	32
XII. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Industry and Initiative.....	33
XIII. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Skill and Intelligence in Performance of Work.....	35

TABLE	PAGE
XIV. Number of Schools in which Janitors Possess Certain Trade Skills.....	37
XV. Principals' Ratings of Janitors for Cleanliness and Neatness in Performance of Work.....	38
XVI. Efficiency Index of Janitorial Service...	40
XVII. Method of Selection of Janitors.....	45
XVIII. Extent to which Principal's Advice Is Solicited in Re-election or Release of Janitor.....	51
XIX. Nature of Employment Relationship between School District and Janitor....	53
XX. Number of Consecutive Years Served by Janitors.....	55
XXI. Location of Authority for Organization and Administration of Janitorial Regulations.....	62
XXII. Methods of Administering Janitorial Regulations.....	66
XXIII. Extent and Time of Janitors' Notification concerning Nature of Regulations.....	69
XXIV. Extent and Time of Janitors' Notification concerning Principals' Authority To Direct and Enforce Regulations.....	70
XXV. Extent of Administrative Control over Janitorial Policies and Practices.....	72

# THE STATUS OF JANITORIAL SERVICE IN THE SMALLER OREGON SCHOOL SYSTEMS

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The problem of janitorial service in the smaller school systems of the country is one to which little direct investigation has been given. It is true that there are many excellent studies explaining the peculiarly important function of the janitor (1). Also, schools, institutes, and conferences for janitors are no longer uncommon, and efficiency experts in the study of janitorial practices, as a phase of plant operation, are in demand. However, such critical consideration has been confined mainly to the large city schools of the country where complexity, both of the municipal and the school unit, admits of and demands constant reorganization and refinement of janitorial practice.

- 
1. Reference has been made in connection with this study to a number of better known studies in the field of janitorial service. Although these studies were not specifically adaptable to the problems involved in this investigation, they proved invaluable for general background. For names of these authors and their studies see bibliography at end of thesis.

Throughout the country, however, there is a singular inadequacy of data regarding the status of janitorial service in the smaller school systems; in Oregon none whatever exist in a form objective enough for reliable interpretation. At the same time, the type of janitorial organization and the quality of services rendered have been subjected to considerable criticism by professional administrators, both in Oregon and elsewhere--criticism which has generally directed attention towards seeming faults and inadequacies of the present system (1).

This situation is significant if for no other reason than that the small school is today under fire, as being an administrative and organizational unit wasteful of professional and community resources--financial, intellectual, and social. For this reason it is advantageous that educators have at hand the facts regarding all problems. Isolated and sporadic forays of criticism, no matter how well meaning, cannot bring about a permanent improvement of conditions until a foundation of understanding concerning the

- 
1. Since this study was begun, a series of regional janitorial schools have been instituted under the direction of the State Department of Vocational Education with the cooperation of the State Department of Education.



problem itself can be had. It is the conviction of the writer, arising partly from personal experience as an administrator, that the janitorial situation in the small schools of Oregon is one which presents a worthwhile problem for careful investigation.

#### Statement of the Problem

This study is a survey of the organizational relationship between the school board, the principal, and the janitor in the smaller school systems of Oregon. Its purposes are to ascertain the salient facts concerning the general features of janitorial employment and personnel; and to determine the prevailing policies of school plant custodial administration.

Certain features of the study which may serve to orient the reader as to the purposed loci and boundaries of the investigation follow:

1. It deals with only the small public school systems of Oregon.

2. It does not attempt to study detailed janitorial duties, schedules, and standards, or methods whereby increased efficiency may be gained in the performance of those duties.

3. It seeks to clarify school organizational policies, as they relate to janitorial service.

4. It attempts to give a broad view of the efficiency level of janitorial service in the small school systems of Oregon, as they are organized today.

A word of explanation concerning each of these points may be advisable:

"Small" public school system is arbitrarily defined as any public school system in Oregon wherein are employed not less than two and not more than twelve teachers. The term "school system", as used here, denotes either a secondary school, an elementary school, or a combination of secondary and elementary schools. The characterizing feature of the term "school system" is that the school have only one administrative head, provided, however, that schools of elementary and secondary rank, both housed in the same building and having separate administrators, are, nevertheless, considered as only one school system. The reason for this becomes evident when one realizes that many elementary schools in Oregon are housed in the same plant with union high schools, each with its own administrator. To consider them as separate systems would have led to a duplication of data which, on a problem wherein the entire school

plant is essentially the unit, would have given rise to inaccuracies in the data.

Much of the current literature dealing with janitorial service has as its purpose the presenting of methods and techniques whereby increased efficiency of labor and lower unit costs of operation are to be gained. Studies, for instance, of various methods of firing furnaces, studies of new types of equipment and supplies and of different methods in sweeping, scrubbing, and dusting,--all with the purpose of saving time, energy, and expense,--make up a large share of the literature on janitorial service today.

This investigation, while conceding the importance of techniques and methods, makes no attempt to encompass these problems. It assumes that organization is primary to all administrative problems, and that refinement of techniques and methods is the product of a stable and enlightened organization, without which janitorial service must inevitably remain on low levels of efficiency.

It is generally recognized in the larger city school systems that janitorial service is largely, if not altogether, vested in the hands of the city school superintendent or an administrative department. Centralization of authority and responsibility has become a recognized principle and fact.

To what extent this is true in the smaller school systems of Oregon is not known. No data are available. It is one purpose of the present study to determine whether any such policy has crystallized or is in the process of crystallization; and, if not, what the nature of the organizational relationship may be.

This investigation, by means of a rating scale, seeks to ascertain the general efficiency level of janitors in the small Oregon schools. The rating scale makes no provision for appraisal of detailed and particularized duties, but rather attempts to measure janitors for those qualities and abilities which make it possible to serve most efficiently in the capacity of school plant custodian.

Insofar as organizational policy and efficiency levels are problems of immediate and primary importance in any account of janitorial service, description and evaluation may be considered as the immediate objectives of this study.

Certain questions arise, however, which go beyond such proximate considerations. For example, are organizational policy and janitorial efficiency levels related? To what extent is one the function of the other? It seems desirable that we should be able to say with a reasonable

degree of validity that a certain level of janitorial efficiency exists because of certain factors of organization. Or, indeed, that we find no causal relationship between policies of organization and levels of janitorial efficiency. Or again, that, while organizational policies appear to bear an influence, certain extraneous factors also enter in. This study, while not so controlled as to give definite answers to these questions, does give inferential data bearing upon them which may aid in their later solution.

Method of Obtaining Data and Response  
to Questionnaire

The study was begun in the summer of 1936. It was the original purpose of the investigator to obtain the data by means of personal interviews. It early became apparent, however, that this method had a number of practical handicaps which virtually precluded its use. Because of this, resort was made to the questionnaire, four hundred and thirty-one of which were mailed to administrators in all counties (1). An individually typed and signed letter was sent with each questionnaire (2)

- 
1. For a copy of the questionnaire see Appendix A, page 82.
  2. For a copy of the letter sent with questionnaire see Appendix B, page 87.

The number of school systems in each county to which questionnaires were sent and the number of replies received are shown in Table I. Included in the totals are forty-four school systems which were studied by the direct interview. Returns constituted 77.7% of the questionnaires sent out.

TABLE I

## NUMBER OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPLYING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

County	Two teacher	3-4 teacher	5-8 teacher	9-12 teacher	Total replies	sent
Baker.....	3	7	3		13	14
Benton.....	2	2	5		9	13
Clackamas...:	21	5	7	4	37	47
Clatsop.....	7	2	2	2	13	18
Columbia....:	11	4	2	2	19	24
Coos.....	4	5	2	2	13	18
Crook.....				1	1	2
Curry.....	1	3			4	5
Deschutes...:			1	1	2	3
Douglas.....		3	11	1	15	17
Gilliam.....	2				2	5
Grant.....		3	1		4	6
Harney.....			2	1	3	4
Hood River..:		2	1		3	4
Jackson.....	7	7	2	4	20	26
Jefferson...:	1	1			2	2
Josephine...:		3			3	5
Klamath.....		4	6	3	13	15
Lake.....			2		2	2
Lane.....	12	15	9		36	41
Lincoln.....	2	1	3	1	7	8
Linn.....	6	2	4	2	14	17
Malheur.....	1		2		3	6
Marion.....	13	8	5	2	28	42
Morrow.....		1	4		5	5
Multnomah...:	6	7	4	3	20	28
Polk.....	5	2	4		11	15
Sherman.....			4		4	4
Tillamook...:	4	4	5		13	18
Umatilla....:		6	8	1	15	17
Union.....	1		3	1	5	6
Wallowa.....	1	1	1	1	4	6
Wasco.....	1	2	2		5	6
Washington..:		9	3	1	13	17
Wheeler.....		1	1		2	2
Yamhill.....			5	1	6	7
Total..:	111	110	114	34	369	475

### Method of Analysis and Presentation of Data

Although this study deals with the smaller school systems of Oregon as if a relatively distinct type, this grouping was made primarily for the purpose of bounding the scope of the study. Certainly, within the range of two to twelve teacher schools, differences and trends of organizational policy should appear; and it was on this assumption that the study was made.

To give a basis for comparison, the school systems were divided into four groups, namely, schools with two teachers, with three and four teachers, with five to eight teachers, and with nine to twelve teachers. These classifications, while to a degree arbitrary, were made only after study of the data showed them to be the most sound on a basis of homogeneity.

It was further determined to include in the problem only those schools employing a full time adult janitor, regardless of whether this might eliminate a number of two, three, four, and even five teacher schools. Consequently, the body of the study deals, not with the three hundred and sixty-nine schools from which replies were received, but with two hundred and twenty-seven schools in which full time adult janitors were employed.



In the following chapters tabulations of data are presented according to classifications set up, together with analyses and evaluations to show trends.

### Validity of the Study

The questionnaire used in this study was devised largely from the writer's observations and experience, and in consequence thereof personal predilections may have placed emphasis on certain aspects of the problem to the neglect of others. The balance and discrimination that comes of group study and approval may be lacking.

A second factor that may affect the validity of the investigation is the possibility of vaguely worded questions. Every effort was made to so state the questions that misapprehension would be reduced to a minimum.

The third factor affecting validity deals with the subjectivity of the rating device. Undoubtedly the opinions of administrators regarding the qualitative service attributes of janitors will differ according to the background of personal qualities, training, and experience possessed by the particular principal. The rating classes are, however, broad, and the service qualities are such as may be readily observed through overt acts.

The fourth factor which may affect the validity of the investigation may be stated as the possible hesitancy on the part of administrators to answer the questions frankly. Data, however, must be accepted at their face value. On the whole, answers appeared to represent a conscientious effort on the part of administrators to be sincere and impartial in their statements.

The final factor affecting validity is the adequacy of the sampling. The writer believes that the high percentage of returns shows an adequate representation of data from all school groups composing the study. Questionnaires were sent to all of the high schools in the state having from two to twelve teachers, to all elementary schools having from three to twelve teachers, and to the preponderant majority of two teacher elementary schools. A total of 325 replies was received to 431 questionnaires sent out. In addition, information about 44 schools was obtained by direct interviews, making a final total of 369 schools or 77.7% of the original 475 selected. The 227 schools which form the basis of the study include all those employing full time janitors and constitute 47.8% of the first selection of 475.

## CHAPTER II

### GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF JANITORIAL EMPLOYMENT AND PERSONNEL

A requisite of any study dealing with personal service is a knowledge of the personal, social, and occupational composition of those individuals performing the given service. This chapter gives consideration to such aspects of janitorial personnel and employment as the following: sex of janitors; age; marital status; salary; term of employment; nominal occupation; occupation prior to and at time of employment; and community status.

#### Types of Janitorships

This study, as explained in the Introduction, deals only with full time adult janitorships. A total of 227 such positions were reported from the 369 schools which gave data. Janitorial service evidently does not rise to any real occupational status in schools of under five teachers, as only 14% of the two teacher group had full time janitors and only 60% of the three and four teacher schools were similarly staffed (Table II).



### Age of Janitors

The ages of janitors were to a certain extent only approximations. Principals were asked to give the age or "estimated" age of the janitor. The presence in the answers of many ages which were multiples of the numbers five and ten indicated the probability that many of the answers were estimates only. The majority, however, appeared to be definite answers from direct questioning of the janitors.

The age of full time janitors ranged from seventeen to eighty-four years. The average age of janitors was highest in the two teacher schools, but there seemed to be no significant differences between the averages of the four school groups. The all-school average of 53.2 years represents an age commonly thought of as the late middle period of life (Table IV).

More illuminating, perhaps, than janitor's average age are the incidences of janitors above and below certain age levels. Nearly two-thirds of those serving in the smaller schools were above 60 years of age and nearly one-third above 65. This is in contrast to the situation in other school groups, which had a lower incidence in the upper age brackets and a somewhat higher incidence in the lower bracket.

TABLE IV

## PERCENTAGE OF JANITORS IN CUMULATIVE AGE GROUPS

Cumulative age groups	Two teacher	3-4 teacher	5-8 teacher	9-12 teacher	All sch. ave.
	%	%	%	%	%
65 years or older	31	21	13	12	17
60 years or older	63	37	26	38	33
55 years or older	69	49	47	52	50
50 years or older	75	62	61	65	63
49 years or younger	25	38	39	35	37
Total number:	16	66	111	34	227
Mean age	56.4	53.1	52.8	53.5	53.2

Note: The mean age was computed on the mid-point of five year intervals rather than on the actual ages of the janitors.

#### Marital Status and Dependents

Information was sought regarding two other, and related, questions: What is the marital status of the janitors and do they have dependents to support?

Eighty-eight per cent of the janitors were married. The incidence of married janitors was highest in the nine to twelve teacher group, being 97.1%; it was next highest in the five to eight teacher class, 91.9%, but fell to 78.8%

and 81.2%, respectively, for the three and four and the two teacher groups.

Fifty-eight per cent of the janitors for the schools as a whole had one or more children to support. A number of the janitors were reported to be supporting or helping to support relatives other than their children. Sixty-two per cent of the janitors in the two teacher schools had no children to support. This may be explained in part by the high incidence of bachelors in this group. But perhaps the best explanation is to be found in the fact, noted in Table IV, that some 63% of these individuals were sixty years of age or over as compared with only 38% in the next highest group.

#### Salaries and Term of Employment

Salaries ranged from \$85.00 in a two teacher school system to \$1800.00 in one of the larger systems. The averages for the various classes of schools showed a definite increase with the probable increase in responsibility, but the variations in salaries from school to school within the respective groups were striking. The average salary for all schools was \$769.10 (Table V).

TABLE V

## SALARIES OF JANITORS

Salary	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Below \$200:	5	31.3	4	6.1					9	3.7
\$200-299	4	25.	3	4.6					7	3.1
300-399	2	12.5	11	16.7	2	1.8	1	2.9	16	7.
400-499	2	12.5	11	16.7	5	4.5			18	7.9
500-599	1	6.3	3	4.6	5	4.5			9	4.
600-699			11	16.7	18	16.2	1	2.9	30	13.2
700-799	1	6.3	7	10.6	25	22.5	2	5.9	35	15.4
800-899			3	4.6	22	19.8	3	8.8	28	12.3
900-999	1	6.3	6	9.1	13	11.7	8	23.5	28	12.3
1000-1099:			3	4.6	10	9.	5	14.7	18	7.9
1100-1199:					1	.9	1	2.9	2	.9
1200-1299:			2	3.	5	4.5	5	14.7	12	5.3
1300-1399:					3	2.7	4	11.8	7	3.1
1400-1499:					1	.9			1	.4
1500-1599:					1	.9	3	8.8	4	1.8
1600-1699:										
1700-1799:										
1800										
or more:							1	2.9	1	.4
No report:			2	3.					2	.9
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.
Mean	\$350.00		\$595.30		\$830.20		\$1094.10		\$769.10	

The salaries reported were for the janitors' respective terms of employment, which varied from nine months--in a few cases, less--to a full twelve month work year, less vacation (Table VI). Nine months was the predominant term of employment in the smaller of the schools. The term, how-



ever, lengthened with the increase in size of the school system until, with the nine to twelve teacher group, approximately two-thirds of the janitors were employed on a twelve month basis. Average salaries, then, must be considered partly in the light of the term of employment.

TABLE VI

## TERM OF EMPLOYMENT FOR JANITORS

Term of employment	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Less than nine months	2	12.5	2	3.					4	1.8
Nine months	9	56.3	29	44.1	20	18.	3	8.8	61	26.8
Ten months	2	12.5	11	16.7	26	23.4	7	20.6	46	20.2
Eleven months			1	1.5	9	8.1	1	2.9	11	4.8
Twelve months	3	18.8	22	33.4	56	50.4	23	67.6	104	45.8
No report			1	1.5					1	.4
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Previous Occupational Status

Information was sought to determine from what occupations the janitors were recruited--specifically, what types of work they professed to follow, what types of work they were following prior to employment, and whether they were gainfully and steadily employed at time of election to jan-

itorship. Table VII shows the nominal or professed occupations of janitors. The data pertain to only one hundred and seventy-eight or approximately 74% of the total.

TABLE VII

## NOMINAL OR PROFESSED OCCUPATIONS OF JANITORS

Occupational class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Agriculture or extractive industries	3	18.8	14	21.2	28	25.2	6	17.6	51	22.4
Manufacturing and mechanical			2	3.	4	3.6	1	3.	7	3.1
Transportation	1	6.2	4	6.1	5	4.5			10	4.4
Trades	3	18.8	12	18.2	24	21.6	9	26.5	48	21.1
Public service			1	1.5	2	1.8			3	1.3
Professional service			2	3.	1	.9	1	3.	4	1.8
Domestic and personal service	1	6.2	1	1.5	2	1.8			4	1.8
Common labor	4	25.	10	15.2	16	14.4	6	17.6	36	15.9
Other	1	6.2	1	1.5	3	2.7			5	2.2
Not known or no answer	3	18.8	19	28.8	26	23.5	11	32.3	59	26.
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Note: The following occupations; forty-seven in number, were reported:--automobile worker, blacksmith, boat builder, brass moulder, building trades, butcher, carpenter, cement worker, chauffeur, contractor, cook, donkey

engine operator, dressmaker, electrician, gas engineer, steam engineer, farmer, fireman, general or common laborer, greenhouse man, housekeeper, janitor, lithographer, logger, lumberman, mechanic, millwright, miner, minister, office worker, painter, policeman, railroad clerk, railroad laborer, railroad shopman, salesman, sawmill laborer, sawmill operator, sawyer, separator man, shoemaker, signalman, steam fitter, teacher, telephone operator, truck driver, well driller.

The greatest frequency existed in agriculture or extractive industries, trades, and common labor, the percentages for these classifications being 22.4%, 21.1%, and 15.9%, respectively. The salient feature of these data, however, is the variety of occupations which janitors stated to have been their chosen or accepted lines of work. However, of the forty-seven occupations represented, only three--farming, carpentry, and common labor--stood out in any appreciable numbers.

It was further found that, while forty-seven professed occupations were represented, fifty-nine different occupations had been followed by these men at some time prior to election as janitors. This indicates that at some time prior to the school employment a number of these individuals were following other than their professed occupations.

A few specific examples may illustrate the situation. For instance, twenty janitors professed to be carpenters by trade, but only fourteen were following the trade at the

time of their employment as janitors. In other words, six men had given up their nominal occupation for some other type of employment or were without employment. Again, thirty-eight men professed to be farmers, but at the time of becoming janitors, fifty-eight were following that occupation. This represents an increase of twenty men in one occupation. Another interesting fact is that fourteen of the forty-seven professed occupations did not appear on the list showing the type of work being carried on prior to employment, while in the latter list twenty-one new types of labor were designated. These new types of work were truck gardening, deputy sheriff, news reporter, bus driver, cat man, watchman, CCC camp laborer, W. P. A. foreman, woolen mill worker, interne, bookkeeper, plumber, woodcutter, stage driver, apiarist, factory worker, filling station operator, fisherman, and insurance agent.

Perhaps the most significant fact about the occupational status of these individuals is to be found in the answer to the question--Was the janitor gainfully and steadily employed at time of his election to janitorship? Answers represented data on one hundred and ninety-seven janitors, or 86.8% of the total.

Only 53.8% of all the janitors were gainfully and

steadily employed at time of election. In short, approximately only one-half of these men had work at the time of being elected to janitorships. The percentages varied according to the school classifications. Only 46.7% and 48.3%, respectively, of the men in the first two groups of schools were gainfully and steadily employed while 54.3% were so employed in the five to eight teacher schools and 67.9% in the nine to twelve teacher schools. This fact may have bearing upon the efficiency of service in the respective schools.

#### Community Status of Janitor

What is the community status of janitors? Administrators, almost without exception, interpreted "community status" to mean the social position of the janitor in the community--not social position in its narrower sense alone but in its definition also of citizenship and civic activities.

Two hundred and ten or approximately 93% of the administrators answered this question. A careful analysis of the answers according to the school classifications revealed no distinctive facts concerning any particular group or groups. Janitors, with few exceptions, were reported by

principals to be regarded as good citizens, accepted on a basis of equality with other citizens of the communities. Approximately 75% were designated as being highly respected; 25% were community leaders in social and civic enterprises. A few, less than 10%, were considered to be either inefficient, "just tolerated", or obstructionists to school and community life.

#### Summary

Assuming that the above analysis portrays correctly the present situation, janitors in the small public schools of Oregon are, with few exceptions, men. They range in age from seventeen to eighty-four years, the average age being fifty-three years. In the two teacher schools the percentage of janitors sixty years of age and older is much higher than in the larger schools.

These janitors, generally speaking, are married men. Particularly is this true among the janitors in the larger schools. In the two teacher and three and four teacher schools, however, approximately one out of every five of the janitors is not married. Approximately 60% of the janitors for the schools as a whole have children to support. The outstanding exception to this is found in the group of

smallest schools in which only 37.5% of the janitors have children to support.

Salaries paid to janitors are generally small, although a few men received from \$1500.00 to \$1800.00 per year. The average for the nine to twelve teacher school group is \$1094.10, while the average for all the schools is only \$769.10. Salaries of janitors in two teacher and three and four teacher schools are much lower. Terms of employment vary from less than nine months to a full calendar year, the term increasing with the size of the school.

Janitors are recruited from a wide variety of occupations, outstanding among which are farming, carpentry, and general or common labor. Many of the men, prior to election as janitors, were doing work other than that which was their professed occupation. Almost fifty per cent of all the janitors were without steady and gainful employment at time of election to the janitorship.

The janitors of these small schools represent with few exceptions a respected class of citizenry in their communities. Many of them are civic leaders, wielding considerable influence; the preponderant majority of them are regarded as on an equality with other members of the community.

## CHAPTER III

### RATING OF JANITORS FOR SERVICE QUALITIES

Service qualities may be defined as those qualities which make it possible to serve most efficiently in the capacity of school plant custodian. The following qualities were made the objects of investigation in this section of the study:

1. Health. As observed by one not medically trained; such as mental health, vitality, freedom from illness, physical defects.
  2. Personal appearance and presentation. Specifically, cleanliness and neatness, carriage, speech.
  3. Cooperation with principal, teachers, pupils.
  4. Responsibility in attitude and performance of work.
  5. Industry and initiative.
  6. Skill and intelligence in performance of work.
  7. Possession of trade skills--carpentry, plumbing, electricity, engineering or mechanics, painting, masonry, interior finishing.
  8. Cleanliness and neatness in performance of work.
- One of the above items, possession of trade skills,



may not in the strictest sense be called a quality. It has been included in this designation because it is a qualification or factor which bears a definite influence on the quality of janitorial service rendered.

Principals were asked to rate their janitors on the above qualities, using a four-point scale:--excellent; good; fair; and poor. Interestingly enough, this was one section of the questionnaire which received a hearty response from all principals.

#### Health

The term "fair" implies a certain negative aspect; and to the extent that principals making this rating adjudged the health of 22% of the janitors with such a feeling of reservation, it may be concluded that, including those janitors whose health was rated as poor, over one-fourth of the janitors in the small schools of Oregon were men whose health was not altogether satisfactory from an efficiency standpoint (Table VIII). This, however, is not altogether surprising when one realizes that approximately 35% of the janitors in these small schools were sixty years of age and older, that better than 15% were sixty-five years of age and older.

TABLE VIII

## PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS' HEALTH

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent:	1	6.3	20	30.3	35	31.5	16	47.	72	31.7
Good	8	50.	23	34.9	49	44.1	12	35.3	92	40.5
Fair	6	37.5	19	28.8	22	19.8	3	8.8	50	22.
Poor	1	6.3	4	6.1	5	4.5	3	8.8	13	5.7
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

More illuminating, however, is an analysis of the situation according to the various school classifications. For example, only 6% of the janitors in the two teacher schools were rated as having "excellent" health whereas 30% were so rated in the three and four teacher schools, 32% in the five to eight, and 47% in the nine to twelve. In the "fair" rating class the percentages were 38%, 29%, 20%, and 9%. In short, the group of smallest schools showed the lowest incidence of "excellent" health and the highest of "fair" health. The group of largest schools showed the highest incidence of "excellent" health, nearly 50% of the janitors being so rated; and the lowest incidence of "fair" health.

An explanation may be suggested by referring to the discussion of the ages of janitors in the respective groups of schools (page 15) in which it was pointed out that there was a much higher incidence of elderly men in the smaller schools and of younger men in the larger schools. It appears that the smaller schools hire, through necessity or otherwise, janitors who are past their prime physical period of life.

#### Personal Appearance and Presentation

The situation which has been observed concerning janitors' health was roughly paralleled by the ratings on personal appearance and presentation, as shown in Table IX. The percentages of "fair" and "poor" ratings aggregated approximately 33% of the janitors, or one in every three. Also, the incidence of "excellent" ratings increased steadily from the two teacher to the nine to twelve teacher schools, and the incidence of "fair" ratings decreased in the same respective classifications.

TABLE IX

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR PERSONAL APPEARANCE  
AND PRESENTATION

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent:	2:	12.5:	15:	22.7:	37:	33.3:	12:	35.3:	66:	29.
Good	: 6:	37.5:	: 24:	36.4:	: 41:	36.9:	: 14:	41.2:	: 85:	37.4
Fair	: 7:	43.8:	: 22:	33.3:	: 28:	25.2:	: 7:	20.6:	: 64:	28.2
Poor	: 1:	6.3:	: 5:	7.6:	: 5:	4.5:	: 1:	2.9:	: 12:	5.3
Total	: 16:	100.:	: 66:	100.:	: 111:	100.:	: 34:	100.:	: 227:	100.

Cooperation with Principal, Teachers, Pupils

Data regarding janitorial cooperation indicated a favorable situation. Almost 60% of the janitors were rated excellent in their cooperation with the administration, the teaching staff, and the pupils. Twenty-five per cent more were rated good, making an aggregate of approximately 84%. It seems reasonable to conclude that the working relationship between janitors and the educational staff and pupils of these small schools is, on the whole, a cordial one, and that instances to the contrary are relatively isolated and rare. It is equally worthy of note that the incidence of cooperation was high irrespective of size of school (Table X).

TABLE X

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR COOPERATION WITH PRINCIPAL, TEACHERS, AND PUPILS

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent:	10	62.5	33	50.	68	61.2	22	64.7	133	59.5
Good	4	25.	23	34.9	23	20.7	7	20.6	57	25.1
Fair	2	12.5	5	7.6	16	14.4	4	11.8	27	11.9
Poor			5	7.6	4	3.6	1	2.9	10	4.4
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Responsibility in Attitude and Performance of Work

Are the janitors interested in maintaining a high standard of janitorial service? Are they observant of all the needs incident to orderly school housekeeping? Are they punctual in having the building properly attended to and ready each morning and during the day for educational activities? In short, do they demonstrate a real desire to keep the school plant at the highest level of efficiency possible?

TABLE XI

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR RESPONSIBILITY IN  
ATTITUDE AND PERFORMANCE OF WORK

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent:	6	37.5	29	43.9	60	54.	23	67.6	118	51.9
Good	6	37.5	25	37.8	28	25.2	6	17.6	65	28.6
Fair	4	25.	7	10.6	18	16.2	2	5.9	31	13.6
Poor	:	:	5	7.6	5	4.5	3	8.8	13	5.7
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Evidence indicated a relatively high degree of responsibility on the part of the janitors. For the schools as a whole, approximately 52% were rated excellent and an aggregate of approximately 80% were rated excellent and good. Also, the percentage of high ratings for responsibility increased with the increase in size of the school. Whereas only 37.5% of the janitors were rated "excellent" in the two teacher schools, 44% were so rated in the three and four teacher schools, 54% in the five to eight, and approximately 68% in the nine to twelve teacher schools. At the same time, the incidence of "fair" ratings decreased, dropping from 25% in the two teacher schools to approximately 6% in the nine to twelve teacher schools.

Industry and Initiative

Closely related to responsibility in attitude and performance of work are the qualities of industry and initiative, and in the rating of janitors for these qualities the trend towards a higher degree of efficiency in the larger schools again appeared. For the rating of "excellent" the frequency rose from 25% for the two teacher schools to 41% for the nine to twelve teacher schools (Table XII). There was no increase between the three and four and five to eight teacher schools; instead, a slight decrease appeared. However, the incidence for each of the two middle school groups was considerably higher than that for the two teacher schools, being approximately 34%.

TABLE XII

## PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR INDUSTRY AND INITIATIVE

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent	4	25.	23	34.9	38	34.2	14	41.2	79	34.8
Good	9	56.3	19	28.8	44	39.6	16	47.	88	38.7
Fair	2	12.5	17	25.8	19	17.1	1	2.9	39	17.2
Poor	1	6.3	7	10.6	10	9.	3	8.8	21	9.2
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Skill and Intelligence in Performance of Work

The ratings made by principals on the skill and intelligence of janitors in the performance of work reveals situations and trends which have been observed to be relatively typical of all the qualities so far discussed. Particularly worthy of note is the fact that more than 90% of the janitors in the nine to twelve teacher schools were rated either excellent or good in these qualities, while the average incidence for all the schools was only 77% (Table XIII). Such data give pertinacity to the questions:-- Is there a more deliberate attempt in the larger schools to secure janitors definitely on the basis of ability to do the work and does the opportunity offered in the larger school systems attract a more skillful and intelligent applicant?



TABLE XIII

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR SKILL AND INTELLIGENCE  
IN PERFORMANCE OF WORK

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%
Excellent:	4:	25.	27:	41.	35:	31.5:	16:	47.	88:	36.1
Good	7:	43.8:	22:	33.3:	48:	43.2:	15:	44.1:	92:	40.5
Fair	5:	31.3:	12:	18.2:	21:	18.9:	1:	2.9:	39:	17.2
Poor	:	:	5:	7.6:	7:	6.3:	2:	5.9:	14:	6.2
Total	16:	100.	66:	100.	111:	100.	34:	100.	227:	100.

Trade Skills

Table XIV presents data on the extent to which janitors possess to an acceptably accomplished degree the following trade skills: carpentry, plumbing, electrical, engineering or mechanical, painting, masonry, and interior finishing. High ratings on these trade skills were more generally reported from the larger schools. This situation may be accounted for by the fact that in the communities surrounding the larger schools, men with varied and trade skilled abilities were more available. Only in carpentry and in engineering or mechanical skills did the janitors of the two teacher schools make as good a showing as did those in the

other school groups. In the latter skills, engineering and mechanical, the first three groups of schools showed roughly similar situations, but in the last group a much higher percentage of janitors was judged to be qualified.

TABLE XIV

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH JANITORS POSSESS  
CERTAIN TRADE SKILLS

Trade skills	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Carpentry</u>	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Yes	9	56.3	33	50.	60	54.1	20	58.8	122	53.7
No	7	43.8	33	50.	51	46.	14	41.2	105	46.3
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.
<u>Plumbing</u>	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Yes	3	18.8	19	28.8	48	43.2	14	41.2	84	37.
No	13	81.3	47	71.2	63	56.8	20	58.8	143	63.
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.
<u>Electrical</u>	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Yes	1	6.3	9	13.6	18	16.2	5	14.7	33	14.5
No	15	93.8	57	86.4	93	83.8	29	85.3	194	85.5
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.
<u>Engineering or Mechanical</u>	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Yes	3	18.8	8	12.1	16	14.4	15	44.1	42	18.5
No	13	81.3	58	87.9	95	85.6	19	55.9	185	81.5
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.
<u>Painting, Masonry, Interior finishing</u>	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Yes	3	18.8	20	30.3	40	36.	13	38.2	76	33.5
No	13	81.3	46	69.7	71	64.	21	61.8	151	66.5
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Cleanliness and Neatness in Performance of Work

Data on cleanliness and neatness in performance of work indicate that a slightly higher standard existed in the larger schools than in the smaller (Table XV). One cannot but feel that any rating of a janitor on these qualities must also be, to a great extent and granting good cooperation, a rating of the administrator's standards of cleanliness and neatness.

TABLE XV

PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF JANITORS FOR CLEANLINESS AND NEATNESS  
IN PERFORMANCE OF WORK

Rating class	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Excellent	3	18.8	23	34.9	34	30.6	16	47.	76	33.5
Good	9	56.3	25	37.8	56	48.6	12	35.3	100	44.
Fair	3	18.8	14	21.2	16	14.4	4	11.8	37	16.3
Poor	1	6.3	4	6.1	7	6.3	2	5.9	14	6.2
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

### Summary

It has seemed advisable for comparative purposes that some graphic form be had which would conveniently summarize the facts adduced in this chapter. Accordingly, Table XVI has been devised, in which the percentages of the "good" and "excellent" rating classes have been aggregated to make one composite rating class. One hundred per cent represents the standard of efficiency in this table. Included in it are all the service qualities except that dealing with possession of trade skills. This latter has been excluded because it represents a factor which, however important as a qualification for janitorial service, is not in the strictest sense of the term a "quality".

TABLE XVI

## EFFICIENCY INDEX OF JANITORIAL SERVICE

Service qualities	Two	3-4	5-8	9-12	All Sch.
	T	T	T	T	ave.
	%	%	%	%	%
Health	56.3	65.2	75.6	82.3	72.2
Personal appearance and presentation	50.	59.	70.2	76.4	66.4
Cooperation with principal, teachers, and pupils	87.5	84.9	81.9	85.3	83.6
Responsibility in attitude and performance of work	75.	81.7	79.2	85.3	80.5
Industry and initiative	81.3	63.7	73.8	88.2	73.5
Skill and intelligence	68.8	74.3	74.7	91.1	76.6
Cleanliness and neatness	75.	72.7	79.2	82.3	77.5
Average efficiency level	70.5	74.5	76.4	84.4	75.7

Certain facts stand out which deserve comment. Perhaps the most significant are the high incidences of cooperation and responsibility reported by the principals. It is to the credit of the janitors that in these two important qualities, which so strongly make for school morale and proper functioning of school activities, they rated so high in service.

Health and personal appearance show the lowest ratings.

It has been suggested that the age of janitors, particularly in the smaller schools, may have a definite causal bearing on the low incidence of health. The low rating in personal appearance and presentation very possibly reflects, to a great extent, the background of social and economic mores of small community and rural life.

The excellent rating for skill and intelligence made by janitors in the largest sized group of schools appears to indicate the availability of a more skilled and intelligent type of applicant for janitorial service, and the determination of the school authorities to secure such a type of individual for the service.

## CHAPTER IV

### ELECTION AND TENURE OF JANITOR

This chapter and the following one set forth data indicating the nature of those organizational relationships and practices bearing on school plant custodial administration. Specifically, they report on the following subjects:

1. Method of selecting janitor.
2. Extent to which service qualities are considered by school boards in analyzing qualifications of applicants for janitorial positions.
3. Extent to which principal's advice is solicited in re-election or release of janitor.
4. Nature of employment relationship between school district and janitor.
5. Number of consecutive years served by janitors in their respective positions.
6. Authority for organization and administration of janitorial regulations.
7. Body from whom janitor takes directions concerning:
  - A. Inauguration of new duties,



- B. Performance of established duties,
  - C. Requests for purchase of equipment, materials, supplies.
8. Method of administering janitorial regulations.
  9. Extent and time of janitor's notification of regulations and their nature.
  10. Extent and time of janitor's notification of principal's authority to direct and enforce regulations.

The first five of these questions are discussed in the present chapter.

#### Method of Selection

Approximately 54% of the janitors in the smaller school systems of Oregon were selected directly by the local school boards without the advice of or consultation with the administrative head of the school (Table XVII). The significance of this fact is better indicated, however, when one goes behind the average to compare the procedures in the several school classifications. Thus, 87.5% of the janitors were selected wholly by the school boards in the two teacher schools while approximately 67% were so selected in the three and four teacher schools, 53% in the five to eight teacher schools, and only 17.5% in the nine to twelve teacher schools.

Conversely, while for all the schools only 33.9% of the janitors were elected on the recommendation of the principal, the approximate percentage for each of the school groups was as follows: 6% for the two teacher schools; 27% for the three and four teacher schools; 34% for the five to eight teacher schools; and 59% for the nine to twelve teacher schools.

TABLE XVII

## METHOD OF SELECTION OF JANITORS

Method of selection	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%
Board of direc- tors without consultation with principal	14	87.5	44	66.7	59	53.1	6	17.6	123	54.1
Board of direc- tors on recom- mendation of principal	1	6.3	18	27.3	38	34.2	20	58.8	77	33.9
Principal out- lines qualifi- cations; board selects on ba- sis of these qualifications	1	6.3	3	4.6	6	5.4	4	11.8	14	6.2
Other					4	3.6	2	5.9	6	2.6
Not known or no report			1	1.5	4	3.6	2	5.9	7	3.1
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

But little use was made of the procedure wherein the principal sets up qualifications for janitors, leaving to the board the function of selection. The nine to twelve teacher schools, however, employed this plan with greater frequency than did the others. It may be further mentioned that the undifferentiated method termed "other" was ex-

plained by the principals so answering as a method of selection wherein the county superintendent exercises a relatively high degree of control over the hiring of the janitor.

The trend is unmistakable. Principals in the smaller schools, almost as a group, were without voice in the selection of the janitor. With the increase in size of school, principals in increasing numbers were granted advisory and recommending powers.

#### Consideration of Service Qualities in Selection

One other question relating to janitorial selection was asked. To what extent do boards of directors consider service qualities in analyzing the qualifications of applicants for janitorial positions? (1)

A total of sixty-nine, or approximately 30%, of the administrators either did not report on this question, or, reporting, professed not to know. For the schools as a whole, thirty-three janitors were, according to administrators, selected "altogether and only" on a strict basis of service qualities. This represents only 14.5% of the total number of janitors studied. Another 14.5% were selected to a "great

- 
1. It has proved virtually impossible to put into table form the innumerable and varied answers to this question.

extent" on a basis of service qualities. That is, most of the service qualities were given consideration by the boards of directors in hiring janitors. Seven per cent were selected on consideration of a certain few of the service qualities and another 7% on just the slightest consideration of service qualities. Approximately 9% of the janitors were, in the opinion of administrators, selected without any apparent consideration whatsoever being given to service qualities. Added to the 7% who were selected on only the slightest consideration, approximately 16% of the janitors concerned in this study were elected to their positions with little or no consideration given to those qualities which would make them most able to serve efficiently in the capacity of school plant custodian.

Still other considerations were remarked by administrators. Approximately 2.5% of the janitors were elected to their positions wholly on their willingness to do the work at the salary offered; service qualities were no consideration in these cases. Another 2.5% were stated by principals as being elected because they were simply the best available, regardless of either salary or service qualities.

And finally, there was that group of janitors who

had been elected on considerations other than either service qualities, availability, or willingness to work for a given salary. Nor was this group inconsiderable in number, accounting for approximately 13% of the janitors concerned in the entire study. Following is a list of the reasons given for the particular selections. Some of them may be justifiable; some appear to be unquestionably spurious; still others, also justifiable, indicate special problems demanding a particular basis of consideration other than, or in addition to, those service qualities presented by the writer.

1. Age and proximity to schoolhouse.
2. Poor health but conscientious.
3. Polite and interested in school.
4. Ability to deal with children.
5. Main thought was to get a man who understood steam boiler and whose wife would help keep building clean.
6. Friendship; "pull".
7. Family to support and people feel sorry for man.
8. Need of work.
9. Ability to drive school bus.
10. Selected on belief he would cause less trouble than preceding janitor.
11. Chosen to appease village quarrel.

The eleven factors above cited served as the basis for the election of approximately 11% of the janitors. Numbers seven and eight above accounted for the greatest incidence, some ten janitors falling under these two related categories. Friendship and "pull" accounted for a half dozen more; age and poor health accounted for three; ability to drive school bus, two; liking for or ability to deal with children, two; and the others, one each. Other answers, so nondescript as to defy classification, were also given.

A brief recapitulation of these facts may be made. Thirty per cent of the administrators either did not reply, or, replying, said they did not know to what extent service qualities were considered. Approximately 30% of the school boards considered service qualities altogether or to a very great extent, or made the basis of their consideration an ability particularly demanded by circumstances peculiar to the need of their school. Seven per cent of the school boards considered certain of the service qualities but not others and 2.5% were obliged to hire whomever they could get, regardless of ability. The remaining 30% of the school boards either did not consider service qualities at all or only to the slightest degree. A large proportion of these selections were made on a basis of willingness to work at

a given salary, sympathy for the infirm and afflicted, need of work, and friendship.

The extent to which service qualities were considered by school boards is particularly interesting when viewed from a comparative study of the four school groups. In the two teacher schools, for instance, no janitors were selected on a basis of all the service qualities and in only 12.5% of the schools were they selected on consideration of most of the qualities. Approximately 6% were selected on consideration of a certain few service qualities, but not others. In the three and four teacher schools 17% were selected on consideration of all the service qualities; 12% on consideration of most of the qualities; and 9% on consideration of a certain few. In the five to eight teacher schools 13.5% were selected on consideration of all, 15% on a majority, and 6% on a certain few of the qualities. In the nine to twelve teacher schools, 20.5% were selected on a basis of all the service qualities and 17% on consideration of most of the service qualities. The trend is definitely towards a consideration of applicants on a basis of service qualities in proportion to increased size of the school.



Solicitation of Principal's Advice  
in Re-election of Janitor

The extent to which principals' advice was solicited in re-election or release of janitor indicates an interesting point of view on the part of boards of directors.

TABLE XVIII

EXTENT TO WHICH PRINCIPALS' ADVICE IS SOLICITED  
IN RE-ELECTION OR RELEASE OF JANITOR

Extent advice solicited	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%
Yes	: 5:	31.3:	27:	41.:	73:	65.7:	27:	79.4:	132:	58.1
No	: 9:	56.3:	29:	43.9:	21:	18.9:	4:	11.8:	63:	27.7
Other	: :	:	1:	1.5:	1:	.9:	:	:	2:	.9
Not known or no report	: 2:	12.5:	9:	13.7:	16:	14.4:	3:	8.8:	30:	13.2
Total	: 16:	100.:	66:	100.:	111:	100.:	34:	100.:	227:	100.

Nearly 60% of the principals, for the schools as a whole, were solicited for advice regarding the re-election or release of janitors. It seems rather strange that almost 60% of the school boards solicited advice from their principals on the re-election or release of janitors when only 34% granted the principal the privilege of recommending individuals for janitorships. If, as it appears, school boards assume that the principal is the man most familiar with the

work of the janitor and therefore most qualified to pass judgment on his ability when the time comes for rehiring, it would seem logical that they should also consider him equally qualified to pass judgment on the qualifications of applicants for janitorial positions. It appears, however, that they do not feel that way about it. However, the frequency with which the principal's advice was solicited in the re-election or release of janitors increased steadily from the two teacher to the nine to twelve teacher schools, it being 31% in the former, and rising through each of the two middle school groups to approximately 80% in the nine to twelve teacher schools.

#### Nature of Employment Relationship

A fairly even distribution, as observed in Table XIX, existed for the schools as a whole regarding the types of employment relationship. Thirty-five per cent of the janitors were under written contract; 35% under verbal contract; and 24% gave service subject to termination on due notice by board. Three per cent were listed as coming under "other" forms. They were explained by the principals as "employment written into the minutes of board meeting." What was written into the minutes was not stated, making

the answer a rather ambiguous one. Indeed, that employment relationship which depends on a verbal contract might, to all purposes, be considered as more or less synonymous with service at will.

TABLE XIX

NATURE OF EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICT AND JANITOR

Nature of relationship	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Written contract for school term	8	50.	28	42.4	37	33.3	7	20.6	80	35.2
Verbal contract for school term	8	50.	22	33.3	37	33.3	12	35.3	79	34.8
Service at will subject to termination on due notice at discretion of board			11	16.7	31	27.9	13	38.2	55	24.2
Other			1	1.5	5	4.5	1	2.9	7	3.1
No report			4	6.1	1	.9	1	2.9	6	2.6
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

The singular facts of these data are the steady decrease in written contractual employment from the two teacher

schools, with 50% of this type, to 21% of this form in the nine to twelve teacher schools, and the steady increase in incidence of service at will, from none in the two teacher schools to 38% in the nine to twelve teacher schools.

One may suspect that the written contract is a formality more than anything else. The small extent of its use in the larger schools and emphasis on service at will subject to termination at discretion of board appears to indicate on the part of hiring bodies a keener appreciation of "ability to do the work" in the retention of janitors. It is probable that in those schools wherein both the janitor and the hiring body consider the janitorship a real job rather than a sinecure, that janitor need not fear the lack of a written contract.

Nothing, however, that has been said should be construed to mean that the written contract may not in instances have certain stabilizing and salutary effects on either or both parties to the contract. Indeed, it seems logical to assume that, when school janitorial service reaches that state of professionalization in which hiring bodies can be reasonably assured of securing qualified men for this service, the written contract will come into more general use.

Years Served by Janitors

A determination of the number of years served by individuals in an occupation is often a reliable index of conditions existing in the occupation. Particularly true does this appear to be in the study of janitorial tenure.

TABLE XX

NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS SERVED BY JANITORS

Number of years	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%	:No.	%
Less than one year	: 2:	12.5:	: 10:	15.2:	: 19:	17.1:	: 3:	8.8:	: 34:	15.
1-5 years	: 11:	68.9:	: 32:	48.5:	: 47:	42.3:	: 14:	41.2:	: 104:	45.7
6-10 years	: 2:	12.5:	: 16:	24.2:	: 28:	25.2:	: 5:	14.6:	: 51:	21.4
11-15 years	: 1:	6.3:	: 4:	6.1:	: 8:	7.2:	: 7:	20.5:	: 20:	9.8
16-20 years	: :	:	: :	:	: 2:	1.8:	: 1:	2.9:	: 3:	1.3
21 to more than 24 years	: :	:	: :	:	: 4:	3.6:	: 2:	5.8:	: 6:	2.7
No report	: :	:	: 4:	6.1:	: 3:	2.7:	: 2:	5.8:	: 9:	4.
Total	: 16:	100.:	: 66:	100.:	: 111:	100.:	: 34:	100.:	: 227:	100.
Mean	: 4:	yrs.:	: 4.5:	yrs.:	: 6:	yrs.:	: 7.8:	yrs.:	: 5.7:	yrs.

Note: Mean computed on actual ages of janitors; not on mid-point of intervals.

Range in years of service was from less than one year in many cases to twenty-eight years in one case. The fact that thirty-four of the janitors had served for less than one year is itself significant, since it may be taken

as an indication of janitorial turnover in the year during which the data were gathered. The turnover was 15%. The largest turnover was in the five to eight teacher schools; the smallest in the nine to twelve teacher schools.

Sixty per cent of the janitors had served less than five years. However, the average number of consecutive years doubled from the two teacher to the nine to twelve teacher schools. This suggests strongly that the stability of janitorial tenure increases in proportion to increase in size of school. It may be inferred that janitorial service in the larger schools offers more permanent satisfactions than does service in the smaller school systems. Certainly, from the janitor's point of view, the salary alone, paid in the smaller schools, is not conducive to either satisfaction or permanence on the job. Neither can one overlook the fact that, insofar as so many janitors in the smaller schools were elected to their positions on bases other than service qualities, so are they liable to be removed on bases other than service rendered.

#### Summary

Janitors in more than 50% of the schools were hired by the board of directors without solicitation of the prin-

principal's advice. This was particularly true in the two teacher and three and four teacher schools, where 87.5% and 67%, respectively, were so hired. In the five to eight teacher schools the incidence dropped to 53%, showing a considerable decline but still marking a majority of the schools as giving no consideration to the administrative officer as a consultant in janitorial selection. In the larger sized group of schools, however, the opposite was more nearly true, only 18% of the janitors in this group being hired by the school board without consultation with the principal.

To the question that sought to determine the extent to which service qualities were considered by school boards in selecting janitorial applicants, innumerable and perplexingly varied answers were given. Analysis of the problem was further complicated by the failure of approximately 30% of the administrators to answer the question, or answering, professing not to know. However, the characteristics and trends noted in other problems of the investigation were equally to be noted in this particular subject. A relatively small number of school boards, 30% for all the schools, gave thorough consideration to service qualities; approximately 30% gave little or no consideration to such qual-

ities. Indeed, an appreciable per cent of the latter group gave consideration to factors which, in the strictest sense, should have no place in the selection of janitors. In the larger schools, however, service qualities were given more extensive consideration than they were in the smaller schools.

There was an extensive solicitation of the principal's advice in the re-election or release of the janitor only in the nine to twelve teacher schools, approximately 80% of the principals in these schools signifying this to be the practice. Only 31% were so solicited in the two teacher schools, 41% in the three and four teacher schools, and 66% in the five to eight teacher schools.

Written contracts for service were given to janitors in 50% of the two teacher schools, but with the increase in size of the school the written contract was much less used. On the other hand service at will subject to termination at discretion of the board became increasingly popular.

The average number of consecutive years served by janitors increased from four years for janitors in two teacher schools to approximately eight years for janitors in the nine to twelve teacher schools. This increased stability of tenure, as evidenced in the larger schools, indicates, possibly, an organization of janitorial service



more stable than is that found in the smaller school systems of the state, thus insuring to the janitors in question more permanent satisfactions than are to be attained by those in the smaller schools.

## CHAPTER V

### ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF JANITORIAL REGULATIONS

This chapter, like the one immediately preceding, presents information on the organizational relationships and practices bearing on school custodial administration. It particularly attempts to throw light on the role played by the school principal in custodial administration.

#### Authority for Organization and Administration of Service

One of the most important problems confronting small schools today centers about the location of authority for the organization and administration of school enterprises. In the field of janitorial service this problem is perhaps foremost. That the ultimate source of authority is residual in the board of directors is generally admitted. The problem, however, in its practical implications, resolves itself about the immediate organizational and administrative policies and practices which may or may not be delegated to the principal of the school, and which, through failure to make a clear cut statement of policy, may result in weak administration or poor coordination of purpose among and

between the personnel of the school system.

Six administrators failed to answer the question relating to the body in which resides the authority for organization and administration of janitorial functions. Another half dozen, or approximately 2.5%, gave other types of authority than those listed by the investigator. Some indicated a dual authority; the majority, however, indicated the authority to be vested in the county school superintendent, the schools being in county unit systems.

TABLE XXI

LOCATION OF AUTHORITY FOR ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION  
OF JANITORIAL REGULATIONS

Authority	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Residual in board	9	56.3	15	22.7	16	14.4	4	11.8	44	19.4
Vested in principal with author- ity to en- force reg- ulations	3	18.8	29	43.9	61	54.9	24	70.6	117	51.5
Vested in principal but no au- thority to enforce reg- ulations	3	18.8	15	22.7	32	28.8	4	11.8	54	23.8
Other	1	6.3	3	4.6	1	.9	1	2.9	6	2.6
No report			4	6.1	1	.9	1	2.9	6	2.6
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

Authority for organization and administration of janitorial regulations resided altogether in the board in only 19% of the schools, taken as a whole. It was residual in the board in 56% of the two teacher schools, 23% of the three and four teacher schools, and in only 14% and 12%, respectively, of the five to eight and nine to twelve teacher schools.

On the other hand, authority for organization and administration of janitorial regulation was vested in the principal with authority to enforce regulations in 51.5% of the schools. Particularly did this situation obtain in the nine to twelve teacher schools, 70.5% being so classed. Only 19% of the two teacher schools came under this form of organization, and the percentage rose sharply in the three and four and five to eight teacher schools.

Twenty-four per cent of the schools were represented as coming under that form of organization in which authority was vested in the principal, but without power to enforce regulations. In only the nine to twelve teacher schools, however, was the incidence, 12%, considerably below the average.

It appears that increased size of school is closely associated with the tendency to delegate authority for organization and administration of janitorial regulations to the principal of the school system.

Three other questions, closely related to the one just discussed, were asked. They were:

1. From whom does janitor take directions concerning inauguration of new duties?

2. From whom does janitor take directions concern-

ing the performance of established duties?

3. To whom does janitor make requests for purchase of equipment, materials, and supplies?

Much the same answers were given to these questions as were given to the question concerning authority for organization and administration of janitorial regulations. The principals of the largest sized group of schools had authority to inaugurate new duties in approximately 59% of the cases; for the performance of established duties, they exercised authority in 65% of the schools. And in 56% of these schools it was to the principal that the janitor made requests for equipment, materials, and supplies.

The findings were similar, though to a less degree, in the three and four and five to eight teacher schools. However, the opposite was the case in the two teacher schools. Janitors in a majority of the schools took directions from the boards not only in the inauguration of new duties but even in the performance of established duties. And particularly did the janitors make their requests for janitorial equipment and supplies to the board of directors.

A considerable amount of dual control evidently existed in all of the schools, regardless of classification, directions being taken by the janitor from both the school

board and the administrator. Even in the nine to twelve teacher schools, 12% of the janitors took directions for the performance of established duties from both board and principal.

#### Method of Administering Regulations

The majority of principals administered janitorial regulations by verbal directions through use of conference, inspection, and discussion with the janitor. Fifty-eight and five-tenths per cent of all the schools designated this method, and it is significant that, although the percentage was highest in the nine to twelve teacher schools, it was relatively high in each school classification (Table XXII). Only approximately 2% of the principals wrote out the regulations and posted them for the janitor's inspection and observance; but, for all the schools, 18% administered the regulations by a combination of written and verbal directions. This combination method was not used in any case in the two teacher schools; in the three and four teacher schools it accounted for approximately 17% of the cases, increasing to 18% in the five to eight teacher group, and to 29% in the nine to twelve teacher group. The very common usage of verbal directions, or at least of a type of

regulation in which verbal directions are a part, undoubtedly indicates the tested wisdom of that method for efficient janitorial administration in smaller schools.

TABLE XXII

## METHODS OF ADMINISTERING JANITORIAL REGULATIONS

Method of administration	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Regulations written and posted for janitor's inspection and observance	1	6.3			3	2.7			4	1.8
Verbal directions thru conference, inspection, discussion, in absence of written regulations	9	56.3	35	53.	68	61.2	21	61.7	133	58.5
Combination of One and Two above			11	16.7	20	18.	10	29.4	41	18.
Customary janitorial practice without direction from principal	4	25.	15	22.7	18	16.2	2	5.9	39	17.2
No report	2	12.5	5	7.6	2	1.8	1	2.9	10	4.4
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.



The incidence of cases, 17%, falling under that method of administration designated as "customary janitorial practice without direction from principal" seems to be relatively high. This situation existed primarily in the two smaller school groups, and, to a slightly less extent, in the five to eight teacher group. The percentage dropped to a negligible figure in the nine to twelve teacher classification.

#### Instructions concerning Duties and Control

The final questions dealt with in this chapter are:

1. To what extent are janitors notified of the nature of their duties, and at what time are they notified?
2. To what extent are janitors notified of the principal's authority to direct and enforce regulations, and at what time are they notified?

These questions are particularly pertinent, and worthy of thorough consideration by any hiring body whenever the necessity arises for the election of a janitor. It is the misfortune of janitorial service that it is too often regarded as a type of labor about which everybody assumes knowledge, regardless of whether he has ever actually performed the duties incident to such service.

It may be contended that no one thing pertaining to janitorial service would have more salutary results than a clear-cut definition on the part of the hiring body of those duties to be performed by the janitor, and an unequivocal notification to the janitor of the principal's authority to direct and enforce the regulations pertaining to janitorial service. Furthermore, such definition of duties and notification of the principal's authority should be made prior to election; certainly not later than at time of election. It is impossible to estimate the amount of misunderstanding that could be avoided by this simple and business like procedure.

Tables XXIII and XXIV show the extent and time of janitor's notification concerning nature of regulations, and extent and time of janitor's notification of principal's authority to direct and enforce regulations.

TABLE XXIII

## EXTENT AND TIME OF JANITORS' NOTIFICATION CONCERNING NATURE OF REGULATIONS

Extent and time	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not notified	2	12.5	15	22.8	28	25.2	6	17.6	51	22.4
Notified										
prior to election	7	43.8	20	30.4	31	27.9	12	35.3	70	30.8
Notified after election	5	31.3	20	30.4	38	34.2	10	29.4	73	32.1
Other			1	1.5	2	1.8			3	1.3
Not known or no report	2	12.5	10	15.2	12	10.8	6	17.6	30	13.2
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

More than 20% of the janitors took up the responsibilities and duties of their position without any notification concerning the nature of the work or the regulations pertaining to it. Such a situation strikingly portrays a weakness in organizational and administrative policy which cannot but be reflected in lowered efficiency in service.

No less illuminating is the fact, to be observed in Table XXIV, that approximately 30% of the janitors are given no notification of the principal's authority to direct and enforce regulations. Such failure to make clear-cut allocations of authority too often leads to friction; at best

it is a potential source of misunderstanding.

TABLE XXIV

EXTENT AND TIME OF JANITORS' NOTIFICATION OF PRINCIPALS AUTHORITY TO DIRECT AND ENFORCE REGULATIONS

Extent and time	Two teacher		3-4 teacher		5-8 teacher		9-12 teacher		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Not notified	8	50.	23	35.	35	31.5	4	11.8	70	30.8
Notified prior to election	2	12.5	16	24.3	36	32.4	16	47.	70	30.8
Notified after election	2	12.5	13	19.8	24	21.6	4	11.8	43	18.9
Authority assumed by principal			1	1.5	3	2.7	3	8.8	7	3.1
Other					1	.9			1	.4
Not known or no report	4	25.	13	19.8	12	10.8	7	20.6	36	15.8
Total	16	100.	66	100.	111	100.	34	100.	227	100.

An interesting situation concerning the above data was found in the answers of seven, or 3%, of the principals, who stated that, although they had never been given any express authority to direct and enforce janitorial regulations, they had assumed the authority and were carrying out their program effectively on the assumption. One may wonder whether this situation is not more typical than these few answers indicate.

Summary

In concluding this chapter there is presented a table from which something of a general view may be had concerning the extent of administrative control in these schools. Certain factors illustrative of administrative control, each derived from a question presented in the questionnaire and discussed in either Chapter IV or V, have been developed. For example, one question asked: What is the method of selection of janitor? And the possible methods listed were "board of directors without consultation with principal," "board of directors on recommendation of principal," and "principal outlines qualifications; board selects on basis thereof." The derived factor illustrative of administrative control in method of janitorial selection can, then, be stated as follows: "principal vested with advisory or recommending power in selection of janitor."

Seven such derived factors have been made the basis of the data presented in Table XXV. Extent of administrative control is expressed only in terms of per cent.

TABLE XXV

## EXTENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OVER JANITORIAL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Factors of control	Two	3-4	5-8	9-12	All Sch.
	T %	T %	T %	T %	ave. %
Principal vested with advisory or recommending power in selection of janitor	12.5	31.8	39.6	70.6	40.
Principal's advice solicited in re-election or release of janitor	31.3	41.	65.7	79.4	58.1
Principal vested with authority to organize and administer janitorial regulations, and power to enforce same	18.8	43.9	54.9	70.6	51.5
Principal vested with authority to inaugurate new duties	25.	48.6	54.9	58.8	51.5
Principal vested with authority to direct established duties	25.	57.8	65.7	64.7	60.3
Principal as director of janitorial equipment and supply purchases	25.	28.9	45.9	55.9	40.9
Janitor notified by board of principal's authority to direct and enforce janitorial regulations	25.	44.1	54.	58.8	49.7
Average extent of administrative control	23.1	42.3	54.4	65.5	50.7

Note: The figures above are presented, not in any sense as arbitrary levels of administrative control, but simply as convenient indices of comparison for an array of data which may be too detailed and extensive for fullest elucidation.

One fact to be observed from these data seems clear and significant. There is a steady increase in principals' administrative authority and responsibility as the size of the school increases. This situation not only coincides with administrative theory but parallels the best practice of large city school systems, in which the superintendent, or an administrative assistant or department, has broad and discretionary powers of control.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

#### The Three Major Problems

This investigation has brought three major problems under scrutiny. The first, pertaining to the general features of janitorial personnel and employment, sought to give some insight into the personal, social, and occupational composition of the individuals who make up the custodial staffs of small Oregon school systems. The second dealt wholly with the efficiency of these individuals as janitors. The third problem considered the nature of the organizational relationships and practices whereby janitorial service is administered. It sought particularly to determine the role of the school principal in the organization and administration of janitorial service.

#### Findings

This chapter presents the significant facts or findings concerning these problems, and indicates such implications as these findings, or generalizations drawn therefrom, appear to warrant. Following is the list of



findings which may be considered most significant:

1. There was a distinct increase in the average level of janitorial efficiency from the two teacher to the nine to twelve teacher class of schools.

2. Janitors were given the lowest ratings in personal appearance and presentation, and in health.

3. In industry and initiative the average rating of janitors was relatively low, but was particularly high in the class of largest schools. It was next highest in the two teacher schools.

4. In skill and intelligence in performance of work the janitors in two teacher schools rated low; the trend was upward through the three and four and five to eight teacher classes, and attained a singularly high rating in the nine to twelve teacher group.

5. Janitorial cooperation with principal, teachers, and pupils attained a uniformly high rating throughout all schools.

6. With the increase in size of school there was a marked tendency to center organizational and administrative control of custodial service in the principal of the school.

7. In the larger schools more principals were granted advisory and recommending power in the selection of jan-

itors and in the re-election and release of janitors.

8. In the larger schools there appeared to be a more explicit attempt prior to or at the time of election to orient the janitor to the nature of his duties and responsibilities.

9. With the increase in size of school there was a steady increase in length of janitorial tenure, suggesting the existence of a more satisfying working relationship between the school district and the janitor.

10. The majority of janitors were selected on bases other than or less than a full consideration of service qualities. Particularly was this true in the smaller schools. In the larger schools the situation, though still obtaining, did so to a considerably less degree.

11. Janitors were recruited from many occupations, among which farming, skilled or semi-skilled trades, and common labor predominated. Farmers made up the largest single class, followed by common laborers and carpenters, respectively.

A relatively high degree of occupational instability was observed among these men. Particularly was this evidenced in the fact that many, prior to their election as janitors, were no longer following the occupation which they

stated to be their professed line of employment. Also, nearly 50% were without employment at time of election as janitors. Unemployment was found to exist irrespective of school classifications, but was preponderant among janitors in the smaller school communities.

12. The average age of janitors was 53.2 years. The average age of janitors in the two teacher schools was 56.4, approximately three years older than the all-schools average age. However, nearly two-thirds of the janitors serving in the smaller schools were sixty years of age or older and nearly one-third were 65 years of age or older,--a marked contrast to the situation in other school groups (page 15).

13. Salaries paid to janitors were low.

14. The term of employment increased with the increase in size of school. The trend appeared to be towards a full year term of employment.

#### Factors of Increased Efficiency

Probably the most significant finding arrived at in this investigation is the fact that there was a steady increase in the average level of janitorial efficiency from the two to the nine to twelve teacher class of schools.

Such a trend cannot be considered merely fortuitous. If the larger schools have, on the whole, more efficient janitorial service, it is reasonable to assume that certain factors causative of such a condition exist in the larger school organizations or communities which either do not exist in the smaller schools and communities or exist to a less effective degree.

Certain of the findings established in this investigation seem to bear out this assumption. The following may be factors causative of increased efficiency in the larger schools:

1. More extensive consideration of applicants on basis of specific service qualities.
2. Greater advisory and recommending power granted to the principal in selection of janitor.
3. Greater organizational and administrative control of custodial service centered in the principal.
4. More explicit efforts prior to or at time of election to orient janitor to his duties and responsibilities.
5. Fewer aged janitors.
6. Larger salaries.
7. Greater availability of occupationally fit applicants.

### Recommendations

Evidence indicated that to a certain extent janitorial efficiency is basically handicapped in the smaller schools by factors often and largely beyond the power of these systems to control, and which factors are implicit in the very organization and structure of the local district system of education. To rectify such handicaps and shortcomings, it is probable that the basic organization of the school system would have to be changed. Such a change, however, does not come readily; it is a matter of relatively slow evolution.

However, even under the present organizational structure, it is possible to state certain conclusions, as pointing the way to increased efficiency of janitorial service. Whether the schools be large or small the following suggestions seem pertinent and worthy of careful consideration by all persons or bodies responsible for control of the public schools:

1. Extend the period of janitorial service to at least a ten, eleven, or twelve month basis, and make up a definite prospectus and schedule of work to be done during the summer months.
2. Make every effort, particularly in the smaller

schools, to increase the base salary, and set up a salary schedule with annual increases, however small.

3. Work out more objective bases for janitorial selection, with emphasis on specific service qualities.

4. In the selection of janitor give more thorough consideration to such problems as age, occupational, community, and marital status, and size of applicant's family.

5. Prior to or at time of election hold a meeting of the board, principal, and applicants, or individual hired, and explain thoroughly, allowing discussion, the duties to be performed; and arrive at a definite commitment of policy, understood by all, concerning the authority for administrative control of the service. It cannot be too much emphasized that carelessness and irresponsibility on the part of a janitor are matters of habit and attitude, and as such can best be eliminated by explicit understanding and supervision at the very outset of the service.

6. The principal, as the man daily on the job and in constant contact with the janitor and school house-keeping problems, should be given greater control of janitorial service by the board of directors, and his advice and recommendations should be solicited concerning the hiring, re-election, and release of janitor.

All of the above recommendations may be summed up as simply the creation of a more professional interest and attitude concerning the work of the janitor. The school system that recognizes its janitorial service as a real problem, that makes a concerted effort to impress upon the students, the community, and upon the janitor himself, the dignity and importance of his work,--that school will certainly attain levels of efficiency not to be enjoyed by those schools that fail to recognize the possibilities for health, sanitation, pride, and character which the service so essentially has to offer.

## APPENDIX A

## QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO ADMINISTRATORS

General Data

1. Name of school \_\_\_\_\_
2. Sectional location of school
  1. Northwestern Oregon \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Southwestern Oregon \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Eastern Oregon \_\_\_\_\_
  4. Central Oregon \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Southeastern Oregon \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of rooms in school building \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of teachers in school system \_\_\_\_\_
5. Number of pupils enrolled in school system \_\_\_\_\_

Chap. II Status of Janitor

1. What type of janitorship does your school employ?
  1. Full time adult \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Part time adult \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Student \_\_\_\_\_
  4. Teacher \_\_\_\_\_
  5. Other \_\_\_\_\_
2. What is the sex of janitor? \_\_\_\_\_
3. What is the age (or estimated age) of janitor? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Is janitor married or single? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Does janitor have children to support? \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is the salary of janitor?
  1. Per month \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Per school term or term of employment \_\_\_\_\_



7. For how many months is janitor employed? \_\_\_\_\_
8. What was janitor's occupation prior to employment?  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. What was his nominal or professed occupation?  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Was he gainfully and steadily employed at time of election? \_\_\_\_\_
11. What is community status of janitor? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Chap. III Rating of Janitor for Service Qualities

12. How would you rate your janitor for health, considering such factors as mental health, vitality, freedom from illness and physical defects? Rate by choice of following: Excellent \_\_\_\_, Good \_\_\_\_, Fair \_\_\_\_, Poor \_\_\_\_.
13. How would you rate your janitor for personal appearance and presentation, considering such factors as personal cleanliness and neatness, carriage, speech? Rate by choice of following: Excellent \_\_\_\_, Good \_\_\_\_, Fair \_\_\_\_, Poor \_\_\_\_.
14. How would you rate your janitor for cooperation with principal, teachers, and pupils? Rate by choice of following: Excellent \_\_\_\_, Good \_\_\_\_, Fair \_\_\_\_, Poor \_\_\_\_.
15. How would you rate your janitor for responsibility in attitude and performance of his work? Rate by choice of following: Excellent \_\_\_\_, Good \_\_\_\_, Fair \_\_\_\_, Poor \_\_\_\_.
16. How would you rate your janitor for industry and

initiative? Rate by choice of following: Excellent\_\_\_\_, Good\_\_\_\_, Fair\_\_\_\_, Poor\_\_\_\_.

17. How would you rate your janitor for skill and intelligence in performance of his work? Rate by choice of following: Excellent\_\_\_\_, Good\_\_\_\_, Fair\_\_\_\_, Poor\_\_\_\_.
18. Does your janitor possess to an accomplished degree any of the following trade skills? Check following: Carpentry\_\_\_\_, Plumbing\_\_\_\_, Electrical\_\_\_\_, Engineering or Mechanics\_\_\_\_, Painting, masonry, interior finishing\_\_\_\_.
19. How would you rate your janitor for cleanliness and neatness in the performance of his work? Rate by choice of following: Excellent\_\_\_\_, Good\_\_\_\_, Fair\_\_\_\_, Poor\_\_\_\_.

#### Chap. IV Election and Tenure of Janitor

20. By whom is your janitor selected?
1. Board of directors without consultation with principal\_\_\_\_\_
  2. Board of directors on written or oral recommendation of principal\_\_\_\_\_
  3. Principal outlines qualifications; board selects on basis of these qualifications\_\_\_\_\_
21. To what extent are service qualities as above named considered by board in analyzing qualifications of applicants for janitorship?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
22. Is principal's advice solicited in the re-election or release of janitor?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

23. What is the nature of employment relationship between the school district and the janitor?
1. Written contract for school term \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Verbal contract for school term \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Service at will, subject to termination with due notice at discretion of board \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
24. How many consecutive years has janitor been in present service? \_\_\_\_\_

Chap. V Organization and Administration  
of Janitorial Regulations

25. In whom does authority rest for organization and administration of janitorial regulations?
1. Residual in board \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Delegated to principal, with authority to enforce regulations \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Delegated to principal, but no authority to enforce regulations \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
26. To whom is janitor responsible, principal or board, for:
1. Directions concerning inauguration of new duties? \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Directions concerning performance of established duties? \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Requests for the purchase of materials, equipment, and supplies? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

27. What is the method of administering janitorial regulations?

1. Regulations written and posted for janitor's inspection and observance \_\_\_\_\_
  2. Verbal directions through conference, inspection, and discussion, in absence of written regulations \_\_\_\_\_
  3. Combination of One and Two above \_\_\_\_\_
  4. Customary janitorial practice without direction from principal \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

28. Janitor's notification of regulations and their nature?

1. Prior to election? \_\_\_\_\_
2. After election? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not notified? \_\_\_\_\_

29. Janitor's notification of principal's authority to direct and enforce regulations?

1. Prior to election? \_\_\_\_\_
2. After election? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not notified? \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

## LETTER SENT TO ADMINISTRATORS

Dear Mr. (Miss or Mrs.)-----:

Pursuant to securing data on a thesis for my master's degree, I am enclosing a questionnaire which I should very much appreciate your filling out. The subject of my thesis is "The Status of Janitorial Service in the Smaller Oregon School Systems." By "smaller" I have arbitrarily limited the schools to those in which not more than fourteen teachers are employed. Approximately seventy-five per cent of the schools dealt with in this thesis, however, have teaching staffs of from two to five teachers.

Your frankest statements regarding the janitorial relationships in your school are requested, in order that an accurate picture of the status of janitorial service may be had. All data will be statistically treated and no individual schools will be mentioned in the thesis. As you will observe, the aim of the paper is not to analyze the duties of the janitor but rather to study the policies of the organizational relationship between the school board, the principal, and the janitor in the smaller schools of Oregon

I trust that the questions are phrased explicitly enough to make possible definite answers. In those smaller schools which employ a student or teacher for janitor, it may not be necessary or possible to answer certain questions. I hope, however, that you will give as complete answers as possible, considering the conditions that prevail in your school.

The cooperation which I am receiving from the principals of schools in the state is proving very encouraging. May I have yours also?.....

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bolton, F. E., Cole, T. R., Jessup, J. H., The Beginning Superintendent, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1937.
- Dressler, F. B., School Hygiene, Chapter XXV, "Qualifications and Duties of a School Janitor." New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923.
- Engelhardt, N. L., Reeves, C. E., Womrath, G. F., Standards for Public School Janitorial-Engineering Service, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926.
- Engelhardt, N. L., Reeves, C. E., Womrath, G. F., Survey Data Book for Public School Janitorial-Engineering Service, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932
- GARDNER, J. A., The School Janitor, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 24, Washington, D. C., 1922
- Henzlik, F. E., "Fundamental Elements in the Training of School Janitors," American School Board Journal, vol. LXXIV, No. 16, June, 1927.
- Holmes, Williams H., "Better Custodial Service for School," American School Board Journal, vol. LXX, No. 6, June, 1925
- Langfitt, R. E., Cyr, F. W., Newsom, N. W., The Small High School at Work, New York: American Book Company, 1936.
- Lovejoy, Philip C., "Securing Efficient Janitorial Service," Nation's Schools, vol. III, January, 1929.
- Otto, H. J., Elementary School Organization and Administration, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1934.
- Reeves, C. E., "The Work of the School Janitor," American School Board Journal, vol. LXX, No. 6, June, 1925
- Reeves, C. E., Ganders, H. S., School Building Management, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.
- Richardson, R. E., "The Selection and Supervision of Janitors," American School Board Journal, vol. LVI, No. 5, May, 1928.

Typed by:

**Marvin L. Schepman**