

**This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received**

66-5331

**TUTTLE, Francis T., 1920-
AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE POSITION OF
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS.**

**The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1966
Education, administration**

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE POSITION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

FRANCIS T. TUTTLE

Norman, Oklahoma

1966

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE POSITION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

APPROVED BY

Claude Kelley

W B Bradshaw

W R Tuttle

Glen S. Grier

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr. Claude Kelley, who, as chairman of the dissertation committee, has given liberally of his time and assistance in directing the study. The writer wishes to express his appreciation to the other members of his committee, Dr. Glen Snider, Dr. William B. Ragan, and Dr. William Fulton, for their services in the organization and preparation of the study.

For their assistance and interest in the problems of educational administration, the writer acknowledges his indebtedness to the Oklahoma Association of School Administrators.

The writer wishes to express his gratitude for the inspiration received from the late Dr. D. Ross Pugmire.

DEDICATION

To my wife,
Vivian L. Tuttle,
whose thoughtfulness and moral support
helped to make this study possible,
and to our three children,
Al, Kay, and Denny Tuttle
for their encouragement and understanding

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background and Need for the Study	1
Statement of the Problem.	3
Delimitation of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	4
Method and Procedure.	4
II. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	9
III. OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS TOWARD CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND SOME DATA ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS AND THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS THEY REPRESENTED	20
Summary	41
IV. OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO SCHOOL ADMIN- ISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS	48
V. A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE OPINIONS OF SUPERIN- TENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS	62
VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	67
Summary	67
Summary of Findings	68
Conclusions	74
Recommendations	76

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	77
APPENDICES	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age, Experience, and Education of superintendents	22
2. Average Number and Type of Personnel.	23
3. Titles and Number of Assistant Superintendents.	24
4. Characteristics of School Districts	26
5. Superintendents Preferences of Administrative Functions	28
6. Superintendents Opinions on Administrative Functions Which Need More Attention	29
7. Superintendents Personal Performance of Administrative Functions and Delegated Functions	31
8. Average Number of Employees Reporting Directly to Superintendents.	33
9. Availability of Superintendents For and Time Given to Conferences With Personnel	34
10. Superintendents Choices of Administrative Functions To Be Delegated	35
11. Superintendents Believing More Administrative Assistants Needed In Schools Comparable In Size To Their Own Districts.	37
12. Superintendents Opinion As To The Number of Administrative Assistants Needed.	38
13. Superintendents Opinions on a Minimum Enrollment of a School System Wherein An Assistant Superintendent Should Be Employed.	39

Table	Page
14. Superintendents Opinions on the Order of Administrative Function To Be Assigned To Administrative Assistants	40
15. Superintendents Opinions As To Factors Which Have Prevented the Employment of Additional Administrative Assistants.	42
16. Highest Educational Level of School Board Presidents.	50
17. School Board Presidents' Preferences of Performance of Administrative Functions By the Superintendent	51
18. Opinions of School Board Presidents on the Administrative Functions Needing More Attention Due to a Lack of Staff	52
19. School Board Presidents' Opinions on Which Functions the Superintendents Performed Personally, Partially Delegated, or Wholly Delegated	54
20. Opinions Expressed by School Board Presidents On the Availability of Superintendents for Conferences and the Need for Positions of Assistant Superintendent.	55
21. Opinions of School Board Presidents on the Number of Assistant Superintendents Which Should be Employed in Schools Comparable in Size to Their Own Schools	56
22. Opinions of School Board Presidents on the Order of Assignments to Assistant Superintendents	58
23. Opinions of School Board Presidents on the Factors Which Have Prevented the Employment of More Administrative Assistance in Schools.	59
24. Opinions of School Board Presidents on the Adequacy of Performance of Administrative Functions Under Certain Conditions.	61

AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF
THE POSITION OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Need for the Study

As positions in school administration evolved in American education, they have developed from the head schoolmaster concept to a concept of administration with many areas of responsibility. The principal areas of responsibility in school administration were generally accepted to include instructional leadership, personnel administration, business management, supervision of teaching, and public relations.

Since World War II, the universal, technological revolution had increased its pace and the results were radical changes--in ways of making a living, in communication, in economic institutions, in government and law, in ways of making war, and in world leadership. The United States and its democratic allies had been challenged by Russia and its satellite nations for military and economic leadership of the world. The race for the control of outer space and superiority in atomic power had caused an upsurge of public interest in the Nation's schools throughout America.

American schools had experienced new growth and development, both in numbers of pupils and in the curriculums offered. The American people had learned that democracy is not assured by laws and elected legislatures alone.¹ The Nation was gripped by a fear for its own existence.

These changes had resulted in greater demands upon the public schools and more and more pressures upon the school administration. The pressures upon school superintendents "had become well-nigh unbearable" as the New England School Development Council put it after a study it sponsored found that 97 per cent of New England superintendents would advise young men not to aspire to a superintendency.²

There was a growing concern that the school administrative force, as it existed just after the mid-century, was not adequate to meet the challenges that faced it.³ There was a general feeling among practicing administrators that the superintendent of schools should be freed from routine duties in order that he might devote more time to educational leadership.

There was general agreement among authorities, that as an organization grew in numbers of employees and its administrative problems

¹Frederick A. Ogg and P. Orman Ray, Introduction to American Government (New York: Appleton-Century Corfts, Inc., 1948), p. 465.

²New England School Development Council, The Pressures and Dilemmas of the School Superintendent (Cambridge, Mass.: The Council, 1954), pp. 4-5.

³Representative authorities include: George S. Counts, Education and American Civilization (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952); Harry S. Gonders, "Some Impossibilities in the School Superintendency," Nations Schools, (January, 1955), pp. 41-42.

became more complex, a larger number of administrative personnel was needed.¹

It had been generally agreed also that the administrative tasks to be performed were as numerous in a small school (although not as complex perhaps) as in a large school.²

An examination of the personnel directories of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arkansas showed that less than 5 per cent of the schools listed any assistant superintendent as being employed.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine prevailing practices concerning the employment of assistant superintendents; to determine and compare the recommendations of superintendents of schools and presidents of school boards concerning the employment and assignment of duties to central office administrative staff members; and to develop recommendations for including the position of assistant superintendents in the minimum program for Oklahoma schools.

Delimitation of the Problem

Because the larger schools had already developed extensive central office administrative staffs and because of the improbability of extremely small schools being able to economically afford additional administrative assistance the study was limited to schools enrolling from 1,200 to 12,000 students during the 1961-62 school year.

¹William C. McGinnis, School Administrative Organizations in Cities of 20,000 to 50,000 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929), pp. 231-36.

²Ibid.

Due to similar economic conditions and organization of school districts only the states of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, New Mexico, and Colorado were used in the study.

Since the historical background of the development of the superintendency of public education and the evolution of the position of assistant superintendent has been well established by numerous studies in the field and by general practice in larger schools, this study was not concerned with the historical study of the position. Nor was it concerned with making a case for the establishment of the position of assistant superintendent.

Definition of Terms

"Assistant superintendent" as used in this study designates any administrative staff member other than the superintendent whose duties and responsibilities include the performance of an administrative function that applies to the whole school system.

Method and Procedure

Method

The normative survey method was used in gathering the data for the study because this method is best suited to the nature of the problem and the data needed. Travers states that surveys are conducted to establish the nature of existing conditions. Survey studies are mainly of the "what exists" type; i. e., they are designed to determine the nature of an existing state of affairs.¹ Hillway describes the survey as a way of

¹Robert M.W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), pp. 231-36.

obtaining facts and figures about a current situation, to describe a situation, or to learn the status of something.¹

A check-list form of questionnaire was the major form of the instruments used to secure the necessary data. Standard library research techniques were used to develop the functions of administrative assignments listed in the questionnaires.

Procedure

The procedure of this study was directed at determining the practice in the field concerning the employment and assignment of assistant superintendents with special emphasis on the size of schools who employ them or have need for them. It was also concerned with the recommendations of superintendents and school boards concerning employment and assignment of assistant superintendents.

To accomplish the purposes of the study, an analysis was made of what was considered to be the most important related studies. A list of these references is found in the Bibliography.

Two questionnaires were developed. One of these was mailed to all superintendents of schools ranging in size from 1,200 students to 12,000 students enrolled in the states of Colorado, Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. The other questionnaire was mailed to the president of the board of education in these same school districts.

The Questionnaires

Questionnaires were mailed to superintendents of 430 schools. This included 42 in Colorado, 215 in Texas, 35 in New Mexico, 84 in

¹Tyrus Hillway, Introduction to Research (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1956), p. 175.

Arkansas, and 54 in Oklahoma. The respondents were asked to provide certain statistical information including the number of employees, titles of assistant superintendents, number of students enrolled, net assessed valuation of their district, per capita cost of education in the district, general fund expenditures, and expenditures for administrative services. The balance of the questionnaire was designed to be answered by selection of choices by check mark. The questions were phrased so as to determine the following:

- I. Respondents preference concerning administrative functions he preferred to do most and to which least.
- II. Which areas of administration, because of lack of staff, need more attention?
- III. Which administrative functions are now performed and which are delegated?
- IV. The number of employees who were responsible to and reported directly to the respondent.
- V. If sufficient administrative assistance were available, which administrative functions would be delegated wholly, which partially, and which not at all?
- VI. If the respondent had adequate time for conferences with employees and time for sufficient leadership to them?
- VII. Respondents opinion concerning the need for additional assistant superintendents.
- VIII. What order the respondent would recommend assignment of functions to assistant superintendents in schools the size of the one in which he was working?
- IX. The factors the respondent believed to have prevented the employment of more administrative assistance.

The school board president's questionnaire was similar to the one sent to superintendents; however, the statistical information was omitted and the questions were designed to determine the respondents

opinions and recommendations concerning the employment and assignment of administrative functions to assistant superintendents.

The Population

The 1961-62 educational directories, published by the State Department of Education for each of the five states, were used to obtain the names and addresses of the superintendent of schools and school board president of each of the schools that ranged in size from 1,200 students to 12,000 students enrolled. Four hundred and thirty schools fell in this range and made up the population for this study.

The Data

In February, 1962, questionnaires were mailed to the superintendents and school board presidents of the 430 schools selected for the study. Included with each questionnaire was a cover letter which explained the nature and reason for the study.¹ The letter stated that the study was sponsored by the Oklahoma Association of School Administrators.² A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed with each questionnaire. Cover letters were enclosed with the instrument and sent to the superintendents and board presidents.³

Questionnaires were returned by 303 superintendents resulting in a 70 per cent return. Questionnaires were returned by 264 board presidents. This represented a 61 per cent return of the 430 mailed.

¹See Appendix. (Original letters)

²Note: (Study approved by the O.A.S.A. executive committee in April, 1961.)

³See Appendix.

Three hundred and eighty schools were represented in the combined returns of the two questionnaires. This was an 88 per cent return of all schools mailed the instruments.

Much of the data is presented in tabular form with a written explanation of each table accompanying it. The tables are organized generally in sequence for each question as set forth in the sections of the questionnaire.

Chapter II presents the most significant related literature in the field of public and school administration as well as pertinent research relating to factors influencing the establishment of the position of assistant superintendent of schools. Chapter III is concerned with the presentation of data obtained by the response to the superintendents questionnaire. Chapter IV contains the data provided from the questionnaires returned by school board presidents. Chapter V is a comparison of the responses from the two populations. Summary, conclusions, and implications are given in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The following analysis of pertinent research and literature is presented in two sections. The first section is a brief review of the development of the public school superintendent's office. In the second section an attempt was made to survey the most important pieces of literature in the field of administrative staffing of the public schools, giving an analysis and/or summation of each.

Development of the Public School Superintendent's Office

A study entitled The Growth of Responsibility and Enlargement of Power of the City School Superintendent was published in 1918 by Arthur H. Chamberlain. He concluded that a proper relationship must be established between the superintendent and the board of education and that definite responsibility for the accomplishment of the administrative jobs must be fixed.¹ W. W. Theisen's study of 1917 concluded that a board of education should define its own duties and those of the superintendent; that it should make the superintendent the administrative leader and executive officer of the school system; that the board should,

¹Arthur B. Chamberlain, The Growth of Responsibility and Enlargement of Power of the City School Superintendent (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1913), p. 114.

itself, serve as an advisory and legislative body, acting only through the superintendent.¹

Bennett C. Douglas' study, published in the 1923 yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, made these recommendations: "All activities should be centered in the superintendent; the superintendent should have power to initiate and execute the appointments of assistant superintendents, business managers, principals, teachers, and other employees; all employees should be responsible to the superintendent."²

In 1929, William C. McGinnis studied the school administrative organizations in cities of 20,000 to 50,000 population. He found the relationships between the number of teachers, pupils, and supervisors and the number of administrative personnel were haphazard relationships. He concluded that it is not possible to devise an administrative and supervisory chart that will be suitable for all cities of approximately the same size or same pupil population. In determining the number of administrative employees, little use is made of common administrative practice, and the number of administrative employees is too small in each group of cities.³

Two studies of the 1930's indicated the growing responsibilities of the superintendency. In his study of the outside pressures on the

¹W. W. Theisen, The City Superintendent and the Board of Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1917), p. 71.

²Bennett C. Douglas, "The Status of the Superintendent," First Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1923), p. 211.

³William C. McGinnis, School Administration and Supervisory Organizations in Cities of 20,000 to 50,000 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929), p. 69.

public school administrator, J. Flint Waller concluded that many pressures were commanding the time and energy of school officials; and he recommended that they take the lead in educating the public as to the school's jobs.¹ Gilliland's study noted that the superintendency gave very little promise of developing into an office of significance and that superintendents were becoming responsible leaders in all phases of public administration.²

Armstrong³ found that the superintendent of schools was not considered to be a strong community leader by a large proportion of governmental officers and Chamber of Commerce presidents, even though they expected him to be one.

Studies conducted in 1953 by Hunter⁴ and Kimbrough⁵ indicated that the leadership of public school superintendents was not as influential as would be expected of administrators of organizations of the scope and extent of the public school. Hunter's study mentioned no public school person as belonging to any power-wielding group in the

¹J. Flint Waller, Outside Demands and Pressures on the Public Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), p. 14.

²Thomas M. Gilliland, The Origin and Development of the Power and Duties of the City-School Superintendent (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 129.

³Louis W. Armstrong, "Community Expectancy Concerning the Superintendency" (unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), pp. 1-114.

⁴Floyd C. Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1953), p. 23.

⁵Ralph B. Kimbrough, "The Operational Beliefs of Selected Leaders in a Selected County" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1953), p. 143.

community. Kimbrough found that the operational beliefs of the leaders in a Pennsylvania county left school administrators "very low" in the leadership structure.

Four studies completed after 1950, Rast,¹ Griffiths,² Ovsiew,³ and McLaughlin,⁴ indicated that the superintendent's concept of his job was broadening. Rast found that the concept of the superintendent's job was broadening to one of leadership on a broad scale. Griffiths found that the difference between successful and unsuccessful superintendents to be not in "technical" practices but in "human" and "conceptual" practices. Ovsiew's study of "emerging practices" found that most superintendents were concerned with "human" and "conceptual" practices rather than "technical" ones. In his study of "progressive" administrators, McLaughlin estimated that 90 per cent of the "forward-looking" superintendent's time was spent working with people, only 10 per cent in working with things.

Yet in spite of the evidence that showed the superintendent's concepts to be broadening and that superintendents were tending to stress human rather than technical aspects of their jobs, a study in

¹G. E. Rast, "The Study of the Changing Character of the Superintendent's Job" (unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 167.

²Daniel E. Griffiths, "An Evaluation of the Leadership of the School Superintendent" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1952), p. 97.

³Leon Ovsiew, Emerging Practices in School Administration (New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1953), p. 21.

⁴Frederick C. McLaughlin, "New Kind of Statesmanship," Nations Schools, Vol. LIII, No. 1 (January, 1954), p. 54.

Pennsylvania's schools by Fitch¹ found supervising principals to be spending 53 per cent of their time performing or supervising operational functions. Since the supervising principals were spending most of their time on business and plant management aspects of administration, there was insufficient time left for educational leadership or human or public relations.

Tritt² studied personnel administration in cities of 30,000 to 60,000 population and found that although only 22 per cent of the schools had personnel departments 77 per cent of the superintendents studied indicated a need for such departments. The school superintendents gave as reasons for the need: (1) increasing personnel problems, (2) increased awareness on the part of the superintendents of the need for expertness in the area, (3) a general increase in administrative duties. Millar³ studied personnel practices in schools in cities from 15,000 to 30,000 population and found that 74 per cent of the superintendents considered such personnel departments desirable, but that only 13 per cent of the schools had them. The superintendents gave as reasons for the need of personnel departments: (1) increased awareness by the administration of the need of expertness in the area, (2) a great increase

¹George E. Fitch, "A Survey of Administrative Operational Techniques Used by Supervising Principals in Pennsylvania" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State College, 1953), pp. 30-149.

²Charles W. Tritt, "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities, 30,000 to 60,000 in Population," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956), pp. 80-143.

³Allen R. Millar, "Teacher Personnel Administration in School Systems in Cities 15,000 to 30,000 Population" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956), p. 189.

in personnel problems, (3) a general increase in administrative duties, (4) the proven worth of personnel management.

Varney¹ made a study of assistant superintendents in charge of instruction in large city school systems. He noted a trend toward unification of all aspects of the instructional program under one assistant superintendent.

Richardson² surveyed the functions and status of superintendencies in Texas and concluded that in the larger schools where the superintendent had a larger administrative staff and was relieved of more details, the superintendent had a better relationship with the board of education and was more likely to use new administrative practices.

Two studies concerning line and staff organizations were completed in 1953 and 1954. Blatnik³ studied the patterns of staff organization in community unit districts in Illinois. He found line and staff patterns of organization in universal use. The majority of the school personnel thought the administrative organization was democratic. Blatnik pointed out a need for more clearly defined lines of responsibility. A survey of the literature of business, governmental and educational administration in an attempt to synthesize a concept of

¹James K. Varney, "The Responsibilities of the Assistant Superintendent or Other Executive for Instructional Supervision and Curriculum Development" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1954), pp. 157.

²Lester S. Richardson, Jr., "The School Superintendent's Job: A Study of His Function and Status in the Public Schools, Located Within a One-hundred Mile Radius of Houston, Texas" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1954). pp. 142.

³William H. Blatnik, "Patterns of Staff Organization in Community Unit Districts" (unpublished doctoral project, University of Illinois). pp. 128.

staff organization that was applicable to all administration was made by Trickett.¹ He concluded that line and staff organization is in no way undemocratic or otherwise undesirable.

Related Studies

The Cooperative Development Program on School Administration was organized in 1954 by the State Education Department of New York for the purpose of studying administrative staffing. This group, composed of the leading school administrators and professors of school administration, immediately instituted a research project. It was limited to the State of New York.

A report in 1955 by the Cooperative Development of Public School Administration² on current practices in New York State revealed:

1. That assistant superintendents were practically nonexistent in schools with an average daily attendance of less than 3,000, but that two-thirds of the schools which had an average daily attendance of over 3,000 had one or more assistants to the superintendents.
2. That few school business officials were found in districts with an average daily attendance of less than 1,000, but that 75 per cent of those districts which had an average daily attendance of 2,000 or more had full-time business officials.

The next year, the Cooperative Development of Public School Administration issued a report entitled Modern Practices and Concepts of Staffing Schools.³ This study was concerned with the effect of

¹Joseph M. Trickett, "A Synthesis of Philosophies and Concepts of Staff Organization of Business, Government, and Education" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1953), p. 142.

²Cooperative Development of Public School Administration, "Current Practice in Administrative Staffing in New York State" (a pamphlet prepared by the State Education Department of New York, 1955), pp. 8-12.

³Cooperative Development of Public School Administration, "Modern Practices and Concepts of Staffing Schools" (a pamphlet prepared by the State Education Department of New York, 1956), p. 28.

administrative relationships on administrative organization. Guide lines for administrative staffing were reported and are as follows:

1. The purpose of organization is to clarify and distribute responsibility and authority among individuals and groups in an orderly manner consistent with the purposes of the enterprise.
2. The role of the administrative staff should be one of leadership, stimulation, coordination, service, and appraisal instead of merely inspection and command.
3. The administrative functions should be organized to provide the machinery for democratic operations.
4. The organization should be under unit control and all major administrative officers should be trained professional educators.
5. The administrative organization, by its very structure, should provide for the continuous and cooperative evaluation and re-direction of the standpoint of adequacy (the degree to which goals are reached relative to the available resources).

The Cooperative Development Program on School Administration.

listed in their publication on practices and concepts of staffing a set of recommendations for staffing.¹ They are as follows:

1. Although no one model administrative organization can serve all school systems well, a flat organization is generally preferable to a pyramidal pattern.
2. Although the line and staff concept of administration has been held in considerable disrepute, there is no way of abolishing line authority without making administration chaotic. The important point is that the operation of line authority should be consistent with reasonable goals of democratic administration.
3. An administrative staff should be organized with attention to work assignment rather than the individual. Staff members should not be hired as broadly qualified people who will work out their assignments to fit their chief interests and competencies without regard to whether they add up to a well-balanced team.
4. All administrative functions are important only to the extent that they contribute to the improvement of educational opportunity for children.
5. The de-emphasis upon the inspectorial role of the administrator raises questions regarding the worth of the span of control theory in administration. With the group approach to administrative operation, the administrator might work very effectively with larger numbers of subordinates.
6. The role of the building principal as an educational leader in his school unit should be enhanced. He should report directly to the chief school officer in all but the largest school

¹Ibid., p. 35.

situations and should be responsible for the total education of the child in his school.

7. The administrative organization should be under unit control.
8. Decision-making and administrative responsibilities should be diffused among as many persons as is practicable. This includes provision for teachers councils, lay advisory councils, and administrative cabinets.
9. Strict chains of command and a multiplicity of control devices should be avoided.
10. All members of the teaching, administrative and supervisory staffs should have a background of training in education.
11. The administrative organization should be set up so that continuous and cooperative evaluation of the organization is an assumed part of the operation.
12. The grade levels for which the administrator is responsible should be broad if a staff is organized horizontally.
13. The subject matter for which the administrator is responsible should be broad if a staff is organized vertically.
14. Administrative staff adequacy is dependent upon a number of variables which cannot be included in an empirical formula or rule of thumb.

The Cooperative Development Program on School Administration issued a publication in 1956 in which it made certain recommendations concerning school staffing of the business administrator.¹ The recommendations were:

1. The name of the position of the school business administrator should be Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs.
2. The State Department of Education should establish a license for the position of school business administrator.
3. The State Department of Education should be the only agency certificating school business administrators.
4. The school business administrator should always report to the chief school administrator.
5. The school business administrator should never be elected school district clerk.

In a study at Northwestern University, Oosting² recommended that a business manager be employed, at least on a part-time basis, in most

¹Cooperative Development of Public School Administration, Your School and Staffing: The School Business Administrator (a pamphlet prepared by the State Education Department of New York, 1956), p. 15.

²Bernard R. Oosting, "The Qualifications, Experience, and Education of Public School Business Managers in the United States with

school systems having total enrollments of 500 or more pupils. He based his proposal on statements from public school superintendents throughout the United States, which indicated that they believed school business managers justified their cost, and on statements from business leaders over the country which expressed the opinion that public school systems should employ business managers.

Murray¹ studied the functioning of nonteaching certificated personnel in certain California school systems and concluded, among other things, that:

1. Line and staff organization and relationships were not thoroughly understood or practiced.
2. Adequate services were not provided, since many of the functions investigated were not performed.
3. The size of a school district was an important factor in the administrative organization, in the type and amount of service rendered, and in the functions performed by the personnel.

Harrison² conducted a study in 1959 to obtain data concerning the status of top-level assistants to Missouri superintendents of schools. He found that top-level assistants had increased in number from 19 in 1949 to 112 in 1959. Top-level assistants were employed in a ratio of approximately 2,000 pupils per assistant. The 112 Missouri assistants

Recommendations by Business Managers, Superintendents of Schools, and Business Leaders" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1953), p. 126.

¹Earl Murray, "The Functioning of the Nonteaching Certificated Personnel in Certain Public School Districts in California" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1953), pp. 370-372.

²Forrest W. Harrison, "Top-level Assistants to the Superintendents of Missouri Public Schools and Their Qualifications" (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1959), pp. 135-36.

had earned 94 master's degrees and 10 doctor's degrees. A majority of the master's degrees and 70 per cent of the doctor's degrees had been granted in 1949 or later.

Harrison's study reported the median salary of the 112 top-level assistants in Missouri to be \$7,833. Generally, the median salary increased as the levy of the district increased, as the number of teachers employed increased, and as the number of pupils enrolled in the district increased. Certification requirements for top-level assistants usually were the same as for superintendents. He concluded that the principal areas of assignment to assistants were elementary education, business affairs, and instruction and curriculum. It appeared that Missouri assistants generally were well trained for their positions. Top-level assistants appeared to be appointed in districts where the electorate desired improved service and were willing to tax themselves at a rate higher than the average for Missouri districts.

CHAPTER III

OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS TOWARD CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND SOME DATA ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS AND THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS THEY REPRESENTED

One purpose of this chapter was to present data obtained from the questionnaires about certain personal characteristics of the superintendents and some facts concerning the school districts they represented. Another purpose was to present and interpret the opinions of superintendents as revealed by their responses to the questionnaire. Most of the tables in this chapter were organized to show the responses by States and the total of the responses from the five States.

Responses were received and tabulated from a total of 303 superintendents, representing 140 from Texas, 27 from New Mexico, 43 from Arkansas, 45 from Colorado, and 48 from Oklahoma. The questionnaires were mailed to schools who were shown by bulletins from the State Department of Education to have student enrollments falling between 1,200 and 12,000. Although some of these schools subsequently had gains or losses in enrollment, which placed them above or below the selected minimum or maximum, all of them were used in the data presented.

Table 1 presented the age, experience, and education of the respondents. The superintendents' average age was reported to be 49.8 years. Variations between the States was shown to be 49.1 for Texas and Colorado to 51.8 for Oklahoma.

The average number of years their men have served as a superintendent was shown to be 13.7 years. The average range was shown to be 11.1 for Texas to 17.2 for Arkansas.

The average number of years served in the present district was shown to be 8.2. The average range was shown to be 3.8 for Arkansas to 9.0 for Colorado.

Only one superintendent was shown to possess no more than a bachelors degree. One hundred sixty two are reported to possess a masters degree and 112 were reported to possess 15 to 30 hours above the masters degree. Twenty four were reported to possess a doctors degree.

Table 2 presented the average number and type of personnel employed in schools represented by the respondents. The total averages were reported to be 140 for teachers, 7 for principals, 1.3 for supervisors, and .88 for assistant superintendents. The average range between the States was shown to be 100 for Arkansas to 165 for New Mexico. The average range for principals was 5.2 for Arkansas to 8.2 for New Mexico. The average range for supervisors was .7 for Arkansas to 1.7 for Colorado. The average range for assistant superintendents was .2 for Arkansas to 1.3 for Texas.

Table 3 showed the titles and number of assistant superintendents. Business manager was the most prevalent title reported at 42. It was followed by assistant superintendent reported 30 times, director of

TABLE 1

AGE, EXPERIENCE, AND EDUCATION
OF SUPERINTENDENTS

	Texas	New Mexico	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	Total Average
Age of Superintendent	49.1	49.9	50.8	49.1	51.8	49.8
No. of Yrs. a Superintendent	11.1	14.5	17.2	15.4	16.6	13.7
Yrs. a Supt. (present dist.)	8.0	8.0	3.8	9.0	8.2	8.2
Education of Superintendent						
B.S. Degree	1	0	0	0	0	1
M.S. Degree	71	13	30	20	28	162
M.S. 15-30 hrs.	57	11	9	21	14	112
Dr. Degree	11	2	3	4	4	24

TABLE 2

AVERAGE NUMBER AND TYPE OF PERSONNEL

Type of Personnel	Texas	New Mexico	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	Average
Ave. No. Teachers	147	165	100	157	125	140
Ave. No. Principals	7	8.2	5.2	7.7	7.6	7.0
Ave. No. Supervisors	1.4	1.1	.7	1.7	1.1	1.3
Ave. No. Ass't Supts.	1.3	1.0	.2	.8	.35	.88

TABLE 3

TITLES AND NUMBER OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

Titles	Texas	New Mexico	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	Total
Ass't. Supt.	15	3	2	4	6	30
Bus. Mgr.	31	7	2	2	0	42
Dir. of Curr.	17	3	1	0	2	23
Ass't. Supt. - Instr.	5	0	0	5	1	11
Admin. Ass't.	9	1	1	3	3	17
Other titles	31	17	7	34	9	98

curriculum 23 times, administrative assistant 17 times, assistant superintendent for instruction 11 times, and other titles 98 times.

Table 4 presented some characteristics of the school districts as reported by the superintendents. Arkansas was shown to have the smallest average with 4180. The average number of students for all States was 3423.

The total number of students by States was reported to be New Mexico 115,541, Arkansas 124,669, Oklahoma 154,567, Colorado 164,321, and Texas 487,836. The total for all States was shown to be 1,046,934 students.

The average valuation of school districts by States was reported to be \$9,923,492 for Oklahoma, \$9,950,784 for Arkansas, \$26,078,350 for Colorado, \$28,000,000 for New Mexico, and \$37,203,809 for Texas. The average valuation for all districts was shown to be \$26,403,575. The total valuation of all schools surveyed was calculated to be \$7,894,669,022.

The average valuation per student of districts by States was shown to be \$3,068 for Oklahoma, \$3,432 for Arkansas, \$6,212 for New Mexico, \$7,388 for Colorado, and \$10,800 for Texas. The average valuation per student for all districts was calculated to be \$7,540.

The average per capita cost of education for current expenses by States was shown to be Arkansas \$139, Oklahoma \$260, Texas \$289, New Mexico \$308, and Colorado \$367. The average for all districts was calculated at \$259.

Total general fund expenditures ranged from \$16,453,563 for Arkansas to \$128,200,521 for Texas. The total expenditure for all districts was shown to be \$271,229,812.

TABLE 4
CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Items	Texas	New Mexico	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	Totals
Ave. No. Students	3484	4180	2899	3496	3220	3423
Total No. Students	487,836	115,541	124,669	164,321	154,567	1,046,934
Ave. Valuation of Dists.	37,203,809	28,000,000	9,950,784	26,078,350	9,928,492	26,403,575
Total Valuation of Dists	5,171,329,420	697,519,217	427,883,725	1,121,369,060	476,567,600	7,894,669,022
Valuation per student	\$10,800	\$6,212	\$3,432	\$7,388	\$3,068	\$7,540
Ave. per Capita Cost of Educ. (current expense)	\$289	\$308	\$139	\$367	\$260	\$259
Total Gen. Fund Expenditures	128,200,521	35,674,032	16,453,563	54,674,200	36,227,496	271,229,812
Cost of Admin. Services	6,042,545	975,066	1,038,291	1,861,398	1,373,909	11,291,209
Ave. % Cost for Admin. Serv.	4.7%	2.7%	6.3%	3.4%	3.8%	4.1%

The total cost of administrative services for all districts was shown to be \$11,291,209 and the percent of total expenditures was calculated to be 4.1%. The percent of administrative services expenditures to total current expense by States was calculated to be 2.7% for New Mexico, 3.4% for Colorado, 3.8% for Oklahoma, 4.7% for Texas, and 6.3% for Arkansas.

Table 5, superintendents' preferences of administrative functions, reported an overwhelming majority would prefer to spend more time on instructional leadership and curriculum, general planning, research, and public relations. The same superintendents showed an overwhelming desire to spend less time on business management and finance, purchasing, management of buildings and grounds, and management of special services. No significant expression of desire was shown concerning personnel management although the responses favored spending more time on this function by a majority of 116 to 92. Texas and Oklahoma superintendents did not prefer to spend more time on research in the same majority as did superintendents from the other States. Texas superintendents also deviated from the average when slightly less than 50 percent of them preferred to spend more time in coordinating community educational agencies. Responses on other items did not appear to be significantly different between superintendents of the different States.

Table 6, superintendents' opinions on administrative functions which needed more attention, showed that instructional leadership was the function which needed the most attention. Research, general planning and public relations were other functions which were reported by a

TABLE 5

SUPERINTENDENTS PREFERENCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

Pref. of Function:	Texas		New Mexico		Arkansas		Colorado		Oklahoma		Total	
	More	Less	More	Less	More	Less	More	Less	More	Less	More	Less
Instr. Ldrship, and Curriculum	111	16	24	3	35	6	35	2	36	8	241	35
General Planning	101	4	19	1	34	1	33	1	42	3	229	10
Research	61	35	19	4	25	8	26	6	25	15	156	68
Coord. of Com. Educ. Agencies	48	51	11	6	19	7	17	10	26	12	121	86
Public Relations	94	9	17	4	29	6	31	6	35	7	206	32
Personnel Management	49	38	11	7	15	17	18	12	23	18	116	92
Bus. Mgt. and Finance	27	67	7	13	11	20	11	15	10	27	66	142
Purchasing	19	70	2	17	3	28	7	22	6	33	37	170
Mgt. of Buildings and Grounds	24	74	3	15	8	29	2	27	7	32	44	177
Mgt. of Spec. Services	20	67	3	13	6	26	3	25	8	30	40	161
Other	3	4							2	0	5	4

TABLE 6

SUPERINTENDENTS' OPINIONS ON ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS WHICH NEED MORE ATTENTION

Functions	Texas	New Mexico	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	Totals
General Planning	57	16	25	27	28	153
Research	77	19	28	30	31	185
Instructional Leadership	107	21	34	31	38	231
Coord. of Educ. Agencies	33	13	12	15	18	91
Personnel Management	32	11	13	21	16	93
Bus. Mgt. and Finance	24	9	8	6	16	63
Public Relations	57	20	22	27	26	152
Purchasing	25	7	11	2	4	49
Bl'dgs. and Grounds	39	8	13	10	12	82
Special Services	31	7	7	4	12	43
Others	1	0	0	1	1	3

majority of the superintendents to need more attention due to a lack of staff. Coordination of educational agencies, personnel management, business management and finance, purchasing, management of buildings and grounds, and management of special services were other functions which were not listed by a majority of the respondents but the number who did list these was significant, since they ran from 14 to 30 percent of the superintendents responding.

Table 7 depicted the superintendents personal performance of administrative functions, those functions which were partially delegated, and those which were wholly delegated as reported by the superintendents responding. One hundred thirty four superintendents reported they personally did the general planning. One hundred nineteen indicated they were personally responsible for personnel management and management of the schools business and finance. Coordination of the community educational agencies was performed personally by 106 superintendents. Ninety seven superintendents did all the purchasing and 92 superintendents were totally responsible for the public relations program.

One hundred ninety four superintendents partially delegated instructional leadership and management of special services while only 31 and 39 wholly delegated these two functions. Management of buildings and grounds was wholly delegated by only 84 superintendents, yet this function was by far the one wholly delegated the most times. General planning, coordination of community educational agencies and public relations were wholly delegated by only 3, 4, and 5 superintendents respectively.

TABLE 7

SUPERINTENDENTS PERSONAL PERFORMANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND DELEGATED FUNCTIONS

Function:	Texas			New Mexico			Arkansas			Colorado			Oklahoma			Totals		
	P.P.	P.D.	*W.D.	P.P.	P.D.	W.D.	P.P.	P.D.	W.D.	P.P.	P.D.	W.D.	P.P.	P.D.	W.D.	P.P.	P.D.	W.D.
Mgt. of Spec. Services	29	87	17	1	17	9	10	26	3	5	35	4	13	29	6	58	194	39
Mgt. of Bldgs. and Grnds.	11	73	48	0	17	10	7	32	4	4	27	14	8	32	8	30	181	84
Mgt. of Bus. and Finance	38	61	32	11	11	5	26	14	4	16	22	7	28	14	5	119	122	53
Purchasing	32	49	30	7	13	6	25	15	3	12	22	11	21	20	4	97	119	54
Public Relations	46	65	1	7	17	0	16	22	1	11	33	1	12	30	2	92	167	5
Personnel Mgt.	56	49	8	12	13	2	20	18	2	13	26	6	18	24	1	119	129	19
Research	28	61	11	6	16	2	9	18	3	6	34	5	12	24	1	61	153	22
Instr. Ldrshp.	17	81	10	3	17	5	6	29	5	3	35	7	8	32	4	37	194	31
Coord. Com. Educ. Agencies	48	39	1	12	13	0	12	16	1	15	28	2	19	18	0	106	114	4
Gen. Planning	62	53	0	11	12	1	21	18	1	18	26	1	22	19	0	134	128	3
Others	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	1

*P.P. - Performed Personally

*P.D. - Partially Delegated

*W.D. - Wholly Delegated

Table 8, average number of employees reporting directly to superintendents, showed the number to be 30.2 for all States. Oklahoma superintendents reported an average of 19 employees reporting directly to them, whereas Texas reported 39.

Table 9 presented superintendents' opinions about their availability for conferences with employees and whether or not that time was sufficient. Ninety percent of the superintendents reporting indicated they were readily available for conferences, yet only 52 percent indicated they gave sufficient time for employee conferences. Sixty percent of the Texas superintendents indicated they gave sufficient time for employee conferences even though they had over twice as many employees reporting directly to them as did Oklahoma superintendents. Only 48 percent of Oklahoma superintendents indicated that they gave sufficient time for employee conferences.

Table 10 presented superintendents' choices regarding a list of administrative functions to be wholly delegated, partially delegated, or not delegated. The choices here were under conditions where sufficient administrative assistants were available. One hundred or more superintendents indicated they would wholly delegate the administrative functions of management of buildings and grounds, purchasing, management of special services, and research. Only 4 superintendents said they would wholly delegate general planning. Thirty superintendents indicated they would wholly delegate personnel management yet 191 would partially delegate this function. Forty five would wholly delegate coordination of community educational agencies but 175 would partially delegate it. Only 9 superintendents would not wholly or partially

TABLE 8

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES
REPORTING DIRECTLY TO SUPERINTENDENTS

Item	Texas	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	New Mexico
Number of Employees	39	30	22	19	21

TABLE 9

AVAILABILITY OF SUPERINTENDENTS FOR AND TIME GIVEN TO CONFERENCES WITH PERSONNEL

State	Texas		Arkansas		Colorado		Oklahoma		New Mexico		Total	
Type-of-answer	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Superintendent available	114	11	38	4	36	6	42	5	25	1	255	27
Supt. gives sufficient time	74	49	13	29	24	19	23	24	13	13	147	134

TABLE 10

SUPERINTENDENTS CHOICES OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS TO BE DELEGATED

	Wholly Delegated	Partially Delegated	Not Delegated
Instr. Leadership and Curriculum	62	196	12
General Planning	4	169	91
Research	106	148	12
Purchasing	121	108	27
Business Management	71	136	48
Management of Bldgs. and Grounds	155	96	11
Personnel Management	30	191	43
Coord. of Com. Educ. Agencies	45	175	35
Management of Special Serv.	115	141	9
Other	8	46	2

delegate management of special services. Only 11 would not delegate management of buildings and grounds and only 12 would not delegate research or instructional leadership and curriculum wholly or partially. Ninety one indicated they would not delegate general planning.

Table 11, superintendents believing more administrative assistant needed in schools comparable in size to their own districts, showed that 226 believed that more were needed while only 53 indicated none were needed. A greater percent of Oklahoma superintendents indicated that assistants were needed than did those from other States, although an overwhelming majority of superintendents from all the States surveyed indicated more were needed.

Table 12 presented the superintendents' opinions on the number of assistants needed in schools comparable in size to their own districts. Fifty two indicated none were needed, 125 said one was needed, 63 thought two were needed, and 40 said three or more were needed. There was no significant deviation between answers of the five States surveyed.

Table 13, superintendents' opinions on a minimum enrollment of a school system wherein an assistant superintendent should be employed, showed the average opinion to total 2396 students. Oklahoma superintendents' opinions averaged 2005 and New Mexico averaged 3079 to form the State average extremes.

Table 14 presented superintendents' opinions on the order in which they would assign titles of administrative assistants. Assistant superintendent in charge of instruction was listed by more respondents as the first assistant, second assistant, and third assistant. A total of 197 superintendents listed this position as either their first, second,

TABLE 11

SUPERINTENDENTS BELIEVING MORE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS NEEDED
IN SCHOOLS COMPARABLE IN SIZE TO THEIR OWN DISTRICTS

State	Texas		Arkansas		Colorado		Oklahoma		New Mexico		Total	
Type Answer	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Number	100	21	27	13	35	10	43	4	21	5	226	53

TABLE 12

SUPERINTENDENTS' OPINION AS TO THE NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS NEEDED

	Texas	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	New Mexico	Total
No. saying none needed	21	13	8	5	5	52
No. saying one needed	48	19	22	26	10	125
No. saying two needed	39	6	8	8	2	63
No. saying 3 or more needed	15	1	8	7	9	40

TABLE 13

SUPERINTENDENTS OPINIONS ON A MINIMUM ENROLLMENT OF A SCHOOL SYSTEM
WHEREIN AN ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT SHOULD BE EMPLOYED

	Texas	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	New Mexico	Total
No. of Superintendents Responding	106	36	41	44	24	251
Average Enrollment	2362	2554	2368	2005	3079	2396

TABLE 14

SUPERINTENDENTS OPINIONS ON THE ORDER OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION
TO BE ASSIGNED TO ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Administrative Function	1st Assistant	2nd Assistant	3rd Assistant	TOTAL 1st, 2nd, & 3rd Choices
Associate or Deputy Supt.	81	29	18	128
Business Manager	68	43	33	144
Purchasing Agent	4	41	25	70
Personnel Manager	4	13	25	42
Assistant Supt. - Instruction	94	56	47	197
Director of Special Services	7	20	19	46
Director of Buildings and Grounds	5	15	34	54
Director of Research	2	9	16	27
Director of Public Relations	0	4	6	10
Other	0	1	0	1

or third choices. The associate or deputy superintendent title received the second largest number of first assistant choices and was followed in number of choices by the title of business manager. Two hundred forty three superintendents listed one of these three titles as their choice for the first assistant. It was noted that in considering the second and third assistant columns that if the choices for business manager and purchasing agent were combined they would total considerably more than the other individual choices.

Table 15, superintendents' opinions on what factors have prevented the employment of additional administrative assistants in their own school districts, showed economic factors were listed by over twice as many superintendents as any other factor. Tradition was the factor listed as the next most prevailing reason followed by lack of understanding, lack of need, and lack of awareness in that order. The superintendents from each of the States listed economic factors as the greatest reason and tradition as the second greatest reason for failure to employ additional assistants. Texas and Colorado superintendents listed "lack of need" as a significant factor.

Summary

This chapter has presented the responses of superintendents relating to their opinions on certain factors of school administrative functions and some data about themselves and their school districts. The tables were organized by following generally the order of appearance on the questionnaires.

Data presented in this chapter revealed the following trends:

TABLE 15

SUPERINTENDENTS OPINIONS AS TO FACTORS WHICH HAVE PREVENTED
THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

Factors	Texas	Arkansas	Colorado	Oklahoma	New Mexico	Totals
Lack of Understanding	32	12	14	13	7	78
Lack of Awareness	22	4	7	4	4	41
Economic Factors	86	35	23	34	20	198
Tradition	38	14	15	32	9	98
Lack of Need	34	9	14	8	2	67
Other	5	0	2	0	3	10

1. That the average number of years the respondents had served as a superintendent of schools was 13.7 years.

a. The average years of service of superintendents by States ranged from 11.1 years for Texas to 17.2 for Arkansas.

2. That the average number of years served by the superintendents in their present positions was 8.2.

a. The average range of years served was calculated to be 3.8 for Arkansas to 9.0 for Colorado.

3. That the highest professional preparation of the superintendents was shown to be:

- a. 1 possessed a bachelors degree
- b. 162 possessed a masters degree
- c. 112 possessed 15 to 30 hours above the masters degree
- d. 24 possessed a doctors degree.

4. That the average of the school district responding employed the following number and type professional personnel:

- a. 140 teachers
- b. 7 principals
- c. 1.3 supervisors
- d. .88 assistant superintendents

5. That the titles of administrative assistants employed by the school districts surveyed were listed in the following proportions:

- a. Business manager 42 times
- b. Assistant superintendent 30 times
- c. Director of curriculum 23 times

- d. Administrative assistant 17 times
- e. Assistant superintendent
for instruction 11 times
- f. Other titles 98 times

6. That the average valuation of the school districts by

States was calculated to be:

- a. \$9,928,492 Oklahoma
- b. \$9,950,784 Arkansas
- c. \$26,078,350. Colorado
- d. \$28,000,000. New Mexico
- e. \$37,203,809. Texas

7. That the average valuation per student by States was cal-

culated to be:

- a. \$3,068 Oklahoma
- b. \$3,432 Arkansas
- c. \$6,212 New Mexico
- d. \$7,388 Colorado
- e. \$10,800. Texas
- f. \$7,540 (All States)

8. That the average per capita cost from general fund expendi-

tures was calculated to be:

- a. \$139 Arkansas
- b. \$260 Oklahoma
- c. \$289 Texas
- d. \$308 New Mexico
- e. \$367 Colorado
- f. \$259 (All States)

9. That the average costs of administration by States calculated as the per cent of total general fund expenditures was:

- a. 2.7% New Mexico
- b. 3.4% Colorado
- c. 3.8% Oklahoma
- d. 4.7% Texas
- e. 6.3% Arkansas
- f. 4.1% (All States)

10. That an overwhelming majority of superintendents personal preference was to spend more time on instructional leadership and curriculum, general planning, research, and public relations and less time on business management, and finance, purchasing, management of buildings and grounds, and management of special services.

11. That superintendents' opinions on administrative functions which need more attention were instructional leadership, research, general planning, and public relations. It is noted that these correlate with their personal preferences.

12. That trends were noted from superintendents answers concerning the administrative functions which they performed personally, partially delegated, and wholly delegated. The trends were:

- a. Performed personally:
 - 1. General planning
 - 2. Personnel management
 - 3. Business and finance
 - 4. Coordination of community educational agencies

- b. Partially delegated:
 - 1. Instructional leadership
 - 2. Management of special services
- c. Wholly delegated:
 - 1. Management of buildings and grounds.

13. That the average number of employees who reported directly to the superintendents was 30.2.

14. That 90 percent of the superintendents reported they were readily available for conferences with employees, yet only 52 percent indicated that they gave sufficient time for employee conferences.

15. That if sufficient administrative assistants were available a significant number of superintendents reported they would:

- a. wholly delegate management of buildings and grounds, purchasing, management of special services, and research.
- b. not delegate general planning

16. That 226 superintendents reported that one or more administrative assistants were needed in schools the size of their own while only 53 indicated none were needed.

17. That the numbers and amount of administrative assistants needed by the superintendents were reported to be:

- a. 52 indicated none were needed
- b. 125 indicated one was needed
- c. 63 indicated two were needed
- d. 40 indicated three or more were needed

18. That the superintendents' opinions on a minimum enrollment for a school district wherein an assistant superintendents should be employed was averaged to be 2396 students.

19. That the title of the first assistant was listed more times by superintendents than any other was "assistant superintendent in charge of instruction."

20. That in the opinion of superintendents "economic factors" followed by "tradition" were the greatest deterrents to the employment of additional administrative assistants.

CHAPTER IV

OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to present and interpret the opinions of school board presidents on certain factors relating to school administrative functions. Opinions were tabulated from 259 questionnaires returned from the five-State area of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado. They represented school districts who had enrolled from 1,200 to 12,000 students the preceding school year of 1960-61.

The data was generally presented in graphic form by use of tables except for the personal information about the respondents and some data which did not lend itself well to graphic presentation. The tables were presented in the same sequence as the questions appeared on the questionnaire.

The data was not presented by States since no effort was made to determine the school the respondent represented.

The average age of the 240 respondents who listed this information was calculated to be 47.8 years. They had served an average of 6.3 years on a board of education.

Table 16 presented the highest educational levels completed of the school board presidents responding. These were shown at 25 completing elementary school, 27 completing junior high school, 110 completing high school, and 99 completing college. The percent of those in each level was calculated to 9.8 elementary, 8.2 junior high school, 43.2 high school, and 38.8 college.

Table 17 showed the school board presidents' preference for his superintendent to spend more time or less time on listed administrative functions, provided there was additional administrative assistance available. It is noted that as a group they preferred the superintendent to spend more time on general planning, instructional leadership and curriculum, coordination of community educational agencies, public relations, and management of special services. They preferred him to spend less time on research, purchasing, business management and finance, and management of buildings and grounds.

Table 18, opinions of school board presidents on the administrative functions needing more attention due to a lack of staff, showed that a majority of the respondents felt more attention was needed on all but 3 of the listed functions. A significant number felt these three functions needed more attention. Eighty percent or more of the respondents indicated they thought the administrative functions of general planning, instructional, business management and finance, public relations, and purchasing needed more attention. Six and two-tenths percent indicated personnel management and management of buildings and grounds needed more attention.

TABLE 16

HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS

School level	Elementary	Jr. High School	High School	College
Number	25	21	110	99
Per Cent	9.8	8.2	43.2	38.8

TABLE 17

SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS PREFERENCES OF PERFORMANCE
OF ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS BY THE SUPERINTENDENT

Administrative Function	More Time	Less Time
Instr. leadership and curriculum	247	9
General planning	249	7
Research	16	217
Coord. of Com. Educ. Agencies	216	29
Public Relations	208	41
Business Mgt. and finance	49	191
Purchasing	31	217
Mgt. of Bldgs. and Grounds	32	184
Mgt. of Special Services	191	43
Other	6	4

TABLE 18

OPINIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS
NEEDING MORE ATTENTION DUE TO A LACK OF STAFF

Administrative Functions	Number Checking Item
General Planning	241
Research	104
Instructional	246
Coord. of com. educ. agencies	103
Personnel management	161
Business management and finance	249
Public relations	231
Purchasing	219
Management of buildings and grounds	161
Management of special services	74
Other	24

Table 19 presented the opinions expressed by school board presidents on which functions their school superintendent performed personally, partially delegated, or wholly delegated. The opinions expressed indicate that the functions most often performed personally by superintendents are coordination of community educational agencies, personnel management, public relations, and general planning. Management of special services was believed to be the function most often wholly delegated. Instructional leadership, management of buildings, and grounds, business and finance, and purchasing were the functions believed to be partially delegated by more superintendents.

Table 20 showed the opinions expressed by school board presidents on the availability and sufficiency of the time superintendents give to conferences with employees and on the need for one or more positions of assistant superintendent. Fifty five percent of the respondents expressed the opinion that the superintendent was not readily available for conferences with the employees who reported directly to him. Sixty five percent expressed the opinion that superintendents failed to give sufficient time and leadership to the employees who reported directly to him. Eighty nine percent of the respondents believed there was a need for one or more assistant superintendents in schools comparable in size to their own.

Table 21, opinions of school board presidents on the number of assistant superintendents which should be employed in schools comparable in size to their own school, showed that only 28 or 11 percent thought no additional administrative position should be created. Ninety nine believed that one assistant should be employed, 81 believed that

TABLE 19

SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS' OPINIONS ON WHICH FUNCTIONS THE SUPERINTENDENTS
PERFORMED PERSONALLY, PARTIALLY DELEGATED, OR WHOLLY DELEGATED

Function	Performed Personally	Partially Delegated	Wholly Delegated
Management of Special Services	76	91	89
Management of buildings and grounds	39	146	62
Management of business and finance	72	122	39
Purchasing	76	119	40
Public Relations	108	111	26
Personnel management	162	64	19
Instructional leadership	46	160	41
Coordination of Com. Educ. agencies	201	27	6
General planning	108	114	11
Other	6	2	4

TABLE 20

OPINIONS EXPRESSED BY SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE AVAILABILITY OF SUPERINTENDENTS
FOR CONFERENCES AND THE NEED FOR POSITIONS OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

Item	Yes	No
Superintendent is available for conferences	113	142
Superintendent allots sufficient time for conferences	91	167
Schools have a need for one or more assistants	226	27

TABLE 21

OPINIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE NUMBER OF ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS
WHICH SHOULD BE EMPLOYED IN SCHOOLS COMPARABLE IN SIZE TO THEIR OWN SCHOOLS

No. of Assistants Needed	Number Responding
None	28
One	99
Two	81
Three or more	48

two assistants should be employed and 48 believed that three or more assistants should be employed.

Results of item 10 on the questionnaire, although not shown by a table, were calculated. The average of the opinions expressed showed 1,862 as the minimum student enrollment before the first assistant superintendent should be employed.

Table 22 presented the opinions of school board presidents on the priority or order of assignment to assistant superintendents. Business manager and assistant superintendent for instruction and curriculum received 114 and 101 first choice opinions respectively. No other function received more than 11 first assignment choices. The same two choices led the second assignment choices by receiving 71 for assistant superintendent for instruction and 53 for business manager. Manager of buildings and grounds received far more third assignment choices than any other function with 70 choices. The title of public relations director received a significant number of second and third assignment choices and a total of 98 first, second, and third choices to rank third in this category. Business manager received 191 total choices followed by 184 choices on assistant superintendent for instruction.

Table 23 presented the opinions of school board presidents on factors which have prevented the employment of more administrative assistance in schools. One hundred ninety seven respondents indicated that the factor which had been the greatest cause for the non-employment of more administrative assistance was that superintendents had not indicated there was a need. One hundred twenty four checked the factor

TABLE 22

OPINIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE ORDER OF ASSIGNMENTS TO ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

Function - Title	1st	2nd	3rd	Total 1st, 2nd and 3rd
Associate Superintendent	6	7	31	44
Business Manager	114	53	24	191
Purchasing Agent	4	6	17	27
Personnel Manager	11	40	24	75
Assistant Supt. - Instruction	101	71	12	184
Director of Special Services	4	2	6	12
Mgr. of Buildings and Grounds	4	20	70	94
Research Director	3	1	7	11
Public Relations Director	5	47	46	98
Other	0	1	2	3

TABLE 23

OPINIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE FACTORS WHICH HAVE PREVENTED
THE EMPLOYMENT OF MORE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOLS

Factors	Number
Lack of community and school board understanding of the complexities of the administrative functions	124
Lack of community and school board awareness of the schools growth	52
Economic factors	81
Tradition	98
Lack of need	57
Superintendent has not indicated that he needs assistance	197
Other	4

of "lack of awareness by the community and school of the complexities of the school administrative functions as the second ranking reason for non-employment of more administrative assistance. Ninety eight respondents indicated "tradition" was a factor, 81 listed "economic factors", 57 said "lack of need" was a factor, and 52 indicated "lack of community and school board awareness of the school's growth" was a factor.

Table 24 showed that most of the respondents to the questions believe that the functions of administration were inadequately performed before the employment of assistant superintendents and that the functions had been more efficiently performed since their employment.

TABLE 24

OPINIONS OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON THE ADEQUACY OF PERFORMANCE OF
ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Item	Yes	No
Functions now performed by asst. supt. were inadequately performed before employment of ass't supts.	26	4
Functions now performed by supt. were inadequately performed before employment of ass't. supts.	31	6
Supts. functions are more adequately performed since ass't. supts. have been employed	33	2

CHAPTER V

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE OPINIONS OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS ON CERTAIN FACTORS RELATING TO SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS

The purpose of this chapter was to present a comparison of the opinions expressed by superintendents and presidents of school boards on certain factors relating to school administrative functions as determined by responses to questionnaires. The responses to the questionnaires were presented in Chapter 3 for superintendents and in Chapter 4 for school board presidents. The comparison was limited to those areas where there was a considerable difference of opinion.

Tables 5 and 17 presented the opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on preferences of administrative functions to which more or less time would be spent by the superintendent. Superintendents indicated they would spend more time on such functions as instructional leadership and curriculum, general planning, public relations, research, coordination of community educational agencies, and personnel management. They would spend less time on the other functions. School board presidents would have their superintendents spend more time on the same functions with the exception of research. Only 16 school board presidents wanted their superintendent to spend more time on

research, while 217 wanted them to spend less time. It was noted that the school board presidents appeared to come nearer total agreement than did the superintendents.

Tables 6 and 18 presented the opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on the administrative functions which needed more attention due to a lack of staff. Both groups indicated that all the functions needed more attention, however school board presidents again seemed to come nearer total agreement than did the superintendents. Over 50 percent of the board presidents named all the administrative functions except three, whereas only four functions were named by 50 percent of the superintendents. Ninety percent of the board presidents named four functions as needing more attention.

Tables 7 and 19 presented the opinions of the two groups on the functions performed personally, partially delegated, and wholly delegated by the superintendents. General planning was the only function which more superintendents said they performed personally than partially delegated. Although four other functions were listed by about the same number who said they performed the function personally as did those who said they partially delegated the function.

School board presidents opinions of what their superintendent did about these functions showed they believed the superintendent performed personally more functions. Two hundred one of 234 indicated the superintendent personally performed the coordination of community educational agencies and 162 of 226 thought they personally performed all the personnel management. About an even number thought general planning and public relations were performed personally as opposed to partially delegated.

Tables 9 and 20 may be used to compare the opinions of superintendents and board presidents on the availability of the superintendents for conferences with personnel. Approximately 90 percent of the superintendents thought they were readily available for conferences with employees yet only 44 percent of the board presidents thought they were readily available.

Forty eight and eight-tenths percent of the superintendents believed they gave sufficient time for conferences with personnel as opposed to 35 percent of the board presidents who believed the superintendent gave sufficient time.

Tables 11 and 20 may be compared to determine differences of opinion between school board presidents and superintendents about the need for employment of assistant superintendents. Eighty percent of the superintendents and 90 percent of the board presidents believed there was a need for one or more assistant superintendents in their school.

Tables 12 and 21 presented the opinions of the two groups on the number of assistant superintendents needed in their schools. Approximately 20 percent of the superintendents and 11 percent of the board presidents thought no assistant was needed. Forty four percent of the superintendents and 39 percent of the board presidents thought one assistant superintendent should be employed. Twenty two percent of the superintendents and 31 percent of the board presidents felt that two assistant superintendents were needed. Fourteen percent of the superintendents and 19 percent of the board presidents thought three or more assistant superintendents were needed.

Table 13 presented the superintendents' opinions on a minimum enrollment wherein an assistant superintendent should be employed. School board presidents' opinions were discussed in Chapter 4, following the discussions on Table 21. The consensus opinion of superintendents was that an enrollment of 2,396 was the minimum enrollment where an assistant superintendent should be employed. School board presidents thought the minimum should be 1,862.

Tables 14 and 22 presented opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on the order of functional assignment to assistant superintendents. Superintendents indicated they would assign the first assistant to instruction, general duties (associate or deputy) or business manager. These three received the majority of their choices. School board presidents gave the majority of their first assignment choices to business manager or instruction. Only 6 indicated a choice for associate or deputy superintendent. Second and third assignment choices of both groups were so varied that no pattern emerged. By totaling the first, second, and third choices it was indicated that a majority of the superintendents gave more emphasis to the assignment of assistant superintendent for instruction, followed by business manager and associate superintendent. Board presidents gave more emphasis to business manager followed by assistant superintendent for instruction and public relations director.

Tables 15 and 23 presented the opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on the factors which have prevented the employment of additional administrative assistance in their schools. Superintendents indicated economic factors as the greatest reason followed

by tradition, lack of understanding by the community and school boards of the complexities of administrative functions, lack of need, and lack of awareness of the schools growth. School board presidents differed greatly in their opinions by indicating that "the superintendent has not indicated that he needs assistance" as a reason in most schools. Other factors also differed as evidenced by their opinions on them. The other factors in order were: lack of community and school board understanding, tradition, economic factors, lack of need, and lack of awareness of the schools growth.

This chapter has presented the differences of opinion between superintendents and school board presidents. Summary of these differences and the implications were treated in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to obtain data concerning various factors affecting the establishment of the position of assistant superintendent of schools and to relate this data to opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on selected factors affecting the need for the position.

To obtain data for the investigation, questionnaires were sent to superintendents and school board presidents in Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma who represented schools with student enrollments ranging from 1,200 to 12,000. Four hundred thirty questionnaires were mailed and 303 were received from superintendents. This represented a 70% return. Two hundred fifty eight were received from school board presidents and represented a 60% return.

Literature and research in the field of school administration was surveyed to identify the administrative functions generally recognized in school administration and were used in developing both questionnaires. The doctoral committee reviewed the questionnaires after professors of education, board members, and superintendents reviewed them to determine if the content and statements were sufficiently clear.

Suggested changes were made before final printing and mailing. The superintendents questionnaire provided for personal data, data about their school district, and opinionnaire type questions. The school board presidents questionnaire contained a minimum of personal data and the balance of it corresponded to the superintendents opinionnaire portion. Responses from the superintendents were grouped by states and totaled. Board president responses were totaled. Tables were constructed to show the expressed opinions of the two groups.

Summary of Findings

An interpretation of the responses to the questionnaire provided the following summary of findings which was broken down in the following manner:

1. Personal data of superintendents and school board presidents
2. Data about school districts
3. Superintendents' opinions
4. School board presidents' opinions
5. Major differences of opinion

Personal Data

Superintendent respondents averaged 49.8 years of age. Oklahoma superintendents averaged 51.8 years which was the highest of the five states surveyed. School board president respondents averaged 47.8 years of age and had served on a board of education an average of 6.3 years. Eighteen percent of the board presidents had not graduated from highschool, however 38.8 percent were college graduates. The average

superintendent had served 13.7 years and 8.2 years in his present school. Only one superintendent had less than a masters degree and 24 held a doctors degree.

School District Data

The averages on school districts represented were:

1. The number of teachers was 140
2. The number of principals was 7
3. The number of supervisors was 1.3
4. The number of assistant superintendents was .88
5. Titles and number of assistant superintendents:
 - 30 assistant superintendents
 - 42 business manager
 - 23 director of curriculum
 - 11 assistant superintendent for instruction
 - 17 administrative assistant
 - 98 other titles
6. Characteristics of school districts:
 - a. number of students 3,423
 - b. valuation per student. \$7,540
 - c. per capita cost (current expense). . \$259
 - d. percent cost of administration . . . 4.1%

Opinions of Superintendents

An interpretation of the responses to the questionnaire provided the following summary of findings concerning certain factors relating to administrative functions:

1. Superintendents indicated if they had additional administrative assistance, they would prefer to spend more time on instructional leadership and curriculum, general planning, research, coordination of educational agencies, public relations, and personnel management and less time on other functions.

2. Superintendents indicated to some extent all areas of administration needed more attention due to a lack of staff. Instructional leadership, research, public relations, and general planning were mentioned most.

3. General planning, management of business and finance, and personnel management were areas mentioned by more superintendents as being performed personally. Management of buildings and grounds was wholly delegated most often.

4. Superintendents reported that an average of 30.2 employees reported directly to them.

5. Two hundred fifty five superintendents said they were readily available for conferences with employees, but only 147 believed they gave sufficient time.

6. Even though sufficient administrative assistants were available, management of buildings and grounds was the only function over 50 percent would wholly delegate, although research, purchasing, and management of special services were each named over a hundred times.

7. Eighty one percent of the superintendents believed one or more administrative assistants were needed in their schools.

8. Two thousand, three hundred ninety six students was the minimum size school which should employ an assistant superintendent.

9. A major portion of the superintendents indicated they would assign the first assistant superintendent to instruction and curriculum and follow this by a business manager and associate or deputy superintendent.

10. Economic factors were listed by more superintendents as a factor which had prevented the employment of additional administrative assistance in their schools. Tradition and lack of understanding were listed by a significant number.

Opinions of School Board Presidents

School board president opinions were interpreted and summarized into the following:

1. Provided the school had additional administrative assistance, it was preferred the superintendent would spend more time on instructional leadership and curriculum, general planning, coordination of community educational agencies, public relations, and management of special services. Less time should be spent on other functions.

2. All administrative functions needed more attention due to a lack of staff.

3. A majority of school board presidents believed their superintendent performed personally the functions of coordination of community educational agencies and personnel management. One hundred eight believed general planning and public relations were performed personally. No function was believed to be wholly delegated by more than one third of the respondents.

4. Fifty five percent said the superintendent was not readily available for conferences with employees and 65 percent said he did not allot sufficient time for these conferences.

5. Eighty nine percent believed their schools had a need for one or more assistant superintendents.

6. Business manager, assistant superintendent for instruction and manager of buildings and grounds appeared to be the first, second, and third choices of board presidents concerning the order of assignment of assistants.

7. One hundred ninety seven of 258 respondents believed that "superintendent has not indicated he needs assistance" was the factor which prevented the employment of more administrative assistance. Lack of understanding, tradition, and economic factors were checked most frequently thereafter and in the order named.

Major Differences of Opinion Between Superintendents and School Board Presidents

A comparison of the opinions of superintendents and school board presidents on factors relating to administrative functions revealed the following major differences:

1. Board presidents appeared to come nearer consensus opinions than did superintendents.

2. If additional administrative assistance were available, superintendents would generally spend more time on the same functions that board presidents preferred with the exception of "research." Only 16 board presidents preferred their superintendent to spend more time on research while 156 superintendents would spend more time on it.

3. Over 50 percent of the board presidents named 7 of 10 administrative functions needed more attention due to a lack of staff. Superintendents named only 4 functions by a 50 percent margin.

4. Board presidents thought a great many more functions were performed personally by the superintendents than was indicated by the superintendents.

5. Approximately 90 percent of superintendents thought they were readily available for conferences with employees, but only 44 percent of board presidents thought they were available.

6. Only 35 percent of the board presidents thought superintendents gave adequate time for conferences, yet 48.8 percent of the superintendents said they allotted adequate time.

7. Eleven percent of the board presidents thought no assistant superintendent was needed, however 20 percent of the superintendents said none was needed.

8. The average minimum student enrollment before an assistant superintendent should be employed was calculated to be 2,396 from superintendent respondents and 1,862 from school board presidents.

9. About the functional assignment of assistant superintendents, more board presidents gave emphasis to business manager and public relations director than did superintendents. Associate superintendent was a high choice of superintendents but only 6 board presidents named this position as a first assignment.

10. More superintendents checked "economic factors" as a reason which has prevented the employment of more administrative assistance than any other factor. More school board presidents listed the factor that

"superintendents had not indicated they needed assistance." They also listed "lack of understanding" and "tradition" more times than "economic factors."

Conclusions

The following conclusions and recommendations were based on findings within the limits of the study:

1. It is evident that there was no consistent pattern in the employment, titles, and assignment of assistant superintendents. It appeared that the superintendent assigned functions according to his own preference of functions.
2. Both superintendents and school board presidents recognized that a lack of staff had caused most of the administrative functions to be performed less well than they would like for them to be performed.
3. Where additional administrative assistants were employed, the administrative functions had been better discharged.
4. One of the greatest deterrents to the employment of additional administrative assistants was the superintendent of schools because he did not indicate he needed help.
5. Even though superintendents listed economic factors as the major factor preventing the employment of additional administrative assistants, a study of actual practices does not indicate this is a fact. Neither assessed valuation nor per capita cost of education in school districts has had much bearing on the employment of administrative assistants in actual practice.

6. Even though several administrative assistants were employed in a school district, it appeared that superintendents still did not "wholly delegate" administrative functions.

7. School board presidents believed that superintendents were not readily available for conference with employees who reported directly to them. Neither did they believe, nor did the superintendent believe that adequate time was allocated for conferences with employees who reported directly to the superintendent.

8. Too many employees were required to report directly to the superintendent for him to give adequate supervision.

9. It appeared that when 2,000 students are enrolled an assistant superintendent should definitely be employed. This was not to say that one should not be employed when 1,200 students are enrolled. It also appeared that an additional administrative assistant is justified and should be employed for each additional 2,000 students up to 12,000 in enrollment. The state minimum programs should include an administrative position above that allowed for principals for each 2,000 students or major portion thereof.

10. State departments of education, school administrator organizations, school board associations, and others should inform the people of the complexities of school administrative functions and the need for school administrative assistants.

11. It is recommended that the first administrative assistant should be assigned to the area of business management. The second assistant should be assigned to instruction and curriculum. The third assistant should be assigned as director of buildings and grounds. The

fourth assistant should be assigned as public information director. The fifth assistant should be assigned as director of special services.

These conclusions were based on the opinions expressed by the superintendents and board president respondents and the opinion of the writer following his study, research, observation of practices, and his own experience in school administration.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the following studies might provide evidence which would further clarify the administrative staffing of school districts and would add materially to the accumulation of data concerning school administrative functions:

1. An investigation designed to determine the efficiency of administrative functions by comparing the school programs of two groups of schools. One group would have employed what was considered to be an adequate administrative staff and the other group less than an adequate staff.
2. Additional research into the assignment of administrative functions to assistants.
3. A study involving the opinions of lay people concerning administrative functions of schools in an attempt to identify their level of understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyris, Chris. "Organizational Leadership and Participative Management," The Journal of Business. Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, January, 1955.
- Armstrong, Louis W. "Community Expectancy Concerning the Superintendency." Unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1951.
- Bendix, Rienhardt. "Bureaucracy, The Problem and Its Setting," American Sociological Review, Vol. XII, October, 1947.
- Blatnix, William H. "Patterns of Staff Organization in Community Unit Districts." Unpublished doctoral project, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1954.
- Cole, T. R. and Hayden, A. H. "Checklist for Superintendents," American School Board Journal, Vol. CXVI, March, 1948.
- Cornell, William B. Organization and Management in Business and Industry. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947.
- Davies, Daniel R. "Organizational Patterns for Today's Schools," Teachers College Record, Vol. LII, November, 1950.
- Davis, Ralph C. Industrial Organization and Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940.
- Ganders, Harry S. "Some Impossibilities in the School Superintendency," Nations Schools, January, 1955.
- Grace, A. G. "The Nature of Democracy in Administration," American School Board Journal, Vol. CXIII, October, 1946.
- Griffeths, Daniel E. "An Evaluation of the Leadership of the School Superintendent." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1952.
- Hagman, Harlan L. and Schartz, Alfred. Administration in Profile for School Executives. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

- Harrison, Forrest W. "Top-level Assistants to the Superintendents of Missouri Public Schools and Their Qualifications." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1959.
- Healey, James H. "Coordination and Control of Executive Functions," Personnel, September, 1956.
- Heer, A. L. "The Present Status of Business Executives in the Public Schools of the United States in Cities of 25,000 or More Inhabitants." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1926.
- Hillway, Tyrus. Introduction to Research. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1956.
- Holy, T. C. and Herrick, John H. The Central Administrative Staff of the Public Schools of Warren, Ohio. A report by the Bureau of Educational Research, The College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1952.
- Hutcheson, Harold L. "The Employment and Designation of Duties to Assistant Superintendents in School Systems Employing from 150 to 200 Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1957.
- McClure, Worth. "Administrative Dilemmas," American School Board Journal, Vol. CIII, November, 1941.
- McGinnis, William C. School Administration and Supervisory Organization in Cities of 20,000 to 50,000. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
- New England School Development Council. The Pressures and Dilemmas of the School Superintendent. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1954.
- Ovsiew, Leon. Emerging Practices in School Administration. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1953.
- Rast, G. E. "The Study of the Changing Character of the Superintendent's Job." Unpublished doctoral project, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1951.
- Richardson, Lester S. "The School Superintendent's Job: A Study of His Function and Status in the Public Schools Located Within A One-Hundred Mile Radius of Houston, Texas." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1954.
- Taylor, C. L. "Does Your School Need A Business Manager?" Nations Schools, Vol. LV, February, 1955.

Travers, Robert M. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

_____ . The American School Superintendent. Thirtieth Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C., 1950.

_____ . Staff Relations in the Public Schools. Official Report of the American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D. C., 1955.

Trickett, Joseph M. "A Synthesis of the Philosophies and Concepts of Staff Organization of Business, Government, and Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California, 1953.

APPENDICES

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
A Department of the Oklahoma Education Association

Dear School Board President:

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by the "Oklahoma Association of School Administrators." It is hoped from the results of the study, that a set of criteria may be drawn which will aid "Boards of Education" in creating additional positions to assist the Superintendent of Schools. It too is hoped that reliable information can be furnished to members of our State Legislature so the positions of "assistant superintendent" may be included as a part of the State Foundation Program.

The questionnaire is designed so it will take a minimum amount of time to complete. All except a few questions may be answered by use of the () check mark.

We are sending the questionnaire to all Presidents of Boards of Education in the states of New Mexico, Colorado, Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas who represent schools that enroll 1,200 to 12,000 students. Your superintendent has been mailed a questionnaire of a similar type as yours. We are desirous of getting the opinions of both school boards and superintendents. All information received will be treated as confidential.

We hope you will cooperate by giving us enough of your time to answer and return the questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope provided.

You may obtain results of the study at its conclusion by writing the sender of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Francis Tuttle, Chairman
Special Study Committee

SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of Board President: _____
 Age _____ Occupation _____ Number of years served on
 School Board _____.

2. What was the highest level you completed in schools?
 _____ Elementary School.
 _____ Junior Highschool.
 _____ Highschool.
 _____ College.

3. If your school district had additional administrative assistance, to which of the following functions would you prefer your superintendent to devote more time and to which less time?

More time		Less time
_____	Instructional leadership and curriculum	_____
_____	General planning	_____
_____	Research	_____
_____	Coordination of community educational agencies	_____
_____	Public relations	_____
_____	Business management and finance	_____
_____	Purchasing	_____
_____	Management of buildings and grounds	_____
_____	Management of special services	_____
_____	Other	_____

4. Which of the following areas, because of lack of staff, do you believe need more attention in your school? General planning _____, Research _____, Instructional _____, Coordination of community educational agencies _____, Personnel management, _____, Business management and finance _____, Public relations _____, Purchasing _____, Management of buildings and grounds _____, Management of other services _____, Other areas _____.

5. Which of the following areas of work or functions does your superintendent perform personally, which does he delegate either wholly or in part, and to whom are the functions delegated?

Function	Performed Personally	Partially Delegated	Wholly Delegated	To Whom Delegated
Management of Special Services	_____	_____	_____	_____
Management of buildings and grounds	_____	_____	_____	_____

Function	Performed Personally	Partially Delegated	Wholly Delegated	To Whom Delegated
Management of business and finance	_____	_____	_____	_____
Purchasing	_____	_____	_____	_____
Public Relations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Personnel management	_____	_____	_____	_____
Instructional leadership and curriculum study and revision	_____	_____	_____	_____
Coordination of community educational agencies	_____	_____	_____	_____
General Planning	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____	_____

6. Is your superintendent readily available for conferences with the employees who must report to him directly? Yes _____; No _____.
7. Do you believe your superintendent gives sufficient time and leadership to the employees who must report to him directly? Yes _____; No _____.
8. Do you believe there is a need for one or more assistant superintendents in schools comparable in size to your school? Yes _____; No _____.
9. In your opinion how many assistant superintendents should be employed in schools the size of your school? _____.
10. What is the minimum enrollment of a school district wherein you feel an assistant superintendent should be employed? _____.
11. In what order would you recommend the assignment of functions to assistant superintendents in schools the size of your school?
 - _____ Associate Superintendent (general duties).
 - _____ Business Manager.
 - _____ Purchasing Agent.
 - _____ Personnel Manager.
 - _____ Assistant Superintendent in charge of instruction and curriculum.
 - _____ Director of Special Services.
 - _____ Manager of Buildings and Grounds.
 - _____ Research Director.
 - _____ Public Relations Director.
 - _____ Other. _____

12. What factors have prevented the employment of more administrative assistance in your school?

_____ Lack of community and school board understanding of the complexities of the administrative functions.

_____ Lack of community and school-board awareness of the schools growth.

_____ Economic factors,

_____ Tradition.

_____ Lack of need for assistant superintendents.

_____ Superintendent has not indicated that he needs assistance.

_____ Other. _____

13. When was the first assistant superintendent employed in your school?

_____.

14. In your opinion, were the functions now performed by the assistant superintendents inadequately performed before assistant superintendents were employed? Yes _____; No _____.

15. In your opinion, were the functions now performed by your superintendent inadequately performed before assistant superintendents were employed? Yes _____; No _____.

16. In your opinion, have the superintendent's functions been more efficiently performed since assistant superintendents have been employed? Yes _____; No _____.

OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
A Department of the Oklahoma Education Association

Dear Superintendent:

The enclosed questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by the "Oklahoma Association of School Administrators". It is hoped from the results of the study that a set of criteria may be drawn which will aid "boards of education" in creating positions of assistant superintendent. It is further hoped that reliable information can be furnished to members of our State Legislature so the positions of "assistant superintendent" may be included as a part of the State Foundation Program.

The questionnaire is designed so it will take a minimum amount of time to complete, all except a few of the questions may be answered by use of () check mark. It should not take more than 10 or 15 minutes to complete all questions.

We are sending this questionnaire to all superintendents in the States of Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas and Arkansas who are in schools that enroll 1,200 to 12,000 students. A shortened version of these questions is being mailed to the president of the board of education in each of these districts. All information given will be treated as confidential and no individual school names will be used in any way without the permission of same.

We hope you will cooperate by giving us enough of your time to answer and return the questionnaire in the stamped addressed envelope.

You may obtain results of the study at its conclusion by writing the sender of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

Francis Tuttle, Chairman
Special Study Committee

1. Name of Superintendent _____ City _____ State _____
2. Age _____. Number of years employed as superintendent _____.
 Number of years employed as superintendent in this district _____.
 Highest level of education:
 _____ Bachelors degree _____ Masters degree
 _____ 15 to 30 Hours above Masters _____ Doctors degree.
3. Number of employees: Teachers ____; Principals ____; Supervisors ____;
 Assistant or Associate Superintendents ____; Other employees ____.
4. Titles of assistant and associate superintendents: (Include staff members which have some administrative responsibility which includes some function of the whole school system. For instance, the Curriculum Director or Director of Research is an assistant superintendent by this definition, but Director of Secondary Education is not.)

5. Number of students enrolled _____.
6. Net assessed valuation of your district \$ _____.
7. Per capita cost of education in your district \$ _____.
8. General Fund expenditure last year \$ _____.
9. Expenditure for "Administrative Services" last year \$ _____.
10. If you had additional administrative assistance, to which of the following functions would you prefer to devote more and to which less time?

More time		Less time
_____	Instructional leadership and curriculum	_____
_____	General planning	_____
_____	Research	_____
_____	Coordination of community educational agencies	_____
_____	Public relations	_____
_____	Personnel management	_____
_____	Business management and finance	_____
_____	Purchasing	_____
_____	Management of buildings and grounds	_____
_____	Management of special services	_____
_____	Other	_____

11. Which of the following areas, because of lack of staff, do you believe need more attention in your school? General planning _____, Research _____, Instructional leadership _____, Coordination of community educational agencies _____, Personnel management _____, Business management and finance _____, Public relations _____, Purchasing _____, Management of buildings and grounds _____, Management of special services _____, Other areas _____.

12. Which of the following areas of work or functions do you perform personally, which do you delegate either wholly or in part, and to whom are the functions delegated?

Function	Performed Personally	Partially Delegated	Wholly Delegated	To Whom Delegated
Management of special services	_____	_____	_____	_____
Management of buildings and grounds	_____	_____	_____	_____
Management of business and finance	_____	_____	_____	_____
Purchasing	_____	_____	_____	_____
Public relations	_____	_____	_____	_____
Personnel management	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____	_____
Instructional leadership and curriculum study and revision	_____	_____	_____	_____
Coordination of community educational agencies	_____	_____	_____	_____
General planning	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____	_____

13. How many school employees are directly responsible to you and report directly to you? _____

14. Are you readily available for conference with the employees who must report directly to you? Yes _____; No _____.

15. Do you believe that you give sufficient time and leadership to the employees who must report to you directly? Yes _____; No _____.

16. If sufficient administrative assistance were available, which of the following functions would you delegate wholly, which partially, and which would you not delegate?

Function	Would delegate wholly	Would delegate partially	Would not Delegate
Instructional leadership and curriculum	_____	_____	_____
General planning	_____	_____	_____
Research	_____	_____	_____
Purchasing	_____	_____	_____
Business management and finance	_____	_____	_____
Management of buildings and grounds	_____	_____	_____
Personnel management	_____	_____	_____
Coordination of community educational agencies	_____	_____	_____
Management of special services	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____

17. Do you believe there is a need for one or more assistant superintendents in schools comparable in size to your school? Yes _____; No _____.

18. In your opinion, how many assistant superintendents should be employed in schools the size of your school? _____.

19. What is the minimum enrollment of a school district wherein you feel an assistant superintendent should be employed? _____.

20. In what order would you recommend the assignment of functions to assistant superintendents in schools the size of your school?

_____ Associate or deputy superintendent (general duties).
 _____ Business manager.
 _____ Purchasing agent.
 _____ Personnel manager.
 _____ Assistant superintendent in charge of instruction and curriculum.
 _____ Director of special services.
 _____ Manager of buildings and grounds.
 _____ Research director.
 _____ Public relations director.
 _____ Other. _____

21. What factors have prevented the employment of more administrative assistance in your school?

- _____ Lack of community and school-board understanding of the complexities of the administrative functions.
- _____ Lack of community and school-board awareness of school's growth.
- _____ Economic factors.
- _____ Tradition.
- _____ Lack of need for assistant superintendents.
- _____ Other. _____

66

66

33

33

1

