

1952

Supervisory and administrative practices
of New Hampshire elementary school
principals who devote fifty percent or
less of their time to teaching.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/9381>

Downloaded from DSpace Repository, DSpace Institution's institutional repository

Ed
Thesis
Bowie, M.W.
1952
stored

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

SUPERVISORY AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WHO DEVOTE FIFTY PERCENT
OR LESS OF THEIR TIME TO TEACHING

Submitted by

Myron Wayne Bowie

B.S., University of New Hampshire, 1947

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for the
degree of Master of Education

1952

Boston University
School of Education
Library

First Reader: B. Alice Crossley, Assistant Professor of Education

Second Reader: Helen A. Murphy, Professor of Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Dr. B. Alice Crossley whose guidance and help make the completion of this study possible. Her untiring efforts and willingness to cooperate are greatly appreciated. Furthermore the New Hampshire Elementary Principals who participated in the study deserve credit and thanks for taking their valuable time to answer the questionnaire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---------|--|------|
| I | STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| | The Problem | 2 |
| | Limitations of the Study | 8 |
| II | REVIEW OF RESEARCH | 9 |
| | A Philosophy of Supervision | 9 |
| | Functions of Supervision and Administration | 10 |
| | 1. The Classroom Visitation | 14 |
| | 2. Conferences and Faculty Meetings | 16 |
| | 3. Stimulation and Direction of Profes- sional Growth | 19 |
| | 4. Standardized Testing | 20 |
| | 5. Miscellaneous Supervisory Activities ... | 22 |
| | The Teaching Principal | 24 |
| III | METHOD OF PROCEDURE | 30 |
| IV | ANALYSIS OF THE DATA | 33 |
| | General Findings | 33 |
| | Classroom Visitation | 37 |
| V | SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 59 |
| | Summary | 59 |
| | Conclusions | 63 |

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---------|---------------------------------------|------|
| VI | SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY | 65 |
| | Bibliography | 66 |
| | Appendix A - Inquiry Card Forms | 68 |
| | Appendix B - Questionnaire | 70 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|-------|---|------|
| I | Population of New Hampshire Elementary Schools Covered by This Study | 34 |
| II | Population of the Twenty Towns and Cities in Which the Schools of the Study Were Located | 35 |
| III | Number of Years Principals Have Held a Principalship in Schools Covered by the Study | 36 |
| IV | Supervisory Practices of Principals | 37 |
| V | Frequency of Classroom Visitation | 38 |
| VI | Distribution of Time Spent on a Supervisory Visit | 39 |
| VII | Distribution of Reasons for More Frequent Supervisory Visits by the Principal | 39 |
| VIII | Responsibility for Administration of the Standardized Testing Program..... | 40 |
| IX | Days Teachers Meetings Are Held | 41 |
| X | Length of Teachers Meetings | 41 |
| XI | Number of Years Principals Taught Before Obtaining First Principalship | 42 |
| XII | Years of Post Secondary Education of Principals | 43 |
| XIII | Number and Type of Most Advanced Degree Held by Principal | 43 |

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|-------|--|------|
| XIV | Institutions Where Principals Received a Larger Part of Their Training | 44 |
| XV | Grades Taught by the Principals of the Study | 46 |
| XVI | Length of School Day in Schools Covered by the Study | 47 |
| XVII | Length of the Lunch Hour in Schools Represented by the Study | 47 |
| XVIII | Hours Per Week Principals Work Beyond the Length of the School Day | 48 |
| XIX | Administrative Organization of Schools Surveyed..... | 49 |
| XX | Full Time and Part Time Teachers Employed in the Schools Surveyed | 50 |
| XXI | Per cent of Student Body In Schools Surveyed Who Are Transported by Bus | 51 |
| XXII | Amount of Time Beyond That Now Available Principals Would Like to Devote To Supervision | 53 |
| XXIII | Activities Engaged In By Principals of the Study and Per cent of Time Consumed | 54 |
| XXIV | Principals Recommendations As to What Is Most Needed For More and Better Supervision | 56 |
| XXV | Methods of Professional Improvement Desired by Principals and Teachers Studied | 57 |

TABLE

PAGE

XXVI Professional Organizations to Which Principals

Studied Belong

58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of finding time to do adequate supervision is one that requires thought and care on the part of the principal. Too many of them, when they find their school running smoothly, are reluctant to do things which may upset the balance of an efficient running machine. Also, some principals who take pride in their managerial ability, find that it is very easy to spend more time than should be necessary on administrative detail and slight the supervisory functions that are so important.

Stone in his book on "Supervision of the Elementary School", states, "There are two main causes of lack of time for supervision on the part of the principal. One lies in the principal himself, and the other in the conditions under which the principal must work."^{1/} He goes on further -

"The main cause for the neglect of the vital professional work on the part of many principals is to be found in the principal himself. Such principals should contemplate the fact that their conception of the relative importance of the main classes of the principal's functions is different

^{1/}Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 27.

from that of the great majority of professors of education, leading superintendents, and first class principals."

"Studies of time expenditure by principals has shown that they generally have been spending an undesirably large amount of time on routine administrative matters, clerical work, and on so-called, imperative, temporary and emergency problems." 1/

The Problem

The average principal is beset by many conditions beyond his control which affect to a large extent his supervisory activities. Too often, superintendents will check him on his managerial ability and little, if at all, on what he is doing with supervision. (How a school is run rather than the kind and amount of supervision done is more apparent to the eyes of the public.) He is checked to see if required reports or records are in on time and nothing else. Much of this work, mostly clerical in nature, could be done by office help who would receive pay commensurate with the duties performed, but, throughout the country the tendency exists of giving elementary principals much to inadequate clerical help or none at all.

The problems of the supervising principal are many and varied in nature. His job, though often considered, to be primarily one of administration should include more supervision than anything else. In the final analysis the positions of supervisor

1/Clarence R. Stone, ibid. p. 29.

and administrator are so closely allied that it is impossible to separate them. Otto in his text on "Elementary School Organization and Administration", makes this statement.

"In the operation of schools today it is difficult if not impossible to draw a fine distinction between administrative, supervisory and leadership functions. Although there are some activities which fall clearly in one or another of these categories, there is an endless number of activities which overlap two or more rubrics. The history of supervision shows how in the early period supervisory responsibilities were gradually attached to the administrative, clerical, and other duties associated with the office of superintendent of schools. Thus from an early period there was no clear-cut distinction between the administrative duties and what might be more logically called supervisory activities." 1/

Jacobsen and Reavis write,

"It is not always easy to distinguish between the administrative and the supervisory activities of principals. If one accepts the definition that any act or duty which has for its purpose the improvement of instruction is supervision; then no duty should be performed which does not directly or indirectly have a supervisory purpose." 2/

However, the function of supervision is usually considered to be, the improvement of instruction, and where one does or tries to draw a line between administration and supervision it becomes largely a matter of individual choice. Stone says, "While supervision in a large part should be concerned with improvement of instruction

1/Henry J. Otto, Elementary School Organization and Administration, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1944. p. 296.

2/Paul B. Jacobsen and W.C. Reavis, Duties of School Principals, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1942. p. 508.

it is also considered and recognized as the most important function of the principal of the elementary school." ^{1/} He lists the following objectives of supervision for the elementary principal.

- "1. Correlation, coordination and integration of the work of teachers and supervisors.
2. Adaptation of the course of study to local needs and provision for needed supplements.
3. Improvement of the materials and instruments of instruction.
4. Improvement of classroom organization and pupil placement.
5. Location and strengthening of weak spots in the total instructional program.
6. Development of a good school spirit.
7. Improvement of instruction through teacher growth." ^{2/}

Our problem however, is one of time involved in the accomplishment of various activities, devoted to and involved in, supervision. For, the writer is attempting to show that New Hampshire Elementary School Principals who devote 50 per cent or less of their time to teaching have so many other things besides supervision to do that there is not time enough for this all-important task.

Stone, who has done some research on how elementary principals spend their time, says,

"Many studies have been made for the purpose of ascertaining how elementary principals spend their time. On the average they spend about one third of a seven hour day in supervisory activities. Studies however, reveal a wide variation among elementary school principals. Some

^{1/}Clarence R. Stone, op. cit. p. 2.

^{2/}ibid. p. 3.

principals spend considerably less than one third, or even one fourth of their time in supervision, while others spend more than one half their time in activities designed to improve instruction." 1/

Many studies have been made in regards to the time elementary principals actually spend on various activities. In 1942 Jacobsen and Reavis wrote,

"Eleven studies of the actual time distribution that elementary school principals have devoted to various duties show that the percentage devoted to supervision varied from 15 per cent to 36 per cent of the total school day and beyond that the percentage devoted to administration varied from 16 per cent to 65 per cent. In general the time devoted to administration is about one and one half times as great as that devoted to supervision." 2/

Hampton's study, a doctors dissertation from the University of North Carolina is probably one of the best on distribution of the elementary principal's time. His findings indicate, "that less time is spent on supervision than is usually supposed." 3/

| Type of Activity | Per Cent |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Administrative Duties | 65.4 |
| Supervision of Instruction | 20.1 |
| Clerical Activities | 8.0 |

1/ibid. p. 27.

2/Paul B. Jacobsen, W.C.Reavis, op. cit. p. 515.

3/William O. Hampton, How Public School Principals Use Their Time. Doctors Dissertation, University of North Carolina Press, 1926. p. 58.

| Type of Activity (cont.) | Per Cent |
|--------------------------|----------|
| Classroom Teaching | 3.9 |
| Community Leadership | 2.3 |
| Professional Study | .3 |

Hampton's study, while by no means conclusive, is very interesting because it indicates that less time in general is spent on supervision than most educators think. Dr. Trabue who supervised the study says of it, "The study (Hampton's) was a well conducted piece of work where the method of procedure should give extremely accurate results. I seriously question the reliability of other studies which have shown a much larger percentage of time devoted to supervision."^{1/} A more complete breakdown of the study will appear later in this writing but for the present the information given will suffice.

A continuous analysis of supervisory needs should be in progress for they change as does the school and it's teachers. However, there are certain phases and areas which a supervisor needs to check constantly. Stone lists the following areas that always need the attention of the supervisor.

- "1. Classroom visitation for the purpose of helping the teacher.
2. Individual conferences, with constructive criticism.
3. Group conferences.

^{1/}National Education Association, Department of Elementary Principals, Seventh Yearbook, The Principal and the Elementary School. Published by National Education Association, Washington, D.C. 1928. p. 204.

4. Faculty meetings.
5. Demonstration lessons.
6. Teaching by the principal.
7. Stimulation and direction of professional reading.
8. Standardized testing." 1/

The above listed areas are ones that follow the normal pattern of supervision and do not include those activities which are primarily administrative in nature.

The supervisor is at his best when he has definite plans and a time budget for his weekly supervisory schedule. A committee in Oakland, California spent much time and effort on the problem of recommended practices of budgeting of the elementary principals time. They came up with the following conclusions -

"Total Minimum of Daily Time to be Spent on Supervision.

| | |
|--|------------------|
| By principals who teach half-time | 72 minutes |
| By principals with no clerk, no teaching | 90 minutes |
| By principals with part time clerks | 108 minutes |
| By principals with full time clerks | 105 minutes " 2/ |

The study also included recommendations as to how, ideally the principal should spend his time, though it did not say how the conclusions were arrived at.

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| "1. Supervision | 51.24 Per cent |
| 2. Administration | 25.04 Per cent |
| 3. Clerical | 5.89 Per cent |
| 4. Teaching | 5.73 Per cent |
| 5. Other | 12.10 Per cent" 3/ |

1/Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 65.

2/ibid. p. 32.

3/ibid.

Although the above distribution of time may be an excellent guide there seems to be no conclusive evidence that it is ideal.

The Seventh Yearbook makes the following statement with regard to time allotments and recommendations as to how the elementary principal should spend his time.

"The best time allotment for a given community or a particular school cannot be determined by nation-wide studies. The committee who has conducted the study believes the standards set by supervisory principals, who conducted them, to be an excellent objective for supervising principals and nothing more." 1/

Limitations of the Study

This problem is limited only to New Hampshire Elementary School Principals who devote 50 per cent or less of their time to teaching. As is natural, it includes schools in the larger cities and towns so will not show supervisory practices in many smaller schools where the principal teaches more than the 50 per cent that has been set as a standard for this study. It is believed by the writer that results will contain a very fair sampling of the supervisory practices used by the Elementary Principals of New Hampshire who teach 50 per cent or less of the time. A more complete study could include schools in other states that are operating under similar conditions. However, for our purposes the area covered is quite adequate.

1/National Education Association, Department of Elementary Principals 7th Yearbook. op. cit. p. 209.

9

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

A Philosophy of Supervision

Supervision and administration are so closely allied it is impossible to separate them. Barr, Burton and Brueckner in their book on supervision have this to say about it, "The separation of supervision and administration is purely an academic question. The two can be separated only arbitrarily for the sake of analysis. A separation in function is impossible."^{1/}

The fact that there is no agreement on separation of administration and supervision indicates there is little use in trying to distinguish them as varied positions but rather as different phases of the same job.

The philosophy of supervision during the last two decades has gone through a number of significant changes. At first the position of supervisor was largely inspectatorial in nature with only an indirect implication for suggested improvements. Training and guidance of teacher personnel is a new phase that has become very important. The authoritarian type of supervisor is being replaced by

^{1/}A.S.Barr, William H. Burton, Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1947. p. 27.

a democratic type of individual who knows how to get the most out of teachers by working with them cooperatively.

Ideas of final central authority from such educational leaders as Cubberley, Strayer, Engelhardt, to mention a few, gave much impetus to this type of supervision but top flight educators today do not wholly agree with their ideas. Factors, basic to our democratic philosophy, that are found in our culture have brought about these changes. Supervision of schools like everything else has been affected by changes in our thinking. The time is past when a supervisor of any calibre pretends to know more about everything than his teachers and the result has been closer cooperation between staff members. This in turn produces a situation where supervisory needs come from actual educative needs and not from needs imposed on education.

Barr, Burton and Brueckner say that the new conception of supervision means, "...that attention is centered more upon the aim, structure and fundamental processes of education and less upon the minute, specific, day-to-day devices for the improvement of trivial aspects of education."^{1/}

Functions of Supervision and Administration

Wiles in his recent book on supervision states, "...the basic function of supervision is to improve the learning situation for children and is a service activity that exists to help

^{1/}ibid. p. 13.

teachers do their job better." ^{1/}

Truly modern supervision grew up largely during the first quarter of the present century. Prior to this era the functions of supervision were very few and were largely general oversight of teaching procedures and classroom management. Early definitions of supervision were meaningless to the point of being humorous. Barr, Burton and Brueckner took the following definition from the context of an old book. "The business of the supervisor is to cast a general influence over his schools but otherwise he is not to interfere with the work." ^{2/}

The first really modern statement and concept of supervision was presented by Burton in 1922. He broke supervision down into the following major areas.

- "1. Improvement of the teaching act.
2. In-service training for teachers.
3. Selection and organization of subject matter.
4. Testing and measuring.
5. Rating of teachers." ^{3/}

These concepts though good in their day have been found to be too narrow and do not distinguish between major and minor functions of supervision.

Dunn in 1923 forecast developments in supervision

^{1/}Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951. p. 3.

^{2/}A.S. Barr, William H. Burton, Leo J. Brueckner, op. cit. p. 8.

^{3/}William H. Burton, Supervision and the Improvement of Teaching, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1922. p. 8.

which were far ahead of the times.

"Instructional supervision therefore, has the large purpose of improving the instruction, primarily by promoting professional growth of teachers and secondarily and temporarily by correcting deficiencies of preliminary preparation for teaching by the training of teachers in service." 1/

The emphasis on the professional growth of teachers was a distinct improvement over the older, almost meaningless term of in-service training. Improvement of teachers therefore becomes not so much a supervisory function as it does a teacher function in which supervisors cooperate.

Wiles, who has done considerable work in the field of supervision makes the following statement.

"The new form of supervision, a within the group approach, resulted from research in the field of social psychology. This research has made it clear that people work together better and accomplish more when the members participate in the establishment of goals and formulation of the ways of work."

"Improvement of the whole learning situation for children cannot be provided by centering supervisory attention on teaching techniques alone. To improve instruction, pupils, teachers and supervisors must develop a unified school program which enriches the environment for all. Effective supervision goes far beyond teaching techniques. It encompasses the following functions which a supervisor must perform well to produce desired end results."

1/Fannie W. Dunn, "What is Instructional Supervision", Proceedings of National Education Association, Vol. 61, 1923. p. 763.

- "1. Skill in leadership.
2. Skill in Human relations.
3. Skill in group processes.
4. Skill in personnel administration.
5. Skill in personnel evaluation" 1/

School administration is so closely allied to supervision that to distinguish them will not be attempted. Various meanings to fit the two areas can oftentimes be interchanged with perfect harmony. In an article in Clearing House for November 1948, C.F. McCormick states,

"School administration must become the process of working with people, to set goals, to build organizational relationships, to distribute responsibility, to develop programs and evaluate results. The purpose of school administration must become the purpose of education itself. The new type administrator does not work over but with other teachers for the good of the whole enterprise." 2/

There can be little or no cooperation without organization and a flow of communication which must be two directional. Though this type of administration makes great demands on the principal it is well worth the effort in the results obtained.

Cole in the American School Board Journal for June 1949 writes,

"Good school administration is dependent upon the ability of a group of individuals to get along together. It is built on human understanding, respect, and faith in one another. It begins with the board of education and the superintendent of schools. While it is predicted

1/Kimball Wiles, op. cit. p. 10.

2/C.F. McCormick, "Clues to Better Administration", Clearing House, Vol. 23 #3, November, 1948. p. 131.

on a basic philosophy of education the final test of a good supervisory program is how it affects boys and girls. No matter how correct it may be it is useless unless it contributes to the welfare of the pupils." 1/

1. Classroom Visitation

The classroom visit as a means of supervision is widely used though often the value derived from such visits is nil. They may be announced, unannounced, or on call. The on-call visits should be made at the invitation of the teacher. Haman in the American School Board Journal of June 1949 writes, "There are distinct limitations to the on-call type of supervisory visit. Teachers who need it most call for it least and teachers who ask for visitation may make elaborate preparations which do not give a true picture at all." ^{2/}

The frequent short visit is valuable and much can be gained from it, although there are times when a prolonged visit is advantageous and desirable. The most successful programs of visitation are in operation where the principal varies the length of his visits and has time budgeted for them.

There should be purpose to a classroom visit. According to Stone,

"The principals purpose in observing the

1/Robert M. Cole, "A Basic Philosophy of Education," American School Board Journal, Vol. 118 #6, June, 1949. p. 27.

2/Allen G. Haman, "Classroom Visitation As A Form Of Supervision," American School Board Journal, Vol. 118 #6, June, 1949. p. 39.

classroom activities should be to determine the strong points that he may encourage the teacher, through definite, truthful commendation, and to locate the problems, difficulties, failures and lacks in order to be able to give definite help when needed." ^{1/}

The conduct of the supervisor while on classroom visits has been widely discussed and there is general agreement on most issues. It should be no unusual affair and should occasion no disturbance. Recitations should not be broken into unless the teacher requests it and the atmosphere should be one of friendliness and cordiality. "The children should see the principal as a welcome friend whose presence does not materially affect what goes on or what happens." ^{2/}

Note taking by supervisors is not widely used though some supervisors still take this method to give detail to their visits. Haman in the American School Board Journal writes, "Studies show there is a wide variation in keeping of records about visiting trips. The majority of supervisors today write a few very brief notes after a visit but none within the classroom." ^{3/}

In general classroom visitation is regarded more highly by principals than by teachers. Melby found, "Studies show that teachers are not satisfied with the classroom visitation by supervisors. There are too many unannounced visits and there are not

^{1/}Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 66.

^{2/}ibid. p. 67.

^{3/}Allen E. Haman, op. cit. p. 40.

enough conferences before or after the visits." ^{1/} Teachers feel that visitation as a supervisory tool is much used though it is generally of little value. Melby further found,

"....from the principals point of view visitation was very time consuming if properly done. The study shows that principals are divided in opinion as to how much time should be spent on any particular visit. Twenty-five per cent said their visits averaged one period; twenty-five per cent said their visits averaged one half a period and the remaining 50 per cent stated that their visits were very short." ^{2/}

It is very difficult to draw definite conclusions about classroom visitation. Studies show it is used much, with varying degrees of success. Teachers rate it far less effective than do principals as a supervisory tool but considering how it is usually done, the over-all effectiveness probably is not great.

2. Conferences and Faculty Meetings

In the busy life of a school principal it becomes necessary to meet with many people and to hold meetings of his staff. These meetings vary in nature and the results will largely depend upon the principal himself. If he has a pleasing personality and good rapport with his staff he can bring his faculty together where they will work cooperatively. This will lessen his work to a large

^{1/}E.O.Melby, A Critical Study of the Existing Organization and Administration of Supervision, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1929. p. 99.

^{2/}ibid. p. 192.

degree.

The general faculty meetings is an area where considerable conflict between views of principals and teachers exists. Wiles, in his modern book on supervision has this to say about faculty meetings.

"Literature of supervision praises faculty meetings as a way of improving the quality of the staff and the school program. Teachers however, do not think they are valuable. When teachers are asked about faculty meetings, the story is altogether different. They rate faculty meetings very low as places for securing ideas about better teaching. Teachers have come to expect nothing from faculty meetings and wait impatiently for meetings to end." ^{1/}

Melby, found that, "...principals rate general faculty meetings high as a technique for supervision but that teachers did not share this enthusiasm." ^{2/}

In general it may be said that faculty meetings are not too acceptable as a supervisory aid, though this is to a large extent due to the supervisor himself. They can be very valuable. If faculty meetings were confined to matters pertaining to improvement of instruction they would be more popular. Too often they are consumed with small talk and irrelevant details that quickly make teachers lose interest. Short special meetings or bulletins should be used to disseminate general information.

^{1/}Kimball Wiles, Supervision For Better Schools, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951. p. 150.

^{2/}E.O.Melby, op. cit. p. 112.

Stone writes in regard to faculty meetings,

"There are two main functions of the professional meetings of the faculty of the school. Occasionally a teacher's meeting should deal with a supervisory project that concerns all the teachers of the building. The other function is that of broadening the views of the teachers with reference to the meanings and aims of education, thus securing their attention and reaction to new developments in education. Objectives related to the second function will probably be most effectively realized by presenting new points of view, new conceptions of the theory of education, and illustrations of application in actual procedures. Too often teachers are attempting to put into operation new procedures without understanding the underlying educational conceptions." 1/

Educators do not entirely agree as to when faculty meetings should be held to make them most successful. They are held before school, during the lunch hour, after school or in the evening on school days, and are sometimes held on Saturday mornings. Studies show that the most popular day of the week or the day they are held most frequently to be Tuesday in the afternoon, but local areas vary from this practice. In some states such as California and Oregon where teachers are hired on more a full time basis, than teachers in the east, it is quite common to require teachers to spend at least part of Saturday mornings in staff meetings. There is general agreement however, that an air of informality should prevail at meetings and wherever possible some type of refreshments be served.

The group conferences should be differentiated from the

1/Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 70.

faculty meeting only by the personnel that attend them. Stone remarks thus about group conferences,

"In the special group conferences, teachers who have common knowledges, work and skills, meet together under the leadership of the principal to discuss their problems and arrive at conclusions agreeable to all. They may also include meetings of teachers from the same grade or groups of grades."

"A part of the conference should include constructive criticism but the principal should have something good as well as poor to say. They should be initiated by both parties and of short duration where this is possible." 1/

3. Stimulation and Direction of Professional Growth

The stimulation of professional growth of the staff is largely the job of the administrative head and where it falls down the principal is usually at fault. Second rate teachers also can contribute to a lack of professional pride and growth in-service.

Barr, Burton and Brueckner, write on teacher growth and education.

"The term, training of teachers inservice is no longer in good repute. A cooperative effort produces teacher growth in a situation where administrators, supervisors and teachers all learn. The modern concept of supervision holds that all teachers should have opportunities for growth, cooperative analysis of their problems and an opportunity to see various techniques that will help solve the problems that confront them. Teachers are anxious to improve their effectiveness, more often apathy is due to lack of organization and leadership from the administrative staff. Imposed training in service is

1/Clarence R. Stone, op. cit. p. 67.

being replaced by a willing self-directed growth on the part of teachers." 1/

Burton refers to the problem in this way,

"Unfortunately many powerful influences work against improvement among teachers, not the least of which is poor planning and poor preliminary training. Another important obstacle to progress is the natural inertia of those individuals who dislike to be disturbed by new ideas and new methods with their attendant effort. The administration is very often to blame for this situation and sometimes seems to reward those most who disturb progress the least." 2/

The good inservice training program utilizes all available resources in bringing to the staff new ideas and methods. Other supervisors and educational experts may be used to implement this program. Extension Courses can be secured and recommended for teachers and the supervisor should set himself up as a consultant on courses which will achieve desired results. Good supervision includes sound concepts of teacher growth.

4. Standardized Testing

Tests of many forms are being used more than ever in the supervisory program of the elementary schools. Important men in education have come to realize the great importance of standardized testing as a technique for better supervision of the school. Standardized tests have improved a great deal in recent years and now are

1/A.S.Barr, William H. Burton, Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1947. p. 566.

2/William H. Burton, The Guidance of Learning Activities, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1944. p. 187.

a component part of many educational systems. Stone writes,

"Another means of supervision is the standardized test. They may be used to good advantage for survey purposes and as a means of achievement in which the school is least effective. However, whenever tests are used by a principal or teacher for special classification the chances of error in a particular individual's score should be kept in mind and adjustments made as an accumulation of other evidence justifies them." 1/

Jacobsen and Reavis state -

"Testing has not been used in supervision as widely as it deserves. Though it appears that comparatively few supervisors are using tests as a means of evaluation, nevertheless a large majority of those employing them, estimate the results as very successful." 2/

Tests may be used for many purposes but all point toward improvement of instruction. They may be used to:

- "1. Find the status of a school system.
2. Set standards for pupil achievement.
3. Measurement of pupil progress.
4. Stimulation of improvement of instruction.
5. Motivation of the pupils.
6. Pupil guidance. 3/

The above list mentions some of the ways testing may be used in the supervision of instruction. Indications are, that this is a valuable technique and will be used more in the future.

1/Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 80.

2/Paul B. Jacobsen and W.C.Reavis, Duties of School Principals, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1942. p. 298.

3/ibid. p. 202.

5. Miscellaneous Supervisory Activities

There are so many things that come under the head of supervision and administration it would be useless to try to elaborate on them here. A principal's job is one of forever wrestling with problems of buses, hot lunch programs, audio-visual aids, et cetera, that seem to prevent him from ever getting his work done. These problems, though largely local in scope, are very time consuming and require much effort. What one principal does in any particular instance may not work well at all in another, and all are greatly dependent upon local conditions which should be seriously considered when surveying an overall supervisory situation.

There is one phase of the situation that remains constant however, this being the everyday office work that all principals must do or cause to be done. The organization of studies for effective school management is imperative and planning should be complete and thorough. Most schools have some type of an office though many have little or no clerical help to run them. Jacobsen and Reavis write on school offices,

"An examination of the available published plans of modern school buildings drawn for school systems throughout the country shows that the conception of office layouts are in advance of those in use in the majority of city schools." 1/

Otto in his work on school offices finds,

1/ibid. p. 183.

"The principal's office in an elementary school should be viewed as a service unit. The space which comprises the office quarters as well as the equipment and the office personnel are there for but one reason, to render services to the on-going program of the school. The chief functions served by a school office are:

1. As a focal point of relations with the school system.
2. As the hub of teacher and pupil personnel services.
3. As a conference room.
4. As the focus of contacts with parents and other visitors.
5. To provide a workroom for teachers.
6. To provide a workroom for the principal.
7. As a center for the professional activities of the faculty.
8. As a center for the management and supervision of textbooks and supplies.
9. As a center for the preparation and housing of records.
10. As a clearing house for the many details encountered in the operation of a school." 1/

These are some of the functions of the elementary school office, and although most principals perform or cause to be done all of the things on the list, many could be put under one heading. The fact of the matter is that most principals have inadequate office space and little or no clerical help to relieve them of this type of activity. Otto writes further -

"Whenever a principal is required or elects to do ordinary office work, he is wasting time and energy which rightfully belong to supervision and administration. A clerk should be employed to carry on office work efficiently at a salary commensurate with the nature of the duties performed." 2/

1/ Henry J. Otto, Administration of the Elementary School, Appleton-Century - Crofts, Inc., New York, 1944. p. 493.

2/ ibid. p. 440.

Little can be accomplished in the way of improvement where this is not or cannot be done. One of the most legitimate gripes of elementary school principals is lack of clerical assistance.

Much has been said about the evaluation of the supervisory program but from the Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence comes a rather short, complete summing up:

- "There are four main methods of evaluating the success of a supervisory program: They are:
1. Measured changes in the achievement of pupils.
 2. Measured changes in teaching procedures.
 3. Observed changes in the teaching or learning situation and in the community.
 4. A change in the judgment of individuals." 1/

The Teaching Principal

It is a poor economy to expect principals to teach a large part of the time but they should all do some teaching. Stone writes in regards to the teaching principal.

"A principal may be able to do effective supervisory work without being able to teach, but, other things being equal, the principal who is a skillful teacher has a distinct advantage. It is well for a principal to do some teaching occasionally and to check up his own teaching in detail in order that he may better understand the situation in which the teacher is placed, and the difficulties involved in actually applying the principles of teaching in a particular situation." 2/

Many principals teach regular classes at least part of

1/National Education Association, Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence, The Superintendent Surveys Supervision, N.E.A. Washington, 1929. p. 99.

2/Clarence R. Stone, Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929. p. 75.

the time but where they do not, a good solution is to do demonstration teaching. This type of activity gives the principal a chance to show a particular teacher how good teaching techniques may be applied and also gives him a chance to bring to that teacher, points where she may be weak.

Melby's study showed, "...teachers as a group regard demonstration lessons as a valuable supervisory technique, 64 per cent of them stated they would like to see more demonstration teaching while 12 per cent stated they did not experience it at all."

The use of demonstration teaching as a supervisory aid is not as popular today as in years past. It is felt by some educational experts, that it is a mistake for principals to do demonstration teaching. The time necessary for proper preparation plus the fact that the supervisor is going into an artificial situation makes the results achieved somewhat doubtful. However, where demonstration teaching is done, much work and preparation should go into it. Stone, commenting upon demonstration teaching says,

"When demonstration lessons are taught they should be well prepared and thought through. Conferences should be held afterwards and discussion of the lesson in view of desired outcomes talked over. Techniques involved need to be explained and understood. It is very important that proper preparation of the teachers for effective observation, take place and that meaningful conferences be held." 2/

1/E.O.Melby, A Critical Study of the Existing Organization and Administration of Supervision, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1929. p. 29.

2/Clarence R. Stone, idem. p. 79.

So much is mentioned, in literature, about the principal and his various activities it is well to review some data on the time principals spend in a supervisory or administrative capacity. Some supervisory activities which are quite time consuming include, classroom visitation, administrative detail, including office work, inservice training of personnel and evaluation.

Kyte says this about the principal and the amount of time he uses on various activities.

"Investigations regarding the distribution of the principal's time disclose that his supervisory visits to classrooms absorb more time than any other single activity in which he engages. Since supervision of teaching is his major function, he should spend considerable time in classrooms. The supervisory visit enables him to obtain first hand information essential to his efficient performance of all other activities." 1/

Furthermore, according to Kyte, "....supervisors are spending more time on a single supervisory visit." He continues,

"A comparison of the authors findings with those of earlier studies disclosed that principals are increasing the length of their supervisory visits to the classroom. Less than 20 per cent of the non-teaching principals averaged under 20 minutes a visit in a classroom and 40 per cent averaged at least 30 minutes per visit. The teaching principal spent almost 25 minutes per classroom visit." 2/

Numerous studies have been made in reference to allocation of the elementary principal's time and at least five studies have been

1/George C. Kyte, The Principal at Work, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1941. p. 241.

2/ibid. p. 243.

made in reference to the ideal. The Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association states,

"The ideal distribution of allocation of the elementary principals time, as averaged from five major studies indicates the following as ideal distribution of the principals time; 41 per cent to supervision; 24 per cent to administration; 7 per cent to clerical duties; 6 per cent to teaching; 22 per cent to all other activities." ^{1/}

Melby, in his study of supervision in 171 cities of over 10,000 population found, "...that principals spend about one half their time in supervisory activities." ^{2/} However, it should be noted that nearly every principal did not teach.

Hampton's ^{3/} study mentioned elsewhere, makes a complete breakdown of time spent by the principal on various activities. His study is perhaps one of the most complete studies that has ever been made.

"Hampton's Study of Time Allocation for the Elementary School Principal."

| | |
|--|--------|
| "Direct Supervision of Teaching | 15.18% |
| Stimulating Professional Growth and Improving Conditions for Teaching | 4.90% |
| Total for Supervision of Instruction | 20.08% |

^{1/}National Education Association, Eighth Yearbook, Department of Superintendence, op. cit. p. 25.

^{2/}E.O.Melby, Organization and Administration of Supervision, Northwestern University, Contributions to Education, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1929. p. 25.

^{3/}William O. Hampton, loc. cit. p. 57.

Administrative Activities

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| Total Relating to Supervision | 7.57% |
| Care of Plant | 5.24% |
| Health and Student Welfare | 1.15% |
| Programs and Exercises | 4.60% |
| Conferences | 12.11% |
| Discipline | 6.25% |
| Business Affairs | 4.69% |
| Extra Curricular Activities | 7.54% |
| Working on Time Saving Devices | 2.43% |
| Miscellaneous | 13.88% |

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| Total Administrative | 65.36% |
|----------------------|--------|

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| Social Activities | 2.26% |
| Teaching Duties | 3.94% |
| Clerical Duties | 8.36% |

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| Total All Activities | 100.00%" |
|----------------------|----------|

The per cent of time consumed in the administrative area appears to be unusually high but according to Melby there is reason to doubt the reliability of other studies which were not nearly as carefully done and show much less time spent on administration.

In 1928 the Department of National Elementary Principals in their Seventh Yearbook made a study of habits and time spent by elementary principals. ^{I/} The study shows that in schools up to 500 pupils, supervisors made 10.10 classroom visits per week and from 500 pupils up they made visits averaging 12.68 times per week and that the visits averaged from 26 minutes to 30 minutes in length. The median length of all classroom visiting was 21 minutes for each visit.

^{1/}National Education Association, 7th Yearbook Department of Elementary Principals, The Principal and the Elementary School, Published by National Education Association. Department of Elementary Principals, Washington, D.C., 1928. p. 156.

Over 26 per cent of all visits were under 15 minutes in duration. Of the 614 principals polled, 58 per cent took no notes. The remainder took notes of some form or other but 41.4 per cent of those who took notes never made any results of note taking available to teachers. This indicates that the visits were largely inspectatorial in nature rather than supervisory and perhaps accounts for their brevity.

The Seventh Yearbook continues,

"Ideals as to time consumption are very good in theory but in actual practice do not work out so well. There are many local situations where such ideals could not be attained and it is under such conditions that the community should urge the use of these data as a starting point for further investigation." 1/

1/ibid. p. 209.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURE

When it had been established that the problem was to be a survey of New Hampshire Elementary School Principals, to determine the amount of time spent on various supervisory and administrative activities, plans were immediately made to construct an instrument for this purpose. References were studied to find the areas where elementary principals spent the most of their time and how much time was actually expended in accomplishing these things. From this information a rough draft of the questionnaire was made.

The first draft of the instrument proved to be too long and too detailed. Thanks to the help of the writers advisor and the seminar class, the questionnaire was refined and again presented for approval. The second draft proved to be more adequate but still was not quite the product desired and another conference with the advisor was necessary. As a result of this conference the questionnaire in it's final form took shape.

During the time that the survey instrument was being constructed double postal cards, one of them self-addressed to this writer, were mailed to each elementary principal in the state of New Hampshire who taught 50 per cent or less of the time. This card, ^{1/}

^{1/}See Appendix A

described to the principals what was being attempted and asked their cooperation in completing a questionnaire if one were mailed to them. The card gave each principal a chance to indicate whether or not he would fill out an inquiry form if one was to be sent to him and to further indicate whether a summary of the findings was desired.

There are 46 principals in New Hampshire who fall within the limits of the category decided upon and as the writer is one of them, 45 of the cards previously mentioned were posted. Within a two week period 39 of the principals had replied. Seven of the cards were never returned and it is assumed these principals had no interest in the study. Of those that returned cards 34 expressed their willingness to cooperate while 4 principals decided they could not participate.

Reasons given were:

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. Too busy to be bothered | 2 |
| 2. Position entailed college teaching giving invalid results | 1 |
| 3. No reason given | <u>1</u> |
| Total | 4 |

When the majority of the cards had been returned, questionnaires, ^{1/} with a self addressed stamped envelope, were mailed to each principal who had said he would cooperate. Within a month all 34 of the questionnaires had been completed and returned to the sender, so that these plus the one done by the writer made a total return of 35 questionnaires from the 46 principals in New Hampshire who are in the previously mentioned category.

^{1/}See Appendix B

This represents 76.09 per cent of the Elementary School Principals in New Hampshire who teach 50 per cent of the time or less.

32

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

General Findings

The findings in this study cover a broad area in New Hampshire, as there is a statewide distribution of returns. The completed questionnaires from 35 of the 46 New Hampshire Elementary Principals, who devote 50 per cent or less of their time to teaching, represented 76.08 per cent of the schools in the state in the above category and results are of a good cross section.

Twenty communities representing 35 schools reported and school populations as in Table I were listed.

TABLE I POPULATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS COVERED BY THIS STUDY

| Community | No. of Schools | Population |
|-----------|----------------|------------|
| A M | 1 | 600 |
| B | 1 | 600 |
| A | 1 | 460 |
| C | 1 | 450 |
| D | 1 | 425 |
| E | 1 | 425 |
| F | 1 | 410 |
| G | 1 | 400 |
| A | 1 | 400 |
| H | 1 | 400 |
| I | 1 | 390 |
| A | 1 | 386 |
| J P | 1 | 380 |
| K C | 1 | 375 |
| L | 1 | 348 |
| M | 1 | 340 |
| N | 1 | 326 |
| O | 1 | 325 |
| A | 1 | 300 |
| P | 1 | 290 |
| K | 1 | 290 |
| A | 1 | 253 |
| K | 2 | 250 |
| J | 1 | 250 |
| J | 1 | 240 |
| A | 1 | 230 |
| K | 1 | 230 |
| Q | 1 | 230 |
| R | 1 | 220 |
| J | 1 | 205 |
| J | 1 | 200 |
| S | 1 | 200 |
| T | 1 | 180 |
| J | 1 | 105 |
| Totals 20 | 35 | 11,363 |

Table I shows that there are 20 communities in which the survey was taken with 35 schools represented. School populations

ranged from 105 to 600 pupils and the average school population was 324.66 students. The total enrollment figures in all schools covered with 11,363 pupils.

TABLE II POPULATION OF THE TWENTY TOWNS AND CITIES IN WHICH THE SCHOOLS OF THE STUDY WERE LOCATED

| Population | No. of Towns Participating | No. of Principals Participating |
|------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 80,000 | 1 | 7 |
| 34,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 30,000 | 1 | 5 |
| 18,000 | 1 | 6 |
| 15,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 8,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 5,000 | 2 | 2 |
| 4,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 3,500 | 2 | 2 |
| 3,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 2,500 | 5 | 5 |
| 2,000 | 1 | 1 |
| 1,500 | 2 | 2 |
| Totals | 20 | 35 |

The population of the communities that were covered by the study varied widely. It included all of the larger cities in New Hampshire plus many smaller towns. Table II shows that the populations ranged from 1500 to 80,000 people and also indicates the number of principals represented in each community.

TABLE III. NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS HAVE HELD A PRINCIPALSHIP
IN SCHOOLS COVERED BY THE STUDY

| No. of Years as a Principal | | | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|--------------------------------|----|----|-------------------|----------|
| 1 | to | 5 | 12 | 34.29 |
| 6 | to | 10 | 11 | 31.43 |
| 11 | to | 15 | 4 | 11.43 |
| 16 | to | 20 | 4 | 11.43 |
| 21 | to | 25 | 2 | 5.72 |
| 26 | to | 30 | 1 | 2.85 |
| 31 | to | 35 | 1 | 2.85 |
| Totals | | | 35 | 100.00 |

The majority of the principals who were in the category that the study covered had less than 10 years experience as a principal.

Table III shows clearly that 65.72 per cent of the principals have been principals for 10 years or less and only 34.28 per cent have been principals for longer than 10 years.

Classroom Visitation

Classroom visitation was used as a supervisory technique by most of the principals who were surveyed.

TABLE IV SUPERVISORY PRACTICES OF PRINCIPALS

| Type of Supervision | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Classroom Visitation | 11 | 31.43 |
| Conferences | 5 | 14.29 |
| Inservice Training | 1 | 2.85 |
| A Combination of Above | 18 | 51.43 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

Table IV indicates that a large part of the supervision done by New Hampshire Elementary School Principals who teach 50 per cent of the time or less, is either done through classroom activities or a combination of the items included in the table. In fact 82.85 per cent of the supervision is done in these ways.

As far as announcement of visitation by the supervisor was concerned, 27 of 35 questioned stated that their visits were usually unannounced; 2 stated that their visits were announced and 6 stated that they used both methods. From these figures 77.14 per cent of the principals use the less valuable method of the unannounced classroom visit.

TABLE V FREQUENCY OF CLASSROOM VISITATION

| Frequency | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Daily | 8 | 22.86 |
| Three times per week | 4 | 11.43 |
| Twice a week | 3 | 8.57 |
| Once a week | 8 | 22.86 |
| Twice a month | 4 | 11.43 |
| Monthly | 1 | 2.86 |
| Three times a year | 2 | 5.71 |
| According to need | 3 | 8.57 |
| Not answered | 2 | 5.71 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

Table V shows the frequency of visiting varied from a daily visit to only 3 visits per year. Results show further that 22.86 per cent of the principals visit each classroom daily and that 65.72 per cent of them visit each classroom at least once each week.

The questionnaire showed that the length of the visit depended to a large extent upon the teacher being visited and that the frequency of visitation also depended upon the teacher. Twenty-six of the 35 principals questioned or a total of 74.29 per cent stated that the length of their visit depended upon the particular teacher concerned, also 77.14 per cent stated that the frequency of visitation was regulated to a large extent to whom was being visited. It was interesting to note that 28 of 35 principals questioned followed up visits with conferences. This represents 80.00 per cent who use this supervisory technique.

TABLE VI DISTRIBUTION OF TIME SPENT ON A SUPERVISORY VISIT

| Time in Minutes | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------|
| 10 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 15 | 10 | 28.58 |
| 20 | 9 | 25.72 |
| 25 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 30 | 6 | 17.15 |
| 40 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 45 | 1 | 2.85 |
| 60 | 2 | 5.71 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

The length of time spent on the supervisory visit was from 10 minutes to 60 minutes with an average of 24 minutes per visit. Table VI indicates that most visits are of relatively short duration with 60.01 per cent being 20 minutes or less in length.

The study revealed that teachers who were visited most frequently were apt to be inexperienced teachers.

TABLE VII DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR MORE FREQUENT SUPERVISORY VISITS BY THE PRINCIPAL

| Reason for Visit | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| New and inexperienced Teachers | 13 | 37.14 |
| Those who ask for help | 11 | 31.43 |
| Traditional Teachers | 2 | 5.71 |
| Question unanswered | 9 | 25.72 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

It can be seen from table VII that principals who were included in the study, visit most frequently the teachers who are inexperienced and who ask for help. Twenty-four of 35 principals or 68.57 per cent visit classrooms more frequently for these reasons.

TABLE VIII RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE STANDARDIZED TESTING PROGRAM

| Individual | No. | Per cent |
|--------------------------|-----|----------|
| Principal | 17 | 48.58 |
| Guidance Officer | 7 | 20.00 |
| Teachers | 5 | 14.29 |
| Entire Staff | 4 | 11.43 |
| Assistant Superintendent | 1 | 2.85 |
| No Program | 1 | 2.85 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

Table VIII is important because it shows rather clearly that most of the schools included in the survey use a standardized testing program. Only one school does not use this supervisory technique, thus 34 of the 35 schools or 97.14 per cent of the schools in the study use this device. Furthermore in 48.58 per cent of the schools, the principal is wholly responsible for the administration of the testing program, and in another 11.43 per cent of the schools he is partially responsible. Thus in 60.01 per cent of the cases the principal is wholly or partly responsible for the administration of the testing program of his school.

TABLE IX DAYS TEACHERS MEETINGS ARE HELD

| Day | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------|
| Monday | 6 | 17.14 |
| Tuesday | 5 | 14.28 |
| Wednesday | 8 | 22.86 |
| Thursday | 2 | 5.72 |
| Friday | 2 | 5.72 |
| Saturday | 0 | 00.00 |
| No Definite Day | 6 | 17.14 |
| Unanswered | 6 | 17.14 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

It can be seen from table IX that there is really no definite day of the week when the principals feel it is best to hold Teacher's Meetings. It is apparent that the first part of the week is considered by them to be the best time to hold meetings with Wednesday the most popular day. Furthermore, 54.28 per cent of the meetings fall on one of the first 3 days of the school week.

TABLE X LENGTH OF TEACHERS MEETINGS

| Minutes | No. of Meetings |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 90 | 7 |
| 75 | 5 |
| 60 | 11 |
| 50 | 1 |
| 45 | 3 |
| 30 | 2 |
| Not answered | 6 |
| Total | 35 |

Results of table X show that teacher's meetings vary in length from 30 minutes to 90 minutes, with a larger percentage of the meetings being one hour in length. The average length of the teachers meeting in schools participating in the study was 66 minutes.

TABLE XI NUMBER OF YEARS PRINCIPALS TAUGHT BEFORE OBTAINING FIRST PRINCIPALSHIP

| No. of Years | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|
| 0 | 4 | 11.42 |
| 1 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 2 | 4 | 11.42 |
| 3 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 4 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 5 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 6 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 8 | 5 | 14.28 |
| 10 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 12 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 14 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 15 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 18 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 20 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 21 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 22 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 23 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 25 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 26 | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

Table XI shows how long various principals taught before obtaining their first principalship. The average time a principal taught before obtaining her first principalship was 8.8 years. There are 25 principals out of the 35 questioned who taught 10 years or less before obtaining their first principalship, this is a total of 71.43 per cent while 11.42 per cent received principalships with no prior experience.

TABLE XII YEARS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OF PRINCIPALS

| No. of Years | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|--------------|-------------------|----------|
| 2 | 8 | 22.86 |
| 3 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 4 | 8 | 22.86 |
| 5 | 12 | 34.29 |
| 6 | 5 | 14.27 |
| 7 | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

TABLE XIII NUMBER AND TYPE OF MOST ADVANCED DEGREE HELD BY PRINCIPALS

| Degree | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| Non | 10 | 28.57 |
| B.A. | 2 | 5.71 |
| B.S. in Ed. | 8 | 22.86 |
| M.A. | 1 | 2.86 |
| M.Ed. | 13 | 37.14 |
| D.Ed. | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

Tables XII and XIII show the number of years of post-secondary education principals who took part in the survey have and the most advanced degrees they hold. The majority of principals, 57.15 per cent have either four or five years post-secondary education and 42.86 per cent hold the Master's Degree. One principal or 2.86 per cent holds the degree of Doctor of Education. Altogether from all principals questioned 71.43 per cent hold one or more degrees.

TABLE XIV INSTITUTIONS WHERE PRINCIPALS RECEIVED A LARGER PART OF THEIR TRAINING

| Institution | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|---|-------------------|----------|
| Plymouth Teachers College | 9 | 25.72 |
| Boston University | 4 | 11.43 |
| Keene Teachers College | 3 | 8.56 |
| Gorham Teachers College | 3 | 8.56 |
| Portsmouth Training School | 3 | 8.56 |
| University of New Hampshire | 2 | 5.71 |
| University of Massachusetts | 1 | 2.86 |
| State Teachers College of Pennsylvania | 1 | 2.86 |
| St. Anselms | 1 | 2.86 |
| New York University | 1 | 2.86 |
| University of Toronto | 1 | 2.86 |
| Mt. Saint Marys | 1 | 2.86 |
| Boston College | 1 | 2.86 |
| Bates College | 1 | 2.86 |
| Teachers College of Wisconsin | 1 | 2.86 |
| University of Maine | 1 | 2.86 |
| University of Rhode Island | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals 17 | 35 | 100.00 |

From table XIV it can be seen that Plymouth Teachers College was most attended by the New Hampshire Elementary Principals included in the study. The table shows that 25.72 per cent of them received a larger part of their education from this institution while 11.43 per cent attended Boston University, Keene Teachers College, Gorham Teachers College and Portsmouth Training School were attended by 8.56 per cent of the principals surveyed while 5.71 per cent attended the University of New Hampshire. Altogether there were 17 institutions represented in the study where the principals included in it received the major part of their post-secondary education.

The majority of the principals in the study do no actual teaching. There are 22 of the 35 or 62.86 per cent of those questioned who are non-teaching. The 13 remaining principals teach in varying amounts. Four principals or 11.43 per cent teach 50 per cent of the time, one principal or 2.86 per cent teaches 40 per cent of the time, seven principals or 20 per cent of them teach 20 per cent of the time and one principal or 2.86 per cent teaches 10 per cent of the time. It was further stated that no principal taught demonstration lessons often, 45.71 per cent or 16 principals taught demonstration lessons occasionally while 54.29 per cent or 19 of them never taught demonstration lessons. Principals seldom have to act as substitute teachers. Eight principals or 22.86 per cent never do any substituting, 25 principals or 71.43 per cent seldom have to perform this activity and only 2 principals or 5.71 per cent often act as substitute teachers.

TABLE XV GRADES TAUGHT BY THE PRINCIPALS OF THE STUDY

| Area Where Teaching Is Done | No. of Principals | Per cent of Time Teaching |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------|
| Grade 8 only | 1 | 50% |
| Grade 2 through 6 (Remedial) | 1 | 50% |
| Grade 7 and 8 | 1 | 50% |
| Grade 4, 6 and 7 | 1 | 50% |
| Grade 7 and 8 | 1 | 40% |
| Grade 7 and 8 (Manual Training) | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 3 and 4 | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 1 through 6 (Remedial Reading) | 1 | 20% |
| Keene Teachers College | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 3, 7 and 8 (Remedial) | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 7 and 8 | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 8 | 1 | 20% |
| Grade 1 through 6 (Remedial) | 1 | 10% |
| Total | 13 | |

Table XV gives a break down of grades and areas where the teaching principals who are included in the study do their teaching. Many of them do remedial work or teach in the upper grades. There are thirteen principals who are placed in a teaching category and six or 46.15 per cent of them teach in grades seven and eight while four of them or 30.77 per cent do remedial work of one type or another.

TABLE XVI LENGTH OF SCHOOL DAY IN SCHOOLS COVERED BY THE STUDY

| Length of Day | No. of Schools |
|----------------|----------------|
| 4 hrs. 30 min. | 2 |
| 6 hrs. | 3 |
| 6 hrs. 10 min. | 1 |
| 6 hrs. 15 min. | 9 |
| 6 hrs. 20 min. | 1 |
| 6 hrs. 25 min. | 3 |
| 6 hrs. 30 min. | 8 |
| 6 hrs. 40 min. | 1 |
| 6 hrs. 45 min. | 6 |
| 7 hrs. | 1 |
| Total | 35 |

Table XVI shows that the length of the school day in the various schools included in the study varied a good deal, the shortest being 4 hours and 30 minutes and the longest being 7 hours. The length of the school day on the average was 6 hours and 15 minutes which included a lunch hour.

TABLE XVII LENGTH OF THE LUNCH HOUR IN SCHOOLS REPRESENTED BY THE STUDY

| Length of Noon Recess | No. of Schools |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| 40 min. | 1 |
| 45 min. | 5 |
| 60 min. | 9 |
| 75 min. | 6 |
| 80 min. | 1 |
| 90 min. | 8 |
| 105 min. | 5 |
| Total | 35 |

From the above table the length of the noon recess varies from 40 minutes to 105 minutes. The average length of this period was found to be 74 minutes and 30 principals of the 35 who completed questionnaires, or 85.71 per cent stated that they were on duty during this period.

TABLE XVIII HOURS PER WEEK PRINCIPALS WORK BEYOND THE LENGTH OF THE SCHOOL DAY

| Hours per Week | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|----------------|-------------------|----------|
| 30 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 25 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 20 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 18 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 16 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 15 | 9 | 25.71 |
| 12 | 4 | 11.44 |
| 10 | 9 | 25.71 |
| 8 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 5 | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

The number of hours per week, principals included in the study, work beyond the regular school day is shown in table XVIII. The extremes ranging from 5 hours to 30 hours per week seem to be rather a large spread but the average of 14.5 hours per week is about the national average. However, the majority of the principals questioned spend less than 15 hours per week working beyond the length of the school day.

Most principals who participated in the study supervise in

only one building there being 23 principals or 64.71 per cent in this category. There are 10 principals in the study who supervise in two buildings or 28.57 per cent, one principal has 3 buildings and another four.

Nine of the schools surveyed are classified as accredited Junior High Schools, 17 schools have grades seven and eight as part of their elementary set up and nine schools have the sixth grade as their highest unit.

TABLE XIX ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION OF SCHOOLS SURVEYED

| Organization | No. of Schools | Per cent |
|----------------|----------------|----------|
| Kgn. through 6 | 11 | 31.43 |
| Kgn. through 8 | 8 | 22.86 |
| 1 through 6 | 6 | 17.14 |
| 1 through 8 | 6 | 17.14 |
| 1 through 12 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 4 through 12 | 1 | 2.86 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

It can be seen from table XIX that the school organization of most schools included in the survey follow the normal elementary administrative pattern of Kindergarten through grade six. There are 11 schools or 31.43 per cent that are so classified. It is worthy of note that in a state where no formal education before grade one is required there are 19 schools for a total of 54.28 per cent that have kindergartens. Also, there are 4 schools that combine the

elementary and the secondary school and include grade twelve.

TABLE XX FULL TIME AND PART TIME TEACHERS EMPLOYED IN THE SCHOOLS SURVEYED

| No. of Full Time and Part Time Teachers | No. of Schools Full Time Teachers | Per cent | No. of Schools Part Time Teachers | Per cent |
|---|---|----------|---|----------|
| 21 | 2 | 5.71 | | |
| 19 | 1 | 2.86 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 17 | 3 | 8.57 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 16 | 3 | 8.57 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 15 | 2 | 5.71 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 14 | 1 | 2.86 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 13 | 3 | 8.57 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 12 | 2 | 5.71 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 11 | 3 | 8.57 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 10 | 5 | 14.29 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 9 | 2 | 5.71 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 8 | 3 | 8.57 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 7 | 4 | 11.44 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 6 | 0 | 00.00 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 5 | 1 | 2.86 | 3 | 8.57 |
| 4 | 0 | 00.00 | 0 | 00.00 |
| 3 | 0 | 00.00 | 4 | 11.44 |
| 2 | 0 | 00.00 | 7 | 20.00 |
| 1 | 0 | 00.00 | 6 | 17.14 |
| 0 | 0 | 00.00 | 12 | 34.28 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 | 35 | 100.00 |

Table XX shows the number of full time and part time teachers employed in the participating schools. The number of full time teachers represented is 425 and the number of part time teachers is 66. This makes a total of 491 teachers or approximately 15 per cent of all teachers in New Hampshire. The greatest number of full time teachers any school has is 21 teachers and the smallest number of

full time teachers in any school is 5. Part time teachers were not as numerous as was anticipated, the greatest number being 7 and there being 12 schools who reported no part time teachers on the staff.

The supervision of buses, assemblies and the hot lunch program in most cases was the responsibility of the principal. Two schools included in the study did not use buses at all and in 33 other schools where buses are used 16 principals or 48.45 per cent are responsible for supervision of them and 17 principals or 51.55 per cent, are not responsible for bus supervision.

TABLE XXI PER CENT OF STUDENT BODY IN SCHOOLS SURVEYED WHO ARE TRANSPORTED BY BUS

| Per cent Transported | No. of Schools |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 90 | 1 |
| 80 | 1 |
| 60 | 2 |
| 55 | 1 |
| 50 | 4 |
| 40 | 2 |
| 33 1/3 | 1 |
| 30 | 2 |
| 25 | 3 |
| 20 | 3 |
| 15 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 7 |
| 0 | 2 |

Table XXI indicates there is wide spread use of buses by various schools surveyed, the range being all the way from zero to

90 per cent. Altogether including all schools studied 26 per cent of the students are regularly transported to school by bus.

Regular assemblies are held by only 14 of the 35 schools included in the study while 21 other schools hold assemblies periodically though not regularly. All schools studied hold assemblies at one time or another during the year and 77.14 per cent or 27 principals stated the assemblies were primarily their responsibility.

Furthermore 22 schools have an established hot lunch program while 13 schools do not. However in most cases principals stated that where regular hot lunches were not available many children brought lunches from home and required noon time supervision. Twenty-four of the principals questioned are on duty during the noon recess or a total of 62.86 per cent. In the other eleven cases where the principal is not on duty most of the children go home for lunch or teachers are required to be on duty during that period. One school pays a teacher or teachers extra to be on duty at noon time.

Most schools also have some type of audio-visual program that is usually in the form of a sound movie projector or a film strip projector and here again it is the principal who is largely responsible for its administration. Twenty-six schools of the 35 studied have a definite audio-visual program, eight other schools have a program of sorts and only one principal reported that his school had no program. In 34 of 35 cases or 97.14 per cent of the time the principal was wholly or partly responsible for the administration of the audio-visual program.

TABLE XXII AMOUNT OF TIME BEYOND THAT NOW AVAILABLE PRINCIPALS
WOULD LIKE TO DEVOTE TO SUPERVISION

| Hours Per Week | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|----------------|-------------------|----------|
| 20 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 18 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 15 | 2 | 5.71 |
| 12 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 10 | 15 | 42.86 |
| 5 | 1 | 2.86 |
| 3 | 2 | 5.71 |
| Not Answered | 11 | 31.43 |
| Totals | 35 | 100.00 |

When principals were asked how much more time per week they would like to have available for supervision 11 principals or 31.43 per cent did not answer the question. It is assumed that either they feel there is time enough available or they could not estimate how much time they actually needed. Results of this question are tabulated in table XXII. It can be seen that the majority of principals or 15 of them for a total of 42.86 per cent would like to have 10 hours additional time, beyond what is now available, per week for supervision. There is general unanimity of opinion that 10 additional hours could be used.

Many principals engage in activities that are very time consuming and take many hours out of a school week. There is a wide variation as to how the time is spent and upon what activities it is expended. Table XXIII gives a comprehensive picture of activities in

which principals engage that are time consuming and the per cent of their time it takes to do them.

TABLE XXIII ACTIVITIES ENGAGED IN BY PRINCIPALS OF THE STUDY AND PER CENT OF THE TIME CONSUMED

| Per cent of Time | No. of Principals | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------|----------------|-------------|-------|
| % | Office Work | Teaching | Administration | Supervision | Other |
| 60 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 55 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 40 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 35 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 30 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 25 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 1 |
| 20 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| 15 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 |
| 10 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 10 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Not Answered | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Totals | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |

Table XXIII shows the various major activities the principals included in the study engaged in. It is interesting to follow the figures through and get the average time spent by each principal in

every activity. Results when averaged are important and illuminating. Principals spend approximately 29 per cent of their time doing office work and another 25 per cent on supervision. Administration consumes 21 per cent of the time, another 14 per cent is used in teaching and the remaining 11 per cent of the principals time is used in all other activities. The 29 per cent of the principals time taken up by office work is abnormally high and the need for clerical help is readily apparent.

Most principals feel that if some office help could be provided and some administrative detail could be removed or delegated there would be plenty of time to do an adequate job with supervision. From the 35 principals polled 31 of them have no clerical help of any kind; 2 principals have part time clerical assistance and only one school has a full time clerk. Only 11.43 per cent of the principals have any clerical help at all and 88.57 per cent have no assistance of this type whatsoever. These facts alone indicate very clearly one of the reasons why there is not time enough for supervision.

Principals were asked to rate in order of importance the two things that would help them most in accomplishing the job of supervision as they felt it should be done.

TABLE XXIV PRINCIPALS RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO WHAT IS MOST NEEDED
FOR MORE AND BETTER SUPERVISION

| Rating | Activity | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|--------|---------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| First | Office Help | 19 | 54.28 |
| First | No Teaching | 7 | 20.00 |
| First | Fewer Reports | 1 | 2.86 |
| First | A Guidance Director | 1 | 2.86 |
| First | No Lunch Room Supervision | 1 | 2.86 |
| First | No Remedial Classes | 2 | 5.71 |
| Not | Answered | 4 | 11.43 |
| Totals | | 35 | 100.00 |

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------------|----|--------|
| Second | Less Administrative Detail | 13 | 37.14 |
| Second | Full Time Secretary | 3 | 8.57 |
| Second | More Adequate Plant | 3 | 8.57 |
| Second | Supervise Only One School | 1 | 2.86 |
| Second | Have a Reading Supervisor | 1 | 2.86 |
| Second | No Lunch Room Supervision | 1 | 2.86 |
| Second | More Time for Professional Growth | 1 | 2.86 |
| Second | No Remedial Classes | 1 | 2.86 |
| Not | Answered | 11 | 31.42 |
| Totals | | 35 | 100.00 |

Results of Table XXIV show rather clearly that most principals think that if they could have office help and be relieved of some of the administrative detail they would be in a position to do a more thorough job with supervision. From all the principals questioned (35) there were 19 or 54.28 per cent who for a first choice, gave more office help, as a partial solution of their supervisory problem. As a second choice 13 of them or 37.14 per cent said less administrative detail would help them do a better job in supervision.

The evidence from this table is quite conclusive and clearly shows the areas where principals feel they could be relieved in order to do more with supervision.

Finally principals were asked to name various methods of in-service training they and their staffs used to promote professional growth and improvement. The results are noted in the following table.

TABLE XXV METHODS OF PROFESSIONAL IMPROVEMENT DESIRED BY PRINCIPALS AND TEACHERS STUDIES

| Method | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Professional Books and Literature | 20 | 57.14 |
| Extension Courses | 16 | 45.71 |
| Teachers Meetings | 10 | 28.57 |
| Conferences | 10 | 28.57 |
| Workshops | 9 | 25.71 |
| Inservice Training (Not Specified) | 5 | 14.28 |
| Lectures | 4 | 11.43 |
| Inter visitation | 4 | 11.43 |
| Library | 3 | 8.56 |
| Demonstration Teaching | 1 | 2.86 |
| Committee and Curriculum | 1 | 2.86 |
| Not Answered | 5 | 14.28 |

Table XXV shows that principals feel their most important methods of professional improvement are from professional literature, extension courses, teachers meetings, conferences and workshops in that order. It was not surprising or unusual that the principals rated teachers meetings high but it is hard to explain why professional literature rates so high. Principals were asked to state professional organizations to which they belonged. Table XXVI below tabulates the results.

TABLE XXVI PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS TO WHICH PRINCIPALS STUDIED
BELONG

| Organization | No. of Principals | Per cent |
|---|----------------------|----------|
| N.H.State Teachers Association | 31 | 88.57 |
| National Education Association | 24 | 68.56 |
| Local Association | 21 | 60.00 |
| National Elementary Principals Association | 16 | 45.71 |
| N.H.Elementary Principals Association | 14 | 40.00 |
| Southeastern N.H.Elementary Principals Association | 8 | 22.86 |
| Delta Kappa Gamma | 5 | 14.28 |
| Lambda Theta | 3 | 8.57 |
| New England Reading Association | 2 | 5.71 |
| National ASCD | 2 | 5.71 |
| Kappa Delta Pi | 1 | 2.86 |
| Coos County Principals Association | 1 | 2.86 |
| Merrimac Valley Guidance Association | 1 | 2.86 |
| National Association of Women Administration | 1 | 2.86 |
| N.E.Council of Colleges & Secondary Schools | 1 | 2.86 |
| N.H.Physical Education Association | 1 | 2.86 |

Table XXVI shows that New Hampshire Elementary Principals who spend 50 per cent or less of their time teaching are very professionally minded. There are 72.34 per cent of them who belong to the local, state and national professional organizations.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

There are 46 elementary principals in New Hampshire who teach 50 per cent of the time or less and 35 of these or 76.09 per cent completed questionnaires for the study. These principals represented 20 communities and included all the large cities of New Hampshire as well as many of the smaller towns. Populations ranged from 1500 to 80,000 people and schools ranged in size from 105 to 600 pupils. There were 425 full time teachers and 66 part time teachers in the schools covered by the study and the average number of teachers per building was 12.14 teachers. This number of teachers represents about 15 per cent of all public school teachers in New Hampshire.

Most of the principals questioned have held a principalship for 10 years or less and there are 23 principals or 65.72 per cent of them in this category. One principal in the study had held such a position for 32 years and another had been a principal for 28 years.

A large part of the principals used classroom visitation and conferences as their primary means of supervision. Twenty-nine principals or 82.86 per cent stated they used this technique as their principle method of supervision.

The actual classroom visit varied a good deal in frequency as

22.86 per cent of the principals visited each classroom daily while 8.57 per cent visited classrooms only 3 times a year. The average frequency of visiting was once in every 8 days. The length of each visit was 24 minutes, and teachers who were visited most frequently were the new and inexperienced ones. Twenty-four of the 35 principals questioned for this study or 68.57 per cent visited most frequently this type of teacher.

There is a standardized testing program in 34 of the 35 schools the study included and 17 of the principals or 50 per cent of them stated they were wholly responsible for its administration.

Results of the questionnaire show that principals think there is no best day in the week to hold teacher's meetings but most meetings fall on Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday, and are usually after school. Their average length is 66 minutes.

The principals of the study average 4.17 years of post-secondary education and altogether 71.43 per cent of them hold one or more degrees. Furthermore 42.86 per cent hold the Master's Degree and one holds the degree of Doctor of Education.

The average principal taught 8.8 years before receiving his first principalship but 4 principals or 11.43 per cent became principals with no prior teaching experience. Several principals taught for more than 20 years before receiving a principals position.

Principals teach in many areas including remedial reading, manual training and general remedial work but most teaching is done in

grades six, seven and eight.

Institutions where principals surveyed received the greater part of their post-secondary education were widespread. There were 17 colleges or universities represented from Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Canada with Plymouth Teachers College in New Hampshire represented most often. Nine principals received a larger part of their education at Plymouth and 4 principals received the greater part of their education from Boston University.

The length of the school day was found to be from 4 hours 30 minutes to 7 hours with the average length of the day in all schools questioned being 6 hours 15 minutes. The noon recess was found to run from 40 minutes to 105 minutes and had as an average 75 minutes. During this time most principals stated that they were on duty. Principals stated further that they worked from 5 hours to 30 hours per week beyond the school day, the average being 14.5 hours.

The administrative organization of the schools included kindergarten through grade twelve and four schools were classified as consolidated elementary-secondary schools. There were 19 schools or 54.29 per cent which had the kindergarten.

Most of the schools have some children who are transported by bus and there are only two schools from those studied where no children are transported. The figure varied from 90 per cent being transported in some schools to only 1 per cent in others. The average

of all children transported in all schools was 26 per cent.

Eleven principals did not answer the question as to how much time they would like to be able to devote to supervision but all of those who did answer stated they would like more time for supervision. Results showed that 42.86 per cent of the principals could use at least 10 hours more time per week for supervision.

Figures based on the returns for the questionnaire show that on the average each principal spends 29 per cent of his time doing office work and 25 per cent of his time on supervision. Administration takes 21 per cent of the time, teaching another 14 per cent and all other activities take 11 per cent of his time.

Almost all the principals feel that full time or part time office help would place them in a position to do a better job with supervision. Only one school in the state of those covered by this study has a full time secretary and 3 schools have part time clerical help. There are 31 schools which have no office help whatsoever. Many principals also feel that they could do a more adequate and a better job if there were someone to whom they could delegate some of the minor administrative duties that are so time consuming but yet must be done to keep a school running efficiently.

Principals included in the study were found to rate professional books and literature first as their most used method of professional growth and improvement. The following activities were considered of next importance in the order of their writing, extension courses, teachers meeting, conferences and workshops.

The New Hampshire Elementary Principals who teach 50 per cent of the time or less are professionally minded, 72.54 per cent of them belong to the local, state and national professional teachers organizations.

Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are valuable because they give an excellent overview of the Elementary Schools in New Hampshire where the principals teach 50 per cent of the time or less.

Some of the conclusions are:

1. Nearly all supervision done by the principals is either done by classroom visitation or conference.
2. Principals are able to spend a maximum of 25 per cent of their time in supervision.
3. All principals should be provided with some clerical assistance. The 29 per cent of the principals time which is spent doing office work could be much more valuably spent doing supervision or administration.
4. New Hampshire Elementary Principals who devote 50 per cent or less of their time to teaching think there is no best day in the week for teachers meetings but they would select one of the first three days of the school week.
5. Plymouth Teachers College is the institution where most principals received a larger part of their post-secondary education, and Boston University was next.
6. There too many details such as hot lunch programs, buses, assemblies, audio-visual programs and testing programs for which the principal is responsible.
7. The principal needs a person to whom he can delegate some authority.
8. Standardized testing programs in use throughout the schools questioned outnumber the average of such programs in most places.

9. The number of principals who hold degrees is high, 71.43 per cent of them hold one or more degrees and 42.86 per cent of them hold the masters' degree.
10. Principals participating in the study are professionally minded. This is evidenced by the number who belong to professional organizations and who attend extension courses and workshops.

The conclusions drawn from this study are based entirely upon answers given by principals, to various questions on the survey form that was sent them. Any conclusions drawn from the questionnaire are true and correct to the best knowledge of the writer.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER VI
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

There are several ways in which other studies might be conducted to correlate results with this study.

1. A study under similiar conditions might be conducted in another state.
2. This study might be continued to also include principals who do more teaching.
3. Teachers might be sent questionnaires to obtain their opinions on the amount and type of supervision they receive.
4. A more complete study including only supervisory practices, time consumed doing them and techniques used could be done.
5. The study could be improved upon and done on a national basis for a more advanced degree.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barr, A.S., William H. Burton and Leo. J. Brueckner. Supervision, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1947.
- Burton, William H., The Guidance of Learning Activities, D. Appleton-Century Company, New York, 1944.
- _____. The Supervision of Elementary Subjects, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1929.
- Caswell, Hollis Leland, Education in the Elementary School, American Book Company, New York, 1942.
- Cole, Luella, Teaching in the Elementary School, Farrar and Rinehart Inc., New York, 1939.
- Cole, Robert M., "A Basic Philosophy of Administration", American School Board Journal, Vol. 118, No. 6, June, 1949.
- Dunn, Fannie W., "What Is Instructional Supervision", Proceedings of National Education Association, Vol. 61, 1923.
- Elsbree, Williard S., and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision, American Book Company, New York, 1951.
- Haman, Allen E., "Classroom Visitation as a Phase of Supervision", American School Board Journal, Vol. 118, No. 6, June, 1949.
- Hampton, William O., How Public School Principals Use Their Time, Doctors Dissertation, University of North Carolina Press, 1926.
- Jacobsen, Paul B., and William C. Reavis, Duties of School Principals, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1942.
- Keos, Leonard V., James M. Hughes, Percival W. Hutson, and William C. Reavis, Administering the Secondary School, American Book Company, Boston, 1940.
- Kyte, George C., The Principal at Work, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1941.
- McCormick, C.F., "Clues to Better Administration", Clearing House, Vol. 23, No. 3, November, 1948.

Melby, E.O., A Critical Study of the Existing Organization and Administration of Supervision, Public School Publication, Illinois, 1929.

Organization and Administration of Supervision, Northwestern University, Contributions to Education, Public School Publishing Company, Bloomington, Illinois, 1929.

National Education Association, Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals, 27th Yearbook, The Elementary School Principalship - Today and Tomorrow, Published by the National Education Association, Department of Elementary Principals, Vol. 28, No. 1, Washington, D.C. 1948.

National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, 7th Yearbook, The Principal and the Elementary School, Published by National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals, Washington, D.C. 1923.

National Education Association, Department of Superintendence, 8th Yearbook, Supervision, Published by National Education Association, Department of Superintendence, Washington, D.C. 1929.

Otto, Henry J., Elementary School Organization and Administration, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1944.

Reeder, Ward G., The Fundamentals of Public School Administration, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1951.

Stone, Clarence K., Supervision of the Elementary School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1929.

Thut, I.N., "Leadership or Authority in School Administration", Educational Administration and Supervision, Vol. 34, January, 1948.

Wiles, Kimball, Supervision for Better Schools, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1951.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Date _____

Dear

As part of an advanced program at Boston University I am making a survey of New Hampshire Elementary Principals to determine the amount of time we spend on various school activities. I think it will show that we are so busy doing incidental tasks that there is not time enough left to do any kind of a job with supervision. As a result of this study it is hoped that we shall have a talking point toward improvement of our positions.

Would you please fill out and mail the attached card indicating whether or not you would mind completing a questionnaire if one were mailed you. Also indicate if you would like a summary of the findings, if you complete a questionnaire.

I would appreciate very much a prompt return of the questionnaire if one is mailed you.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Day, Principal
Durham Center School
Durham, N.H.

Appendix A (cont.)

Date _____

I have read the attached card and Will -
Will Not (cross out the one not applicable) partici-
pate in the survey.

If I do participate in the survey I Would -
Would Not (cross out the one not applicable) like to
have a summary of the findings.

Signature _____

Mr. M. Wayne Bowie
34 Locke Road
Hampton, N.H.

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE

The object of this questionnaire is to determine supervisory and administrative practices of New Hampshire, Elementary School Principals, who devote less than 50% of their time to teaching. It is being done with the idea in mind of improving our positions.

Kindly fill in blanks, or make check marks where applicable which indicate the practices you as a principal pursue. In cases of doubt please try to approximate as closely as possible. As has been mentioned to you previously all information will be regarded with strictest confidence, but, if for some reason there are particular questions you do not wish to answer please feel free to omit them.

Part 1

General Information

1. Name of town in which school is located _____
2. Approximate population of the town _____
3. Total population of the school, or schools of which you are the principal _____
4. How many years have you been a principal? _____
5. How many years did you teach before you obtained your first principalship? _____
6. How many years of post-secondary education do you have? 2____
3____4____5____6____
7. What degrees, if any, do you hold? _____
8. From what institution did you receive the greater part of your post-secondary education? _____
9. What time does your school begin in the morning? _____ A.M.
End in the afternoon? _____ P.M.
10. How long is your lunch hour? _____ minutes
Are you on duty during that time? Yes _____ No _____
11. About how many hours per week, beyond the length of the school day, do you work? _____ Hours

Part II

Administrative Duties

1. How many buildings are there, over which you supervise?
Number _____
2. What is the administrative set-up over which you supervise?
Encircle lowest and highest: Kgn. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. If grades 7 and 8 are included are these grades organized as a Junior High School? Yes ___ No ___
4. How many full time teachers do you supervise? _____ How many part time teachers? _____
5. About what per cent of the school day do you teach? If none, so state. _____%
6. If you do teach, in what grades is most of it done? _____
7. Do you act as a substitute teacher? Often ___ Seldom ___
Never _____
8. Do you have a school secretary? Full Time ___ Part Time ___
None _____
9. What percentage of your student body regularly travels by bus _____%
10. Is supervision of buses as to schedules, pupil behavior etc., part of your job? Yes ___ No ___
11. Do you have regular school assemblies? Yes ___ No ___
When you have them are they mainly your responsibility? Yes ___
No _____
12. Do you have a Hot Lunch program? Yes ___ No ___
If so, about what percentage of your students use this facility? _____%
13. If you have a lunch program is the supervision of it part of your responsibility? Yes ___ No ___
14. It is taken for granted that you do not have time enough to do the kind of supervisory job you would like to do; with this in mind please list in rank order below the two things which would

help you most accomplish the job of supervision as you would like to have it done.

a. _____

b. _____

15. How much more time per week would you like to be able to devote to supervision? _____Hours and / or _____Minutes
16. From the list below would you try to approximate as a per cent, the amount of time you spend on various activities pertaining to your position.
- a. Office Work _____%
 - b. Other administrative detail _____%
 - c. Supervision _____%
 - d. Outside activities _____% P.T.A., Scouts, Clubs etc.
 - e. Miscellaneous _____%

Part III

Supervisory Practices

1. Do you have regular teachers' meetings. Yes ___ No ___
2. If so, what day are they held? _____What is their average length? _____Minutes
3. When, in the day do you hold your meetings? _____
4. Is most of your supervision done by: classroom visitation ___; conferences ___; through inservice training ___; a combination of these ___; other (Specify) _____.
5. Are your supervisory visits usually, announced ___; unannounced ___.
6. About how often do you visit each individual classroom? _____
_____.
7. How long do you usually spend on a classroom visit? _____Minutes
Does this vary with the teacher that is being visited? Yes ___
No ___
8. Are all of your teachers visited with the same frequency? Yes ___
No ___

9. If no, what type of teacher gets more of your supervisory time?
_____.
10. Do you follow-up supervisory visits with individual conferences?
Yes ____ No ____
11. Do you teach demonstration lessons? Often ____ Sometimes ____
Never ____
12. Do you check teachers' plan books as part of your supervisory program? Yes ____ No ____
13. Do you have a standardized testing program in your school?
Yes ____ No ____
14. If you do, who is responsible for its' administration?
Principal ____; Teachers ____; Guidance officer ____; other
(Specify) _____.
15. If you have an audio-visual program in your school are you responsible for its' operation? Yes ____ No ____
16. List below any methods of professional improvement you use.
a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
d. _____
17. Please list below the professional organizations to which you belong.
a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
d. _____
18. In the space provided below and on the reverse side of the sheet if necessary, please feel free to make any criticisms of this questionnaire you wish or to make any comments you wish concerning your supervisory position as regards, time spent, things expected of you, other duties etc., which the questionnaire does not bring out. All information will be treated as strictly confidential.