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Purpose. The purpose of the study was to search the related
literature for criteria for acceptable supervision and to construct an
instrument by which information could be collected from the general
supervisors in North Carolina county school systems to determine how
supervisors spent time, how they wished to spend time and to compare
the preferred supervisory activities with recommended criteria for
supervision found in the related literature.

Method. Questionnaires were sent to the general school super-
visors in the one hundred North Carolina counties. Responses were
received from the ninety-nine counties which had general school super-
visors. Thirteen of the North Carolina county general supervisors (13
percent) were personally interviewed and ten were interviewed by tele-
phone. All responses were used in the data tabulation. Tables, lists,
bar graphs and percentages were used to present the findings.

Summary. Analysis of the questionnaire data revealed that fifty-
five of the ninety-nine North Carolina general county supervisors were
female. Fifty-three of the supervisors were fifty years old or younger.
Twenty-one respondents were between the ages of fifty-one and fifty-five.

Ninety of the ninety-nine supervisors had experience as classroom
teachers. Sixty-eight of these had six years or more classroom experience.
Seventy-two supervisors had ten years or less supervisory experience.
Sixty-four supervisors had previous experience in non-school jobs.

Although ninety-two of the general county supervisors held
Master's degrees, only twenty-one had degrees in supervision. Few
North Carolina general county supervisors were educationally prepared
to perform supervisory activities.

Twenty-one supervisors (21 percent) received their most recent
degrees after 1970. North Carolina colleges and universities granted
degrees to 87 percent of the respondents, indicating that North Carolina
general county supervisors lacked educational experiences in other states.
Job descriptions for general supervisors were not available in fifty-eight of the North Carolina county school systems located throughout the state. The county superintendent of schools defined job specifications for the majority of the respondents. Few general supervisors participated in formulating existing job descriptions.

Data from the questionnaires showed that North Carolina general county supervisors often co-ordinated instructional activities, arranged in-service training, conferred with teachers, provided materials and facilities and organized instruction. The supervisors wanted to spend additional time planning buildings with administrators, serving as consultants outside their school systems, visiting other school systems for ideas and participating in supervisory workshops.

Conclusions. Age, sex and an earned degree in supervision influenced the way in which supervisors perceived themselves as change agents in the school systems. However, school experiences and non-school experiences did not influence the way in which supervisors perceived themselves as change agents.

North Carolina general county supervisors wanted to be change agents in the school systems. Few supervisors planned innovative programs except for programs in reading. The respondents indicated that all innovative programs had not been successful. Prior to 1974, reading programs were emphasized.

Supervisory activities differed according to the size of the county and the number of supervisors in the school system. Small counties had one supervisor who served as an administrator. In the large counties with several supervisors, the general county supervisor served as the coordinator of supervisors.

The forty-three existing job descriptions did not reflect the supervisors' ideas about desired supervisory activities. North Carolina general county supervisors had little or no input in writing job descriptions.

North Carolina was wasting money when supervisors were doing secretarial work and janitorial services. Personnel to perform these necessary services was needed to provide time for supervisors to engage in higher-level activities.

Questionnaire data showed that North Carolina general county supervisors were not planners of change. They wanted more opportunities to improve the teaching-learning environment, such as additional workshops, visits to other school systems and planned meetings with supervisors.

North Carolina general county supervisors were not performing activities which they considered important. Although they were willing
to assist the superintendent and plan buildings with administrators, they wanted to spend more time in the classroom working with teachers and students.

Dissertation prepared under the guidance of Dr. Martha W. Bradley, Dr. T. Madison Eyar, Dr. Thomas G. Ronald, Dr. Charles W. Burkett, and Mr. George Killough.
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Chapter 1

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

For some time, supervision has been described as "standing at the crossroads"; yet little has been achieved to determine its choice of direction.¹

To be effective, supervision must include vital instructional leadership. As recently as 1973, supervisors were confronted with confused conceptions of their professional missions, conflicting and overwhelming duties, and lack of appreciation and understanding from fellow teachers and administrators. These conditions existed at a time when the services of supervisors were needed for educational excellence to be achieved.²

Each state had an established policy to control the certification of specialists in the teaching profession. Therefore, certification of supervisors varied from state to state since supervisors were usually included in regulations which governed teachers. In some states certification was specialized and rigid; in other states certification was extremely general.³

²Ibid.
The North Carolina General Assembly of 1972 passed a bill which provided for teacher tenure after a three-year period of probation. The period of probation began in the fall of 1973. This bill replaced the bill for continuing contracts for teachers and supervisors. Early in 1973, the General Assembly passed a bill for twelve-month employment of North Carolina supervisors. Administrators, taking a new look at supervisory positions, began to emphasize the activities and responsibilities of the general county supervisors.

Following the passage of these bills, county administrators emphasized supervisors' work assignments and began to write job descriptions. Supervisors themselves expressed priorities on how time should be spent.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to search the related literature for criteria for acceptable supervision and to construct an instrument by which information could be collected from the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems to determine how supervisors spent time, how they wished to spend time and to compare the preferred supervisory activities with recommended criteria for supervision found in the related literature.

Importance of the Study

Prior to 1973, no survey of the activities of North Carolina county general supervisors had been reported. In order to improve
school supervision in any state, a survey of the activities of general county supervisors should be conducted periodically. Each supervisor's interpretation of supervision concepts should be expressed, evaluated and, where advisable, incorporated into the educational framework.

Findings from this study could be useful to members of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction to identify how general county supervisors spend their time, whether or not general county supervisors are change agents, the effectiveness of educational requirements for state certification, what written job descriptions for general county supervisors include, and to identify the significance of teacher in-service training programs.

Procedures of the Study

The procedures of the study were as follows:

1. The related literature was searched for criteria for acceptable supervision. This included an ERIC computer search performed by the Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit in Knoxville, Tennessee.

2. A questionnaire was constructed to collect data from general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems.

3. Letters were written to the State Superintendent of Instruction and the county school superintendents asking permission to conduct the survey in the North Carolina county schools. A postcard was enclosed for the county superintendent's convenience in granting permission and naming the general supervisor in the school system.
4. A letter and a copy of the questionnaire were mailed to the designated general supervisor in each North Carolina county school system.

5. After two weeks, a second letter and another copy of the questionnaire were mailed to each non-respondent.

6. After eight weeks, a table of random numbers was used to select 5 percent of the respondents and 5 percent of the non-respondents who were visited and interviewed personally.

7. After ten weeks, a telephone call was made to each non-respondent heretofore not interviewed. Each non-respondent answered the questionnaire orally.

8. All answers on the questionnaire were tabulated, recorded, and reported.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The related literature was searched for appropriate definitions. The definitions for this study were selected during 1973-1974.

Supervision

Supervision was the process of directing improvements in the teaching-learning environment. It was a control which functioned to evaluate action while in progress to assure that execution was taking place in accordance with plans and instructions. Supervision was identified positively by each teacher as a source of assistance for

---

program improvement or, negatively, as a threat to individuality.\textsuperscript{5} Supervision was not a discrete entity,\textsuperscript{6} but was included in the organizational processes of administration, management and inspection. Administration, management, inspection, and supervision were terms used to name aspects of organizational activity.\textsuperscript{7}

**Concepts of Supervision**

Concepts of supervision were ideas formulated to develop "a consistent and comprehensive program"\textsuperscript{8} to influence other teachers and administrators to improve the teaching-learning environment.

**Cooperative Supervision**

Cooperative supervision was a plan for improving instruction by which teachers, supervisors, and administrators worked as a team to formulate objectives for improving the teaching-learning environment and to plan procedures for achieving the objectives.\textsuperscript{9}

**Supervisory Behavior**

Harris identified the three components of supervisory behavior as tasks, skills, and processes. Ten major tasks were identified and defined:


\textsuperscript{8}Good., op. cit., p. 572.

\textsuperscript{9}Ibid.
1. Developing curriculum. This includes designing or redesigning that which is to be taught, by whom, when, where, and in what pattern. Developing curriculum guides, establishing standards and developing instructional units or courses.

2. Organizing for instruction. Making organizational arrangements to implement the curriculum design. Grouping students and planning class schedules are examples of this task.

3. Staffing. Selecting and assigning the appropriate instructional staff member to appropriate activities in the organization. Programs related to this task include recruitment, screening, testing, and maintaining personnel records.

4. Providing facilities. Designing and equipping appropriate facilities for effective use by instructional staff members. This includes programs for school building planning and developing educational specifications for equipment.

5. Providing materials. Identifying, evaluating, selecting, and securing utilization of materials for instruction that make for efficient and effective instruction.

6. Arranging for in-service education. Arranging for activities which will promote the growth of instructional staff members to make more efficient and effective use of time and facilities.

7. Orienting new staff members. Providing new staff members with necessary information and understandings to maximize their chance of initial success with a minimum of difficulties. This is closely related to in-service education.

8. Relating special services. Relating special services program to the major goals of the school. This involves identifying those services which have the greatest contributions to make to the instructional program, developing policies and working relationships which facilitate and do not impede instruction and organizing for the maximum utilization of special services staff competencies to facilitate instruction.

9. Developing public relations. Developing relationships with the public in relation to instructional matters. This task is concerned with informing, securing assistance, and avoiding undesirable influences from the public in relation to the instructional program.
10. Evaluating, planning, organizing, and implementing activities for the evaluation of all facets of the educational process directly related to instruction.10

The skills of supervision included writing, listening, observing, empathizing, diagnosing, synthesizing, visualizing, and analyzing.11 Katz identified three classes of skills: human, conceptual, and technical.12

The areas of supervisory processes were identified as planning, organizing, leading, controlling, and assessing.13

Creative Supervision

Creative supervision was defined as supervision which encouraged teachers to think critically in matters pertaining to objectives, organization of curriculum, teaching methods and evaluation methods. Teachers were encouraged to present ideas voluntarily to the other teachers and to the supervisor. Teachers were also encouraged to experiment with ideas. Creative supervision endowed teachers with the power to perform constant evaluation and imbued them with self-confidence.14

11 Ibid., p. 12.
13 Harris, op. cit., p. 12.
County School System

A county school system was a group of schools located in one county and operated by the administrators of the county. This system may or may not have included all of the schools in the county. Sometimes there was also a city school system. If there were a city school system, then all of the schools in the county which were not included in the city school system composed a county school system.

Supervisor

A supervisor was one of the school personnel who was responsible for supervision to improve the teaching-learning situation. Spears identified almost a hundred different supervisory positions, but the general supervisor was of primary concern in this study.

General Supervisor

A general supervisor was the member of the county central office staff responsible for the supervision of special area supervisors, principals, and teachers in the entire county school system.

Supervision for Continuity

Supervisory activities geared toward continuity were those which sought to maintain the status quo with only minor changes in the program, and to resist pressure for change from various inside and outside sources.

---

Supervision for Change

Supervision for change was the opposite of supervision for continuity. Supervision for change was supervision which emphasized discontinuity, or the disruption of existing practices and the substitution of others.

Change Agent

Good defined a change agent as:

... a person that attempts to alter, change, or restructure concepts, conditions, or processes; for example, a change agent in the curriculum area seeks to make different the learning opportunities provided at a given time and place.16

Educational Districts of North Carolina

The state of North Carolina was divided into eight districts, each of which was composed of eight or more counties. These were known as the educational districts of North Carolina. The counties which made up each numbered district were:

District 1: Pitt, Beaufort, Hyde, Dare, Tyrrell, Martin, Washington, Bertie, Hertford, Gates, Chowan, Perquimans, Pasquotank, Camden, Currituck.

District 2: Pender, Duplin, Onslow, Jones, Craven, Lenoir, Sampson, Wayne, Greene, Pamlico, Carteret, New Hanover, Brunswick.


District 4: Montgomery, Moore, Lee, Harnett, Cumberland, Hoke, Scotland, Richmond, Robeson, Bladen, Columbus.

16Good, op. cit., p. 89.
District 5: Stokes, Rockingham, Caswell, Person, Forsyth, Guilford, Alamance, Orange, Davidson, Randolph, Chatham.

District 6: Cleveland, Union, Anson, Stanly, Cabarrus, Lincoln, Mecklenburg, Gaston.

District 7: Ashe, Allegany, Surry, Watauga, Wilkes, Yadkin, Caldwell, Alexander, Iredell, Davie, Rowan, Catawba, Burke, Avery.

District 8: Cherokee, Clay, Macon, Jackson, Henderson, Polk, Graham, Swain, Haywood, Transylvania, Buncombe, McDowell, Yancey, Madison, Mitchell, Rutherford.

Director of Elementary Education or Director of Secondary Education

The director of elementary or secondary education was the general supervisor whose major function was to improve instruction. The director was known by a variety of titles: elementary or high school supervisor, director of instruction, or elementary or high school instructional supervisor.

State Board of Education

The governing board of the North Carolina school system was the North Carolina State Board of Education. The board was composed of fourteen members, one from each school district and three at large. The lieutenant governor and the state treasurer were ex-officio members. The state superintendent served as secretary.

State Department of Public Instruction

The state department which administered the North Carolina school systems was called officially the Department of Public Instruction. The publicly-elected state superintendent of schools
served as head of this department.

CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTABLE SUPERVISION

Criteria for acceptable supervision were formulated from an analysis of the related literature and were the bases of the questionnaire distributed to the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems. To be effective a supervisor should:

1. act as a change agent in the school system.
2. coordinate the instructional activity.
3. develop curricula with other school personnel.
4. organize for instruction.
5. orient new staff.
6. arrange in-service training.
7. provide materials and facilities.
8. give demonstration lessons.
9. observe student classroom behavior.
10. confer with teachers.
11. analyze and evaluate teachers.
12. visit other school systems for ideas.
13. attend professional meetings.
14. participate in supervisory workshops.
15. work as a consultant outside the system.
16. develop public relations.
17. plan buildings with administrators.
LIMITATIONS

The following limitations were imposed:
1. The data utilized were obtained primarily from questionnaires completed by the general supervisor in each North Carolina county school system.
2. The North Carolina city school systems were not included.
3. The list of supervisory activities used on the questionnaire was not exhaustive.
4. The list of innovative changes used on the questionnaire was not exhaustive.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made:
1. An instrument could be constructed to collect data concerning the activities of general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems.
2. North Carolina school superintendents would grant permission for the survey to be conducted.
3. North Carolina general supervisors would respond to the questionnaire.
4. All North Carolina county school systems would not have written job descriptions for general supervisors.
5. North Carolina general supervisors wished to spend time differently from the way they were spending time when this survey would be made.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 included an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the importance of the study, the definitions of terms and the limitations.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the related literature.

Chapter 3 contains a description of the survey and an analysis of the data.

Chapter 4 contains the summary, the conclusions, the implications and suggestions for further study.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Research studies in the area of supervisory activities and responsibilities were not extensive. Many theories of supervision were presented in the related literature, but few empirical studies concerning supervisory activities and responsibilities of general supervisors were reported. Selected theories of supervision are presented in this chapter, as well as comprehensive studies of supervisory activities and responsibilities. The survey-studies are presented in chronological order. A study of the certification of general supervisors and a study of the effects of supervision on learning are also included.

RELATED THEORIES OF SUPERVISION

Functions of Supervision

According to Melchoir, long-established functions in the field of supervision were preliminary inspection, research, training, guidance and evaluation. Melchoir reported that teachers interpreted inspection as unfair instantaneous judgment in which the supervisor alone evaluated materials selected by the teachers. Therefore, teachers misunderstood the role of inspection, a vital and initial phase of the promotion of learning opportunities.¹

Melchoir defined supervision as "superior-vision." This particular terminology was chosen to express a superior-subordinate relationship which emphasized cooperative, democratic supervision among professionals and supervision as human relations.  

Wiles perceived the basic function of supervision as the improvement of the learning situation for children. It was reported in Supervision for Better Schools that Mort and Cornell asked 2,416 teachers in Pennsylvania where ideas for change were secured. Only thirty-five teachers mentioned the supervisor.  

Wiles defined a supervisor as any official leader, superintendent of schools, principal, department head or staff officer. Improving interpersonal practices, emphasizing leadership, group processes and human interaction were stressed.  

Gwynn viewed supervision as guidance, curriculum development and effective group process. This concept of creative supervision was unique. Creative supervision was an outgrowth of the conflict between scientific supervision and democratic supervision. Supervision included skill in human relations and group processes, skill in guidance, skill in curriculum reorganization and skill in supervising through instructional teams.  

---

2 Ibid.  
4 Ibid., p. 20.  
Gwynn noted two different types of supervisory devices, group and individual. Thirteen specific group devices including committees, teachers' meetings, field trips, bulletins and workshops were listed. Included among the individual devices were observation, experimentation, conferences and self-evaluation.6

Therefore, the supervisors' major responsibilities were to coordinate instructional services, give individual help to teachers and serve as a resource person for the superintendent. In guiding the teachers, the supervisor helped to understand child development, to use instructional materials effectively, to master evaluation techniques and to serve as a school system's unofficial public relations person.7

Lucio and McNeil defined a supervisor as (1) one who held a supervisory position, (2) one who actually made a difference in the operations of the school by exercising authority or influence, and (3) one who spent time on particular organizational functions. The supervisor possessed a superior perspective on education; a perspective developed by intensive and extensive study of the learner, knowledge and social conditions. A supervisor gave stability and direction to the organization. Supervision should be based on objectives. Therefore, Lucio and McNeil concluded that those accepting responsibility were accountable for the objectives which were developed from related disciplines. Reason and practical intelligence were applied to supervision. Reason required the

6Ibid., pp. 326-327.
7Ibid., pp. 27-32.
formulation of explicit purposes. Practical intelligence judged the purposes.8

Barr, Burton and Brueckner developed a definition of supervision focused primarily on the totality of the teaching-learning situation. Supervision was more than teaching and teachers. Educational objectives, pupils, curriculum, methods and social-physical learning environments were also included. A supervisor was viewed as a cooperative member of a professional team. Supervision was an expert technical service primarily concerned with studying and improving conditions which surrounded learning and pupil growth. The aims were improving teaching and learning.9

Earl Johnson suggested that thinking and loving were the components of a democratic supervisor. A supervisor was a teacher-leader who appreciated and felt. The role and status of a supervisor was earned, not assigned. Human associations, common tasks and talented individuals working in a democratic environment fostered the emergence of the teacher-leader.10

Bartky indicated that an educational supervisor induced and stimulated teacher needs and drives. Need-fulfillment improved instruction. Teacher personality was emphasized. Supervision was identified as teaching teachers to improve instruction. Instruction


was appropriate to the educational program of the school and consistent with community demands. The school was not necessarily an agent for social change.\textsuperscript{11}

Sergiovanni and Starratt defined supervision as a process. All personnel who practiced supervision in schools were supervisors at one time or another. Supervisory action to achieve goals through other people was stressed. Every aspect of the social, cultural, attitudinal and behavioral environment influenced the supervisory process. Positive human relations were important. Supervisors worked through people to pursue school goals. Every supervisory act was an attempt to change behaviors, attitudes and school relationships.\textsuperscript{12}

Hicks\textsuperscript{13} defined supervision as a process for stimulating teacher growth so that children in school were provided better learning experiences. Emphasis was on human relations. Effectiveness of supervision depended on the human interaction that was initiated and maintained.

Four components of supervision were visualized. These were the leadership process, the counseling process, the coordinating process and the evaluative process. The purposes of supervision were to extend the vision of teachers and learners, to create a

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{11}James A. Bartky, \textit{Supervision as Human Relations} (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1953), p. 2.
\end{enumerate}
desire for improvement, to unify the efforts of people who formulate and operate school programs, to increase productivity and to evaluate the results.

MacKenzie and Corey stated that supervision was "another person helping with analysis and evaluation."¹⁴ Leadership and leadership skills were emphasized. Evaluation, problem diagnosis and stimulation of interest were mentioned.

Corey suggested that the main job of the supervisor was to do whatever possible to get someone else to work more effectively. The supervisor who was seen as judgmental or evaluative in terms of professional ineptitude created definite barriers and caused defenses to be erected, thus blocking communication. A supervisor concentrated on the process of learning.¹⁵

Franseth enumerated specific tasks which an effective supervisor performed. These included providing information, doing demonstration teaching, observing children, observing teaching, holding individual conferences, offering suggestions, listening understandably and assisting in many group activities.¹⁶

Harris divided supervision into ten major tasks: developing curriculum, organizing for instruction, staffing, providing materials, arranging for in-service training, orienting new staff members,


relating special services, developing public relations and conducting research or evaluation. Each category contained specific activities.\(^\text{17}\)

Neagley and Evans stressed the importance of satisfactory human relations among all staff members. Each person was recognized as a worthy human being, capable of making unique contributions to the educational system. The supervisor was democratic in the most enlightened sense. The staff was actively and cooperatively involved in all aspects of the instructional program. Supervision was comprehensive in scope.\(^\text{18}\)

Harrison mentioned teacher evaluation, evaluation programs, curriculum development and in-service education as major supervisory duties. Supervisory objectives were achieved through people. Therefore, a supervisor worked to create a secure atmosphere for teacher-student well-being. Cooperation was attained through the recognition of teachers' individual differences. A supervisor encouraged the maximum utilization of individual talents and abilities.\(^\text{19}\)

Erickson suggested that general supervision was effective when advisory consultation was favored over critical consultation. A supervisor was not cast as a critic of the performance, but as an advisor for future teaching.\(^\text{20}\)


Cross and Nagle accentuated method of reason and practical intelligence in supervision. Supervisory strategies designed to develop thinking skills and student involvement were described. One-to-one supervisory relationships were emphasized. A supervisor was actively involved in analyzing the teaching-learning situation.21

Douglass, Bent and Boardman accented a supervisor's responsibility to perfect teaching procedures and to stimulate teachers to use better methods of instruction. This improvement program was not developed unilaterally by a supervisor. Instead, teacher participation was included in planning and implementing the program.22

Job Descriptions for Supervisors

Whittier discussed a need for job descriptions for supervisors: "... a continuing effort must be made to define and redefine what the supervisor does and who the supervisor is." A barrier to effective supervisory services was the lack of a clear-cut definition for the role of the supervisor.23

---


The Supervisor as a Change Agent

Wilson, Byar and others defined supervision as the "art and science of designing the educational environment"\(^{24}\) in which a supervisor was a planner. Creative planning was obtained through a synergistic personality who was able to unite the actions of others to produce a planned effect. A new definition of supervision as comprehensive design and planning was presented. A plan as defined by Wilson, Byar and others was "a forcing-structure to produce change."\(^{25}\)

Cooper and Seidman proposed a different supervisory approach referred to as "shotgun supervision," which included micro-teaching in place of classroom observation. Micro-teaching stressed selective, focused supervision, short, frequent observations and a guidance in teacher self-evaluation.\(^{26}\) Discontinuity of supervision was emphasized.

Klopf stated that supervisors needed to guide teachers to experiment with new educational approaches for attaining teaching-learning goals. A supervisor was expected to know the curriculum and new concepts of learning in order to effect necessary changes. The supervisor needed to "work hard at experimenting with and investigating new processes."\(^{27}\)


\(^{25}\)Ibid., pp. 2-11.


Foster declared that supervision had changed from inspection to a consultative relationship. Supervisors became "leaders in educational revolts." Therefore, the supervisor needed to be an action leader.28

Crosby suggested that a supervisor was a "catalyst of the American scene, perceiving change, weighing its implications for education and providing leadership in planning to meet it."29

Gaber believed that supervisory personnel, regardless of assignment level, should be aware of procedures and processes for change at all educational levels. Change should be planned.30

Jordan described changes initiated by a supervisor as "osmosis." A supervisor began the "osmosis" process by searching through the teaching staff for "an adventurous soul." The supervisor worked as a partner with this teacher to develop a new teaching technique, explore a new method of classroom organization or experiment with a unique unit. In essence, the supervisor stopped talking and started doing.31

Therefore, from the analysis of the literature, it was concluded that most authors of supervision theories recognized that

---


the supervisor should be a change agent in the school system, able to unite the actions of others to produce planned effects, aware of procedures and processes for change, working as a partner with teachers to develop programs, stressing selective, focused supervision and serving as a consultant in the school system. The supervisor, a creative planner of teaching-learning improvements, was a change agent. This creative planner, aware of change procedures, had an understanding of teachers' potential for change. Although the supervisor originated the idea for change, it was through the efforts of energetic administrators and teachers that change was initiated. The supervisor-change agent, identified as a leader who studied educational implications of change, encouraged teachers to participate in the decision-making process through which objectives were formulated and methods of evaluation were investigated. In this context, the supervisor was not only a team worker but also a creative planner.

RELATED SURVEY-STUDIES

The related survey-studies are presented in the chronological order in which the surveys were conducted. The studies are presented by decades: 1941-1950, 1951-1960, 1961-1970, 1971--.

Studies during 1941-1950

In 1945, Taggart and Evans conducted a questionnaire survey of supervisors and curriculum directors in 260 schools in the United States. The supervisors were asked to list functions which were regularly or frequently performed. The following activities were
listed on 80 percent of the questionnaires: making classroom visits, evaluating and selecting books, interpreting test data for teachers, helping teachers organize or develop teaching units, holding individual conferences and group conferences with teachers, discussing teaching methods with teachers, attending professional meetings, discussing educational objectives and philosophy with teachers and organizing curriculum revision programs. The functions of the supervisors as presented in this study were teacher-centered.

In 1947, Perkins completed a study of supervisory activities in North Carolina local programs. There were twenty-two white supervisors employed by county or city administrative units at that time. A check-list of supervisory activities was completed by the supervisors.

The following activities were mentioned by eighteen of the twenty-two supervisors: guides principal in elements of school organization related to instruction, directs or supervises teaching personally, directs observation of teaching, exhibits examples of good classroom work, plans for demonstration teaching by gifted teachers, holds individual conferences with teachers following visits, assists teachers in applying knowledge of child growth and development, holds office hours for teachers seeking help, holds instructional group conferences, seeks out and organizes instructional aids for general use, selects tests to be administered, interprets data obtained through testing programs, acts as consultant in local faculty group meetings, provides

---

for intervisitation, encourages teachers to be active community participants, promotes in-service professional study and travel, directs workshops and clinics, studies professional literature and recommends readings, stimulates membership in professional organizations and encourages the development of satisfactory social relationships. The major emphasis of Perkins' study was supervisors' services to teachers. There was concern as to whether or not the supervisors' services reached all teachers. The list of supervisory activities was more extensive than the list used in the study conducted by Taggart and Evans.

Perkins found that supervisors most frequently engaged in activities which seemed to conform to the principles of acceptable supervision presented in the related literature. Some of the supervisory activities did not reach all teachers or the amount of cooperative planning did not make all teachers sensitive to some phases of the supervisory program.

Morrison conducted a study in 1949-1950 to discover areas in which improvement of supervision in North Carolina school systems was most needed and to make recommendations regarding ways to improve the supervisory program. It was concluded that supervisors had adequate educational experience. However, the study showed a need for further supervisory training. An average supervisor showed a desire for self-improvement and improvement of services to teachers.

---

Morrison recommended that the State Department of Public Instruction, teacher training institutions and North Carolina supervisors cooperatively prepare a supervision handbook to be placed in the hands of all superintendents, principals and supervisors. It was proposed that this handbook include job descriptions for supervisors.\textsuperscript{34} Morrison's study was intended to determine what improvements were needed in the supervisory activities. There was no concern with specific supervisory activities.

\textbf{Studies during 1951-1960}

In 1951, Franseth attempted to appraise supervision in Georgia by studying some of its effects on the learners. A comparison was made between students in supervised schools with children in unsupervised schools. The groups were matched as nearly as possible except for supervision. The Iowa Every Pupil Tests were given in reading, work-study skills, arithmetic and language. Achievements of the two groups were compared. Children in supervised schools made higher scores than children in unsupervised schools. It was concluded that supervision in these schools helped to increase pupil achievement.\textsuperscript{35}

Adams and Dickey made a survey of the supervision theories which were popular in 1953. Eighty-three principles of supervision were discussed. The principles mentioned were: effective supervision

\textsuperscript{34} Boyce McKnight Morrison, "A Study of Supervision in the Public Schools of North Carolina, 1949-50" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of North Carolina, 1950), passim.

is creative; a supervisor derives his authority from a group or situation; teacher participation is essential; supervisors should help teachers meet the needs of the pupils; and all who participate in the supervisory program should be included in evaluation. Adams and Dickey summarized supervision theories which were popular in 1953.36

In 1954, Hanes related the trends and changes in secondary school supervision from 1925 to mid-century. It was found through historical research that supervisors spent the greatest amount of time in the following activities: supervision of classroom instruction through demonstration teaching and classroom experimentation, evaluation of instruction through supervisory rating of teachers, selection of teachers, orientation of new teachers, individual conferences and group conferences, professional faculty meetings and bulletins. Data were collected from periodical literature. The study showed that in 1954 supervisors were not setting up new programs or planning. The activities were still teacher-centered.37

Palmer questioned Indiana supervisors in 1955 to determine what supervisory services were offered and which supervisory services were most desired. It was found that both groups wanted inter-school visitations, demonstration teaching and professional literature available for teachers.38 This study was the first to show that supervisors


were interested in change. Respondents wished to visit other school systems and read professional literature.

Characteristics of supervisors and supervisory services in North Carolina were determined by Gale in 1958. Questionnaires were sent to superintendents, supervisors, principals, and teachers. Results of the study showed that North Carolina supervisors were well qualified.39

In 1959, the Ohio Education Association conducted a study to determine how supervisors spent time and how supervisors wished to spend time. Ohio supervisors indicated that much time was spent in the following activities: conferring with teachers and principals, making classroom visits, attending and planning in-service training sessions, attending professional meetings and doing general office work. This study showed that supervisors were beginning to spend time planning in-service workshops and doing general office work.

The supervisors wanted to spend more time performing activities which they considered important. Several supervisors indicated that classroom visitation consumed too much time. Activities in which supervisors wished to spend additional time were not cited.

In 1959, Landry and others reported on projects of Louisiana supervisors to improve supervision of instruction. The Louisiana School Supervisor's Association in cooperation with the Louisiana State University developed an approach for evaluating supervisory

practices. The participating supervisors kept a log of activities. These were analyzed to learn what part of the supervisor's time was given to various activities.

It was found in the data that supervisors worked closely with principals. There was considerable variation in what was done by supervisors while visiting in the classroom. Teachers' and principals' suggestions and questions were used to determine what services the supervisor provided. It was common practice for supervisors to serve as consultants to individuals and groups. Supervisors provided opportunities for the persons involved to share in the planning of activities.40

Foster interviewed ninety supervisors and elementary teachers in California in 1959. It was found that both groups felt that on-the-job training for teachers was one of the important functions of a supervisor. No indication was given that supervisors wanted to be change agents.41

Studies during 1961-1970

Guss and others conducted a study in Indiana to determine how supervision was perceived. Questionnaires were sent to administrators, principals, teachers, supervisors and parents. Of the 300 persons included in the survey, 139 returned the completed questionnaires.


41 Lucille Estelle Caster Foster, "Perceived Competencies of School Supervisors" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Stanford University, 1959), passim.
The following activities were mentioned by a majority of the respondents: develop curricula to meet the needs of the community, help teachers achieve the most effective learning environment, improve instruction, inspire teachers, render expert advice concerning methods and materials and serve as consultant or coordinator. Administrators and teachers gave ideas about supervision. There was no indication as to how many supervisors were included in the 139 respondents to the questionnaire.

Puckett conducted a study in the state of Arkansas in 1962. Supervisors and teachers were asked to rate various supervisory activities. The following activities were considered most important by the supervisors: keeping teachers informed of school policies, keeping teachers informed of new teaching methods, orienting new teachers and selecting instructional materials. Teachers believed the following three supervisory activities were of high importance: holding individual and group conferences, holding workshops and giving suggestions for professional reading. This study also showed that supervisors believed that important supervisory responsibilities were teacher-related.

Burgess questioned Alabama supervisors in 1962 about what supervisors should be doing. It was found that nineteen of the forty-six services listed in the questionnaires were performed differently.

---


from the way supervisors thought these activities should be performed. Burgess concluded that supervisors performed many tasks which were not theoretically accepted supervisory activities.44

Armstrong and Stinnett conducted a survey and reported in 1971 that all states required specific preparation for school administrators. It was found that 72 percent of the states issued supervisory, as well as administrative certificates. Differentiation between certification for school administration and certification for school supervision was seldom found.

The minimum requirement for school administrators was a Master's degree. In eighteen of the states that issued supervisory certificates, the minimum requirement was a Master's degree. In thirteen states, the minimum requirement was a Bachelor's degree.45

A study which described the activities of North Carolina public school supervisors was conducted by Ross in 1968. The percentage of the supervisor's typical work week which was spent in various supervisory activities was reported. Questionnaires were sent to 681 supervisors who held membership in the North Carolina Education Association, Division of Supervisors and Directors of Curriculum. The survey represented a diverse group of school personnel, including supervisors of special services.

44Clifford Vernon Burgess, "A Descriptive Investigation of Instructional Supervision in Alabama" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Auburn University, 1962), passim.

Data collected from the 327 returned questionnaires indicated that supervisors spent the largest percentages of time assisting individual teachers, developing curriculum and organizing and coordinating instruction, respectively.\(^4\) Evidence from this study showed that a North Carolina supervisor did not spend a major portion of the time visiting individual teachers' classrooms, conferring with individual teachers, doing demonstration teaching or evaluating the performance of classroom teachers.

The activities of Florida supervisors were compared with their perceptions of the supervisory role by Rentz in 1969. Data were collected from county level supervisors. Those who completed questionnaires comprised 62.27 percent of the population of Florida supervisors. The study showed a lack of homogeneity among supervisors with respect to role performance despite a similarity with respect to role expectations. The researcher concluded that in terms of actual role activities, categories of activities overlapped to the extent that it was not possible to identify categories as separate and distinct. The following activities received the most responses, respectively: assist textbook selection committee, collect and disseminate current curriculum materials, assist in the development of curriculum guides and other publications, develop curricular designs and coordinate curriculum improvement efforts, assist in the orientation of new and beginning teachers, coordinate instructional programs, hold individual conferences with teachers, develop and prepare new instructional media and assist

teachers in the location, selection and interpretation of materials.47

In 1969, Russell reported on the role of instructional supervisors as perceived by principals, teachers and supervisors of the Caddo Public Schools in Louisiana. A questionnaire was submitted to principals, teachers and supervisors. The supervisors rated thirty functions according to the amount of attention and effort supervisors gave to each function. It was concluded that there was not sufficient consensus among the respondents on the functions of instructional supervisors in the Caddo Public Schools. It was also concluded that the supervisor-teacher ratio was too low to permit an adequate number of appropriate contacts with teachers. It was suggested that supervisors performed functions which were more "line" than "staff."48

Smith conducted a survey in 1969 designed to evaluate supervisory techniques among beginning teachers of mathematics in the public secondary schools of the Middle Atlantic States. The mathematics teachers supervised had five years or less experience.

Data for this study were obtained through a questionnaire directed to teachers in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Maryland and Delaware. Three hundred responses were returned. The following techniques were evaluated by the teachers:


48Herschel Lynn Russell, "The Role of Instructional Supervisors as Perceived by Principals, Teachers, and Supervisors of the Caddo Public Schools in Louisiana" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1969), passim.
2. Classroom Visitation.
3. Individual Conferences.
4. Faculty Meetings.
5. Departmental Meetings.
6. Workshops.
7. Small Group Activities.
8. Teacher Committees within the School.
10. In-service Education.
11. Professional Growth.
12. Instruction in the Use of Audiovisual Aids.

The techniques of research and experimentation, orientation of new teachers, evaluation, workshops and demonstration teaching were among the least utilized techniques. All of the other techniques were used often. 49

Studies Reported in 1971

Dublin made a survey in Monroe County, West Virginia. An open-end questionnaire was used. Eighty-eight questionnaires were returned from teachers in the county.

Teachers indicated that cooperation, county meetings, printed materials and supervisors' visits were the components of the supervisory

---

program which were most helpful. Increased classroom visits, more constructive criticism, demonstration teaching, more arranged meetings and provision of additional materials and supplies were suggestions for improvement of the supervision. The teachers listed observation, attendance at meetings, conferences, workshops and examination of new supplies and equipment as the kinds of experiences a supervisor should arrange for teacher self-improvement.50

In 1971, Smith studied the normal duties and responsibilities of school supervisors in selected rural West Virginia school districts. Supervisors' duties and responsibilities were evaluated for essentiality of the school supervisory function. Thirty-four supervisors completed questionnaires which contained fifty-eight normal supervisory duties. Supervisors indicated performance or non-performance of the activities.

More than 50 percent of the rural West Virginia supervisors performed forty-four of the fifty-eight questionnaire duties. Planning, instruction, resources and evaluation were considered important by 68 percent of the respondents. It was found that 52 percent of the supervisors considered administrative duties least important. Only two school districts had written job descriptions for supervisors.51

This was the first report to mention planning as a supervisory responsibility. A need for job descriptions for supervisors was also mentioned.


SUMMARY

Several selected theories of supervision were presented in Chapter 2. Creative supervision was envisioned by many writers. Planning was emphasized as one of the important responsibilities of a supervisor. Most authors inferred that the supervisor should be a change agent. The following suggestions for supervision which fostered change were: short frequent visits, creative planning, an awareness of methods of change, consultative relationships with school personnel and a synergistic personality. In summary, a change agent formulated educational objectives, planned change and investigated evaluation techniques, allowing teachers to participate in each change-process phase.

Related survey-studies were also summarized in this chapter. These studies were conducted between 1945 and 1973. Supervisory functions in the 1940's were primarily teacher-centered with the supervisor serving as a teacher model and assistant. By 1973, the supervisor's primary function was as planner of change emphasizing inter-school visitation, recommendations for professional literature, in-service workshops and teacher evaluation.
Chapter 3

THE SURVEY AND THE ANALYSIS OF DATA

THE SURVEY

In 1973, a questionnaire was constructed to secure information concerning duties and responsibilities of general supervisors in North Carolina counties. The related literature was searched for criteria for acceptable supervision to be included on the questionnaire. Questions were formulated from the criteria most frequently mentioned in the literature. A pilot study was conducted to test two versions of the questionnaire.

The Pilot Study

On May 4, 1973, twenty-eight supervisors from the Upper East Tennessee area participated in a pilot study conducted on the East Tennessee State University campus. Half of the supervisors received questionnaires with percentage answers and the remaining half received questionnaires with scaled answers: 4 (often), 3 (sometimes), 2 ( seldom), and 1 (never). Twenty completed questionnaires were returned.

The respondents preferred the scaled answers to the questions and volunteered no recommendations for additional activities. Therefore, the questions with scaled answers were used in the North Carolina survey. Supervisory activities selected from the related literature were used on both questionnaires. Questionnaire reliability was established by the correlation between supervisors' responses in informal interviews on May 4, and their written responses on the questionnaires.
Method of Collecting Data

On April 6, 1973, a letter requesting permission to conduct a survey in the one hundred North Carolina county school systems was mailed to Dr. Craig Phillips, Superintendent of North Carolina Public Schools. Permission was granted by the assistant state superintendent, William W. Peek, on June 15, 1973. Then, letters requesting permission to obtain information from the general supervisor in each county were mailed to school superintendents. A self-addressed postcard was enclosed for the superintendent's convenience in granting permission and designating the general supervisor in the county school system. After two letters of request, eighty-six superintendents granted permission.

On September 26, 1973, copies of the questionnaire were mailed to eighty-six designated supervisors. A third letter, another copy of the questionnaire, and a self-addressed envelope were mailed to the fourteen superintendents who had not previously responded. These superintendents were requested to refer the enclosures to the general supervisors. Seventy-two general supervisors responded. On November 14, 1973, a second letter and a copy of the questionnaire were mailed to each of the twenty-eight supervisors who had not responded. Fifteen additional responses were received, bringing the total number of responses to eighty-seven.

During the last week of December, 1973, thirteen North Carolina counties were visited and the general supervisors were interviewed. A table of random numbers was used to choose 5 percent of the counties which were visited. The other counties were chosen for convenience, due to the gasoline shortage. During the visit to Yancey County, a questionnaire was completed while the general supervisor was interviewed.
In Cabarrus County it was found that there was not a general supervisor. Watauga, Caldwell, Cleveland, Henderson, Polk, Gaston, Madison, Rutherford, Buncombe, Avery, and Mitchell counties were visited. The general supervisors were interviewed and questionnaires were completed.

During the second week of January, 1974, telephone calls were made to the following counties and questionnaires were completed while the general supervisors were interviewed: Martin, Hyde, Chowan, Pender, Lee, Vance, and Clay. Personal letters were mailed to the five non-respondents and five completed questionnaires were returned. Therefore, all of the ninety-nine general supervisors in North Carolina school systems responded either by phone, personal interview, or mail. A summary of the personal interviews is given later in this chapter.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

All of the ninety-nine responses were used in the tabulation of the data. Total number of responses to specific items on the questionnaire were tabulated. Percentages were determined by using ninety-nine as the total number of general supervisors in the state. Therefore, the percentages represented complete statistics for the North Carolina county school systems. Bar graphs were used to show differences between supervisors who considered themselves change agents and those who did not consider themselves change agents in the North Carolina county school systems.

Answers to specific items on the questionnaire were counted and reported. The data were presented in the same order as the questions appeared on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The categories of information were professional experience, vocational experience, professional
preparation, job descriptions, and supervisory activities.

A summary of activities in which time was spent and activities in which supervisors wanted to spend additional time was presented. A comparison was also made between supervisors' preferred activities and recommended criteria for supervision as presented in the related literature.

General Information

The questions in Part I of the questionnaire were formulated in order to elicit some personal information concerning the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems. The questions were not designed to give a complete personal record of each supervisor.

Age of supervisors. Forty-three of the North Carolina general supervisors were over fifty years old. Twenty-one supervisors, or 21 percent, were between the ages of fifty-one and fifty-five. An additional 22 percent were older than fifty-five. Therefore, within ten years almost half of the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems will be old enough to retire. Only one supervisor was under thirty years of age.

Sex of supervisors. Women participating in the study outnumbered men. Fifty-five of the ninety-nine general supervisors were women.

Vocational experience of the supervisors. Ninety of the respondents, or 90 percent, had experience in classroom teaching. Fewer supervisors, 37 percent, had experience as a principal of a school. Several supervisors, 42 percent, had taught for more than
fifteen years, but only ten supervisors had served as a principal for more than fifteen years. Eighteen supervisors had experience as program coordinators, but none of these supervisors had been program coordinators for more than ten years. The availability of federal funds for programs may have accounted for this length of time. Table 1, page 43, gives a distribution of the supervisors by age, sex, and school experience. The availability of federal funds for programs may have accounted for this length of time. Table 1, page 43, gives a distribution of the supervisors by age, sex, and school experience. Table 2, page 44, gives a distribution of the professional education of the supervisors.

Twelve of the supervisors appointed in 1973 had no previous supervisory experience. The remaining eighty-seven had experience as supervisors, although thirty-six had fewer than six years of supervisory experience. By contrast, one person had twenty-six years of experience as a supervisor. Sixty-four North Carolina supervisors had experience in non-school work. See Table 3, page 45. Nine of the sixty-four supervisors with non-school job experience had worked in some phase of retailing. Eight supervisors held professional or semi-professional positions. Almost 10 percent of the non-school jobs were in some branch of the military service. Supervisors' contracts in 1973 provided for twelve-month employment. Therefore, after summer, 1973, it was illegal to obtain full-time non-school summer employment.

Professional preparation of supervisors. All of the North Carolina county general supervisors held Baccalaureate degrees. Ninety-two of the ninety-nine supervisors held Masters' degrees. Twenty supervisors had completed the sixth-year program and two persons had completed the requirements for a doctorate. See Table 4, page 46. Several supervisors were working toward a higher degree.
Table 1
North Carolina County General Supervisors by Age, School Experience, and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
<th>Number of Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males 44
Females 55
Total 99

NOTE: The number of supervisors in each case is also the percentage of North Carolina general supervisors.
Table 2
North Carolina County General Supervisors by Professional Educational Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years of Experience</th>
<th>Classroom Teacher</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Program Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
## Table 3

**North Carolina County General Supervisors: Vocational Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Service</th>
<th>Kinds of Non-School Jobs as Stated on Questionnaire</th>
<th>Semi-skilled Workers</th>
<th>Professional and Semi-Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farming and Industry</td>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Intelligence</td>
<td>Computer Programmer</td>
<td>Avon Representative</td>
<td>Brick Mason's Helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>Carpenter's Helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Army</td>
<td>Lumber Manufacturer</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Lifeguard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Marine Corps</td>
<td>Textile Plant Worker</td>
<td>Department Store Clerk</td>
<td>Maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Signal Corps</td>
<td>Textile Researcher</td>
<td>Fish Market Owner</td>
<td>Plumber's Helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control Defense</td>
<td>Tobacco Company Representative</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>Utility Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>Therapist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stenographer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toy Shop Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of supervisors with experience in non-school jobs - 64

Number of supervisors with no experience outside of schools - 35

Total Number of Supervisors - 99
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Degree</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year Advanced</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduate Degrees</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Supervisors</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99

NOTE: The number of supervisors is equal to the percentage of supervisors.
Several supervisors were working toward a higher degree. Even though supervisors held graduate degrees, the degrees were not in the field of supervision. Seventy-one of the ninety-nine supervisors had no degrees in supervision. In fact, 50 percent of the North Carolina county general supervisors had thirty hours or less course work in curriculum development and/or supervision. Table 5 on page 48, shows a distribution of course work in curriculum development and/or supervision. Supervisors had more hours of course work in curriculum development than in supervision.

Eighty-one respondents had fifteen quarter hours or less of supervision course work. Only 5 percent of the supervisors had at least forty-five hours of supervision course work. Therefore, North Carolina general supervisors had a better educational background in curriculum development than in supervision. Fourteen respondents had forty-five quarter hours or more of course work in curriculum development.

The majority of the North Carolina county general supervisors, 87 percent, were educated in North Carolina colleges and universities. Therefore, North Carolina county school systems were almost entirely influenced by North Carolina educators. Seventy supervisors had received degrees since 1959, while two supervisors' degrees were in the 1930's. Table 6 on page 49, contains information about the acquisition of degrees.

There were more female supervisors than male supervisors employed in the North Carolina county school systems. A greater percent of the female supervisors than male supervisors were change agents, but there was little difference between the educational
Table 5

North Carolina County General Supervisors: Course Work in Supervision and/or Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors with Hours in Curriculum Development</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors with Hours in Supervision</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors with Hours in Supervision and Curriculum Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Last Degree Was Received</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1973</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Degrees Received 99

Degrees received in North Carolina 87

NOTE: The number of supervisors is also the percentage of supervisors.
preparation of the two groups. It was found that 31 percent of the female supervisors held degrees in supervision as compared to 28 percent of the male supervisors. Ten of the fifty-five female supervisors, or 19 percent, held advanced degrees, while seven of the forty-four male supervisors, or 15 percent, held advanced degrees. More females than males held only Bachelors' degrees, 9 percent compared to 4 percent.

Job descriptions. Job descriptions for general supervisors were available in 53 percent of the counties represented in the survey. In the counties without job descriptions, supervisors' work was defined by superintendents, boards of education, principals, teachers, a steering committee, precedent or the supervisor himself. See Table 7 on page 51.

Job descriptions for general supervisors were available in the following counties:

District 1: Martin, Hertford, Bertie, Camden, Pitt, Pasquotank
District 2: Sampson, Duplin, Wayne, Brunswick, Onslow, New Hanover, Craven
District 3: Wake, Halifax, Wilson, Granville, Warren, Franklin, Durham, Nash, Vance
District 4: Richmond, Moore, Columbus, Scotland, Harnett, Montgomery
District 5: Randolph, Forsyth, Stokes, Alamance, Orange, Guilford, Rockingham
District 6: Union, Gaston, Cleveland, Anson
District 7: Alexander, Caldwell, Iredell, Wilkes, Surry, Burke, Davie, Rowan
District 8: Rutherford, Mitchell, Macon, Swain, Clay, Graham, Transylvania, Jackson, Buncombe, Henderson.
### Table 7

North Carolina County General Supervisors: Job Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means of Defining Job if No Job Description Existed</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Self</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Principals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent, Principals, and Self</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Board of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent and Precedent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 46

Number of Written Job Descriptions: 53

N = 99

NOTE: The number of supervisors is also the percentage of supervisors.
The counties with available job descriptions for general super-
visors were not concentrated in one area. More than 50 percent of the
counties in each school district had written job descriptions for
general supervisors. Eight supervisors were involved in the writing
of job descriptions. Twenty-six job descriptions were written by the
superintendent, principals and/or general supervisor. Therefore, it
was concluded that the superintendent had the greatest input in job
descriptions for general county school systems. See Table 7 on page
51.

The written job descriptions for general supervisors were
similar. Appendix J contains written job descriptions submitted from
North Carolina county school systems. Staff development and improve-
ment of instruction were included on more than 50 percent of the
descriptions. Six of the general supervisors served as special area
supervisors. Guidance, federal programs or library coordination was
emphasized on these job descriptions.

Thirty-four major responsibilities were identified on the
available job descriptions. These were as follows in rank order:

Staff development (31)
Improvement of instruction (20)
Instructional materials (12)
Coordinate special services (10)
In-service education (7)
Public relations (6)
Testing (6)
Teacher assistance (5)
Develop new programs (5)
Evaluation (4)
Curricula planning and implementation (4)
Observation (4)
Coordinate libraries (3)
Assess needs (3)
Assist superintendent (3)
Supervision of personnel (3)
Selection of personnel (3)
Visitation (2)
Coordinating student teaching and internships (2)
Federal programs (2)
Leadership (2)
Orient new teachers (2)
Pupil personnel services (1)
Guidance (1)
Administration (1)
Exchange teaching coordination (1)
Public speaking (1)
Assist principals (1)
Conferences (1)
Research (1)
Study current literature (1)
Prepare bulletins (1)
Demonstration teaching (1)
Liaison between the State Department of Education and the local system (1)

Table 8, on page 54, shows a distribution of the major responsibilities identified on the available written job descriptions.
### Table 8

**Major Responsibilities Identified on Written Job Descriptions for North Carolina County General Supervisors Contrasted with Responsibilities Considered Major by the Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Responsibility Identified on the Job Description</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</th>
<th>Kind of Responsibility Considered Major by Supervisors</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Assists teachers and principals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of instruction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Plan and organize instruction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate special services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>In-service education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coordinate programs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plan and develop new programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher assistance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review and select new materials</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing new programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Set up new programs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Resource person</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct workshops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum planning and implementation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parent conferences</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of Responsibility Identified on the Job Description</td>
<td>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</td>
<td>Kind of Responsibility Considered Major by Supervisors</td>
<td>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Order supplies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library coordination</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist superintendent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Correlate teacher activities and central office staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arrange faculty meetings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Counsel teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop long-range plans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient new teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assist supervisory personnel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating student teaching and internships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attend professional meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional media</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with state consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil personnel services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orient new staff members</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assess needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist principals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduce new materials and techniques</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of Responsibility Identified on the Job Description</td>
<td>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</td>
<td>Kind of Responsibility Considered Major by Supervisors</td>
<td>Number of Supervisors Who Mentioned the Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange teaching coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Serve on committees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Change agent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison between state department and local system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom visitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study current literature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare bulletins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents mentioned thirty-four different responsibilities considered major supervisory responsibilities. The responsibilities mentioned follow in rank order:

- Assist teachers and principals (19)
- Staff development (18)
- Organize instruction (17)
- Curriculum development (14)
- In-service education (13)
- Coordinate programs (12)
- Plan and develop new programs (10)
- Review and select new materials (9)
- Set up new programs (7)
- General supervision (7)
- Resource person (5)
- Conduct workshops (4)
- Parent conferences (3)
- Order supplies (3)
- Evaluation (3)
- Observation (2)
- Develop long-range plans (2)
- Assist supervisory personnel (2)
- Testing (2)
- Arrange faculty meetings (2)
- Correlate teacher activities and central staff (2)
- Counsel teachers (2)
- Project writing (1)
- Change agent (1)
Classroom visitation (1)
Serve on committees (1)
Attend professional meetings (1)
Public relations (1)
Public speaking (1)
Work with state consultants (1)
Orient new staff (1)
Assess needs (1)
Introduce new materials and techniques (1)
Leadership (1)

Staff development, improvement of instruction, instructional materials, and coordination of special services were emphasized on the written job descriptions. The general supervisors emphasized assisting teachers and principals, staff development, planning and organizing instruction, and curriculum development. These data revealed that job descriptions did not reflect the supervisor's input except in the area of staff development.

Supervisory Activities to Improve Teaching and Learning

There were four categories of supervisory activities on the questionnaire:

1. Improving teaching and learning
2. Self-improvement
3. General activity
4. Acting as a change agent
The respondents spent time in the following activities in rank order:

- Coordinating instructional activities
- Arranging in-service training
- Conferring with teachers
- Providing materials and facilities
- Organizing for instruction
- Orienting new staff
- Developing curricula
- Observing student classroom behavior
- Giving demonstration lessons
- Analyzing and evaluating teachers

Twenty-three supervisors never gave demonstration lessons and twenty-five supervisors never analyzed and evaluated teachers. Table 9, page 60, shows a distribution of the activity performance of supervisors to improve teaching and learning. Some supervisors omitted certain activities even though there was a choice of using 1 (never) for an answer. Some respondents wrote notes indicating no responsibility in particular areas.

Supervisors preferred to spend time performing specific activities to improve teaching and learning. These activities were listed according to the greatest number of supervisors who wanted to often perform the activity. Table 10, on page 61, gives in more detail a distribution of how supervisors wanted to spend time improving teaching and learning. A list of how supervisors wanted to spend time follows:

- Coordinating instructional activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activity to Improve Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curricula</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and services</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Table 10

How North Carolina County General Supervisors Wanted to Spend Time Improving Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activity to Improve Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curricula</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99.
Conferring with teachers
Arranging in-service training
Providing materials and facilities
Organizing for instruction
Orienting new staff
Observing student classroom behavior
Developing curricula
Giving demonstration lessons
Analyzing and evaluating teachers

A comparison of answers for each activity was made for each supervisor. The results were given at the end of this chapter.

Supervisors indicated on the questionnaires that more time was spent in self-improvement activities as follows:

Attending professional meetings
Participating in supervisory workshops
Visiting other school systems for ideas
Working as consultant outside your system

Fifty-eight supervisors, or 58 percent, attended professional meetings often. An additional thirty-three supervisors sometimes attended professional meetings. Two persons never attended such meetings.

Only two supervisors often worked as a consultant outside the school system. Seventeen persons served as a consultant sometimes.

Table 11 on page 63, shows a distribution of the activity performance of supervisors for self-improvement.

Supervisors wanted to spend time in the following activities:

Attending professional meetings
Table 11
North Carolina County General Supervisors: Activity Performance for Self-improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activity for Self-improvement</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as consultant outside your system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Participating in supervisory workshops
Visiting other school systems for ideas
Working as a consultant outside the system

This list was exactly like the list representing how supervisors spent time in self-improvement. There were differences, however. Fifty-seven supervisors attended professional meetings often while forty-eight supervisors, or 48 percent, wanted to attend professional meetings often. Only two supervisors often served as consultants to other school systems, but twenty-five supervisors wished to work often as consultants outside the school system. See Table 12, page 65. A summary of these differences is given at the end of this section.

General Activities of Supervision

Forty-two supervisors often assisted the superintendent. An additional forty-three supervisors assisted the superintendent sometimes. The following list shows how supervisors spent time. These items were listed in rank order by the number of "often" answers:

- Assisting the superintendent
- Planning buildings with administrators
- Doing secretarial work
- Developing public relations

Twenty-five supervisors, or 25 percent, never did secretarial work. Twenty-seven supervisors never planned buildings with administrators. Table 13, page 66, shows the responses concerning general activity performance of general supervisors.

Participating supervisors wanted to spend time in the following activities.
Table 12

How North Carolina County General Supervisors Wanted to Spend Time for Self-improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activity for Self-improvement</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as consultant outside your system</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Table 13
North Carolina County General Supervisors: General Activity Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of General Activity</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Developing public relations
Assisting the superintendent
Planning buildings with administrators
Doing secretarial work

Forty-nine supervisors wanted to often spend time developing public relations. Only two wanted to often do secretarial work. In fact, sixty-three supervisors never wanted to do secretarial work. Table 14, page 68, gives a listing of how supervisors wanted to spend time in general supervisory activities.

Supervisors Acting as Change Agents

The completed questionnaires and the interviews with the thirteen supervisors yielded different conclusions. Forty-four supervisors often planned innovative programs. Thirty-seven of the ninety-nine supervisors changed old programs often. An additional forty-seven supervisors changed old programs sometimes. During the thirteen personal interviews, each supervisor identified himself as a change agent in the school system. However, the answers given on the questionnaire did not agree. Either the supervisors did not understand the concept of a change agent or believed that supervisors were expected to be change agents. The data revealed that supervisors spent about the same amount of time planning innovative programs and changing old programs. Table 15, page 69, contains data concerning how supervisors wanted to spend time acting as change agents in the school systems. See Figure 1 on page 70 for a comparison of the general supervisors who were change agents with the supervisors who were not change agents. A greater percentage of women than men were change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of General Activity</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public relations</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning buildings with</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance of Supervisors</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing old programs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Supervisors Wanted to Perform</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing old programs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Figure 1

North Carolina County General Supervisors as Change Agents
by Sex, Age, Educational Preparation, and Past Experiences
agents. A greater percentage of supervisors with degrees in supervision were change agents than those without degrees in supervision. Past experiences did not seem to affect a supervisor’s becoming a change agent, but more supervisors fifty years old or younger were change agents than supervisors older than fifty.

**Summary of the Supervisors' Opinions on How to Spend Time**

Responses to items of supervisory activities were compared to determine how supervisors wanted to spend time performing activities. Table 16, page 73, shows how supervisors wanted to change the amount of time spent in improving teaching and learning and self-improvement. Supervisors wanted to spend additional time in all of the activities to improve teaching and learning except arranging in-service training and analyzing and evaluating teachers. The supervisors wanted to spend less time arranging in-service training and analyzing and evaluating teachers.

Thirty-four of the ninety-nine supervisors wanted to spend additional time visiting other school systems. Twenty-six supervisors wanted to spend additional time participating in supervisory workshops. The supervisors wanted to have opportunities to obtain ideas for change. Visits to other school systems and supervisory workshops afforded these opportunities. Therefore, supervisors were not satisfied with existing conditions in the schools.

Ten supervisors wanted to spend additional time attending professional meetings, but thirteen supervisors wanted to spend less time. Therefore, more than 50 percent of the North Carolina supervisors were attending professional meetings as often as was wanted. These
Table 16
Summary: How North Carolina County General Supervisors Wanted to Change the Amount of Time Spent in Improving Teaching and Learning and Self-improvement Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Activity to Improve Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Wanted to Spend More Time</th>
<th>Wanted to Spend Less Time</th>
<th>Satisfied or No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curricula</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as consultant outside your system</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
data indicated that professional meetings were not affording opportunities or experiences which supervisors wanted.

Supervisors wanted to spend less time doing secretarial work and assisting the superintendents. An increase in the amount of time spent in planning buildings with administrators was preferred. Thirty-one persons wanted to spend additional time in planning buildings.

Twenty-five supervisors wanted to spend additional time planning programs and twenty-four persons wanted to spend additional time changing old programs. Since forty-four supervisors already planned innovative programs, and two wanted to spend less time, at least 66 percent of the North Carolina county general supervisors wanted to plan innovative programs often. At least fifty-four supervisors wanted to change old programs often. Two supervisors wanted to spend less time changing old programs. Therefore, general supervisors in North Carolina counties wanted to make improvements in the teaching-learning environments. See Table 17 on page 74.

**Participation in Setting up or Organizing Programs**

Supervisors often performed the following activities (the activities were listed in rank order):

- Developmental reading
- Individually-guided instruction
- Remedial reading
- Classes for educable retarded
- Continuous progress
- Team teaching
- Open classrooms
Table 17
How North Carolina County General Supervisors Wanted to Change the Amount of Time Spent in General Supervisory Activities and Activities for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Activity</th>
<th>Wanted to Spend More Time</th>
<th>Wanted to Spend Less Time</th>
<th>Satisfied or No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public relations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing old programs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Classes for the gifted

Classes for the physically handicapped

Twenty-seven supervisors often set up developmental reading programs, remedial reading programs, and classes for the educable retarded. Twenty-three supervisors set up continuous progress programs often. Fewer persons set up classes for the physically handicapped than any of the other programs. Fifty supervisors never set up programs for the physically handicapped (see Table 18 on page 76). The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction began stressing programs for the physically handicapped during the last years. Therefore, supervisors probably had not spent much time in this area.

Table 19 on page 77 shows whether the supervisors were successful in setting up specific programs. Several persons gave no response concerning success. The majority of the respondents indicated that all of the programs were successful. Notes written by supervisors on the questionnaires showed that some supervisors were not responsible for all of the areas encompassed by the programs listed on the questionnaire.

Comparison of Findings with Criteria for Accepted Supervision

Writers in supervision unanimously agreed with Wiles that the function of supervision was to "improve the learning situation for children." Some writers emphasized one supervisory activity more

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Program</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open classrooms</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually guided instruction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous progress</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental reading</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for educable retarded</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the gifted</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for physically handicapped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99
Table 19
Success of North Carolina County General Supervisors in Setting Up or Organizing New Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Program</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open classrooms</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually-guided instruction</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous progress</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental reading</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the educable retarded</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the gifted</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the physically handicapped</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 99

NOTE: The numbers also represent percentages.
than another. There was no consensus about the major responsibility of a supervisor. North Carolina county general supervisors usually agreed with writers in supervision about important supervisory duties.

**Coordinating instructional activity.** Many writers in supervision stated that a supervisor should help coordinate instructional activities. The writers did not agree about the major responsibility of a supervisor.

Curtin emphasized a supervisor's duties toward coordinating the instructional program. The first duty of a supervisor was to thoroughly examine the instructional program. A supervisor should then formulate a set of objectives for improving the instructional program, execute those activities and establish evaluative criteria for determining the extent of the instructional improvements.²

Melchoir believed that preliminary study and inspection of the instructional program was a long-established function of supervision. This aspect of supervision was viewed as a vital phase of the promotion of learning opportunities.³

Lucio and McNeil stressed a need for objectives to guide the coordination of instructional activities. Objectives needed to be developed from related disciplines so that the activities were coordinated.⁴

---


Erickson suggested that coordinating instructional activities was necessary, but that general supervision or supervision across academic fields was only effective when it focused on teacher behavior. Therefore, a general supervisor could not coordinate activities alone. Many other personnel should be involved.5

Gwynn listed the coordination of instructional services as a major responsibility of a supervisor. Much of a supervisor's time should be spent in improving the instructional services.6

Sixty-nine North Carolina general supervisors preferred to often coordinate instructional activities. This number represented 69 percent of the general supervisors in North Carolina counties. Therefore, the majority of the North Carolina general supervisors replied that supervisors should coordinate instructional activities.

Developing curricula. Authors in the field of supervision agreed almost without exception that a supervisor should help develop the curricula. It was also agreed that all school personnel should be involved in the process.

Neagley and Evans divided supervisory techniques and responsibilities into two areas of individual and group. It was stressed that the entire group of school personnel should be involved in initiating and carrying out any new organizational patterns or


instructional programs.  

Franseth emphasized good supervision as a helping activity. Good supervision was supervision which fostered meaningful involvement of teachers and other school personnel in making and carrying out plans. Therefore, a supervisor should work with other school personnel to develop new curricula.  

Gwynn mentioned a need for a supervisor to have special skill in curriculum reorganization. Four major skills were listed. Therefore, curriculum reorganization was an important supervisory duty.  

Foster stressed that curriculum changes occurred when school systems placed top priority on school personnel. The supervisor and other school personnel should be involved in developing curricula.  

Forty-seven supervisors wanted to develop curricula sometimes. These responses indicated that North Carolina supervisors wished to be involved in developing curricula, but supervisors should not develop curricula without assistance from other school personnel.

Organizing for instruction. Very few writers about supervision mentioned organizing for instruction specifically as a major supervisory responsibility. Although it was agreed that a supervisor

---


should help teachers and principals improve the learning environment for students.

In the book, *Leadership for Improving Instruction*, published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the authors stressed the duty of the supervisor to provide adequate resources to enable teachers to become effective.11

Twenty-two North Carolina supervisors wanted to spend more time organizing for instruction. Five supervisors wanted to spend less time. Thirty-nine supervisors currently organized for instruction often. Therefore, at least sixty-one North Carolina supervisors reported that organizing for instruction was an important duty of a general supervisor.

**Orienting new staff.** Most authors of supervision agreed that a supervisor should assist beginning teachers. Franseth defined good supervision as a helping activity. Supervision was most effective in the improvement of teaching and learning when it contributed to the solution of problems.12

Crosby reported that the typical supervisor usually felt that the first responsibility was to the teacher new to the system or school. The supervisor felt a greater obligation toward those who were new to the field of teaching.13

---


Gwynn listed "giving individual help to the teacher" as a major responsibility of the supervisor. The new teacher usually needed more help than teachers who had worked in the system for several years unless some new method of teaching was being integrated into the original program. Gwynn further stated that it was the job of the supervisor to make new teachers wish to remain in teaching. The supervisor could help a new teacher develop confidence and a love for his work.14

Curtin stated that "those who were beginning their teaching careers were most in need of supervisory services."15 These services were usually a different kind of service from those needed by teachers who had been a part of the system for several years.

Thirty-nine general supervisors in North Carolina counties often oriented new staff members. Thirty additional supervisors wanted to spend more time orienting new staff members. Therefore, a majority of the North Carolina county general supervisors indicated that orienting new staff members was an important duty of a supervisor.

Arranging in-service training. Sixty-eight North Carolina county supervisors often arranged in-service training. More supervisors participated in arranging in-service training, conferring with teachers, and coordinating instructional activities than in other activities.

Five other supervisors wanted to spend additional time

---

14Gwynn, op. cit., p. 209.
15Curtin, op. cit., p. 187.
arranging in-service training. Supervisors indicated that this was a major supervisory responsibility.

Authors of supervision agreed with supervisors in North Carolina that arranging in-service training was an important duty of a supervisor.

Hicks defined supervision as "a process for stimulating teacher growth" so that students were provided better learning experiences. Personal growth through professional activities was emphasized.

Harris mentioned in-service training as one of the ten major tasks of a supervisor. A supervisor should arrange for in-service training for teachers in the school system.

Leeper stressed a supervisor's role in planning in-service teacher education. In-service education for supervisors was also stressed. Gwynn defined the supervisor as "a special agent in training teachers in service." Spears said that a supervisor should "provide proper conditions for the continuing in-service growth of teachers."

---


19Gwynn, op. cit., p. 27.

Providing materials and facilities. Harris mentioned providing materials as a major task of a supervisor.\(^{21}\) Gwynn identified the major supervisory responsibility as giving individual help to the teacher.\(^{22}\)

Spears mentioned the development of proper and adequate instructional materials as one of the four major objectives of supervision. Providing proper conditions for learning was also mentioned.\(^{23}\)

Wear stressed on-the-job assistance to teachers. It was believed that this assistance was rapidly becoming one of the important functions of local supervisory personnel.\(^{24}\)

The majority of the general supervisors in North Carolina counties did not want supervisors to spend additional time providing materials and facilities. Only ten supervisors wanted to spend additional time. The others evidently were spending enough time providing services for teachers or did not consider this task as important as other tasks. Fifty-one supervisors provided materials and facilities often.

Giving demonstration lessons. Thirty-three North Carolina county general supervisors wanted to spend additional time giving demonstration lessons. The supervisors who were interviewed did not want to give demonstration lessons, but a desire to work in the

\(^{21}\)Harris, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

\(^{22}\)Gwynn, op. cit., p. 27.

\(^{23}\)Spears, op. cit., p. 117.

\(^{24}\)Pat W. Wear, " Supervision: Coordination of Multiple Consultations," Educational Leadership, XXIII (May, 1966), 652.
classroom with the students was mentioned.

Authors did not agree as to whether supervisors should do demonstration teaching. Neagley and Evans said that it was a needed practice. A list of suggestions for supervisors to use when doing demonstration teaching was given.\textsuperscript{25}

Franseeth found that demonstration teaching had little effectiveness. It was feared that teachers copied the supervisor's lessons. Cooperative teaching was favored.\textsuperscript{26}

Hammock and Owings said that demonstration teaching usually had ill effects. It developed "superiority-inferiority relationships."\textsuperscript{27}

Observing student classroom behavior. Authors agreed that supervisors should visit classrooms. Curtin stated that classroom observation was essential.\textsuperscript{28}

Wiles stressed that classroom visitation was effective only if the classroom teacher requested the supervisor to visit the classroom. A need for good personal relationships between the supervisor and the teacher was emphasized.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{25}Neagley and Evans, loc. cit.
\textsuperscript{26}Franseeth, op. cit., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{28}Curtin, op. cit., p. 59.
\textsuperscript{29}Wiles, op. cit., p. 259.
Kyte agreed with Wiles. A need for an invitation from the classroom teacher before the supervisor observed in the classroom was stressed.30

Twenty-seven North Carolina county general supervisors wanted to spend additional time observing student classroom behavior. Thirty-three supervisors were already visiting classrooms often. Therefore, sixty North Carolina supervisors indicated a need for classroom observation.

Conferring with teachers. Authors of books on supervision agreed that conferring with teachers was necessary. There was no consensus about the effectiveness of supervisory conferences.

Hicks mentioned the counseling process as one of the four components of supervision. Human relations was also emphasized.31

Curtin wanted the conference method improved. Its full potential was not utilized.32

Sixty-eight North Carolina county general supervisors were often conferring with teachers. Eighteen supervisors wanted to spend additional time conferring with teachers. Therefore, the majority of the general supervisors in North Carolina counties declared that conferring with teachers was an important supervisory function.

Analyzing and evaluating teachers. Authors agreed that some kind of evaluation was necessary. Evaluation was mentioned as a major task of a supervisor.


31Hicks, op. cit., p. 53.

32Curtin, op. cit., p. 59.
Corey pointed out that the supervisor was sometimes seen as judgmental. This attitude caused definite barriers and defenses to emerge and block communication.33

Lucio and McNeil described evaluation of teacher performance and instruction as a technical skill. A model for the evaluation of teacher performance was developed. The model embraced three main phases: objectives, supervisory assistance, and evaluation.34

Hicks listed the evaluative process as one of the four components of supervision. The four components were to extend vision of teachers and learners, to create a desire for improvement, to unify the efforts of school personnel, to increase productivity and to evaluate the results.35

North Carolina county general supervisors did not wish to evaluate teachers. Thirty-four supervisors never wanted to evaluate teachers. However, thirteen supervisors wanted to evaluate teachers often.

Visiting other school systems. Authors agreed that supervisors needed to visit other school systems for ideas. Lucio and McNeil stressed that students of supervision had a "responsibility for exploring."36


34Lucio and McNeil, op. cit., pp. 165-236.

35Hicks, op. cit., p. 21.

Douglass, Bent, and Boardman emphasized investigation as a necessary part of supervision. Supervisors should visit other school systems and see what methods were being used for effective teaching and learning.\textsuperscript{37}

Thirty-eight general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems wanted to often visit other school systems for ideas. An additional fifty-one supervisors wanted to visit other schools sometimes. Thirty-four persons indicated a desire to spend additional time visiting other school systems for ideas. These data showed that North Carolina supervisors believed that visiting other school systems was important and enough time was not spent visiting other schools.

**Attending professional meetings.** Authors agreed that supervisors should participate in professional activities. Leeper, the associate secretary for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, emphasized the professionalization of supervisors.\textsuperscript{38}

Crosby stressed the need for the "professionalization of supervisors."\textsuperscript{39} McMaster stressed the significance of relationships


\textsuperscript{38}Leeper, op. cit., p. 34.

among professionals. Attendance at professional meetings aided in the fulfillment of this need.40

Fifty-seven supervisors in North Carolina county school systems often attended professional meetings. Ten other supervisors wanted to spend additional time. Thirteen supervisors wanted to spend less time attending professional meetings. Therefore, the majority of the respondents did not wish to spend additional time attending professional meetings.

Participating in supervisory workshops. Authors agreed that participation in workshops was essential. Antell mentioned attendance in workshops as an important supervisory function.41

Leeper stressed the preparation of supervisors. Workshops afforded outstanding opportunities for additional preparation of supervisors.42

McMaster suggested a need for working relationships among supervisory colleagues and associates. Workshops aided in the development of good relationships.43

Seventy-seven North Carolina county general supervisors wanted to attend workshops for self-improvement at least sometimes. Two supervisors never wanted to attend workshops.

42 Leeper, op. cit., p. 60.
43 McMaster, loc. cit.
Working as a consultant outside the school. Antell reported that 60 percent of the two hundred New York City elementary school teachers who participated in a survey wanted to act as a consultant or technical advisor. Teachers also wanted the help of consultants.44

Ebey and Hamilton reported about a group of experienced classroom teachers in Portland, Oregon, who were selected to serve as consultants. These teachers worked exclusively as helping teachers. Other teachers enjoyed the help of the consultants.45

Forty-nine North Carolina county general supervisors wanted to serve as consultants sometimes. Forty supervisors wanted to seldom or never serve as consultants outside the school systems. Therefore, it was not agreed that supervisors needed to serve as consultants.

Doing secretarial work. Some authors omitted performing secretarial duties from the list of supervisory responsibilities. The Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development reported that Ohio supervisors spent a great deal of time doing general office work.46

Only two North Carolina county general supervisors wished to do additional secretarial work. Sixty-three supervisors never wanted


to do secretarial work. Therefore, North Carolina county general supervisors did not indicate that it was the supervisor's duty to do secretarial work.

Assisting the superintendent. Some authors stressed assisting the superintendent as an important supervisory function. Others did not mention it as a duty of the supervisor.

Gwynn believed that acting as a resource person for the superintendent was a major responsibility of a supervisor. Neagley and Evans emphasized the importance of staff members actively and cooperatively being involved in the instructional program. Each member of the staff should be willing to assist another staff member.

North Carolina county general supervisors did not object to assisting the superintendent. Seventy-seven supervisors wished to assist the superintendent often or sometimes. However, fourteen supervisors wished to spend less time assisting the superintendent.

Developing public relations. Authors of supervision books agreed that developing public relations was an integral part of supervision. Neagley and Evans stressed the duty of all school personnel to interpret the instructional program to the public. It was a supervisor's duty to make informal contacts for developing public relations.

Gwynn declared that supervision should include skill in human relations. One of the major responsibilities of a supervisor

---

47Neagley and Evans, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

48Ibid.
was to serve as a public relations person. A supervisor should be an "interpreter of the school and its program to the school personnel and to the public."\textsuperscript{49}

Harris listed developing public relations as one of the ten major tasks of supervisors.\textsuperscript{50} Eye and Netzer mentioned public interpretation as a supervisor's responsibility.\textsuperscript{51}

Seventeen North Carolina county general supervisors indicated a desire to spend additional time developing public relations. Forty-four supervisors often or sometimes developed public relations. Therefore, at least 60 percent of the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems stressed developing public relations as an important duty of a supervisor.

**Planning buildings with administrators.** Authors of books pertaining to supervision agreed that planning was a major function of supervision. Wilson, Byar, and others defined the role of a supervisor as the role of a planner. A supervisor should be a creative planner.\textsuperscript{52}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{49}Gwynn, op. cit., pp. 27-32.

\textsuperscript{50}Harris, op. cit., pp. 13-14.


Melchoir emphasized that supervisors should be directly involved in beautifying grounds and buildings. A supervisor should possess "superior-vision." 53

North Carolina county general supervisors declared that there was not enough time spent in planning. Thirty-one supervisors wanted to increase the amount of time spent in this area of supervision. Thirty-five supervisors often planned buildings with administrators.

**Acting as change agents.** The majority of writers in supervision agreed that supervisors should be change agents. Harris declared that leaders must find new ways of leading schools toward rational change. A need for new leadership positions to be created to facilitate change in educational organizations was emphasized. 54

Crosby defined a supervisor as a change agent. A supervisor should be an initiator of change and constantly provide new ideas for change. 55

Foster disagreed with the majority of writers in supervision. Supportive personnel were not responsible for producing change in others. It was each person's own responsibility to create change. Supervisors needed to participate only in the "interchange of ideas and the expression of feelings." 56

---

53 Melchoir, op. cit., pp. 1-10.
54 Harris, op. cit., pp. 739-42.
55 Crosby, op. cit., pp. 43-64.
56 Foster, op. cit., pp. 151-54.
Eye and Netzer maintained that a supervisor no longer needed only to improve ways of doing things, but that supervisors were often initiators of the change itself. The major function of supervision was to influence situations and persons in order to stimulate change which could be evaluated as improvement.57

Harris defined "dynamic supervision"58 as supervision which was designed to change the instructional program. The major function of supervision as changing rather than maintaining the teaching-learning processes was visualized.

Cunningham emphasized a supervisor's responsibility to establish a climate for innovation and change. A need for supervisors to be internal change agents and to use outside consultants as external change agents in order to effect needed changes within school systems was stressed.59

Supervisors in North Carolina county school systems often performed as change agents in the school systems. Forty-four supervisors often planned innovative programs. Thirty-seven supervisors often changed old programs. Twenty-four supervisors wanted to spend additional time in these activities.

Summary of the Interviews

Twenty-three general supervisors in North Carolina counties were interviewed. Ten supervisors were interviewed by telephone and

57Eye and Netzer, op. cit., p. 39.
58Harris, op. cit., p. 34.
thirteen were interviewed in person.

Eleven of these supervisors had already returned completed questionnaires. No disagreements between answers on the returned questionnaires and the interviews were found except for the supervisors' self-perceptions as change agents. During the interviews, reports were given that all supervisors interviewed were change agents in the school systems. The answers on the questionnaire did not show that everyone was a change agent.

Supervisors interviewed were complimentary about the form of the questions and the answer selections on the questionnaire, except one. This supervisor was not complimentary because the questionnaire was interpreted to be too personal. The other twenty-two supervisors did not consider any part of the questionnaire personal.

Some of the supervisors interviewed wanted to do less office work. One supervisor did janitorial work in the central offices because no janitor was employed. All preferred to spend time visiting the schools and working with teachers and students.

The supervisors, during the interviews, gave various reasons for non-responses. Several supervisors had not received questionnaires. One person returned the completed questionnaire but the researcher did not receive it. Others were very busy and had not found time to answer the questions. One county did not have a general supervisor. The superintendent chose to use the allotted supervisory position for an assistant superintendent. One supervisor expected the researcher to come for an interview since the county was close to the researcher's home county.
Chapter 3 contained a summary of the pilot study, the methods of collecting data for the North Carolina study, and an analysis of the data collected by means of questionnaires completed by North Carolina county general supervisors. A comparison was made between the preferred supervisory activities of general supervisors in North Carolina counties and accepted supervisory activities presented in the related literature.

Chapter 4 gives a summary of the entire study, findings of the study, and suggestions for further study.
Chapter 4

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

SUMMARY

The problem of the study was to search the related literature for criteria for acceptable supervision and to construct an instrument by which information could be collected from the general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems to determine how supervisors spent time, how they wished to spend time and to compare the preferred supervisory activities with recommended criteria for supervision found in the related literature.

Questionnaires were sent to the general supervisors in the one hundred North Carolina counties. Responses were received from the ninety-nine counties which had general supervisors. All of the responses were used in the data tabulation. Tables, lists, bar graphs, and percentages were used to present the findings. Thirteen of the North Carolina county general supervisors, or 13 percent, were interviewed in person. In addition, ten supervisors were interviewed by telephone.

FINDINGS

The majority of the ninety-nine respondents, 55 percent, were women. Fifty-three of the North Carolina county general supervisors
were fifty years old or younger and forty-three were over fifty years of age. Twenty-one persons were between the ages of fifty-one and fifty-five.

There were differences between males and females in their perception of themselves as change agents in the school systems. It was found that 15 percent more females than males perceived themselves as change agents in the school system.

There were differences in self-perceptions as change agents in the school systems between supervisors fifty years old or younger and supervisors older than fifty. It was found that 60 percent of the forty-five supervisors fifty years old or younger were change agents. Twenty-eight of the fifty-four supervisors, or 52 percent, older than fifty were change agents.

Ninety of the ninety-nine respondents had experience as classroom teachers. Sixty-eight of these supervisors had at least six years of such experience. There was only a 2 percent difference between the group with teaching experience and the group without such experience in self-perception as change agents in the school systems. These general supervisors wanted to be change agents in the school systems but indicated a lack of sufficient time.

Seventy-two of the respondents had ten years or less experience as supervisors. Sixty-four of the respondents had previous experience in non-school jobs. Experience in non-school jobs did not increase supervisors' self-perceptions as change agents in the school systems. In fact, there was no difference between general supervisors with school experience only and those with non-school experience.
Ninety-two of the ninety-nine general county supervisors held Master's degrees, but only twenty-one of these degrees were in supervision. Therefore, few North Carolina general county supervisors were educationally prepared to perform supervisory duties and responsibilities. Respondents with degrees in supervision differed in their self-perception as school system agents from respondents without degrees in supervision. It was found that 10 percent more supervisors with degrees in supervision were change agents in school systems than those without degrees in supervision.

Six supervisors had received their most recent degree before 1950. Twenty-one supervisors had received their most recent degree since 1970. North Carolina colleges and universities had granted degrees to 87 percent of the respondents. Only eleven supervisors received degrees from out-of-state schools. Therefore, North Carolina general county supervisors lacked educational experiences in other states. Changes in North Carolina school systems were not influenced by college experiences of out-of-state supervisors. By 1974, several supervisors in North Carolina counties were becoming better educated and younger people were completing degrees in supervision.

Job descriptions for general supervisors were not available in all of the North Carolina county school systems. Forty-one supervisors did not have written job descriptions. The counties with job descriptions were not concentrated in one area. The superintendent defined the job of the supervisor for the majority of the respondents. The available job descriptions did not reflect the thinking of the supervisors.
The following ten major supervisory responsibilities in rank order were identified on the available job descriptions:

Staff development
Improvement of instruction
Instructional materials
Coordinate special services
In-service education
Public relations
Testing
Teacher assistance
Develop new programs
Evaluation

These duties and responsibilities included three of the activities considered important by the North Carolina general county supervisors: coordinating activities, arranging in-service training, and providing instructional materials. This indicated that supervisors did not write the job descriptions, because the respondents did not agree with the duties and responsibilities as set forth in the written job descriptions.

North Carolina general county supervisors often performed the following activities:

Coordinating instructional activities
Arranging in-service training
Conferring with teachers
Providing materials and facilities
Organizing for instruction
The respondents preferred to spend time in the following activities:

- Coordinating instructional activities
- Conferring with teachers
- Arranging in-service training
- Providing materials and facilities
- Developing curricula

Therefore, the respondents wanted to coordinate instructional activities, confer with teachers, arrange in-service training, and provide materials and facilities, but indicated that developing curricula was more important than organizing for instruction. Fifty-one of the ninety-nine general county supervisors in North Carolina provided materials and facilities to teachers and principals often. Only 16 percent of the respondents did secretarial work often. Forty-one supervisors assisted superintendents often. In the data, there was evidence that North Carolina supervisors were providing materials and facilities when they wanted to be making changes in the teaching-learning environment.

Ten supervisors wanted to spend additional time visiting other school systems for ideas. Ten of the ninety-nine supervisors also wanted to spend additional time attending professional meetings. Thirty-one of the ninety-nine general supervisors wanted to spend additional time planning buildings with administrators. It was concluded from this study that supervisors were not encouraged to serve as consultants in other school systems since the respondents wanted to serve as consultants outside the school systems. Serving as
consultants outside the school systems was a frontier in North Carolina supervision. Administrators had not provided financial compensation for supervisors to work as consultants.

It was further concluded that North Carolina general supervisors wanted to be change agents in the school systems. Fifty-two supervisors wanted to be change agents in the school systems. The respondents indicated that too much time was spent arranging in-service training and analyzing and evaluating teachers. Forty-four respondents often planned innovative programs. It was also concluded that few North Carolina general county supervisors planned innovative programs. Twenty-one respondents in the one hundred North Carolina county school systems often participated in setting up or organizing team teaching. Twenty supervisors often participated in setting up or organizing open classrooms. Twenty-eight respondents often participated in setting up or organizing individually-guided instruction. Therefore, few innovative programs had been planned by general supervisors in North Carolina counties.

New educational concepts were only beginning to filter into the North Carolina county school systems in 1974. Approximately 25 percent of the supervisors had set up innovative programs. There was evidence that many of the new programs which had been initiated were not successful according to the respondents.

North Carolina general county supervisors often set up developmental and remedial reading programs. Therefore, it was concluded that reading programs were given priority over other innovative programs in North Carolina prior to 1974. If county
administrators employed a reading specialist, the general supervisor had time to plan other innovative programs.

Activities of the supervisors tended to differ according to the size of the county and the number of supervisors in the school system. Small counties or counties with less than two hundred employed teachers had only one supervisor. (See Appendix A for the regulations of the North Carolina Department of Instruction concerning allotment of supervisors to county school systems.) Therefore, this person was responsible for all supervisory activities. A great deal of time was spent doing general office work and assisting the superintendent. Large counties which had several supervisors presented a different picture. The general supervisor served as a coordinator of the other supervisors. There were special area supervisors for elementary and secondary schools.

The study showed that supervisors had become administrators in many school systems, especially in the small counties. Most of the supervisors wanted to spend time in the schools, but found it necessary to spend a great deal of time in the central office.

The 100 percent response of the North Carolina general county supervisors indicated an exceptional degree of cooperation. All respondents expressed a concern for improving supervision.

Data from this study indicated that sex, age, and a degree in supervision had an effect on a supervisor's self-perception as a change agent in the school system. However, experience in teaching, as a principal, as a program director, or in a non-school job made no difference in a supervisor's self-perception as a change agent in the
school system, More female supervisors than male supervisors perceived themselves as change agents in the school systems. More supervisors fifty years old or younger considered themselves change agents than supervisors older than fifty (60 percent as compared to 52 percent). Supervisors with supervision degrees, or 54 percent, were change agents, while only 44 percent of those supervisors without supervision degrees considered themselves change agents.

IMPLICATIONS

From the findings of the study the following implications were made:

1. North Carolina county general supervisors were not educationally prepared for school supervisory positions. The supervisors' educational backgrounds were not in the area of supervision, even though they held Master's degrees or advanced educational degrees. Not only advanced degrees, but additional training in the area of supervision would be advantageous.

2. One-fifth of the North Carolina county general supervisors were nearing retirement age in 1974. Therefore, younger supervisors with supervision degrees would soon replace them.

3. Since sex, age, and supervision degrees were the influential factors in a general supervisor's self-perception as a change agent, more general supervisors in North Carolina will perceive themselves as change agents.

4. Only 53 percent of the North Carolina counties had written job descriptions for the general county supervisors, therefore, job descriptions were needed in forty-six counties where they were lacking.
5. Job descriptions did not reflect the supervisors' ideas about activities they identified as important. If one accepts the proposition that supervisors should be allowed an increased role in determining their duties, it would seem desirable that supervisors should participate in the writing of job descriptions in the future.

6. Supervisors did not have opportunities to serve as consultants in other school systems; therefore, if consulting is deemed desirable, then plans should be made to allow general supervisors to work as consultants.

7. Supervisors were taking additional courses and earning higher degrees, but most were taking courses in administration. There was evidence that supervisors viewed supervisory positions as administrative positions. Supervisors wanted to participate in the decision-making.

8. North Carolina was wasting money when supervisors were doing secretarial work, janitorial services, and other jobs which an unskilled worker could do for a lower salary. Therefore, other personnel should be hired for these duties.

9. There was evidence from the questionnaire that North Carolina general county supervisors were not planners of change. The general supervisors wanted visits to other school systems, one-day workshops, and in-service training for supervisors. While supervisors provided these opportunities for teachers, they did not have similar opportunities.

10. Age and sex were influential in determining general supervisors' self-perceptions as change agents, therefore, a female supervisor fifty years old or younger with a degree in supervision is
more likely to be a change agent than a male supervisor or a supervisor
without a degree in supervision.

11. Teaching experience, experience as a principal, or experience as a program director did not seemingly increase a supervisor's self-perception as a change agent in the school system. Therefore, if school administrators want supervisors to be change agents, factors other than teaching experience should be considered.

12. Non-school jobs did not seem to influence a supervisor's self-perception as a change agent in the school system, but with the twelve-month contract it is unlikely that supervisors in the future will have non-school employment.

13. North Carolina county general supervisors were not performing activities they considered important, such as planning and serving as a consultant outside the school system. Therefore, it is likely that these supervisory activities will be included when supervisors are allowed to establish priorities in work assignments.

14. Supervisors were not obtaining desired experiences and opportunities at professional meetings, therefore, planning of professional meetings should be improved.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Further studies need to be completed in the area of supervision. The statistics obtained in North Carolina compared with statistics obtained in other states and with a national sampling would be worthwhile.

Supervisors as change agents presents an interesting topic for study. A survey of teachers' opinions of how supervisors serve as
change agents in school systems would be beneficial to general supervisors and administrators.

Some of the supervisors in North Carolina county schools indicated that the scope of supervision is changing. One wonders if this was true in all counties or just in large counties where more supervisory personnel were available. The number of possibilities for studies is limitless.

Few studies in supervision have been completed. There is a need for additional studies in all areas of supervision. A supervisor's role needs to be defined. A supervisor needs to know how to serve school personnel in the best possible way to improve teaching and learning.

Suggestions for further studies are:

1. a comparison of data on North Carolina general supervisors' duties and responsibilities with data on those of general supervisors in other states.

2. a comparison of North Carolina supervisory activities with a national sampling.

3. a study of special area supervisors in North Carolina to compare supervisory duties of general supervisors in counties with special area supervisors.

4. a comparison of general supervisors in North Carolina county school systems with general supervisors in North Carolina city school systems.

5. the scope of general supervision in North Carolina schools.

6. the personality traits a general supervisor should have to become a change agent in the school system.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

Name__________________________Age_________Sex ___________County________

I. Experience: (1) Teacher ____________years
    (2) Supervisor ____________years
    (3) Principal or superintendent ________ years
    (4) Program coordinator ____________ years

II. Since age twenty have you worked full time at any non-school job?
    Yes_____ No_____. If yes, explain briefly the nature of each such job and give the number of years experience in each job. ________

III. Professional Preparation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>No. of Yrs. Attended</th>
<th>Degree Awarded</th>
<th>Year Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Year Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Estimate of Course Work in Curriculum Development and Supervision: (Please indicate whether your estimates are in quarter or semester hours).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Hours in Curriculum Development</th>
<th>Hours in Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Does your school system have a written job description for your position? Yes____ No____ If no, how and by whom is your work defined or described?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

If yes, what major responsibilities are identified? __________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(I would appreciate a copy of your written job description if one is available.)

VI. What do you consider your major responsibility as a supervisor?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

VII. As you view yourself in your position, rank the following items according to the number of times you perform the activities during a typical school year. Use the following scales: 4=often, 3=sometimes, 2=seldom, 1=never. Circle your answer. Then again rank each item according to how you think you should spend your time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>How you currently spend your time</th>
<th>How you would like to spend your time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Improving Teaching and Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curricula</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Self-improvement Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. General Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public relations</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. Acting as a Change Agent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>How you currently spend your time</th>
<th>How you would like to spend your time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing old programs</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. Have you ever participated in setting up or organizing any of the following? (Use the following scale: 4=often, 3=sometimes, 2=seldom, 1=never.) Were you successful? Answer yes or no. Circle your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Have you participated in setting up or organizing</th>
<th>Were you successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open classrooms</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individually-guided instruction</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous progress</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental reading</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the educable retarded</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the gifted</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes for the physically handicapped</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please feel free to use the back of this sheet to make additional comments concerning instructional supervision as practiced in your school system.
APPENDIX B

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POLICIES AND REGULATIONS COVERING THE ALLOTMENT
AND USE OF SUPERVISORS, 1973-74

1. Objectives in the Allocation and Use of Supervisors

Supervisors are allotted to school administrative units to provide competent and effective leadership. In the total pattern of educational leadership, the supervisor's responsibility lies uniquely in the area of leadership for improvement of programs and the quality of instruction. County and city boards of education and school administrators shall use these positions for this purpose only. It is not intended that a supervisor allotted under these policies and regulations shall be assigned administrative or managerial duties usually assigned to an assistant or associate superintendent or administrative official.

2. Local Plans for Supervisory Program Filed with State Superintendent

On forms to be supplied, county and city superintendents shall submit to the Assistant Superintendent for Program Services, Department of Public Instruction, a proposed plan for the supervisory services in their respective administrative units. The plan submitted by a local unit shall show the following:

a. The total number of supervisory positions, regardless of source of salary. (Part-time assignments reported in terms of full-time equivalents.)

b. The specific position(s) to be paid from State funds.

c. Description of the work assignment for personnel in each position, including specific assignments and plans for 12 months employment. (Part-time assignments reported individually.)

d. Provisions for travel, office accommodations, clerical assistance, and office expense.

In the case of joint employment, the plan shall indicate also the amount of time the supervisor(s) will give to each administrative unit.

Failure of local unit plans to reflect conformance with these rules and regulations, or finding that these rules and regulations are not sustained in the implementation of the program, shall constitute sufficient cause to withhold salary funds for State-allotted positions pending necessary corrective action.
3. **Basis of Allotment**

   a. The original total allotment of teachers to an administrative unit from the State Nine Months School Fund for the year 1973-1974 shall determine the number of supervisory positions to be allotted to each administrative unit for 1973-1974 as follows:

   1 for 75 State-allotted teachers  
   2 for 200 State-allotted teachers  
   1 additional for each additional 145 State-allotted teachers

   b. If a county school administrative unit does not qualify for a supervisor under the above, it and a city unit or city units within the county, or it and an adjoining county may, by joint agreement, make application to the State Board of Education for the allotment of a supervisor or supervisors on the basis of the total original allotment to all the school administrative units concerned.

   c. Likewise, if a city school administrative unit does not qualify for a supervisor under the above, it and any unit or units in the county may, by joint agreement, make application to the State Board of Education for the allotment of a supervisor or supervisors on the basis of the total original teacher allotment in all the school administrative units concerned.

   d. At least one position shall be allotted to each County Administrative Unit.

4. **Request for Allotment of Supervisor**

   The number of instructional supervisory positions to which each administrative unit is entitled under Paragraph 3.a. above will be allotted by the Controller of the State Board of Education. Those units which may qualify for an allotment under the provisions of Paragraph 3.b. or 3.c. above will be allotted a supervisory position upon receipt by the Controller of a joint application and request from the boards of education which have agreed to share and have made provision for sharing the services of a supervisor, such allotment to be made to the unit designated on the joint application. The joint application and request must be filed annually on forms prepared by the Controller.

5. **Division of Costs between State and Local Units**

   a. The State Board of Education will participate in this program to the extent of the salary costs for each employed State-allotted supervisor on the State Salary Schedule for a period of twelve calendar months.
b. The local administrative unit will provide: (1) funds for necessary traveling expenses in carrying out assigned duties in the position; (2) necessary office space; (3) necessary office expenses and clerical assistance. In case the services of one person are shared by two administrative units, the proportion of such local expense shall be borne by each in accordance with agreements between the local boards concerned.

6. Agreements between Administrative Units

If the supervisory unit includes more than one administrative unit, time of such personnel shall be distributed between the administrative units on the basis of the percentage of teachers in each unit.

7. Agreement between Supervisors and Administrative Units

If the services of a supervisor are shared by two or more units, there shall be a written working agreement between the supervisor and the boards of education as to duties, time to be devoted to each unit, the amount of salary and travel expense each unit will pay, and the office expense and clerical assistance which will be provided by each board of education.

8. Extending Supervisory Services by Prorating Positions

As a means of deriving maximum leadership value from supervisory positions, state-allotted positions may be prorated between two or among three supervisory assignment areas. No supervisory assignment shall be for less than one third time. All part-time supervisory assignments will be charged against the supervisor allotment to the administrative unit and will be subject to all provisions of these policies and regulations.

9. Qualification of Supervisor

The supervisor shall hold, or be qualified to hold, the Supervisor's Certificate, except that: The holder of a regular Class A or C Teacher's Certificate who will be continuing in a supervisory position held prior to 1966-67 may be employed as a provisional supervisor. A person entering supervision for the first time who does not hold the Supervisor's Certificate, but holds the Graduate Teacher's Certificate in the area of assignment and who has a minimum of five years of successful teaching experience in the area of assignment, may be employed to serve as a professional supervisor, provided he enrolls in a graduate program leading toward the Supervisor's Certificate and earns per year not less
than six semester hours of graduate credit toward qualifying for the Supervisor's Certificate. Continued approval to serve as a provisional supervisor will be granted upon receipt of an official transcript showing the completion of the required graduate credit.

10. **Annual Report of Supervisors**

Each administrative unit shall submit such report of the supervisory services in the unit, as the Department of Public Instruction may request, on forms provided by the Department.
May 4, 1973

Dear Educator:

I am a student in the doctoral program at East Tennessee State University. I have chosen for my dissertation topic: "A Survey of the Activities and Responsibilities of General School Supervisors in North Carolina Counties."

In your hand, you have a copy of the questionnaire I plan to use in North Carolina. Would you please complete the questionnaire and return it to me as you leave the room? Mr. John Horner and Mr. Donald Bull have given their approval for your participation in this study.

I am not concerned with your names, so if you prefer, you may leave that space blank.

This is a pilot study. The information obtained from the questionnaires here will be used only to test the questionnaire. I would welcome any comments you have.

Thank you for your time and helpfulness.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
Route 2
Marshall, N.C.
April 4, 1973

Dr. Craig Phillips
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dear Sir:

I am a student at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. I am doing some research in partial fulfillment for the requirements of a Doctorate in Educational Supervision.

The study I wish to make is "A Survey of the Responsibilities and Duties of the General Supervisors in North Carolina Counties." I am a member of the Madison County Board of Education in Marshall, North Carolina, and a teacher at Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, North Carolina. Therefore, I would like to conduct my study in North Carolina.

Would you please grant me permission to conduct the study. If you do grant the permission, may I enclose a copy of your letter when I write to the superintendents of the counties to ask them to designate someone to complete the questionnaire? If you have a particular question or questions you would like to have included on the questionnaire, I shall be happy to do so.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
Mrs. Bobby Jean Peek Rice  
Route 2  
Marshall, North Carolina  

Dear Bobby Jean:

It has just come to my attention that your letter of April 6th to Dr. Craig Phillips concerning your doctoral research was inadvertently held in file without a response. I sincerely apologize for this delay, which was my fault but completely unintentional.

We would, of course, be delighted to have you conduct your proposed study, "A Survey of the General Supervisors in the North Carolina Counties." As you are aware from your service on the Madison County Board of Education, we have no direct jurisdiction over employees of local boards of education. However, we would anticipate that you are likely to receive excellent cooperation from most of the supervisors, provided your questionnaire is structured to avoid too great time-consumption in preparing a response.

Of course, the fact that supervisors are now employed for twelve months may well make them more responsive during the next two months than would have formerly been possible.

As an excellent initial contact, you might want to talk to Marcus C. Smith, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Salisbury City Schools. I know of no one more knowledgeable than Marcus in the area of instructional supervision.

Again, I apologize for the delay in responding to your request.

Sincerely,

William W. Peek  
Assistant to the State Superintendent

WWP/jap  
cc: Marcus Smith
Dear

I am a student at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. As partial fulfillment for the doctorate of educational supervision, I am doing some research in the area of supervision. The topic of my proposed dissertation is "The Responsibilities and Duties of the General Supervisors in North Carolina Counties."

Your superintendent has designated you to give me information concerning your school system. I have enclosed a questionnaire. Would you please complete it and return it to me in the enclosed envelope? I would appreciate a prompt reply.

Permission to conduct the study has been received from your superintendent and also from the State Department of Public Instruction.

Thank you very much for your time and effort. If you would like a copy of the results of the study, please indicate on the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
Mr.
Superintendent of Schools

Dear Sir:

Recently I sent a request to you asking for permission to use your school in a survey which I am doing for my dissertation. Since I have not received an answer from you, I am enclosing a copy of my questionnaire. Would you please select a supervisor in your school system to complete it? It should take only about ten minutes to complete it.

I would very much like for each county to be represented in the survey. No individual statistics will be reported. All information will be confidential. I am interested only in the statistics for the entire state. In fact, if the supervisor prefers not to sign the questionnaire, it will be agreeable with me. I just need to know if I have received an answer from your county.

Thank you very much. I realize that your time is valuable. I do plan to send the combined results to Dr. Craig Phillips, therefore, I want to make every effort to have each county represented.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
Dear Sir:

I few weeks ago I mailed a copy of my questionnaire which I am using in order to collect data for my dissertation to your supervisor. I have not received an answer. I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire. Would you please urge your supervisor to complete it at his earliest convenience. If he prefers to omit his name, I do not mind. Most of the counties have already reported and I would like very much to get as near one hundred percent as possible. I feel that this would present a clearer picture of what supervision is like in our state.

May I remind you that no individual county statistics will be reported. Answers will be totaled, no mention of separate counties will be made.

Thank you very much for a prompt reply. I realize that superintendents and supervisors are very busy and I know it really is an imposition to ask them to complete another questionnaire, but I truly would be grateful for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
APPENDIX I

Route 2
Marshall, N. C.
September 9, 1973

Dear Sir:

Several weeks ago I requested permission to use your school system in my survey of the activities and responsibilities of general supervisors in North Carolina counties. This survey will be used for my dissertation, therefore, I would like very much to have each county represented. If you agree to participate in my study, I will send a two-page questionnaire to the person you designate. Completion of this questionnaire should take only approximately ten or fifteen minutes. I plan to interview ten percent of the respondents for about five minutes. A random table of numbers will be used to select those to be interviewed. I do not think that you will find any part of the questionnaire objectionable.

I would appreciate your giving this request your consideration. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice
APPENDIX J

JOB DESCRIPTION: General Supervisors (K-6)

(The elementary supervisor is directly responsible to the Superintendent and the Director of Instruction.)

1. To coordinate state programs and attend state sponsored and other professional meetings.

2. To work cooperatively with coordinators in specialized areas--federal programs, etc.

3. To coordinate the testing program in assigned area--administer individual or group tests as needed and aid in interpretation of results.

4. To aid in the development of curriculum guides.

5. To direct the selection of newly adopted state textbooks.

6. To work with the principal as coordinator for the basic instructional program, identify characteristics of the curriculum and instructional methods, and aid in the selection of supplementary books, instructional materials, equipment, and resources.

7. To coordinate the work of those responsible for special services such as music, art, reading, etc.

8. To work in cooperation with the Exceptional Children Coordinator with problems, referrals, and tests (K-6).

9. To continuously evaluate curriculum approaches used within the LEA and the student's responses to the approaches.

10. To assist Attendance Counselor and Home-School Coordinator with problems and referrals.

11. To serve personnel upon request concerning individual needs and instructional program.

12. To serve as contact person for school system (K-8) Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (reports, self-studies, etc.).
JOB DESCRIPTION: General Supervisors

Duties of general supervisors:

1. Classroom observation including follow-up conferences with the teachers observed and principals when applicable.

2. Individual and group conferences concerning curriculum and instruction.

3. Planning and conducting in-service training programs with follow-up of programs.

4. Assisting in selection and in the effective use of instructional materials and supplies.

5. Preparing for and providing follow-up services of visiting consultants and specialists.

6. Serving as coordinators for special projects.

7. Compiling and interpreting test results.

8. Assisting in curriculum development.

9. Administering individual diagnostic tests and recommending remedial action.

10. Supervising special projects, experimental and research projects, etc. in the curriculum area.

11. Orienting new teachers to the availability of materials, equipment, and resource people on the administrative staff.
JOB DESCRIPTION: Director of Instruction

The Director of Instruction shall devote a great portion of his time to scheduling classroom visitation. Classroom visitations without any helpful objective or follow-up conference are useless. Other requests for classroom visitation may be made by the teacher or the principal.

The person holding this position must be an expert teacher who is able to suggest techniques, methods, and materials to improve instruction; must be a person teachers and principals respect for his personal integrity, professional knowledge and competency; must be able to establish good relations with school personnel; must be able to inspire confidence in co-workers.

The Director shall be responsible for working with the superintendent and principals in planning and implementing improvements in the instructional program. He shall not be assigned administrative duties. The employment of school personnel must be done according to G. S. 115-58 as quoted in "Recruitment and Selection of Teachers."

Other duties of the Director of Instruction are as follows:

1. Be responsible for the elementary education and secondary education programs.

2. Have direct responsibility for special programs as assigned by the Superintendent.

3. Supervise and direct to completion temporary projects assigned by the Superintendent.

4. Coordinate programs and services as directed by the Superintendent.
   
   A. Curriculum
   
   B. Instructional Supervision
   
   C. Staff Development
   
   D. Pupil Personnel Services

5. Assist the Superintendent and staff to evaluate, coordinate, and develop the curriculum.

6. Assist the Learning Resource Center Director in maintaining a curriculum library which shall consist of the latest textbooks and supplementary materials in the area in which they have been assigned. Encourage the principals and teachers to use this material in planning units of work.
JOB DESCRIPTION: Director of Instruction (continued)

7. Assist principals and teachers in the selection of supplementary readers.

8. Assist the Superintendent and principals in planning and conducting meaningful in-service training programs.

9. A Director of Instruction shall not hold two positions simultaneously, such as Director of Head Start or Director of Summer School, while serving as Director of Instruction.