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Abstract

A STUDY OF THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE COUNTIES OF TENNESSEE

by

Jane Williams Afifi

The purpose of this study was the description of the instructional supervisory role in the state of Tennessee as perceived by county public school instructional supervisors. The description constituted a determination of differences which existed between the actual and ideal role perceptions of county instructional supervisors. The determination was thought to be essential for movement toward role congruency, enhancement of instructional supervisory behavior, and the heightening of teacher-student engagement opportunities.

Section VII, 'A' through 'D' of a survey instrument constructed by Dr. Bobby Jean Rice for North Carolina supervisors was utilized to elicit the desired information from the sample of one instructional supervisor from each of Tennessee's ninety-five counties. The structured closed questionnaire produced usable returns from seventy-one supervisors (74.7 percent) and contained responses concerning twenty-two functions of supervisory behavior which had been derived from contemporary literature.

The data collected were acceptable and were processed by the East Tennessee State University Computer and Research Center utilizing the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test and SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), version H, release 7.2: Subprogram Cross-tabulations, which provided frequencies (percentages) and a dispersion into the desired categories. Tests of significance at the .05 level for a two-tailed measurement provided justification for either rejecting or failing to reject the null hypotheses relating to actual and ideal role perceptions.

Dissimilar role perceptions were revealed in the following functions:
1 - Coordinating instructional activities
2 - Developing curricula
3 - Organizing for instruction
4 - Orienting new staff
7 - Giving demonstration lessons
8 - Observing student classroom behavior
9 - Conferring with teachers
10 - Analyzing and evaluating teachers
11 - Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction
12 - Visiting other school systems for ideas
14 - Participating in supervisory workshops
15 - Working as a consultant outside your system
16 - Doing secretarial work
18 - Recommending staff
19 - Developing public relations
20 - Planning buildings with administrators
21 - Planning innovative programs
22 - Changing old programs

Similar role perceptions were revealed in the following functions:

5 - Arranging in-service training
6 - Providing materials and facilities
13 - Attending professional meetings
17 - Assisting the superintendent

Conclusions drawn from the findings were indicative of role incongruencies and confusion. In the function of orienting new staff, no supervisor perceived a desire to perform less, with thirty (44.1 percent) perceiving role satisfaction, while thirty-eight (56.0 percent) were dissatisfied. In the performance of the function of conferring with teachers, there were no supervisors perceiving role performance as actual greater than ideal. However, responses for the same function indicated that fifty supervisors (70.4 percent) were functioning ideally, with twenty-one supervisors (29.5 percent) perceiving a lack of ideal incumbency.

In consideration of the function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction, thirty-seven supervisors (52.1 percent) indicated a desire for engaging more in educational accounting, while thirty-one (43.6 percent) perceived their role to be similar to ideal role incumbency. Three supervisors (4.2 percent) perceived that the actual role was greater than the ideal and because this function represented accountability as well as interest in the improvement of instruction—the traditional focus of the instructional supervisor—the lack of agreement was remarkable. Recommendations for conducting training programs designed to aid in curriculum development, time study, and educational accountability were among those proposed as a means of achieving convergence of objectives, expectations, and goals: namely, the enhancement of teacher-student engagement opportunities in Tennessee county public school systems.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Acquiring additional knowledge of the actual and ideal role perceptions of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors and comparing the preferred role to approved criteria in related literature could be beneficial to those in responsible positions seeking improvement of the public educational system. Recommendations could thus be formulated which might enhance the teaching-learning engagement opportunities for teachers and students.

Professional educational literature abounds with such statements as:

Instructional supervisory behavior is behavior which is officially designated by the organization for the purpose of directly influencing the 'teaching behavior sub-system' in such a way as to facilitate the achievement of the goals of that system.¹

There is need for close communication among teachers in the process of curriculum development and the implementation of the instructional program.

Teachers have needs for security, belonging, affection, and recognition.

... the instructional supervisory support system needs to facilitate the process of teacher change, and program change

by helping teachers acquire new ideas, develop new skills and implement new programs.  

To make operational decisions . . . supervisors must study formal organization, role theory, communication, decision making, personality theory, the change process, and other areas significant to the human relations perspective of supervision.  

Role theory and the view of the institution of public education as an organization was basic to the study. That is to say, the organization was "a society of people interacting at various levels rather than . . . an impersonal system of positions."  

Furthermore, the successful accomplishment of fulfillment of supervisors' needs might occur when their role is in the optimum position in the system. The possible consequence could be the creation of a learning environment that would provide enhancement of the teaching-learning engagement opportunities for teachers and students. Specifically, a study of instructional supervisors' role perceptions might provide information concerning their role in Tennessee county public school systems and lead to solutions of problems.  

The following statement summarizes the theoretical structure underlying the study:  

Viewing an organization as a social institution consisting structurally of a system of roles can improve the understanding of the mechanisms by which the individual actualizes himself through the organization and,  

---

2Lovell and Phelps, pp. 1-2.  
simultaneously, the organization actualizes itself through the individual.5

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine differences which existed between the actual and ideal role perceptions of instructional supervisors in the public schools in the counties of Tennessee.

Statement of the Subproblems

Subproblems of this study were designed to answer the following questions:

1. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of coordinating instructional activity?

2. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing curricula?

3. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of organizing for instruction?

4. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of orienting new staff?

5. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of arranging in-service training?

6. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of providing materials and facilities?

7. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of giving demonstration lessons?

5Knezevich, p. 92.
8. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of observing student classroom behavior?

9. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of conferring with teachers?

10. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating teachers?

11. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction?

12. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of visiting other school systems for ideas?

13. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of attending professional meetings?

14. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of participating in supervisory workshops?

15. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of working as a consultant outside the school system?

16. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of doing secretarial work?

17. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of assisting the superintendent?

18. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of recommending staff?

19. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing public relations?
20. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning buildings with administrators?
21. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning innovative programs?
22. Did a difference exist between the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of changing old programs?

Purpose of the Study

This study had as its purpose the description of the instructional supervisory role in the State of Tennessee as perceived by county public school instructional supervisors. The description included selected functions as delineated in contemporary literature. Responses to a questionnaire from one instructional supervisor from each county revealed perceptions of the current instructional supervisory role within their individual school systems.

Significance of the Study

A review of the related literature in the field of instructional supervision revealed a call within the field for reconstruction of the role of supervision reflecting the national attitude of a search for quality control through definition of agents of change. In affirmation of this trend, educators wrote of dynamic supervision, which included the endeavors directed toward changing instructional practices and competencies of supervision, meaning any combination of...

---

knowledge and skill that is adequate for accomplishing some specified outcome. The use of such terminology directed attention to analyses of specifics in performance of duty and focused on identifying personal qualities relating to good teaching, together with the improvement of teacher skills so that teachers can deliver education with optimum effectiveness.

Limitations

The study was limited to a consideration of the actual and ideal role perceptions of public school instructional supervisors in the counties of Tennessee. One county instructional supervisor from each public educational system constituted the sample. The data gathered from the sample were tabulated responses to the questionnaire and were arranged in an appropriate mode.

A further limitation was that the results were relative to April and May, 1980. In addition, the questionnaire did not exhaust all aspects of the scope of actual and ideal role perception.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were basic to the development of this study:

1. There was a need for the study.


2. The perceived actual and ideal roles of public school instructional supervisors in the counties in Tennessee were believed to be different.

3. The sample consisting of one public school instructional supervisor in each county in Tennessee was adequate.

4. A questionnaire could be utilized as a method of determining perceptions of county public school supervisors of their actual and ideal roles.

5. County public school instructional supervisors in Tennessee would respond honestly and accurately to the questionnaire.

6. Responses obtained to the questionnaire would be typical of all county instructional supervisors in the state of Tennessee.

7. The statistical procedures employed would be valid for treatment of the data.

**Definitions of Terms**

Many of the terms used in the study needed no explanation. Others were explained as used; however, definitions of selected terms seemed appropriate for the study.

1. **Change agent** - Carter V. 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.⁹

---

2. **Concepts of supervision** - Concepts of supervision were ideas formulated to develop "a consistent and comprehensive program"\(^\text{10}\) to influence other teachers and administrators to improve the teaching-learning environment.

3. **Instructional supervision** - Instructional supervision encompassed those actions by school personnel which had as their central aim the realization of the school goals or objectives by adding new dimensions to the role of teachers through creative and helpful assistance in the teaching-learning process.\(^\text{11}\)

4. **Actual role** - For the purposes of this study, the actual role of public school instructional supervisors in the counties of Tennessee was derived from the responses to the question, "... how do you perceive your function in your actual role ...?" The responses were recorded under the columnar heading "Actual Role" and included the following categories of supervisory functions:
   a. Improving Teaching and Learning
   b. Self-improvement Activity
   c. General Activity
   d. Acting as a Change Agent\(^\text{12}\)

5. **Ideal role** - For the purpose of this study, the ideal role of public school instructional supervisors in the counties of Tennessee was derived from the responses to the question, "how would you perceive your function in your ideal role ...?" The responses

\(^{10}\)Good, p. 572.

\(^{11}\)Harris, p. 75.

were recorded under the columnar heading "Ideal Role" and included the following categories of supervisory functions:

a. Improving Teaching and Learning
b. Self-improvement Activity
c. General Activity
d. Acting as a Change Agent

6. Perception - Perception might be defined as a sensation which should lead to the interpretation of a current situation affected by past experience: an awareness.

7. Role theory - Lawrence W. Wrightsman defined role theory as follows:

Role theory seeks to explain social behavior through an analysis of roles, role obligations, role expectations, and role conflicts. Roles are behaviors a person performs while holding a particular position within a social context.

8. Supervisor - A supervisor should hold a leadership position which functions as a bridge between administration, curriculum, and teaching and as a coordinator of those school activities concerned with learning.

9. Supervisory behavior - Ben M. Harris identified the three components of supervisory behavior as tasks, activities, and competencies.

---

13Rice, pp. 118-119.


16Jon Wiles and Joseph Bondi, Supervision: A Guide to Practice, (Columbus, Ohio; Charles E. Merrill, 1980), p. 11.

17Harris, p. 17.
10. **Supervisory functions** - For the purpose of this study, supervisory functions might be said to conform to the practices described by Harris as distinctive endeavors directed toward people, problems, and situations as they are faced in school.  

Hypotheses

For this study of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors, the following hypotheses stated in the null were considered to be relevant.

1. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of coordinating instructional activity.

2. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing curricula.

3. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of organizing for instruction.

4. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of orienting new staff.

5. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of arranging in-service training.

6. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of providing materials and facilities.

---

18Harris, p. 17.
7. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of giving demonstration lessons.

8. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of observing student classroom behavior.

9. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of conferring with teachers.

10. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating teachers.

11. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction.

12. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of visiting other school systems for ideas.

13. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of attending professional meetings.

14. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of participating in supervisory workshops.

15. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of working as a consultant outside the school system.
16. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of doing secretarial work.

17. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of recommending staff.

18. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of assisting the superintendent.

19. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing public relations.

20. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning buildings with administrators.

21. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning innovative programs.

22. There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of changing old programs.

Procedures

A manual search for related literature was undertaken in the following areas: history of instructional supervision, selected theories of effective instructional supervision, role theory, and selected related research studies, with concentration in the latter two categories in the 1970's. The manual search included books, periodicals, and government documents at East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, and The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. In addition, computer information retrieval sources were utilized at these institutions with the Bureau of Educational Research and
Service at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, providing a list of names of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors.

A survey instrument constructed by Bobby Jean Rice\textsuperscript{19} was chosen as the medium for collecting data as it was thought to yield current perceptions relative to the actual and ideal role of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors. The study replicated Section VII of the 1974 study of North Carolina general supervisors by Rice.\textsuperscript{20}

The questionnaire was modified with the permission of Rice and submitted to the Institutional Review Board, East Tennessee State University. Permission was granted by the Board to pursue the investigation and on April 25, 1980, a questionnaire was mailed to one instructional supervisor from each county public school system in Tennessee. Included with the questionnaire were directions for its use, an assurance of anonymity, and a request to return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Responses to the questionnaire were analyzed using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs-signed-ranks test, and the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Crosstabs subprogram.

\textbf{Organization of the Study}

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, a statement of the subproblems, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study, assumptions, definitions of terms,\textsuperscript{19,20}
Chapter 2 includes a review of related literature. The review of literature includes a history of instructional supervision, selected theories of effective instructional supervision, role theory and selected related instructional supervision research studies.

Chapter 3 contains the introduction to and a description of the chapter, the questionnaire, and the sample. Data collection, data analysis, and the summary are presented. Chapter 4 is a presentation of data and contains an analysis of the findings.

Chapter 5 contains the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter a survey of literature pertaining to the major concerns of this study is presented. The review was directed toward the history of instructional supervision and theories of effective supervision. The research studies included were concerned with the aspects surrounding instructional supervision and the perceptions of the role by supervisors. All studies were conducted in the southeastern United States within the last decade, 1970 to 1980.

History of Instructional Supervision

The purpose of this section was to trace the evolution of educational supervision in the United States from colonial times to the present. A collateral aim was to show how changes within the country were reflected and/or enhanced by the educational progress of its people, with a corresponding alteration of the concepts of supervision.

In the colonial period (c. 1642), the schools were supervised by local or religious officers and lay committees who were empowered to oversee individual systems. In Massachusetts, the Governor and Company of Massachusetts expected supervisory purposes to be directed to the ability of the children "to read, to develop religiosity,
and to obey laws of the country."\(^1\)

Glen G. Eye stated that effort was made to ensure the proper development toward these goals by the Commission of the City of Boston who called on "an old English concept of supervision" and enlisted a group of citizens to scrutinize "the methods of teaching and the resultant proficiency."\(^2\)

J. Minor Gwynn stated that the Puritans brought with them to New England the English and European pattern and purpose of public education which were "the perpetuities of established religion." Further, Gwynn advanced the idea that supervision was developed through the emerging American school system, citing the visiting committees of 1650 to 1827.\(^3\)

Eye, commenting on these committees, stated that their purpose was to scrutinize the methods of teaching and the resultant proficiency by inspection through direct and frequent visits. And, in addition, that the committee was not to surprise the schoolmaster with a visit of consultation and advisement.\(^4\) However, around the year 1670, the secondary school was founded with the headmaster placed in a supervisory position.\(^5\)


\(^2\)Eye, p. 14.


\(^4\)Eye, p. 14.

\(^5\)Gwynn, p. 6.
Gwynn noted that in 1710 and extending to 1821, there were visiting committees for both elementary and secondary school divisions, and that assistant teachers were employed who functioned under the traditional head teacher. But with the establishment of the public secondary school in 1821, supervision was relegated to the superintendent.

In 1835, the concept of supervision by laymen was still very much alive. Lay people at this time were referred to as the "school master's friend," and the requirement was to be observed by the lay committee that "stimulation be given to the teacher to want to improve teaching practice so that the learning of the students might be greatly improved."^7

Eye reported that c. 1850, principalships for supervision of each division were established. Although, according to William Lucio and John McNeil, "certain principals were released from part of their teaching to assist teachers, . . . the position of supervising principal did not become well-known until the twentieth century."^9

Gwynn reported that the years around 1850 were significant in that other institutions or agencies were also identified as having supervision. The various officers were the General Supervisor of the Normal School, the High School Inspector of the State Department of Education, and the High School Inspector of the State University.

---

^7 Eye, p. 14.  
^8 Gwynn, p. 7.  
The latter position functioned until 1900.\textsuperscript{10}

Eye commented that during a time of tremendous internal conflict brought about by the Civil War (c. 1861-1865), the United States maintained progress in the supervision of schools. He reported, for example, that it was recommended that a school officer, a professional, make a visit "to the school building to check the adequacy of the facility and to make a judgment with respect to the competency of the teachers."\textsuperscript{11}

Ten years later in 1874, with establishment of legal support for the secondary school along with compulsory attendance laws, greatly increased secondary school attendance gave rise to a situation where experienced teachers were often used to supervise other teachers in the same subject fields; thus, the position of department head or supervisor was created.\textsuperscript{12}

Researcher Alfred A. Arrington's historical study of supervision detailed a series of changes through which the field evolved. He stated:

\begin{quote}
From 1870 to 1885 supervision was viewed as the teaching of teachers. During this period supervision had a semblance of democracy.

From 1885-1905 the supervisor was presumed to be a highly trained, professional man. He had a philosophy which was born out of knowledge rather than experience.

From 1900-1920 the administrator was seen in the role of a business manager. The supervisor emerged as an efficiency expert whose duties were to set standards, study the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{10}Gwynn, p. 6. \hfill \textsuperscript{11}Eye, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{12}Gwynn, p. 7.
methods of business and industry, and implement these methods for the efficient organization and operation of the school.

From 1920–1940 the supervisor no longer wanted to be seen in the role of efficiency expert. He took the scientific approach to educational supervision as he worked with a science which gave time and attention to child study and to the democratic processes in general.

From 1940–1950 the emphases were on democracy as a means and an end in supervision of education.

Since 1950 the supervisor has continued to be involved in research, evaluation of teachers, accreditation activities, interpretation of the educational program to the public, induction and orientation of new teachers, professional growth responsibilities, curriculum development, testing programs, participation with professional organizations, human relations, and group dynamics.

Supervision has been evolving into an activity that establishes all the professional people involved in the teaching and learning activities as professional colleagues who are adequately and appropriately prepared with common and special talents which can be shared on a professional and voluntary basis to facilitate effective teaching and learning activities.\textsuperscript{13}

Researcher Henry W. Button's historical analysis added the concept that the first period, ending roughly about 1880, was characterized by a belief, held by superintendents who had power only to advise, in the importance of the individual. In the next period, ending in 1905, "teaching practices were determined by an idealistic philosophy of education," while "supervision was to secure and verify conformity with ascertained general truth."\textsuperscript{14}


\textsuperscript{14} Henry W. Button, "A History of Supervision in the Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXIII (September, 1961), 797A.
Button declared that the following period, from 1905-1920, saw an increasing influence upon educational administration by business and industrial methods. The trend was reflected in supervision since "it was generally felt that the function of the supervisor was to convey instruction (from the administrator) to the teacher, and to observe the efficiency of the teacher." He advanced the theory that the subsequent years, 1920-1940, revealed that "writers were concerned with teacher morale as an aspect of supervision," while at the same time the "science of supervision" and "scientific supervision" were in their professional focus.  

Button concluded that the period after 1940 was one in which "democratic supervision . . . [was] generally accepted": "in general, approaches seem to have been rejected in favor of democratic supervision."  

Lucio and McNiel stated that in the late 1920's there was protest against imposition of curriculum and method by impersonal authority of administrative officers which led to a conception of supervision as guidance. And in agreement, Gwynn stated that the contemporary principle of creative supervision had four allied concepts closely associated with it. The four concepts were those of supervision as skill in human relation or group processes, supervision as guidance, supervision as curriculum reorganization and improvement, and supervision through instructional teams. 

---

15 Button, p. 797.  
16 Button, p. 797.  
17 Lucio and McNeil, p. 10.  
18 Gwynn, p. 17.
As early as 1890, Eye reported, there was a forecast of group dynamics. He stated that it was no longer a matter of seeing that things were going well, but rather to work with the teacher and the learner and encourage them to stimulate their own improved performance.

Eye called a subsequent period, until 1913, "a matter of improving teaching practice," but termed the next four years, until 1917, the origin of the so-called "sweetness and light period." At this time, the supervisor was called upon to offer a "genial influence" over the schools and to see that people were happy while learning.

Eye theorized that the next era, termed a technical services era, continued through the 1930's. He referred to the services as having the "primary purpose . . . of improving the products of learning . . . and to influence conditions which surround learning and pupil growth." Eye stated that "this same notion of helpfulness to the teacher had gained the point of having the supervision referred to as a service that helps teachers do a better job." He correlated this concept to the theories of the 1950's when teachers and pupils were to be thought of as "cooperative beneficiaries" who should be stimulated to a "better learning output."

Later in the 1960's, according to Eye, the emphasis was on a leadership designed to accommodate instructional expectations as defined by community and professional workers. The new leader

---

20 Eye, p. 15.
utilized research as a base to reinforce the performance of supervisory functions. 21

Eye concluded his historical review with the statement that the aims of supervision in the 1970's were to reformulate education to accommodate a swiftly changing society and thus keep people prepared and disposed to match the changes of society with the changes in supervision.22

In agreement with this estimation were Ralph L. Mosher and Daniel E. Purpel who stated that the tasks of supervision were primarily teaching people how to teach and providing professional leadership in reformulating public education—its curriculum, teaching and its forms.23 They advocated a curriculum and instructional leader who would be a "clinical professor," whose clinic would be the classroom and whose goal would be to demonstrate how to deal with problems of curriculum and instruction and, in so doing, to generate the new knowledge about teaching.24

And indeed, Eye postulated that it is a principle that leadership in supervision is a result of actions rather than an assigned position. He advised a movement from a position of "system executioner" to master "of a body of appropriate, esoteric, and definable skills."25

21Eye, "Supervisory Skills:" p. 15. 22Eye, p. 15.


24Mosher and Purpel, p. 193.

25Eye, p. 19.
Summary

There were indications in the literature that conceptualizations of supervision have changed through the years. The evaluation of supervision can be traced from beginning as an inspection-oriented procedure in the colonial period to scientific management in the 1900's with human relations entering the scene from the 1930's until the 1950's. The 1960's and the 1970's may be said to be characterized by a systems approach to instructional supervision with the added dimension of clinical supervision and client-therapy the provision as facilitation toward a better learning outcome. Thus, the process can be seen as a shift from a focus of existence for the system, to existence for the clients of the system. In this process, the instructional supervisor seeks actualization as a part of the organizational actualization.

Selected Theories of Effective Instructional Supervision

In this section of the review of literature are presented selected theories of effective instructional supervision, with concentration on the 1970's. The theorists presented a broad range of conceptualizations encompassing the management-systems approach, the roles-systems approach, and the clinical professor approach, to mention but a few. All theorists were seen to be in agreement with the idea that instructional supervisors should seek to improve the teacher-student engagement opportunities.

In 1961, J. Minor Gwynn stated that supervision in elementary and secondary schools in the United States faced another crisis with the major problem involving both the curriculum and school
Gwynn viewed the main tasks of the supervisor as centering around the attainment of the best possible teaching and learning situation for pupils. He identified the supervisor as primarily a resource person, a teacher of teachers, of as much help to the administrator as to the teacher. Gwynn's supervisor would have a sourcebook in which to find some help on many of the problems that arise in his particular supervisory situation.

Improvement of instruction, Gwynn felt, would be derived from a leadership having a marked power of persuasion which created power with other people. The leadership based on a well-balanced, sound philosophy of life and education would produce an orderly change by changing circumstances.

The supervisor, a professional with high prestige, secure in work and position, would have the capacity to learn from failure and adjust to what he could accomplish. In this process, the principles to be followed would be a constant search for the new knowledges and skills he needed, couched in human relations terms recognizing that power in a group was derived from the successful individual. Finally, Gwynn determined that the good supervisor had an "insatiable desire to learn new things, new skills, new information, new methods."

Robert Goldhammer declared that the focus of supervision is generally aimed at technical improvement. He listed three handicaps impeding success as invalid techniques, inability to cope with the

26 Gwynn, Theory and Practice of Supervision, pp. vii-ix.
emotional ramifications of teaching, and failure to exemplify the principles of good teaching.  

To transform the quality and effectiveness of supervisory practice in American schools, Goldhammer refined and extended a concept called the observation cycle, during which the teaching of fellow trainees was observed, analyzed, and discussed in a supervisory conference. He cautioned, however, that it is of crucial importance . . . to have supervision that is fundamentally humane . . . and to value personal counseling or psychotherapy as useful adjuncts to professor preparation in supervision especially in individual cases where, as a source of personal learning, such experiences represent efficient approaches.

William Lucio and John McNeil assumed that supervisors have responsibility for exploring, surveying, and mapping new terrain in supervision. They further stated that the supervisor must assist in the selection of instructional objectives, while keeping in mind the habits, attitudes, skills, and knowledge that are called for in the objective.

These writers termed the skill of writing objectives as a necessity to meet the dual problems of a demand for increased

---


33 Goldhammer, pp. 369-370.


35 Lucio and McNeil, p. 281.
achievement in schools as well as an elimination of malpractice resulting from failure to assess results. Appropriate objectives, in their thinking, would be derived primarily from social conditions and subject matter. In the former case, there are some measuring rods of good culture, as seen by social scientists, to aid the decisions in supervision, such as the questions:

1. How will attainment of the objective further subgroup communication?
2. Will the objective help the learner reach aspirations rather than merely foster aspirations without providing means?
3. How will the objective help the learner effect a smooth transition from childhood to adulthood?
4. How will the objective help the learner adjust to the tempo of change?

In addition, it was recommended in the latter case that the supervisor select subject matter that is consistent with the role of the school.

Lucio and McNeil warned supervisors to analyze disciplines in terms of elements which consider "sources used in different fields for the discovery and validation of knowledge" and the kinds of objects, data, and systems of organization of importance to a discipline. Moreover, it was obligatory that philosophical analysis be made of subject matter and theoretical statements or concepts sought which formulated questions in inquiry, thereby incorporating into the systems aspects which were central and could be used to explain and predict.

---

36Lucio and McNeil, p. 300.
37Lucio and McNeil, p. 300.
38Lucio and McNeil, p. 301
To assure attainment of instructional objectives, these educators stated that the criteria for objectives would be the selection of contacts likely to bring a particular response from the learner and the provision of an opportunity for the learner to practice. Relevant responses should be evoked from the learner, and care must be taken to relate ideas.

Lucio and McNeil admonished the supervisor to consider the traditional view of curriculum organization as developed by Tyler and the sequence built into hierarchial psychological tasks recommended by Robert Gagne in the framework of curriculum organization—the latter mode being a method establishing the final objective to be reached and then breaking the task into a number of incremental steps.

Ronald C. Doll reported that 160 instructional leaders had voiced concern over communication within schools or school systems in the areas of appropriate bases for curriculum decision, procedures to effect change, the change agent process, methodology of improvement, interpretation of change, curriculum improvement tasks, and allocation of people.

---

40 Lucio and McNeil, pp. 311-312.
He noted that effective supervision, according to teachers, supplied stimulation, encouragement, ideas, materials, and skill in trouble-shooting. Aiming as it should to improve the curriculum, supervision had the advantage of dealing with down-to-earth situations, building consciousness of highly specific needs for improvement, and keeping close to the feelings of teachers.\textsuperscript{44}

Quoting Muriel Crosby, Doll suggested that supervisors must consider evaluative questions to more nearly fulfill the potential of their contribution to curriculum planning. The questions Muriel Crosby asked were:

- Has rapport between participants deepened?
- Have teachers developed a greater freedom in expressing opinions and sharing ideas?
- Does leadership move more freely and frequently from person to person?
- Is there greater teacher initiative?
- Are teachers better able to identify their own problems?
- Do they seek help more frequently?
- Are teachers better able to identify the needs of boys and girls and meet them in more satisfying ways?\textsuperscript{45}

Doll emphasized that the supervisor has a very special role to fill as a superintendent's delegate with the role requiring the knowledge and skill as educational engineers manipulating the teaching-learning processes which are based on an understanding of learners and of the intellectual disciplines.\textsuperscript{46} As an aid to supervisors,

\textsuperscript{44}Doll, p. 354.


\textsuperscript{46}Doll, p. 283.
Doll referred to various themes or criteria to be considered while evaluating progress toward the goal fulfillment of the role as follows:

1. Continuous evaluation of the procedures in the improvement program and of the changes which result is made an integral part of the curriculum program.
2. Techniques of evaluation employed are consistent with the principles accepted for curriculum development.
3. Provision is made for the practical testing on a limited basis of ideas for curriculum improvement and for the dissemination of results.
4. Systematic gathering and appraisal of evidence serves as a basis for determining need for changes in curriculum planning and improvement activities, and for consequent modifications.
5. Evidence is sought of the effectiveness of curriculum planning and in changing the quality of instruction.
6. The objectives of the program, both short-range and long-range, are specified in terms of (a) the changes sought in the educational program, and (b) the changes sought in staff perception and operation.47

Moreover, he perceived the depth of the role as seeking to discover quality and to answer questions concerning "the best that can be adopted, adapted, or devised."48

James Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops commented on the individuality of effective supervision stating that a supervisory program should be evaluated in terms of its own objectives and the instructional improvement which it achieves by evaluating personnel,

procedures and outcomes. These writers agreed with S. H. Moorer who declared that an effective supervisor continuously seeks to narrow the gap between what is and what might be in the supervisory program.

Both sources suggested the use of the cooperative approach to professional problems.

According to Marks, Stoops and King-Stoops, assessment of the effectiveness of the supervisory program could be obtained through review of various data such as achievement tests, intelligence and aptitude tests, adjustment inventories, anecdotal records, teacher's estimates, community records, and classroom visits and supervisory conferences.

Finally, quoting Shirley Cooper and Charles Fitzwater, these authors described the superintendent's successful intermediate staff as one that should be well-trained with courage to stand for their professional convictions and principles.

Glen G. Eye, Lanore A. Netzer and Robert D. Krey maintained that supervisors desired technical services for the instructional program to be appropriate, effective, and developmental. They further noted

---


51 Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 391.

52 Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops, p. 798.

that a developmental approach in planning the individual program must be based on attention to the selection of interrelationships which would constitute a developmental approach.\textsuperscript{54}

In 1965, these authors presented their developmental design for instructional supervision of purposes, patterns, processes, and procedures, noting that the design commits supervisors to a high degree of effort in developing a structured consideration of each segment as well as to a total program of supervision.\textsuperscript{55} As presented, their design for improvement of instruction was based on managerial tasks producing a means whereby, along with instruction, an amalgamation might be integrated into the administration. The tasks of administrative responsibilities, supervisory in intent, were directing, controlling, stimulating, initiating, analyzing and appraising, and designing and implementing.\textsuperscript{56}

Eye, Netzer, and Krey suggested that each supervisor should develop a personal definition of supervision, but they presented as a "catalytic agent" in the development of a consistent and comprehensive supervisory program the following: "Supervision is that phase of school administration which focuses primarily upon the achievement of the appropriate instructional expectations of educational systems."\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, they recommended that a statement be formulated describing the "focal point" or concluding state, and that the products should include


\textsuperscript{55}Eye, Netzer, and Key, p. xi.

\textsuperscript{56}Eye, Netzer, and Krey, p. ix.

\textsuperscript{57}Eye, Netzer, and Krey, p. 30.
professional maturity, curriculum developments, instructional improvements, school-community consolidations, and emerging expectations.

The term instructional improvement, in their way of thinking, meant that when subjected to change, the move should be in the direction of better outcomes on the broad base of various types of teaching and learning aids and the selection and use of techniques providing an evaluation of the results of the teaching-learning activities. Furthermore, reorganization of the content should be in the direction of more desirable pupil behaviors through the establishment of an organization or sequence of learning experiences with that aim in mind. Care should be taken, so these experts said, to consider the factor of "emerging expectations" as a reflection of some aspect demanding societal support for desired change.

Michael C. Callahan stressed the importance of aid to departmental heads. It was his opinion that the chairmen could be guided to become curriculum leaders in their fields through specification of instructional objectives and assistance to teachers in acquiring the ideas, skills, and materials which they would need to accomplish those objectives.

Callahan also recommended on-the-job evaluation of the performance of the chairman as the final step in producing effective school department heads, as well as indicating progress. The process would

---

involve teachers and would be expandable to a district level.  

Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt termed supervision a process aiming to facilitate the emergence of instructional leadership throughout the professional staff. Their theories were directed toward humanizing American education with the goal of self-actualization of youngsters and were characterized by terminology such as "client enrichment." In order to explain their position to the practitioner, these experts characterized supervisory behavior as action to achieve goals through other people with the supervisor as an agent of change whose efforts would be directed toward long term results. Specifically, they proposed that effective management of the school enterprise would come about through a process of the promotion of personal and professional growth of the entire staff. A second premise in their theory was that meaningful need satisfaction, at least for professional and semi-professional workers, depended on achievement of school goals.

Sergiovanni and Starratt stressed that creativity should be the touchstone of supervisory success. They stated that

Effective administration and supervision involve processes thoroughly dependent upon creative acts. Few occupations can rival educational management's dependence upon creativity for success. Modern large high schools, for example, are characterized by extremely complex goals, fully diversified clients, highly professional workers, pluralistic internal and external influence systems, sophisticated professional

---

63 Callahan, p. 173.


65 Sergiovanni and Starratt, pp. 10-36.
knowledge, and specialized educational technology. The successful accomplishment of school goals in this keenly professional and complex educational environment is dependent upon creative administration and supervision.66

A different approach was used by Ralph L. Mosher and David E. Purpel in Supervision: The Reluctant Profession. Their call was for a new kind of educational leader to reformulate or reconstruct the educational system. The proposal included a new breed of supervisor whose outlook would be broad and varying, embodying notions of what constitutes the good man and the good society. These notions in turn, would form the bases for appropriate educational patterns.67

A more practical course of action was proposed by Arthur J. Lewis and Alice Miel, who referred to the supervisory officer as being in the business of promoting change in constructive ways that were not of necessity innovative.68 They recommended group problem solving as a method of developing and implementing change since it should place a high value on the worth of the individual, and thereby result in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and trust.69

Morris L. Cogan advised that "the proper subject of supervision is the teacher's classroom behavior, not the teacher as a person."70

66Sergiovanni and Starratt, p. 156.
69Lewis and Miel, p. 187.
He suggested that the intense interaction resulting from the close and continued interaction of teacher and supervisor in their mutually supportive and important work is not personal in nature, but clinical. He developed this theme stating that to participate in clinical supervision, one does not have to yield one's privacy.\textsuperscript{71}

To implement the clinical supervision process, Cogan conceptualized an eight segment cycle forming categories including establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship, planning with the teacher, planning the strategy of observation, observing instruction, analyzing the teaching-learning processes, planning the strategy of the conference, the conference, and renewed planning.\textsuperscript{72} Cogan's cycle would be of aid to the instructional supervisor as methodology assisting the enhancement of the responsible professional teacher—analytical, open, and self-directing.\textsuperscript{73}

James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., held that certain activities comprised the competency-based approach which validated the necessary conceptual human and technical skills for supervisors. Assessment would depend upon function and be the basis for improvement.\textsuperscript{74}

Robert J. Alfonso, Gerald R. Firth, and Richard F. Neville termed instructional supervision as a behavior system with an "organizational viability . . . provided and evidenced through

\textsuperscript{71}Cogan, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{72}Cogan, pp. 10-12.
\textsuperscript{73}Cogan, p. 12.
conditions that support effective supervision." They reported that viability could evolve in a school system exhibiting the following characteristics:

1. a living, dynamic organization which places a high priority on change and instructional improvement;
2. oriented toward teaching and learning rather than maintenance and control;
3. realistic but insistent on quality teaching performance;
4. clear in its objectives and expectations;
5. fully supportive of a system of instructional supervision that will ensure the achievement of objectives considered essential by the organization and the community it serves.76

Stephen Knezevich stated that "supervision is concerned with people, and an effective supervisor must be able to stimulate individuals or groups to higher performance levels." In order to cope with the "knowledge explosion," he advised that the position of special-subject supervisor be created to function along with an overall general supervisor, the latter carrying the responsibility for the professional development of special supervisors.77

To fill the role of change agent, the effective supervisor must exhibit an awareness of promising developments and a sensitivity in regard to the adoption of a particular social invention by the school. There should be development and dissemination of appropriate strategies, according to Knezevich, so that the effectiveness of specialized supervisory staff could be measured.


76 Alfonso, Firth, and Neville, p. 339.

Knezevich stressed verification of teaching-learning outcomes, an educational auditing, as a necessity emerging from the increased emphasis on accountability. He declared that the increased cost would be justified if improved instruction resulted.\textsuperscript{78}

Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell defined improvement of instruction as the improvement of the development and actualization of engagement opportunities for students involving both direct interaction with the teaching behavior system and the indirect influences on the teaching situation. They stated that the human relations movement was the basis for the growing concern for the nature and needs of teachers.\textsuperscript{79}

In technical terms, these educators assumed that the quality of teaching and learning in the teacher-student systems could be improved if teachers had help from an expert source concerning the crucial points of planning, actualizing the plans, describing what was actualized, analyzing what happened, and generalizing in terms of future planning.\textsuperscript{80}

Wiles and Lovell described instruction as the actualization of certain learning outcomes and the effective supervisor as the one who made it possible for the teachers to accept support and encouragement and to trust him. Moreover, mutual esteem and trust and common

\textsuperscript{78}Knezevich, p. 370.


\textsuperscript{80}Wiles and Lovell, p. 146.
understandings about the particular phase of teaching being planned were termed as required interdependent conditions.\textsuperscript{81}

In addition, Wiles and Lovell pointed out that factors such as rapid changes in content and process of teaching and the growing diversity of students, teachers, and supervisors required the provision of certain functions to ensure a quality learning environment. They defined the functions as provision for psychological support, helping people to communicate, helping people to help and be helped by each other, helping people to accept each other, coordination of the contributions of highly specialized people toward the needs of human beings in the learning environment, and utilization of the total staff in the system of instructional supervisory behavior.\textsuperscript{82}

Wiles and Lovell advised that supervisory effectiveness was a function of a multiplicity of factors. The achievement of educational improvement, according to these authors, would be constant and continuous effort to identify and release variable human resources.\textsuperscript{83}

Ben Harris advocated a systems approach to instructional supervision. He suggested that supervision programs require a series of supervisory competencies by task area as follows:

A. Developing Curriculum
B. Allocating Staff Personnel
C. Allocating Time and Space
D. Providing Materials and Equipment
E. Coordinating Noninstructional Services

\textsuperscript{81}Wiles and Lovell, pp. 147-150.  \textsuperscript{82}Wiles and Lovell, p. 295.
\textsuperscript{83}Wiles and Lovell, p. 306.
F. Developing School-Community Relations
G. Providing In-Service Education
H. Evaluating the Instructional Program

His process was characterized by goal setting. Goal setting components were developing curriculum, organizing for instruction, providing staff, providing facilities, providing materials, arranging of in-service education, orienting staff members, relating special pupil services, developing public relations, and evaluating instruction.

According to Harris, the program planner of educational change would perceive the objective as the immediate outcome of the program which is produced by the activity with the two dimensions of behavioral and organizational goals both adequately served. He saw the supervisor as a professional whose responsibilities in the administrative, teaching, management and special pupil service function areas are limited to projects directed toward learners.

Harris pointed out that a successful evaluation system must be focused clearly on the improvement process and operated close to the points of intervention for change. He described classroom observation as indispensable to anyone who needed to know about instruction, with the supervisor as the key person in determining the efficient use of the instruments.

---

85 Harris, p. 11. 86 Harris, p. 71. 87 Harris, p. 132.
88 Harris, p. 159. 89 Harris, p. 196.
Jerry J. Bellon, Robert E. Eaker, James O. Huffman, and Richard V. Jones, Jr. collaborated on the theory of synergism and instructional improvement. They believed that the combined healthy action of all elements of a system, or synergism, as this concept is known in the field of science, was applicable as the working theory. The methodology was clinical supervision, which emerged from an early 1960's supervision process whose proponents were Abraham Fischer and Morris Cogan. Essential to their notion of synergism was the leadership style, noted for a cooperative, non-hierarchical working relationship featuring shared power and influence. Special prominence was given to renewal and the process of change with incorporation of all the foregoing into the supervision-evaluation program. 90

Bellon, Eaker, Huffman, and Jones supported their premise and traced the development of supervision from the original inspection attitude to the more democratic human relations focus of the 1930's. They stated that the authoritarian style was reintroduced for the sake of an expediency which reflected the militancy of war years and a response to problems of rapid school expansion. Findings of the 1950's concerning the teaching-learning process led to several strategies promising to aid the instructional supervisor: micro-teaching, interaction analysis, and the goal-oriented cooperative endeavor between teacher and supervisor of the use of performance objectives. In an attempt to humanize the system by individualized

instruction for pupils and personalized professional support programs for teachers, movement was made toward differentiated staffing. The latter procedure allowed teachers to assume different responsibilities. Thus, there was promotion of cooperative planning as well as of evaluation of classroom teaching.\textsuperscript{91}

Bellon, Eaker, Huffman, and Jones pointed to the development of performance-contracting and state-mandated programs of evaluation which aimed at meeting the public's demand for accountability and encompassed the problems of tenure and teacher evaluation. They noted a necessity for evaluation instruments giving some true indication of a teacher's success, workable alternatives to the tenure systems, and effective plans for merit pay.\textsuperscript{92} Their methodology or synergetic process provided solutions based on trusting\textsuperscript{93} and improved teacher-supervisor relationships through improved self-awareness, certain skill sessions, and the aim of the building of more productive and positive attitudes.\textsuperscript{94}

The theories of L. Craig Wilson were predicated on the theme of open access. Wilson advocated an equality expressed best by collaboration between teachers, supervisors, and administrators as well as the utilization of new supervisory strategies.\textsuperscript{95} Collaboration would answer the call for demanagement deemed strategic in

\begin{itemize}
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    \item \textsuperscript{95}L. Craig Wilson, \textit{School Leadership Today: Strategies for the Educator} (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978), p. 337.
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combating role-oriented survival symptoms. He argued for adoption of an attitude in which the only authority required would be the quality of a new idea.

Summary

In this section of the review of related literature, the theories of educational leaders in instructional supervision were presented. Gwynn, Lucio and McNeil, Cogan, Goldhammer, Eye, Wiles, and Harris were prominent among the theorists included. While there was agreement in their conceptualizations that the major task of the instructional supervisor was the improvement of instruction, the methodologies were divergent for the attainment of effective supervision.

Role Theory

The purpose of this section was to present social psychological role theory. It was felt that this theoretical structure would provide a means of understanding the complexity of the social organization of the school as a whole and thereby clarify the role of instructional supervision.

Included with a description of the theory were writings of educators such as William Lucio and John McNeil, Ronald Doll, Ben Harris, Stephen Knezevich, J. W. Getzels and E. B. Guba, and others who provided in-depth study of the topic. Works from these authors, and from others prominent in the field, should aid the instructional

---
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supervisor in understanding sources of role conflict, and avenues of role congruency and complementarity.

Role theory was a situation theory in sociology rising out of the perception-oriented philosophy of phenomenology\(^98\) and founded on an explanation of behavior based on social systems and their properties.\(^99\) The sociologists adhering to this point of view were termed symbolic interactionists, and placed emphasis on role-taking procedures which constantly assessed and anticipated another's future actions for the establishment of patterns of interaction with that person.\(^100\) Thus, "... an individual's personality and thinking habits develop through social interaction ..."\(^101\)

Much was owed to analyses by men such as E. Durkheim (1893, The Division of Labor in Society, Paris: F. Alcap), W. James (1890, The Principles of Psychology, New York: Holt), and J. M. Baldwin (1897, Mental Development in the Child and in the Race, London: Macmillan).\(^102\) However, this contribution to sociological thought was strongly American and was advanced by Charles Horton Cooley (1929-1964)


\(^{100}\)Spencer, pp. 157-158.

\(^{101}\)Spencer, p. 152.

with "... his description of the development of the social self within the primary group"\textsuperscript{103} and the "looking-glass self."\textsuperscript{104} Further work by George Herbert Mead (1863-1931) and his followers defined the abstract role of the "generalized others" as mental imagery standing for a set of particular familiar roles. \textsuperscript{105}

Later, theorists such as George McCall and J. L. Simmons held that roles were flexible and stated that:

To the role theorist, the archetypical role is that seen in ritual of classic drama, in which every line and every gesture of each actor is rigidly specified in the sacred script. In our view, the archetypical role is more nearly that seen in improvised theater—which performs extemporaneously within broad outlines of the sketcher and of the characters assumed.\textsuperscript{106}

A member of another discipline, psychologist K. J. Gergen, supported the foregoing view. He questioned the assumption that humans have one identity, stating that the many masks worn and the many roles assumed by individuals were an indication that they had many identities. Furthermore, Gergen suggested that perhaps the true concern of persons should be aroused upon becoming too comfortable within themselves and becoming a fixed identity.\textsuperscript{107}

The opinion of Peter Berger was in agreement with that of Gergen since he defined role theory as "sociological anthropology—a view of

\begin{itemize}
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man based on his existence in society,"\textsuperscript{108} with a need to make himself aware of his role in society and thereby be able to position himself in an attitude of control to avoid being victimized. \textsuperscript{109} In addition, roles were stressed by Douglas who stated that the factor of victimization produced roles in organizations which in turn produced institutions and the characteristics of the overall social system. \textsuperscript{110} He further underscored the usefulness of role theory by relating that symbolic interactionism developing out of phenomenology, an experiential philosophy, could better meet the challenge of "our complex, pluralistic, changing, and conflictful Western societies."\textsuperscript{111}

The usefulness to educators of the theory of roles can be seen from the writings of eminent authorities such as Gordon N. Mackenzie, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, who, in 1961, depicted the progressions of the role of the supervisor as moving from one emphasizing "quality control" (1900-1920); to "overall objectives, such as the cardinal Principles of Education and revision by course-of-study writers," (1920's); to changing teaching and teachers (1930's-1940's). At this juncture, as educators sought "to understand themselves and the social system within which they

\begin{footnotes}
\item[109]Berger, pp. 97 and 150, passim.
\item[110]Douglas, pp. 84-85.
\item[111]Douglas, p. 85.
\end{footnotes}
operated . . . significant progress was made." However, in MacKenzie's opinion, the effects of the war were not fully evident until the mid-fifties. Factors such as automation, electronics, nuclear power, and the growth of large foundations exerted great influence on the educational scene and thus "increasingly, supervisors became involved in interpretations of the educational program to the public." In addition, new demands were made of supervisors to facilitate the development of "public education toward greater uniformity, [and] toward national as distinct from local initiative and determination." MacKenzie concluded that supervisors could "improve the quality of their own group by taking responsibility for clarifying their role, improving selective admission, setting standards of preparation, and developing requirements for licensing." 

Similarly, in 1969, Fred T. Wilhelms remarked on the complexity of the educator's role by acknowledging that:

Roles are changing; staff organization is swirling, titles and functions are shifting . . . [and] the person in a position of supervisory leadership is caught in the middle. . . . It is apparent that the need for trained, dedicated leaders will not change—except to grow.

Too little has been made of this. The best educational leaders have often been, by the very nature of their sophistication in leadership, self-effacing and low in visibility. Just because of their sophistication, they are often the least 'sure' people in the whole world of education . . .

Yet the truth is that the whole forward motion of education depends to a fantastic degree, upon this little band


113 MacKenzie, p. 43

114 MacKenzie, p. 43

115 MacKenzie, p. 45.
of 'supervisors.' At best they are only a handful, these lifelong students of teaching and learning and leading. They deserve to be cherished.\textsuperscript{116}

Lucio and McNeil recommended a clarification of the supervisory role as a continuous obligation, since indefiniteness and lack of understanding of these roles have led to conflict and disorder. They directed attention to the Role Theory as conceptualized by Theodore R. Sarbin who viewed a school system as follows:

\ldots It is a miniature society in which administrators, supervisors, teachers, and pupils represent positions or offices within the system. Certain rights and duties are associated with each position. The actions appropriate to the positions are defined as roles. It should be emphasized that a role is linked with the position, not with the person who is temporarily occupying the position. \ldots One cannot enact the supervisory role if he lacks the necessary role expectations. \ldots The ability to learn a supervisory role is probably limited by a view of self as well as by previous experiences.\textsuperscript{117}

Certain definitive actions included in the supervisor's role, according to Lucio and McNeil, would be organizing abstract material, defining needs of learners, cooperating with community groups, personal qualities such as good-naturedness, cooperativeness and supportiveness.\textsuperscript{118} They warned, however, that consultative service would be ineffective if the administrator and consultant failed to behave according to the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[\textsuperscript{118}]Lucio and McNeil, pp. 27-28.
\end{footnotes}
manner that each expected of the other.\footnote{119}

Lucio and McNeil noted that role incumbents must solve the problem of incongruent role expectations originating from competing subroles in various ways. Some solutions might involve declaring that the competing role had a hierarchical priority, repudiating one subrole, stalling, and playing one group against the other. They emphasized that congruent qualities would bring role agreement and like perceptions and expectations between players\footnote{120} and that likewise there must be a complementarity between roles if the objectives of the schools are to be accomplished.\footnote{121}

The role expectations for the supervisor as revealed in professional literature, according to Lucio and McNeil, pointed to a coordinator and facilitator who provided inspiration, encouraged development of organizations for in-service education, facilitated the work of groups, and created a climate for growth. Further, change and group work would be the premise on which the concepts of facilitation and coordination were promoted.\footnote{122} A systems approach and a "look beyond . . . to the larger patterns of institutional development" led to the title of "supervisory statesman," with "responsi-

\footnotesize{\footnote{119}Elmer F. Ferneau, "Role-expectations in Consultation" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1954), cited by Lucio and McNeil, p. 31.}

\footnotesize{\footnote{120}Lucio and McNeil, p. 33.}

\footnotesize{\footnote{121}Lucio and McNeil, pp. 28-29}

bility for crucial purpose-setting decisions the amplification."\(^{123}\)

Thus, Lucio and McNeil perceived that the supervisor's role as statesman would be that of giving direction and providing an adaptation of aspiration recalling the history of the organization with reference to the choice of goals. However, the indications were strongly pointed toward a supervisory team with the function of the central office supervisor being one of acquainting the teachers with the available instructional resources in the district.\(^{124}\)

Ronald C. Doll declared that "supervisors of school programs have very special roles to fill," noting that they are frequently superintendents' delegates and serve as the most active and important agents of curriculum change. He advised that the variety of roles and role-perceptions made difficult role balancing and assignment, but that:

\[\ldots\] conflict about roles is not necessarily unfortunate: it often serves to clear the air and to eventuate in a more definite and happy clarification of roles. By troubleshooting in cases of conflict, curriculum leaders can assure greater balance and harmony among roles.\(^{125}\)

Doll counseled the role-occupant to strive for role convergence through study of similarities and differences in perceptions, observing that the techniques of case studies and sociodramas could be


\(^{124}\)Lucio and McNeil, pp. 35-37.

used to resolve conflict. Also, the supervisor, the teacher-educator, must be cognizant of the importance of good communication, with face-to-face communication without equal as a medium for transmitting subtle cognitive and emotional content.

Mosher and Purpel expressed the opinion that the supervisor had difficulty in establishing "an identity as a bona fide expert who knows something that teachers do not, and who is therefore uniquely equipped to help the teacher." In their opinion, the difficulty was that much of what is known about teaching and supervision is in the realm of wisdom and insight culled from accumulated experiences and intuitions. They further remarked that descriptions of supervisory positions were derived from extrapolation from experience and observation. However, for the sake of classification, they noted that the supervisor had the primary responsibility of providing leadership in supervisory activities.

---
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Stephen J. Knezevich emphasized that the ingredient for success in educational administration was the ability to work well with people. One explanation of an organization, said Knezevich, was to categorize "institutional obligations" as nomothetic dimensions, and personal needs as idiographic dimensions. A compromise between the nomothetic (stressing institutional demands) and the idiographic (emphasizing individual needs) represented transactional leadership and, as such, was worthy of much study, since "leadership is an important force in the operation of educational systems."

Another resource for the educator, according to Knezevich, was a "view of the organization 'from the bottom up,'" that is, the social systems theory called the Role Theory. Sociologists and social psychologists researched this area, formulating the concepts of "expectation, role, and referent group." Their assumptions were that the actor's perception of his role, and the "perception of the role of an actor by various referent groups" might affect the satisfactions of such referent groups. The leader must be encouraged to understand organizational structure since as

---
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administrators, leaders make things happen through the efforts of other people. 137

James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., suggested that significant differences often existed between actual role behavior and idealized role behavior. 138 They remarked that improved performance could be the outcome of studies of the relationships of role expectations, perceptions and behavior as affected by variables such as effectiveness, efficiency, satisfaction, leadership, and morale. 139

In addition, they cited communication as an area that when neglected, resulted in a morass of operational problems whether in terms of limiting the opportunity for upward communication, or failure to define expectations in terms of policies, participation, processes, or products.

Lipham and Hoeh presented the professional educator as having "historical-legal, professional and school district policies" as points of origin for role expectations. Moving from such a base, the role incumbent would be able to construct a model of role perceptions, role complementarities, role-personalities, and referent groups. Included in the exploration of a role would be delineation of types of possible role conflict as follows:

137 Knezevich, pp. 91-95.


1. interrole conflict, or disparity between and among two or more roles . . . simultaneously . . .

2. inter-reference-group conflict, or disagreement between and among . . . reference groups regarding the expectations held for his role . . .

3. intra-reference-group conflict, or disagreement within a reference group regarding the expectations held for the role . . .

4. role-personality conflict, or divergency between the role expectations and the personality needs . . .

Thus, in visualizing the school as a social system organized with various roles, a mutuality of expectation could be ascertained, thereby enhancing the probability of success, for if the organization is to achieve its goals, roles must complement each other. The role of the leader, involving a lifetime, would be devoted to maximizing both institutional and personal goals. Moreover, they weighted their argument by declaring that leaders "who utilize a higher theoretical orientation to problem-solving than their colleagues, also fulfill their role expectations more satisfactorily."^142

Summary

The review of related literature pertaining to role theory indicated that the achievement of organizational goals could be enhanced by understanding the role structure and its incumbents. Various authorities, Knezevich, Harris, Lucio and McNeil, to mention but a few, directed educators to the study of roles within the schools.

^140 Lipham and Hoeh, pp. 146-147.

^141 Lipham and Hoeh, pp. 147-148.

as a means of resolving conflict and achieving a state of role convergence, congruence, and success. Supervisors as facilitators were focused on as the medium through which this state might be attained.

Selected Related Research Studies of the Role of the Instructional Supervisor

The purpose of this section was to present selected related research studies relative to the supervisor's role. The research studies included were concerned with the aspects surrounding instructional supervision and the perceptions of the role by supervisors. All studies were conducted in the southeastern United States with concentration on the last decade, from 1970 to 1980.

Randolph Scott Bradshaw investigated instructional supervision activities and found that the activities of priority were collection, selection, utilization, and dissemination. The study included an evaluation of materials and media.\(^{143}\)

Beatrice Davis Carman synthesized studies on the roles and responsibilities of instructional supervisors and reported that the position dealt primarily with coordination of effort to improve instruction. She noted that helpful actions included developing curriculum, providing specific materials and resources, and giving practical assistance to specific problems. Carman discovered that the major hindrances to supervisory efforts were budget restriction,

\(^{143}\)Randolph Scott Bradshaw, "A Study of the Role of the Local Level Supervisors of Instruction in Georgia," Dissertation Abstracts International, \textit{XXXI} (May, 1971), 5689A.
lack of time, and resistance to change.  

Jerry Lynn Austin developed a conceptual model for selection of content which was to be included in simulations for preparing supervisors of instruction. The effectiveness of simulated experiences would be evaluated and the results fed back into the system as input. The principles of simulation, concepts of learning, and a model for instructional behavior were components of the input with Tyler’s four questions concerning instruction and curriculum development guiding the process of simulation development. The simulated experiences for preparing instructional supervisors were the outputs in Austin’s design.

James Esposito, Jr., reported that open-minded individuals in supervision performed the tasks of developing curriculum. He noted that they preferred those tasks along with evaluating. In contrast, the investigator found that close-minded individuals performed the tasks of staff, orienting new staff, and developing public relations more frequently. His study on the disbelief-belief system of supervisors revealed that personality influenced behavior, and emphasized that dogmatic individuals were resistant to change.


145 Jerry Lynn Austin, "The Development of a Conceptual Model for Selection of Content to Be Included in Simulations for Preparing Supervisors of Instruction," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXII (February, 1972), 4478-79A.

Critical behavior, according to Gordon, whose study dealt with supervisors' perceptions in the individual supervisor conference in Georgia, was that of advising and informing, supporting, and diagnosing. This judgment was rendered by experienced supervisors who analyzed effective behavior in a one-to-one conference. 147

Nedra K. Johnson, in the course of developing an instrument to assess supervisory behavior, found that supervisors had a role identification problem, as there were numerous divergent views about the role of the instructional supervisor. General supervisors and experienced teacher-fellowship program members, along with selected experts in the field, were the participants of her study. Johnson recommended further explanation to determine a supervisor's most effective contributions in assuming a leadership role in improving curriculum and instruction. 148

Supervisors were the target population of a humanistic theory developed by William Shipp. The theory analyzed and incorporated the concepts of Rogers, Maslow, and Combs. 149

In rural West Virginia, Gary Smith reported that although only two districts had available job descriptions, supervisors


performed duties not significantly different from those that comprise the supervisory function. His findings were that supervisors desired and requested a clear role definition.  

Helping behavior and its implications for instructional supervisors were studied by Raymond Barber in a review of the discipline of social psychology from 1910 to 1971. As a result of this study he concluded that supervisors should be empathetic, competent, nonfatalistic, not overly concerned, and have a positive self-image. Other important factors he noted were that each supervisor-teacher situation was unique and that a lack of appropriate time span dictated that only a limited number of clients could be helped.  

Robert Eaker analyzed supervision as a process and found acceptance of the methodology. His favorable report stated that both groups involved, teachers and administrators, agreed with clinical supervision's basic assumptions.  

Thomas Foster, in his investigation of supervisor visitations, reported differences of teacher reaction. He revealed that teachers correlated content application and learning activities when they were notified ahead of time of an impending visit. Student responses

---


were also affected and more correlation to content application was observed under the foregoing condition. \(^{153}\)

Supervisors in South Carolina were found to be higher in the factor of experimentalism that other selected factors included in the investigation of Sidney Gosnell. Gosnell reported that beliefs were not experimental, even though the practices might tend to be. \(^{154}\)

Supervisors were concerned about their role and function in Maryland public schools, according to Richard Earl Wagner. He reported that their position was distant from the superintendent, teachers, and principals in his study of Montgomery County, Maryland public schools from 1945 to 1970. \(^{155}\)

John Crowder, Jr., reported that supervisors in Virginia public schools were evaluated in 20 percent of the school divisions. In his investigation and appraisal of Virginia's systems, he discovered that 56 percent of the divisions have written policies concerning the supervisory roles. \(^{156}\)

---


The role of instructional supervisors as it was affected by professional negotiations was investigated by Robert Lee Van Winkle. He reported that in the 1970's a negative attitude toward supervision was present in an environment of professional negotiation. In addition, he found that there was more identification with administration correlationally, an obscuring of the perceived supervisory role.157

An instrument yielding a four-dimensional profile was developed by Gian Berchielli to evaluate supervisory behavior. Berchielli constructed a Supervisory Reactive Test consisting of forty problem supervisory tasks. Democratic-autocratic, staff-line, good-poor human relations, and decentralized-centralized were solutions provided by the instrument for the evaluation of subjects.158

One hundred fifty-three Georgia supervisors using John C. Flanagan's critical incident technique ranked leadership as a critical requirement for effective supervisory behavior (Area III), reported Harris Lentini in his investigations of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors. Other critical requirements in order of ranking were (Area IV) professional growth opportunities, (Area I) administration, (Area II) resources, and (Area V) curriculum development


and improvement. 159

Burma Lockridge investigated the validity of a rating scale of competencies of instructional supervisors. The measurement mode had a validity of moderate to highly reliable range, according to Lockridge's determination. 160

Claude Nolen, Jr., appraised the doctoral program for Educational Administration of the University of Virginia using a modification of the Competency Pattern in Educational Administration from the Southern States' Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. The respondents rated the importance of each of the competency areas higher than they rated the extent to which that competency area was emphasized in their doctoral program, according to Nolen's investigation. 161

Richard Petersohn, Sr., devised an instrument to analyze the supervision of curriculum development. The methodology, based on Harris' model for supervision of instruction and Taha's model for curriculum facilitation, was developed in a school system


161 Claude Buford Nolen, Jr., "An Appraisal of the Program Leading to the Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Administration and Supervision at the University of Virginia," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXV (November, 1974), 2596A.
and the process, was an assessment of supervisory behavior.  

Edward Reimer designed a training process for dyadic supervisory interaction. The design was field tested and although new skills consistent with the program objectives were learned, it was discovered that there was not enough practice to internalize new behavior and related concepts.  

General supervisors in North Carolina wanted to spend more time in the improvement of teaching and learning, investigator Bobby Jean Rice reported. She found that supervisors' priority was working with teachers and students in the classroom, but that other activities not relating to these higher level activities—such as secretarial work and even janitorial services—took up valuable time. Rice determined that age, sex, and an earned degree in supervision influenced the way in which supervisors perceived themselves as change agents, although all respondents indicated a desire to fulfill the role of agent of change.  

Callie Shingleton developed a model that conceptualized open supervision. The concept was visualized by the investigator as a  


humanistic process to be used for the humanization of curriculum and instruction.\textsuperscript{165}

Tommy Street, in Tennessee, assessed the state's educational administration and supervision. He recommended a uniform admission practice and an accounting for all administrative and supervisory personnel.\textsuperscript{166}

Role expectations of tasks of Virginia elementary supervisors revealed that supervisors gave great importance to organizing instruction for groups and evaluating instructional tasks. The researcher, Robert Lee Evans, employed an instrument constructed by Cardenas and the study was an operational replicative study.\textsuperscript{167}

William Ormond, Jr., reviewed the periodical \textit{Educational Leadership} and reported on six supervisory functions from his content analysis. The functions and rankings were 5.6 percent, determining objectives; 6.4 percent, formulating policies; 7 percent, conducting research; 10.1 percent, evaluating; 14.9 percent, developing staff; 27.8 percent, developing curriculum; and 28.1 percent, non-category material. Ormond's survey covered the years 1945 to 1949, 1955 to 1959,
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In Tennessee, Ted Avery Beach found that the instructional supervisors' role identification was higher on administration than instruction. As a result of his study, he recommended an intensification of the instructional supervisory support services in Tennessee public schools.\footnote{Ted Avery Beach, "The Perceptions of Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors of the Instructional Supervisory Support Services in the Public Schools of Tennessee," \textit{Dissertation Abstracts International}, XXXVII (March, 1977), 5466-67A.}

Julia Capps found that females in administration in North Carolina were in the classroom more often, absent from the job twice as much, had more career interruptions, and were less mobile than their male counterparts. Capps reported results from her investigation that showed male supervisors in positions more oriented to the classification. They possessed higher degrees and certification and had more administrative experience.\footnote{Julia Anna Capps, "The Roles of Assistant Superintendents and Supervisors in North Carolina Relative to Sex Differences," \textit{Dissertation Abstracts International}, XXXVIII (September, 1977), 1140A.}

Karen Callison devised a competency-based preparation program for supervisors. Her methodology was based on a systematic and orderly approach to curriculum decision-making and included the concepts that curriculum analysis should be used in curriculum planning as one method of identifying the existing curriculum and providing data for input in decision-making and that training in curriculum analysis\footnote{William Cunningham Ormond, Jr., "A Content Analysis of Educational Leadership with Reference to Six Supervisory Functions," \textit{Dissertation Abstracts International}, XXXVI (March, 1976), 5709A.}
should be provided for those responsible for the program planning and development.  

Frances Majors Ferguson investigated certified elementary supervisors in Louisiana and reported that supervisors and principals agreed on the perceptions of rules and task assignments. Ferguson noted that the most important "Ideal" characteristics designated by supervisors were described as knowledgeable, helpful, and friendly. Other concerns revealed by the study were consistency of performance in the improvement of instruction involving close teacher-principal contacts. Supervisory functions that were emphasized were sharing ideas, listening, assisting, offering suggestions, recommendation, supplying resource persons, materials, planning cooperatively, stimulating creativity, conducting workshops, and acting as liaison persons.  

Clifford Hendrix, Jr., investigated the perceptions of supervisors in Tennessee in the context of classroom visitations. He reported that the varying tasks of supervisors precluded the practice of meaningful classroom visitation. As an approach to this task, he recommended an attitude of asking, sharing, trusting, and helping—the humanistic concept.

Hendrix recommended that an emphasis be placed on a continuous

---


and ongoing program of staff training and development, with specific focus on improved classroom observation and conference procedures. The program, Hendrix advised, would aid supervisors to the realization of their potential for competence.  

Carole Crews reported that interpersonal relations and school policy administration were major sources of job satisfaction for instructional supervisors. Her study of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction examined instructional supervisors and their immediate superiors.  

Gwendolyn Ann Gantt reported on role conflict in selected Georgia public school systems, with principals and supervisors as the subjects of her study. Her conclusions were that the primary cause for role conflict was the organizational condition and that the secondary cause was attributed to personal characteristics. She stated that there was a need for the development of clearcut job descriptions for principals and supervisors.  

Caroline Holder analyzed the tasks of the instructional supervisor with findings that were indicative of a shortage of time. She reported

---


that nonsupervisory duties were a problem due to a lack of proper personnel.\textsuperscript{176}

Edward Thomas investigated funding for instructional supervision in Florida. His findings were that a more effective level of performance might be attained when local level money was increased. He noted that in-service education had been improved in many school districts.\textsuperscript{177}

Mary Louise Anderson investigated the role of the supervisor of instruction in Mississippi schools. One finding from her study was that the function of supervision in the improvement of teaching and learning should be better understood. Anderson observed constraints in the supervisory process which should be decreased, while at the same time the concepts of supervisory personnel in the total educational environment should be expanded.\textsuperscript{178}

James Miller studied supervisory theory and reported a greater emphasis placed upon human relations in the modern behavioral era. Investigating common administrative concepts in important theories of three different areas, his focus was on the theoretical evolution of

\textsuperscript{176}Caroline Ware Holder, "Task Analysis of Selected Leadership Personnel Responsible for Instructional Supervision and/or Curriculum Development in Local School Systems of Georgia," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVIII (February, 1978), 4546A.

\textsuperscript{177}Edward Ward Thomas, "Instructional Supervision in Florida Schools as Affected by Austerity Budgeting and School-Based Funding," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXVIII (May, 1978), 6512-13A.

\textsuperscript{178}Mary Louise Anderson, "The Status and Role Perceptions of the Supervisor of Instruction in Mississippi Public Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International, XXXIX (April, 1979), 5823A.
administrative and supervisory theory.¹⁷⁹

Lack of agreement regarding personnel administration, curriculum development, and instructional supervision were findings of Moses Norman, Sr. His investigation revealed a need for role clarification and responsibility for specific activities. The study was of Atlanta schools.¹⁸⁰

In West Virginia, James Thompson, utilizing the Ritchie Supervision Rating Scale, reported that supervisors' decision-making perceptions differed from principals' and teachers'. As a result of his findings, Thompson recommended that the Ritchie Scale be used at intervals to determine the changes in the perceptions of supervisors so that revisions could be made in the preservice and in-service program.¹⁸¹

A role study of instructional supervisors, using their perceptions and their superintendents', was conducted by John Douglass, Jr. Findings from the Alabama investigation were:

1. The instructional supervisor and the superintendent were in agreement that the purpose of instructional supervision was


instructional improvement.

2. A significant problem for supervisors was role diffusion.

3. Instructional supervisors possessing a doctorate were more likely to perform a variety of supervisory activities.

4. Instructional supervisors considered some administrative tasks as important.

5. Varying role expectations among superintendents and supervisors increased the possibility of misunderstandings in on-the-job situations.182

Philosophy and the bases of instructional supervision were investigated by Nancy Hart. Hart reported some agreement as to the areas on which supervision should have impact, but little knowledge of the process.183

Martha Lawrence reported on satisfiers and dissatisfiers of elementary school supervisors, basing her work on the Herzberg motivation-hygiene theory. Her findings were that achievement and recognition could be identified as statistically significant satisfiers, proving a relevancy for the use of her measurement technique.184

182 John Morgan Douglass, Jr., "Role of Instructional Supervisors as Perceived by Instructional Supervisors and Superintendents in Alabama," Dissertation Abstracts International, XL (April, 1980), 5414A.


The testing behavior of teachers was investigated by Canton Napier, who sought for an effective system to influence the teachers' classroom behavior. His mode was computer-based test analysis-feedback. Napier concluded that the analysis of data did not support the concept that feedback from the system directly to the individual concerned could influence the testing behavior of teachers.185

A role study was conducted by supervisors concerning the supervisory techniques of observations and conferences as perceived by middle, junior high, and high school personnel. The researcher, Russell Frotti, reported that not only were observed responses different from the expected responses in the model, but also that differences existed among the perceptions of teachers, principals, and supervisors relative to the supervisory practices of observations and conferences.186

Barbara Burch and W. Elzie Danley of Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee investigated the accountability of Tennessee instructional supervisors in the context of teacher effectiveness. They reported that the five roles directly related to working with teachers and the instruction program were information and dissemination, resource allocation, training and development, observation and evaluation, and motivation.


Burch and Danley stated that supervisors desired to spend 79 percent of their time on the above roles, but, in actual practice, supervisors spent only 59 percent of their time on these activities or functions. They advised supervisors to find ways to give time to the roles that contribute to the improvement of the quality of teaching. Another recommendation was that the role of the instructional supervisor be clarified, with the conclusion that school boards, state departments of education, and graduate preparation programs should be involved in the process. In their opinion, the general aim should be to find ways for supervisors to be accountable for the improvement of instruction.  

Summary of the Review of Related Literature

This chapter presented historical precedents in instructional supervision in the United States. The development of attitudes toward the profession was traced, beginning with the theme of religion, progressing to the era of scientific management, and evolving to theories emphasizing the art of living for both the student and professional.

Next, selected theories of instructional supervision were presented to provide "expert testimony" on the state of the profession, and concentrating on the decade of the 1970's. In this section of related literature, it was revealed that effective instructional

---

supervision was difficult to perceive and that the profession was in a state of stress as much was expected in a confusing age of rapid change.

Subsequently, role theory as a vehicle to aid in the understanding of the complexity of the social organization of the school was presented. Role definition was deemed to be useful for clarification of functions and purposes, and thus the accompanying goals essential for the improvement of the supervisor-teacher-student engagement opportunities.

Finally, selected research studies, taken from the past decade (1970-1980) relative to various aspects of instructional supervision in the southeastern United States, were presented with perceptions recorded by the supervisors themselves. In these investigations, role confusion and shortage of time with regard to role expectations were revealed as significant problems in an era of accountability.
Chapter 3

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The objective of this study was to determine differences which existed between the actual role and ideal role perceptions of instructional supervisors in the public schools in the counties of Tennessee. To achieve this objective, a questionnaire was selected because it was believed to yield the desired information concerning supervisory functions. The criteria on which the questionnaire were based were supervisory activities selected from the related literature. Statistical measures were utilized to analyze the perceptions of public school instructional supervisors in the counties of Tennessee concerning selected supervisory functions.

The Questionnaire

The data for the study were collected by using a survey instrument constructed and utilized in the investigation, "A Survey of the Activities and Responsibilities of General School Supervisors in North Carolina Counties,"\(^1\) using Section VII, "A" through "D" with certain modifications (see Appendices A and B). Permission was granted by the author for use of the modified questionnaire (Appendix C).

The questionnaire utilized measurements of ordinal level. In addition, the instrument's reliability was established by means of a pilot study and interview correlation when constructed.

The questionnaire included twenty-two supervisory function items and the sample of the Tennessee public school county instructional supervisors were requested to rank their perceptions of their actual and ideal role with regard to a scale of 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, and 1 = never. The twenty-two supervisory functions were as follows:

1. Coordinating instructional activity
2. Developing curricula
3. Organizing for instruction
4. Orienting new staff
5. Arranging in-service training
6. Providing materials and facilities
7. Giving demonstration lessons
8. Observing student classroom behavior
9. Conferring with teachers
10. Analysing and evaluating teachers
11. Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction
12. Visiting other school systems for ideas
13. Attending professional meetings
14. Participating in supervisory workshops
15. Working as a consultant outside your system
18. Recommending staff
19. Developing public relations
20. Planning buildings with administrators
21. Planning innovative programs
22. Changing old programs

The Sample

The respondents of the study consisted of one public school instructional supervisor from each of the ninety-five counties in Tennessee (Appendix D), therefore the population for the study was a representative sample. A list of supervisors was obtained from the Bureau of Research and Service at The University of Tennessee in Knoxville, Tennessee.

Data Collection

Permission was granted from the Institutional Review Board at East Tennessee State University to pursue the investigation and a public school instructional supervisor from each county in Tennessee was mailed a questionnaire, a cover letter, an assurance of anonymity (see Appendices E and F), and a stamped addressed envelope on April 25, 1980. Within two weeks, seventy one, or 74.7 percent, of the questionnaires had been returned. Members of the researcher's advisory committee considered the percentage of returns to be adequate, and the collected data were submitted to the East Tennessee State University Computer Center for statistical analysis on May 29, 1980.
Data Analysis

The collection and analysis of data in this study were for the purpose of determining differences existing between the actual and ideal role perceptions of instructional supervisors in the public schools in the counties of Tennessee as shown by their responses to a questionnaire. Since the problem was concerned with the difference between two related samples according to a measured trait, one measurement utilized was the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test.

According to Dean J. Champion,

This test is designed to take into account ranked differences between two samples, where ranks have been assigned according to the magnitude of difference between matched pairs of subjects.\(^2\)

Moreover, because the two sets of data were derived from the same subject the subject acted as his own control.\(^3\)

The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test takes into account not only the direction of the difference in scores but also observes the magnitude of the change. Other characteristics of the test were facility of interpretation of test results from a table and ease in application and comprehension.

The investigator was able to use this test with ordinal-level information since the data approached interval level data and could be called "equal-appearing interval" data or information, and could lie


\(^3\)Champion, p. 165.
somewhere between ordinal and interval measurement levels. In addition, with the sample size exceeding 25, a modification of the Z test was used to identify significant changes in scores. The formula for the test was as follows:

\[ Z = \frac{\sum T - \frac{N(N+1)}{4}}{\sqrt{\frac{N(N+1)(2N+1)}{24}}} \]

where \( T \) = the sum of the ranks with the less frequent sign; and
\( N \) = the number of pairs of scores.\(^4\)

An .05 level of confidence was utilized to determine significance. An additional measurement, the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), Related Measures of Association: Subprogram Crosstabs was utilized as a computer program method of measurement.\(^5\) The specific measurement was represented by frequency counts and percentages which were accumulations in cells and a clustering into categories of reported activities in the actual role which were less than the ideal, the same as the ideal, and more than the ideal.

The East Tennessee State University Computer Center was utilized in analyzing the data in this study. Responses to questionnaire items were previously coded and the data keypunched on cards. Programs were then completed and computer print-outs provided. Data were arranged in tabular form for presentation in Chapter 4.

\(^4\)Champion, pp. 167-169.

Summary

This chapter contained the methods and procedures utilized in the study. The methodology was a questionnaire for use in a survey of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors to elicit information concerning their actual and ideal role perceptions relative to twenty-two supervisory functions. A return was achieved which was deemed adequate, and the data were processed using the Wilcoxon signed-ranks matched-pairs test and the SPSS subprogram crosstabulation. The tests were chosen as they were thought to yield data consistent with the aim of the study, which was the determination of the differences between the county instructional supervisors' actual and ideal role perceptions.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION OF DATA AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This study had as its purpose the description of the actual and ideal instructional supervisory role in the state of Tennessee as perceived by county public school supervisors. A questionnaire chosen to secure the desired data was sent to one public school instructional supervisor in each of the ninety-five counties in Tennessee on April 25, 1980. Seventy-one returns (74.7 percent) were received. The percentage of returns was accepted by the researcher's Advisory Committee. The data were processed at the East Tennessee State University Computer and Research Center on May 29, 1980.

Presentation of Data

Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors indicated dissatisfaction with their actual role in 18 out of 22 selected supervisory functions. They expressed satisfaction with only four out of 22 of the selected functions.

The instructional supervisors in the county public school systems in Tennessee reported agreement between their perceptions of an actual and ideal role in the following areas:

(5) Arranging in-service 68 supervisors (68.6 percent)

(6) Providing materials and facilities 34 supervisors (48.6 percent)

(13) Attending professional meetings 49 supervisors (69.0 percent)
(17) Assisting the superintendent 44 supervisors (62.0 percent)

An analysis of functions showing dissimilar—actual greater than ideal plus actual less than ideal—role perceptions included:

(1) Coordinating instructional activity 37 supervisors (53.5 percent)
(2) Developing curricula 43 supervisors (61.4 percent)
(3) Organizing for instruction 38 supervisors (56.0 percent)
(4) Orienting new staff 38 supervisors (54.8 percent)
(7) Giving demonstration lessons 43 supervisors (61.4 percent)
(8) Observing student classroom behavior 41 supervisors (57.6 percent)
(9) Conferring with teachers 21 supervisors (29.5 percent)
(10) Analyzing and evaluating teachers 43 supervisors (61.5 percent)
(11) Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction 40 supervisors (56.3 percent)
(12) Visiting other school systems for ideas 48 supervisors (67.6 percent)
(14) Participating in supervisory workshops 27 supervisors (37.9 percent)
(15) Working as a consultant outside your system 41 supervisors (58.5 percent)
(16) Doing secretarial work 48 supervisors (68.7 percent)
(18) Recommending staff 38 supervisors (53.5 percent)
(19) Developing public relations 27 supervisors (38.0 percent)
(20) Planning buildings with administrators 46 supervisors (64.7 percent)
(21) Planning innovative programs 41 supervisors (58.6 percent)
(22) Changing old programs 36 supervisors (50.6 percent)

Of the 18 role functions reported as showing dissimilarity as perceived by the respondents, 17 had the highest proportion of responses falling within the actual less than ideal category. The specific functions were as follows: (1) coordinating instructional activity, 36 supervisors (52.1 percent); (2) developing curricula, 42 supervisors, (60.0 percent); (3) organizing for instruction, 38 supervisors, (56.0 percent); (4) orienting new staff, 36 supervisors, (52.0 percent); (7) giving demonstration lessons, 42 supervisors (60.0 percent); (8) observing student classroom behavior, 32 supervisors (45.0 percent); (9) conferring with teachers, 21 supervisors (29.5 percent); (10) analyzing and evaluating teachers, 31 supervisors (44.4 percent); (11) analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction, 37 supervisors (52.1 percent); (12) visiting other school systems for ideas, 48 supervisors (67.6 percent); (14) participating in supervisory workshops, 23 supervisors (32.3 percent); (15) working as a consultant outside your system, 38 supervisors (54.3 percent); (18) recommending staff, 34 supervisors (47.9 percent); (19) developing public relations, 25 supervisors (35.2 percent); (20) planning buildings with administrators, 44 supervisors (61.9 percent); (21) planning innovative programs, 37 supervisors (52.9 percent); and (22) changing old programs, 34 supervisors (47.8 percent).

One role function (16), doing secretarial work, was assigned to the actual greater than ideal category by the respondents. Forty-eight supervisors (68.7 percent) perceived their actual role to be greater than their ideal role.
None of the Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors perceived their actual role to be greater than their ideal role concerning these functions: (3) organizing for instruction, 68 out of 68 cases, and (12) visiting other school systems for ideas, 71 out of 71 cases. None perceived their actual role as less than ideal in the function of (16) doing secretarial work.

Analysis of Data

The preceding discussion dealt with the perceptions of the actual and ideal role of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors as revealed by a questionnaire. The data furnished by the respondents were computer analyzed using the SPSS crosstabulations and the Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks measurement. Twenty-two null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance with a two-tailed test. The hypotheses and the results of the investigation were as follows:

$H_0$: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of coordinating instructional activity.

Table 1 represents an analysis of the responses to this inquiry into the selected role function. Examination of the crosstabulations of 69 responses revealed that 32 supervisors (46.3 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar with regard to coordinating instructional activity. Thirty-six (52.1 percent) perceived their actual role to be less than their ideal and one subject (1.4 percent) perceived the actual role to be greater than the ideal.
Table 1

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Coordinating Instructional Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-5.092</td>
<td>32 (46.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
In order to be considered significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test, the observed Z score must be $\pm 1.96$ (see Table 2 for verification of Wilcoxon) or larger; since the score was -5.092, the difference was significant. The null hypothesis was rejected.

$H_0_2$: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing curricula.

The data depicted in Table 3 represents 70 instructional supervisors' perceptions of their role function of developing curricula. Inspection of the crosstabulations indicated that 27 supervisors (38.7 percent) viewed their actual and ideal role as similar. A majority, 42 (60.0 percent), regarded their actual role to be less than their ideal and one subject (1.6 percent) perceived the actual role to be greater than the ideal.

The observed Z score was -5.488, a value greater than the $\pm 1.96$ Z value necessary for a .05 level of significance when using a two-tailed test. Thus, the difference in judgment of the actual and ideal roles was significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

$H_0_3$: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of organizing for instruction.

Data in Table 4 are an analysis of the 68 responses to this examination of the selected role function. Thirty supervisors (44.1 percent), according to the data, perceived their actual and ideal role function of organizing for instruction to be similar, while 38 (56.0 percent) distinguished their actual role to be less than their ideal and none saw the actual role to be greater than the ideal.
### Table 2

**Verification of Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$N_{-}$</th>
<th>$N_{+}$</th>
<th>$N_{-}$ Mean</th>
<th>$N_{+}$ Mean</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>2-tailed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>-5.052</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing curricula</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>-5.488</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>-5.374</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>-4.982</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>16.78</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>22.19</td>
<td>-5.542</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>-3.154</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>-4.015</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>-2.733</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>-6.631</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>-3.207</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>20.52</td>
<td>-4.671</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-6.031</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending staff</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>-4.524</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>-3.156</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>-5.610</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>-4.542</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing old programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>18.13</td>
<td>-4.454</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $N$ = number of responses  
** $N_{-}$ = number of negative responses (Actual greater than Ideal)  
*** $N_{+}$ = number of positive responses (Actual less than Ideal)
Table 3
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Developing Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ideal</td>
<td>&gt; Ideal</td>
<td>&lt; Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Developing curricula</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.488</td>
<td>27 (38.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
<td>42 (60.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Organizing for Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual  Actual Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=   &gt;       &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal  Ideal  Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-5.373</td>
<td>30 (44.1%) 0 (0%) 38 (56.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
= the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
An observed Z score of ±1.96 or greater was the Z value required for a significant difference at the .05 level using a two-tailed test. The computed Z score was -5.373. Thus, the difference was significant and the null hypothesis was rejected.

\( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of orienting new staff.

A summary and analysis of 69 responses to this inquiry into the selected role function of orienting new staff are included in Table 5. Thirty-one supervisors (43.1 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. Over half of the respondents, thirty-six (52.0 percent), perceived their actual role to be less than their ideal and two (2.8 percent) judged their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

An achieved Z score of -4.982 derived from the data furnished by the respondents met the requirement of an observed Z value of ±1.96 or larger for a two-tailed test at the .05 level of significance. The difference in perceptions of the role function of orienting new staff was significant; consequently, the null hypothesis was rejected.

\( H_0 \): There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of arranging in-service training.

Table 6 shows the results of the analyzed data from 70 respondents concerning the particular supervisory role function of arranging in-service training. According to the crosstabulated data, over two-thirds of those responding, 68 instructional supervisors (68.6 percent), viewed their actual and ideal role as similar. Ten
Table 5

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Orienting New Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Orienting new staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-4.982</td>
<td>31 (44.1%) 2 (2.8%) 36 (52.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

*= the same as

> = greater than

< = less than

*N = number of responses

**Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 6

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Arranging In-Service Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ideal</td>
<td>&gt; Ideal</td>
<td>&lt; Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Arranging in-service</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>68 (68.6%)</td>
<td>12 (17.1%)</td>
<td>10 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
* = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
(14.2 percent) indicated that their actual role was less than their ideal and 12 (17.1 percent) observed that the actual role was greater than the ideal.

The Z score, -0.016, for the data concerning this particular role function was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis. Instructional supervisors observed their actual and ideal roles in arranging in-service training to be more similar than dissimilar.

\[ H_{06} : \text{There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of providing materials and facilities.} \]

A breakdown and analysis of the 70 instructional supervisors' viewpoint of the selected role activity of providing materials and facilities is illustrated in Table 7. Slightly less than one-half, 34 supervisors (48.6 percent), judged their actual and ideal role to be similar, according to the data. Eighteen (25.7 percent) deemed their actual role to be less than their ideal and the same number, 18 (25.7 percent), observed their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

The Z score of -0.487 indicated that no significant difference existed between the supervisors' perceptions of their actual and their ideal role responsibility of providing materials and facilities at the .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test. Thus, the investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis.

\[ H_{07} : \text{There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of giving demonstration lessons.} \]
### Table 7

**Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Providing Materials and Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Actual = Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &gt; Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &lt; Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
<td>34 (48.6%)</td>
<td>18 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.

p ≤ .05

= the same as

> = greater than

< = less than

* N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 8 represents an analysis of the 70 responses to this inquiry into the selected role function. Examination of the cross-tabulations revealed that 27 supervisors (38.6 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. A majority, 42 respondents (60.0 percent), viewed their actual role as less than their ideal and only one (1.4 percent) perceived the actual role to be greater than the ideal.

At the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test, concerning the actual and ideal role perceptions of the instructional supervisors with regard to the function of giving demonstration lessons, the Z score value of -5.542 indicated that a significant difference existed. The null hypothesis was rejected.

H₀: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of observing student classroom behavior.

The data shown in Table 9 describes the analysis of the 71 respondents' attitudes toward the particular role function of observing student classroom behavior. According to the data resulting from the crosstabulations, 30 supervisors (42.3 percent) determined their actual and ideal role to be similar while a slightly larger number, 32 supervisors (45.0 percent), deemed their actual role to be less than their ideal. A minority of nine supervisors (12.6 percent) indicated the actual role to be greater than the ideal.

A significant difference existed at the .05 level in supervisors' perceptions of their actual and ideal role function. Since the observed Z score, -3.194, was larger than the stimulated ± 1.96 value, the null hypothesis was rejected.
Table 8  
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Giving Demonstration Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.542</td>
<td>27 (38.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P ≤ .05  
= = the same as  
> = greater than  
< = less than.  
*N = number of responses  
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 9

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Observing Student Classroom Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Actual Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=          &gt;          &lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal      Ideal      Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.194</td>
<td>30 (42.3%) 9 (12.6%) 32 (45.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
H₀₉: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of conferring with teachers.

Table 10 describes the results of an analysis of 71 instructional supervisors' responses to this inquiry into the individual role activity of conferring with teachers. A scrutiny of the cross-tabulations revealed that almost three-fourths of the respondents, 50 supervisors (70.4 percent), judged their actual and ideal role to be similar. Twenty-one supervisors (29.5 percent) perceived their actual role to be less than their ideal while none saw their actual role as greater than their ideal.

The observed Z score of -4.015 was larger than the required ± 1.96 value for a two-tailed test. Thus, the discrepancy in the supervisors' perceptions of their actual and their ideal role for this function, conferring with teachers, was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected.

H₁₀: There will be no significant differences in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating teachers.

A summary and an analysis of the data furnished by 70 respondents with regard to the supervisory role function of analyzing and evaluating teachers is portrayed in Table 11. According to crosstabulated data, one-third of the respondents, 27 (38.5 percent), viewed their actual and ideal role to be similar. A slightly greater proportion, thirty-one supervisors (44.4 percent), regarded their actual role as less than their ideal while less than one-fifth, 12 supervisors (17.1 percent), saw their actual role as greater than the ideal.
Table 10

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Conferring with Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Actual = Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &gt; Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &lt; Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 (70.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>21 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
* = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table II

Analyzing of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Analyzing and Evaluating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2.753</td>
<td>27 (38.5%)</td>
<td>12 (17.1%)</td>
<td>31 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

= = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Since the observed Z score of -2.753 was greater than the value stipulated for a two-tailed test, ± 1.96; the difference in supervisors' perceptions of their actual and ideal roles was considered significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

H11: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction.

An examination of the 71 responses to this investigation of the especial supervisory role function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction is represented in Table 12. Inspection of the data indicated that 31 supervisors (43.6 percent) judged their actual and ideal role to be similar. A majority, 37 supervisors (52.1 percent), reckoned their actual role to be less than their ideal, but only three (4.2 percent) deemed their actual role to be greater than the ideal.

At the .05 level of significance, the observed Z score of -4.886 indicated that a significant difference existed in the instructional supervisors' perceptions of their actual and ideal role with regard to the function of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

H12: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of visiting other school systems for ideas.

Table 13 represents an analysis of the 71 responses to this inquiry into the selected role function. Examination of the cross-
Table 12

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Analyzing and Evaluating the Outcome of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>% Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Analyzing and evaluating the outcomes of instruction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.886</td>
<td>31 (43.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
= = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 13
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Visiting other School Systems for Ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-6.031</td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-6.031</td>
<td>23 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
= the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
tabulations revealed that 23 supervisors (32.3 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. Forty-eight (67.6 percent), over two-thirds of the supervisors, observed their actual role to be less than their ideal and none accounted their actual role to be greater than the ideal.

Computation of the data revealed disagreement between the instructional supervisors' judgment of their actual role and their ideal role with regard to the function of visiting other school systems for ideas. The observed Z score, -6.031, indicated that a significant difference existed at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

H : There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of attending professional meetings.

Table 14 displays an analysis of the 71 responses to this investigation of the instructional supervisors' regard of role function (13), attending professional meetings. Forty-nine supervisors (69.0 percent), according to crosstabulations, viewed their actual and ideal role as similar. Fifteen supervisors (21.1 percent) saw their actual role as less than their ideal and seven (9.8 percent) regarded their actual role as greater than their ideal.

The observed Z score, -1.266, indicated that no significant difference existed at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test. The respondents' perceptions of their actual and their ideal role functions of attending professional meetings tended to be in agreement. The investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis.
Table 14

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Attending Professional Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
<td>49 (69.0%)</td>
<td>7 (9.8%)</td>
<td>15 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

* N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
H \text{ i}\text{4}: \text{ There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of participating in supervisory workshops.}

Table 15 describes an analysis of the 71 responses to this inquiry into the selected role function of participating in supervisory workshops. Perusal of the crosstabulatory data revealed that 44 supervisors (62.0 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. The actual role was deemed to be less than the ideal role by 23 supervisors (32.3 percent), but only four (5.6 percent) observed their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

In order to be considered significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test, the observed \( Z \) score must be \( \pm 1.96 \) or larger. Since the observed \( Z \) score was -3.207, there was a significant difference in the instructional supervisors' discernment of their actual and their ideal role concerning the function of participation in supervisory workshops. The null hypothesis was rejected.

\( H \text{ i}\text{5}: \text{ There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of working as a consultant outside your system.} \)

A summary and an analysis of the 70 respondents' perceptions of their actual and ideal role with regard to function (15), working as a consultant outside your system, are shown in Table 16. Twenty-nine supervisors (41.4 percent), upon examination of the crosstabulations, were found to view their actual and ideal role as similar. A majority, 38 supervisors (54.3 percent), looked upon their actual role as less than their ideal, but only three (4.2 percent) saw their actual role as greater than their ideal.
Table 15
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Participating in Supervisory Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual &gt; Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual &lt; Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Participating in supervisory</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.207</td>
<td>44 (62.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

= = the same as

> = greater than

< = less than

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 16

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Working As a Consultant Outside Your System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4.671</td>
<td>29 (41.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

= the same as

> = greater than

< = less than

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
The instructional supervisors' perception of their actual role was divergent from their judgments of their ideal role concerning function (15), working as a consultant outside your system; for the observed Z score, -4.671, indicated that a significant difference existed at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test. The null hypothesis was rejected.

$H_{16}$: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of doing secretarial work.

Table 17 represents an analysis of 70 responses to this inquiry into selected role function (16), doing secretarial work. Examination of the crosstabulations revealed that 22 supervisors (31.5 percent) judged their actual and ideal role to be similar. None perceived their actual role to be less than their ideal, but over two-thirds of the respondents, 48 supervisors (68.7 percent), regarded their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

The observed Z score, -6.031, was larger than ±1.96, the value required for a two-tailed test at the .05 level of significance. The difference in the respondents' perception of their actual and their ideal role with regard to this function, doing secretarial work, was significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

$H_{17}$: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of assisting the superintendent.

Table 18 exhibits an analysis of the 71 responses to this inquiry into the actual and ideal role perceptions of supervisory activity (17), assisting the superintendent. Almost two-thirds of the respondents, 44 supervisors (62.0 percent), according to the
## Table 17

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Doing Secretarial Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6.031</td>
<td>22 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05  
* = the same as  
> = greater than  
< = less than  
*N = number of responses  
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Table 18

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Assisting the Superintendent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>44 (62.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
* = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
crosstabulatory data, perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. Eight supervisors (11.2 percent) viewed their actual role as less than their ideal and 19 (26.7 percent) regarded their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

The instructional supervisors tended to view their actual role and their ideal role as similar in the function of assisting the superintendent. An observed Z score of -1.357 indicated that no significant difference existed at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test. The investigator failed to reject the null hypothesis.

H18: There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of recommending staff.

An analysis of the 71 respondents for this inquiry into the particular supervisory function of recommending staff is presented in Table 19. Inspection of the crosstabulations revealed that 33 supervisors (46.4 percent) deemed their actual and ideal role to be similar. A slightly larger number, 34 supervisors (47.9 percent), acknowledged their actual role to be less than their ideal, but only four (5.6 percent) judged their actual role to be greater than the ideal.

An analysis of the data indicated a discrepancy in the responding supervisors' perceptions of their actual and ideal role in the function of recommending staff. The observed Z score, -4.394, established a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.
Table 19
Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Recommending Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual  = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Recommending staff</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.394</td>
<td>33 (46.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05
= = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than
*N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of developing public relations.

Table 20 represents an analysis of the 71 responses to this inquiry into the selected role function. Examination of the crosstabulations revealed that 44 supervisors (62.0 percent) regarded their actual and ideal role to be similar. Twenty-five (35.2 percent) viewed their actual role as less than their ideal, but only two (2.8 percent) looked upon the actual role as greater than the ideal.

In order to be considered significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test, the Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger; since the score was -3.916, the difference was significant. Dissimilarity existed among the instructional supervisors' perceptions of their actual and their ideal role in the function of developing public relations. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning buildings with administrators.

Table 21 depicts an analysis of the data provided by the 71 instructional supervisors responding for investigation of the special role function of planning buildings with administrators. Inspection of the crosstabulated data indicated that 25 supervisors (35.2 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. Forty-four supervisors (61.9 percent) judged their actual role to be less than their ideal, but only two (2.8 percent) accounted their actual role to be greater than their ideal.
Table 20

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Developing Public Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Developing public relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.916</td>
<td>44 (62.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

= = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
### Table 21

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Planning Buildings with Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Actual = Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &gt; Ideal</th>
<th>Actual &lt; Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20) Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-5.610</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (35.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.8%)</td>
<td>44 (61.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = number of responses
** Observed Z score must be ±1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.

p ≤ .05
> = greater than
< = less than.

p ≤ .05
> = greater than
< = less than.

N = number of responses

Observed Z score must be ±1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
Statistical analysis of the data indicated a disparity in the respondents' judgment of their actual role and their ideal role in the supervisory function of planning buildings with administrators. An observed Z score of -5.610 established a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

\[ H_{21}: \text{There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of planning innovative programs.} \]

An analysis of the 70 responses to function (21), planning innovative programs, is presented in Table 22. Twenty-nine supervisors (41.5 percent) were found to view their actual and ideal role as similar. A majority, 37 supervisors (52.9 percent), regarded their actual role to be less than their ideal while only four (5.7 percent) perceived their actual role to be greater than the ideal.

The observed Z score, -4.542, indicated that a significant difference existed at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test. The instructional supervisors shared a marked disagreement in their perceptions of their actual role and their ideal role in the function of planning innovative programs. The null hypothesis was rejected.

\[ H_{22}: \text{There will be no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of changing old programs.} \]

Table 23 represents an analysis of the 71 responses to this inquiry into the selected supervisory function of changing old programs. Examination of the crosstabulations revealed that 35 supervisors (49.3 percent) perceived their actual and ideal role to be similar. Thirty-four (47.8 percent) acknowledged their actual role to be less
Table 22

Analysis of Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions in Planning Innovative Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4.542</td>
<td>29 (41.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p ≤ .05

* = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score**</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual = Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Changing old programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.454</td>
<td>35 (49.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p \leq .05 \)

- = the same as
> = greater than
< = less than.

*N = number of responses

** Observed Z score must be ± 1.96 or larger to be significant at the .05 level with a two-tailed test.
than their ideal and two (2.8 percent) judged their actual role to be greater than their ideal.

In order to be considered significant at the .05 level using a two-tailed test, the Z score must be $\pm 1.96$ or larger; since the score was $-4.454$, the difference was significant. The responding instructional supervisors' perceptions of their actual role and their ideal role were divergent in the function of changing old programs. The null hypothesis was rejected.

**Summary**

As a result of the findings, the investigator failed to reject hypotheses 5, 6, 13, and 17. The following null hypotheses were rejected: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22.

Table 24 summarizes the hypotheses of the study in relationship to the instruments of measurement utilized in the study. Less comprehensive tables of the results of this investigation were included in Appendix H.
### Table 24

*Summary of Total Responses of Tennessee County Public School Instructional Supervisors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Actual Greater than Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Actual Same as Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Actual Less than Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>-5.052*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Developing Curricula</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-5.408*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Organising, for instruction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>-5.374*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Orienting new staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>-4.922*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-5.542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>-3.194*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Confering with teachers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>-4.015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>-2.753*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>-4.886*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>-3.207*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>-4.671*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>-4.394*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Recommending staff</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>-3.916*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Developing public relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>-5.610*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>-4.542*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>-4.454*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total N = 71

++H = number of responses

* Significant at .05 level
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains the summary, presentation of the findings of the study, and conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data. Recommendations based on the findings of the study were included in the final section.

Summary

The purpose of this study was the description of the instructional supervisory role in the state of Tennessee as perceived by county public school instructional supervisors and included selected supervisory functions derived from contemporary literature. Responses to a questionnaire submitted from one instructional supervisor from each county revealed actual and ideal role perceptions derived from the performance of supervisory functions in their individual school systems.

Findings

The data were analyzed and the 22 null hypotheses were tested for significance beyond the .05 level.

Null hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 were rejected. The rejection of these research hypotheses indicated that there was a significant difference
between the actual and ideal role perceptions of Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors according to selected functions as follows:

1. Coordinating instructional activity
2. Developing curricula
3. Organizing for instruction
4. Orienting new staff
5. Giving demonstration lessons
6. Observing student classroom behavior
7. Conferring with teachers
8. Analyzing and evaluating teachers
9. Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction
10. Visiting other school systems for ideas
11. Participating in supervisory workshops
12. Working as a consultant outside your system
13. Doing secretarial work
14. Recommending staff
15. Developing public relations
16. Planning buildings with administrators
17. Planning innovative programs
18. Changing old programs

Four null hypotheses were not rejected. They were:

H₀₅: There was no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of arranging in-service training.

H₀₆: There was no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of providing materials and facilities.
There was no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of attending professional meetings.

There was no significant difference in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the function of assisting the superintendent.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions were warranted:

1. In general, Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors were dissatisfied with their role under the classification of improving teaching and learning in regard to the following functions: coordinating instructional activity, developing curricula, organizing for instruction, and orienting staff. The functions in this general grouping dealt more closely with pupils, namely: giving demonstration lessons, observing student classroom behavior, conferring with teachers, analyzing and evaluating teachers, and analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction. These were also areas of role dissatisfaction.

2. In general, in the classification of self-improvement, dissatisfaction was indicated by the responses concerning visiting other school systems, participation in supervisory workshops, and working as a consultant outside the respondents' own school system.

3. In general, three of the functions in the general activity classification regarding recommending staff, developing public
relations, and planning buildings with administrators showed
disparity between actual and ideal role perceptions.

4. In general, change agent activities, the final classi-
fication, revealed a difference between perceptions of actual and
ideal activities concerning the functions of planning innovative
programs and changing old programs.

5. In general, Tennessee county public school instructional
supervisors perceived themselves as functioning closely to an ideal
role in only three of the classifications of supervisory functions.
Those classifications and functions were as follows:

a. Improving teaching and learning
   (1) Arranging in-service training (5)
   (2) Providing materials and facilities (6)

b. Self-Improvement
   (1) Attending professional meetings (13)

c. General activity
   (1) Assisting the superintendent (17)

6. Responses to the questionnaire were generally indicative
of less participation than desired by Tennessee county public school
instructional supervisors in the following selected supervisory
functions:

a. Coordinating instructional activity (1)

b. Developing curricula (2)

c. Organizing for instruction (3)

d. Orienting new staff (4)

e. Giving demonstration lessons (7)
f. Analyzing and evaluating teachers (10)
g. Working as a consultant outside your school system (15)
h. Recommending staff (18)
i. Planning buildings with administrators (20)
j. Planning innovative programs (21)

7. In general, responses to the questionnaire were indicative of an attitude of satisfaction with participation in the following selected functions:
   a. Arranging in-service training (5)
   b. Providing materials and facilities (6)
   c. Attending professional meetings (13)
   d. Assisting the superintendent (17)

8. There were discrepancies revealing role confusion in the following specific considerations:
   a. Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors were active in the function of observing student classroom behavior, but almost one-half of 71 cases, 32 supervisors (45.0 percent), wanted more opportunities for observation.
   b. The supervisors approved of their role in recommending staff; however, almost one-half of 71 cases, 34 supervisors (47.9 percent) wanted to engage more in this function.
   c. More than one-tenth, eight or more supervisors, thought they were doing too much in functions traditionally thought of as instructional supervisors' duties.

The functions were:

(1) Arranging in-service training (5)
(2) Providing materials and facilities (6)
(3) Analyzing and evaluating teachers (10)
(4) Assisting the superintendent (17)

d. No Tennessee county public school supervisor wanted to engage less in the function of organizing for instruction, but almost one-half, 30 supervisors (44.1 percent) thought their actual and ideal roles were similar.

e. No Tennessee county public school supervisor wanted to engage less in the function of conferring with teachers, but 50 supervisors (70.4 percent) thought their actual and ideal roles were similar.

f. No Tennessee county public school instructional supervisor wanted to engage less in the function of visiting other school systems for ideas, but 23 supervisors (32.2 percent) thought their actual and ideal roles were similar.

8. In consideration of the function, "Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction," 37 (52.1 percent) Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors indicated a desire for engaging more in educational accounting, although 31 (43.6 percent) revealed an opposite position.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this study the following recommendations were proposed:

1. Because large areas of unsatisfactory instructional supervisory roles were reported, an examination of priorities and a
convergence of objectives, expectations, and goals might result in less role dissatisfaction.

2. Individual systems in the state of Tennessee's county educational organization should consider allocating more time to instructional supervisors for increased performance in the functions of conferring with teachers and observing students' classroom behavior.

3. Administrative officials of the Tennessee county public school educational systems might give consideration to involving the instructional supervisors in the function of recommending staff, because the supervisor represents the 'link' between the teacher and the central office.

4. Clerical assistance should be provided so that the instructional supervisor would not 'waste' time engaging in this activity.

5. Investigations should be conducted to ascertain why some Tennessee county public school instructional supervisors wished to engage less in the traditional functions of arranging in-service training, providing materials and facilities, observing student classroom behavior, and analyzing and evaluating teachers. The supervisory behavior function of assisting the superintendent fell into this category as well.

6. The Tennessee State Department of Education should continue to lend support to supervisory personnel in the following areas:
   a. Coordinating instructional activity
   b. Developing curricula
   c. Organizing for instruction
   d. Orienting new staff
e. Giving demonstration lessons
f. Conferring with teachers
g. Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction
h. Visiting other school systems for ideas
i. Working as a consultant outside your system
j. Planning buildings with administrators

7. Assistance should be given to supervisors for curriculum development. Released time and programs originating in continuing education departments of the university system might offer a solution to the problem.

8. Instructional supervisors desired to be included in the planning of buildings with administrators. A solution to this problem might involve active participation with school boards as well as enrollment in school planning extension courses.

9. A study of ways supervisors allocate their time might be helpful, particularly in helping them to fill the traditional role of analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction.

10. This study should be replicated using a larger sample to determine the validity of the findings and to obtain more conclusive results on certain factors; for example, the instructional supervisors' involvement with parents should be studied.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Improving Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>How you currently spend your time</th>
<th>How you would like to spend your time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Confering 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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Self-improvement 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>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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. General 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>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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Acting as a Change Agent</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>
APPENDIX B

MODIFIED QUESTIONNAIRE - SECTION VII
I.D. No.  
(1-2-3)

Please answer the following:

Within your school system during a typical year, how do you perceive you function in your actual role, and how would you function in your perceived ideal role? Circle your answer using the following scale:

4=often 3=sometimes 2=seldom 1=never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual Role</th>
<th>Ideal Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing curricula</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Orienting new staff</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Confering with teachers</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Recommending staff</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing public relations</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Changing old programs</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
<td>4, 3, 2, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

PERMISSION LETTERS FROM RICE
May 21, 1979

Ms. Jane Afifi  
Education Department  
East Tennessee State University  
Johnson City, Tennessee

Dear Ms. Afifi:

This letter is to confirm our telephone conversation on May 21, 1979. I have given you permission to use the questionnaire contained in my Doctorial Dissertation with the following modifications:

PART A: Improving Teaching and Learning
    Analyzing and evaluating Teachers

CHANGE: Analyzing and evaluating Instruction

PART C: General Activities

ADD: Providing Staff

I requested a copy of the results of the study. I also suggested that you check Tennessee laws for procedure for employing personnel. The North Carolina law states that the principal must recommend teachers to the local board of education. The local board of education then employs the personnel. You may want to read Tennessee law before you decide to use "provide" Staff.

Best wishes with your study. I'll be happy to talk with you when it is convenient for you and me. Give my regards to Dr. Greninger.

Sincerely,

Bobby Jean Rice, Ed. D.
Ms. Jane W. Affici
4 Northwood Court
Johnson City, Tenn. 37601

Dear Ms. Affici:

It certainly was a pleasure hearing from you again and to know that you are progressing well with your study.

The suggested additions to the questionnaire seem feasible. However, many of us find ourselves doing more administration than supervision - much to our dismay.

You will enjoy receiving and processing the responses. The worse is over! Best wishes for the remainder of your work at East Tennessee.

Give my regards to Dr. Grenenger.

Bobby Jean Rice, Ed. D.
Supervisor

BJR/aa
APPENDIX D

TENNESSEE COUNTIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tennessee Counties: Source of Sample*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bledsoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheatham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crockett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grainger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamblen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loudon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNairy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*95 Respondents
APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER
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 "A Study of the Perceived Ideal Role and the Actual Role of Instructional Supervisors in the Public Schools in the Counties of Tennessee."

I have enclosed a questionnaire. Would you please complete it and return it to me in the enclosed envelope?

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,

Jane Williams Afifi
APPENDIX F

ASSURANCE OF ANONIMITY
To the respondent:

Immediately upon return receipt, the county represented will be noted and thereupon the county record page discarded. Moreover, there will not be a report of individual county statistics as there will be just an addition of the answers and a total reported.

COUNTY __________________ 148
APPENDIX G

WILCOXON Z VALUES FOR DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF THE ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLE OF TENNESSEE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Function</th>
<th>N*</th>
<th>Z Score</th>
<th>Two-tailed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-5.092*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing curricula</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.483*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-5.375*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Orienting new staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-5.902*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Providing materials and facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-0.437</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.912*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.194*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Conferring with teachers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.015*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-2.253*</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.606*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-6.031*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.266</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.207*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-4.671*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-6.031*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Reorganizing staff</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-1.359*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing public relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-3.916*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-5.610*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-5.912*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Changing old programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4.495*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N* = number of responses

*Significant at .05 level (p > .05)
APPENDIX H

TENNESSEE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS' ACTUAL AND IDEAL ROLE PERCEPTIONS: SPSS CATEGORIES AND PERCENTAGES
### Tennessee County Public School Instructional Supervisors' Actual and Ideal Role Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Function</th>
<th>n*</th>
<th>Actual Greater than Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Actual Same as Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Actual Less than Ideal</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Coordinating instructional activity</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Developing curricula</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Coordinating new staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Arranging in-service training</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Providing training facilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Giving demonstration lessons</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Observing student classroom behavior</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Confering with teachers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Analyzing and evaluating teachers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Analyzing and evaluating the outcome of instruction</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Visiting other school systems for ideas</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Attending professional meetings</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Participating in supervisory workshops</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Working as a consultant outside your system</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Doing secretarial work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Assisting the superintendent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Recommending staff</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Developing public relations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Planning buildings with administrators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Planning innovative programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Changing old programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n* = number of responses
APPENDIX I

COMPUTER PRINTOUT VERIFICATION OF THE SPSS PROGRAM FOR CROSSTABULATIONS: SAMPLE
## Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col Pct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Pct</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function: Providing material and facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number of missing observations 1
VITA
VITA

JANE WILLIAMS AFIFI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Data:</th>
<th>Place of Birth: Pawnee City, Nebraska</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status: Single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education:             | Public Schools: Pawnee City, Nebraska |
|                        | Boston, Massachusetts                |
|                        | Simmons College for Women, Boston,   |
|                        | Massachusetts                        |
|                        | University of New Hampshire, Durham,  |
|                        | New Hampshire                        |
|                        | University of Michigan, School of Music, |
|                        | Ann Arbor, Michigan; voice, French,   |
|                        | piano, B. M., 1950                   |
|                        | Certification, Music Education, East  |
|                        | Tennessee State University, Johnson City, |
|                        | Tennessee, 1963                      |
|                        | East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, |
|                        | Tennessee; instructional communications, |
|                        | education, M. A., 1975               |

| Professional Experience: | Teacher, Johnson City, Tennessee 1977-1980 |
|                         | Doctoral Fellow, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee 1975 |
|                         | American College for Girls, Cairo, Egypt 1951-52 |
|                         | Kindergarten, Maadi, Egypt, 1950 |

| Honors:                 | Mu Phi Episilon                      |
|                        | Phi Kappa Phi                         |
|                        | Kappa Delta Pi                        |
|                        | Phi Delta Kappa                       |