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PREFACE

Certain conventions have been established in the body of the dissertation which it will be to the reader's advantage to know at the outset in order to avoid ambiguity or a misunderstanding concerning the interpretation of data. A listing of these conventions follows:

1. The title, "state foreign language supervisor", is the one used throughout the dissertation to refer to the individual at the state level, regardless of the title (such as "consultant") which he may use for himself, who provides supervisory and/or consultant services in foreign language education in the 50 states and the territories of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. This is consistent with the title chosen by the state foreign language supervisors themselves in their national organization, the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, in reference to their position. Territories are differentiated from states in the discussion only where the information may be of some interest statistically.

2. The term, "respondent", is used to refer to any person, regardless of his state or territory, who has returned a completed questionnaire.

3. In accordance with suggested guidelines for microfilming the dissertation, the use of footnotes has been avoided in preference for the device of parentheses in the body of the text, except where
reference is made to a published work.

4. Percentages are reported in whole numbers only, since the fraction serves no useful purpose with numbers that are designed to give relative approximations. Any fraction over one-half is reported as the next nearest whole number.

5. Where a complete listing is done, apart from tables, with reference to all the states (e.g., the various divisions in which the foreign language supervisor is located), and the totals given do not equal the number of states—or respondents, as the case may be—which are represented by the returned questionnaires, it is to be understood that the remaining respondents declined to furnish the information for some reason.

The writer would like to take this opportunity to express his thanks to the many state foreign language supervisors who have given so generously of their valuable time by providing needed information in a lengthy questionnaire, and especially to Miss Leona Glenn of Ohio and Mr. Frank Grittner of Wisconsin, whose kind assistance in the revision of the basic questionnaire was invaluable. Thanks, too, is due to Mr. V. André Paquette, himself a former state foreign language supervisor (New Hampshire) and presently Executive Secretary of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, for assistance in locating other former state supervisors and needed materials. Many others, too numerous to detail here, also deserve a word of gratitude for encouragement and help through correspondence and personal contact. It is indeed gratifying to be a part of a profession which gives so unstintingly and unselfishly of its assistance.
A special note of gratitude is extended to the members of my reading committee, Drs. Edward D. Allen and L. O. Andrews, whose suggestions and comments were of great value. Thanks also is given to Dr. Alexander Frazier for his pertinent evaluations.

Finally, and most importantly, it is appropriate to express high esteem of, and sincere thanks to, Dr. Frank Otto, whose friendly inspiration and ready willingness to advise during the months this dissertation was in preparation has been deeply appreciated.
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CHAPTER I
OBJECTIVES, RELATED LITERATURE, AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

For foreign language supervision on the state level, 1958 marked the beginning of a new emphasis. In that year, the National Defense Education Act was passed by Congress to promote, together with other selected disciplines, the teaching of foreign languages. Title III of the Act provided funds for a number of specific purposes, among which was the establishment, at the state level, of a foreign language supervisor.

The position of state foreign language supervisor was virtually unknown nationwide prior to 1958. New York, in 1912, had been the first state to establish the office of foreign language supervisor at the state level, and in the two score years which followed, only two other states, Pennsylvania and New Mexico, followed suit. Following 1958, however, forty-seven more states, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands established such an office, even though, in many cases, qualified personnel were unavailable to fill the office. The new supervisors who took office were obliged, for lack of direction or guidelines, to create the role which they themselves were going to fulfill.

The individual who has assumed responsibility for the supervision of foreign language activities within his state, by the very fact that his title carries with it the implied, if not always real, authority
of the state in educational programs, and the considerable prestige as the ranking state official in his field, is a person whose potential influence is tremendous, not only as he meets and talks to persons of his own state involved in foreign language education, but also as he travels from meeting to meeting about the country. This factor has recently been recognized by the state foreign language supervisors themselves, who, at the February, 1968, meeting of the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, have drawn up plans to begin a series of publications under the auspices of their organization.

Except for three states, the state foreign language supervisors have been functioning for somewhat less than a decade, and in many cases, the title of foreign language supervisor in any one state has been held by several individuals. During this time, as the state foreign language supervisor has worked to create his role, he has had to work largely on his own, and the role which he has developed has been one which, by its very newness, has not come under close scrutiny by any educational or governmental agency. Only the U. S. Office of Education has been keeping detailed records of the state foreign language supervisors' activities, and then largely in connection with disbursement of Title III funds, rather than any attempt at role analysis.

Objectives

Recent expirations of certain funding provisions of NDEA Title III and the uncertain future of funds being made available under other
federal legislation (such as ESEA, Title V) for foreign language supervision, imperils the future status of the state foreign language supervisor in many states. It is very likely that, without federal support, many of the positions created since 1958 will not be continued by the states. Consequently, the structure which has since evolved will likely revert to the 1959 position—a very few states with foreign language supervision.

It will, therefore, be one of this study's principal aims to show what the relevance and value of the state foreign language supervisor is, and what reasons there may be for continuing or discontinuing the functions of the office. A study of the role of the state foreign language supervisor as he himself sees it should provide a comprehensive picture of what it is that he actually does in the performance of his job, and should point up existing similarities and differences in the roles as envisioned and developed by the present supervisors themselves.

Additional studies involving the supervisor's immediate superior, as well as the former state foreign language supervisors, should provide additional dimensions to see whether others associated presently and formerly with the position view it as the supervisor does.

The results of such studies have general application in five broad areas:

1. To discover the relevance and value of continuing the foreign language supervisor's position at the state level.

2. To point up what practices or policies appear to work well, so that they may possibly be implemented by those not using them.
3. To point out what deficiencies presently seem to exist in state foreign language supervision for remedial purposes.

4. To indicate what services of the state foreign language supervisor may be utilized by the local foreign language supervisor and the classroom teacher.

5. To discern what services of the state foreign language supervisor appear necessary to the successful continuation of an effective foreign language program within the state in the event that the position is vacated.

The objective of this dissertation, then, simply stated, is to identify and define the present role of the state foreign language supervisor as a means of giving coherence to that role, both intra-state and nationally.

Related Literature

An examination of related literature dealing with foreign language supervision yields very little that is directly related to the field. The paucity of pertinent literature is due, undoubtedly, to the fact that foreign language supervision, especially on the state level, has become widespread only in the last decade, since the advent of the National Defense Education Act. During this period of time, foreign language supervision has been in the process of establishing identity for itself and developing, with the result that very little has been written about it. None of the available literature relating to foreign language supervision, on the state level or otherwise, can be considered research in the strictest sense, and since even that literature is meager in total amount, it is felt by this writer that, brief as it is, to ignore it completely would be to depend entirely
on literature that has no direct reference to foreign languages.

Consequently, this review of related literature is really a review of two different kinds: (1) that literature already alluded to above which deals specifically with state foreign language supervision, but which are articles of a descriptive nature based on opinion rather than research, and (2) that literature dealing with supervision in general and based on empirical data which relates broadly to supervisory practices in foreign languages at the state level. The former should provide an indication of expert thinking by those involved in the field in an attempt to give coherence to the functions of the state foreign language supervisor, and to provide the reader with a rather comprehensive viewpoint on the part of these same experts so that he may have some idea as to current thinking in this particular field, quite in addition to present opinion in supervision generally. The latter is presented to show what conclusions and implications have resulted from studies done in the general area of supervision which could, by extension, apply to the area of state foreign language supervision.

The Literature Relating Directly to State Foreign Language Supervision

Available literature referring directly to state foreign language supervision amounts to four articles, two NDEA Institute résumés, an NDEA Title III summary, a speech, and two pages of a book on another topic. The composite picture of the state foreign language supervisor gained from this material deals with the following four aspects: (1) personal qualifications, (2) local functions, (3) state functions,
and (4) national functions. (It should be noted at the outset, however, that local, state, and national functions tend to overlap, and are frequently separated only arbitrarily).

Clemens L. Hallman, in a speech of the First Southern Conference on Language Teaching (Atlanta, Georgia, 1965)\(^1\), set forth some major characteristics of the good state foreign language supervisor: he should have a solid background in languages, instructional material, and teaching philosophy and techniques, and should be able to understand and assist teachers. The 1967 NDEA Foreign Language Institute under the directorship of Lester W. McKim, coalesced some of these same ideas into a formal statement of needed qualifications\(^2\):

1. Educational preparation: A Master's Degree or equivalent in Foreign Language study and substantial graduate level work in professional education.

2. Experience: Evidence of several years of successful classroom teaching experience in the secondary school level. If the school district has a FLES program, the supervisor should have either work experience in the elementary school level, or graduate courses which will provide adequate background.

3. Satisfaction of state requirements for supervision.

Concerning the various functions of the state foreign language

---

\(^1\)Clemens L. Hallman, "The Role of the State Foreign Language Supervisor," (Speech at the First Southern Conference on Language Teaching, Atlanta, Georgia, February 4-6, 1965).

supervisor—on local, state, and national levels—James R. Powers\(^3\), himself a state supervisor (Massachusetts), points out that the foreign language supervisors taking office have been pioneers without tradition or guidelines; teachers of teachers, but with no course of study or syllabus. He briefly describes the functions of the state supervisor as a leader in dissemination of theory and technique, and as a busy individual involved in all levels of foreign language instruction.

Other contributors have been more specific in attempting to delineate the functions of the state foreign language supervisor. With reference to the local level, Frank M. Grittner\(^4\), another state supervisor (Wisconsin), sees the supervisor involved in instruction, as an influence on the position of foreign languages in the curriculum, and as a liaison with non-language educators. Hallman\(^5\), suggests that the role of the supervisor at the local level is to assist teachers and administrators. Powers\(^6\), detailing what has been done


\(^5\)Hallman, op. cit.

by state supervisors, includes at this level the use of new approaches in foreign language teaching, the development of longer sequences of study, the improvement in student achievement of standardized tests, and the encouragement of long-range planning by school districts, rather than mere purchase of equipment. Lester W. McKim, former state supervisor of Montana and present city supervisor of Bellevue, Washington, is chiefly concerned with supervisory responsibilities on the local level. In one article, he discusses the role of the foreign language supervisor with the classroom teacher. The two NDEA Institutes of 1966 and 1967 under his direction resulted in a delineation of duties of the foreign language supervisor, which include curriculum planning, evaluation of program and staff, procurement of new materials, in-service programs, aiding in proper articulation, assisting in the testing program, and the dissemination of the latest developments in foreign language education.

Functions of the state foreign language supervisor at the state level are envisioned by Grittner and Powers as providing a liaison

---

9Grittner, op. cit.
10Powers, Annual Reports.
between secondary and higher education, and as an influence on expenditures of funds for foreign language materials. Hallman\textsuperscript{13} views the supervisor at the state level as a coordinator of language programs, and Jerald Green\textsuperscript{12}, former supervisor of New York, discusses the role of instructional supervision of foreign languages within the state.

The national functions of the state foreign language supervisor are described by Hallman\textsuperscript{13} as consisting of a liaison between state and national agencies. Grittner\textsuperscript{14} suggests the national implications of the supervisors' influence by listing twelve recommendations for the provision of good foreign language instruction in the elementary and secondary schools of America.

The various aspects of the state foreign language supervisor's role appear, in every case, to be a positive force, needed for effective implementation of a strong program in foreign languages statewide. McKim probably sums up this feeling best as he declares, referring to the last decade of foreign language teaching\textsuperscript{15}:

\begin{flushend}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{11}Hallman, op. cit.


\textsuperscript{13}Hallman, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{14}Grittner, op. cit., p. 94.

\end{flushend}
A major change, and a salutary one, has been the impressive increase in the number of foreign language supervisory positions at the state and local levels. . . . Effective foreign language supervision results in improved instruction for students. . . . My conviction that effective supervision is needed and my impressions of the supervisor's role are based on personal experience as a supervisor at the state and district level and on information from colleagues who are supervisors, many of whom attended one of the two NDEA Foreign Language Institutes for Supervisors which I directed.

The latter of the two NDEA Institutes to which McKim refers provides, in its final report, the strongest statement to date for foreign language supervision, and, incidentally, a suggestion for implementation of a study similar to the one which this writer has here undertaken. (Note underscoring, not part of the original text, below). The report asserts in unequivocal terms the need for good supervision:

The increases in the general school enrollment and a growing interest in the study of foreign languages have brought with them an urgent need for leadership in the language departments of our schools and school systems. . . . In some cases language personnel have been assigned to these positions without any pre-determined limits of authority or lists of duties. In others, these duties are vague or at variance with those established in neighboring school districts. It is evident that there is a need to explore the variety of tasks assumed by foreign language supervisors and the differences in compensation and from these to formulate suitable job descriptions and an equitable remuneration formula. . . .

If a foreign language department is to function efficiently and the quality of the instruction is to remain high, there is a need for specialized supervision which embraces the responsibilities and problems that relate specifically to language teaching. . . .

---

16 McKim, Institute, pp. 7 and 8.
Supervision is one of the essential functions in the operation of schools if they are to provide effective educational programs. Rapidly changing demands being made upon the public schools for increasing effectiveness have given supervision a unique position of importance in recent years. Second only to the teaching function itself in importance, supervision is responsible for facilitating educational change and giving it direction.

The Literature Relating Indirectly to State Foreign Language Supervision

A survey of research studies done in the general area of supervision indicates some three rather distinct areas into which the studies tend to group themselves: (1) why the state supervisor is needed, (2) what his functions are, and (3) why he remains on the job or, conversely, leaves it for another.

Available studies in the first of these areas—why the state supervisor is needed—provide a kind of rationale for supervision from the state level. Hopkins' study\(^\text{17}\) outlines five services from the state department of education which he finds to be needed and wanted by the local school districts. These include (1) assisting with in-service programs, (2) services in the areas of finance, organization and public relations, and (3) services related to the instructional program, (4) coordinating other educational forces and agencies to improve education, and (5) assisting school systems in their evaluation and accreditment activities—all factors which, in

\(^{17}\text{George W. Hopkins, "The Critical Requirements for Services of State Departments of Education As Reported by Local School Administrators", Dissertation Abstracts, (21, 1961), pp. 2554-2555.}\)
some measure, have come to be associated with the role of the state supervisor.

An interesting study, highly apropos to the relevance of state supervision, is that of Martin's, done in 1960 before the creation of the position of state music supervisor in Arizona. This study is designed to answer the following two questions:

1. Is a state music supervisor for Arizona desirable?

2. What would be the functions and responsibilities of such an office?

Martin finds the answer to the first question to be comfortably affirmative: 53% of Arizona's music educators felt a state supervisor would be desirable to aid in solving local music education problems, and 77% felt the position desirable to aid in solving statewide music education problems. The composite picture resulting in answer to the second question envisions an individual who is largely responsible as a consultant-coordinator of the state's music program. The position was subsequently established in 1966)

A study done by Jackson reveals that teachers have not been receiving the quantity nor kind of supervisory assistance which he deems essential to an effective system of education. Jackson points


out that teachers need and want supervision which is of a helping nature and which is particularly designed to improve instruction in their particular situation. He suggests that the most probable source of such supervision is at the local level, but such services could well fall within the province of the state supervisor, especially in the absence of the local supervisor.

The general need for supervision on the part of the individual teacher as shown by Jackson is studied more in detail by Miller, who finds five supportive reasons for supervision, as seen by the teachers themselves:

1. Supervisory activities are reported effective in solving teachers' professional problems in general.

2. Supervisory activities cause specific learnings as described by the teachers.

3. Supervisory activities result in specific instructional changes.

4. Supervisory activities affect the professional growth of teachers.

5. One of the most effective supervisory activities is the securing and the guided use of instructional materials.

It becomes evident, then, from these four studies that supervision is needed and wanted by the teachers, and is beneficial to them, but is not always readily available. The various areas of need strongly suggest the utilization of a qualified supervisor at the

---

state level, as well, perhaps, as additional supervisory personnel at the local level.

The second of the three areas—the functions of the state supervisor—yields the greatest number of studies, which seem to deal primarily with two aspects of the supervisory role: what is expected of a supervisor, and what is done by him.

Role expectations form the basis for three studies which examine what teachers, administrators and supervisors themselves expect that the functions of the supervisor should be. Hallberg, in Oregon, compares expected behavior with actual behavior and discovers that there are evidences of confused thinking with contradictory expectations for the supervisory role, and that the supervisory programs appear to lack cooperative planning. The supervisor behaves passively rather than forcefully, emphasizes the human relations aspect, and is freed from many administrative and clerical duties, all factors in agreement with prior expectancies, but disparity appears in connection with factors relating to the consultant concept expected and that actually done.

Cardenas, working in Texas, divides the work of the supervisor into ten areas called "tasks of supervision": curriculum development,
organizing for instruction, staffing, providing facilities, providing materials, in-service education, orienting new staff, relating special services, public relations and evaluation. Using these ten tasks as the basis for his study, he finds that respondents—teachers, administrators, and supervisors—tend not to be in agreement as to the tasks of the supervisor (a factor which would seem to support Hallberg's finding of "evidences of confused thinking with contradictory expectations for the supervisory role"), but there is a tendency to agree that a supervisor should be dynamic, method-centered, directive and goal-oriented.

Schroeder's study confines itself exclusively to the state level supervisor. The role expectations of the state supervisor in vocational agriculture are examined, as seen by teachers, administrators and state supervisors from eight different states, two each in four selected regions. Comparison of expectations with actual behavior was not conducted in this instance. Conclusions drawn show the supervisor on the state level as a "stimulator", defined as an individual who would not provide final direction, but would offer ideas and suggestions without awaiting the invitation of personnel at the local school level.

Studies treating of supervisory functions tend to list behaviors

---

23 Hallberg, loc. cit.

and techniques which are helpful in the implementation of the position. Burgess\textsuperscript{25}, in Alabama, finds that supervisors, where employed, perform many services to improve the teaching-learning situation, their primary area of concern. Foster, limiting her investigation to the elementary general curriculum supervisor, sees four major areas of activity for this position\textsuperscript{26}:

1. Providing opportunities for acquiring in-service growth.
2. Curriculum materials.
3. Interpersonal relations.
4. Working with parents and parent groups.

Foster concludes with a strong statement for needed on-the-job training of teachers as an important function of the supervisor.

Puckett\textsuperscript{27}, working in Arkansas, examines the role of both elementary and secondary supervisor. He finds that the primary function of the supervisor is to coordinate the instructional program, but rated very important are the functions of keeping teachers informed on methods of teaching, and help with selecting textbooks and instructional aids. Techniques of the supervisor found to be most useful are group conferences, individual conferences, workshops and suggestions.


\textsuperscript{26}Lucille E. Caster Foster, "Perceived Competencies of School Supervisors", Dissertation Abstracts, (20, 1959), pp. 568-569.

concerning professional reading. Demonstration teaching receives a low rating.

Gogan's detailed study, at the secondary level, covers supervision in six western states. Among his extensive findings (he lists twenty-six separate items) most pertinent here are the following:

1. Teachers and supervisors are generally favorable toward some type of supervisory program and to the services currently being offered.

2. A majority of classroom teachers in secondary schools receive most of their ideas for the improvement of instruction from "books and periodicals" and "other teachers".

3. Consultant services, demonstration teaching, and inter-school visitations are offered too infrequently in supervisory programs.

4. Teachers desire workshops, but are somewhat dissatisfied with the methods used and the results obtained.

5. Supervisors cannot devote enough time to supervision due to other assigned duties.

Grossman, in New York, examines supervisory practices considered by teachers to be helpful, and concludes that they are as follows: have a helpful attitude, hold informal conferences, show teachers how to teach, help with discipline, observe teachers informally, assist with planning, provide books and materials, help new teachers, and provide administrative assistance.


It appears, consequently, that the functions of a state supervisor, while frequently not clearly defined, nor always well understood by the various professional groups with which he comes into contact, tend rather positively in the direction of the consultant, one who has a ready expertise to assist in the teaching situation. The supervisor is generally seen as an individual who is definitely needed—and wanted—in the educational program, but one whose responsibilities vary widely within a rather broad framework of consultant services.

The last of the three areas of the literature—why the state supervisor remains on the job or, conversely, leaves it for another—appears incidentally as part of the findings in two studies, and is the main thesis of investigation in a third. Of the former, Hallberg discovers that the fact that the supervisor's role is not always well defined holds the potentiality of creating role conflict, job dissatisfaction for the supervisor, and a feeling on the part of the other professional groups that the supervisory program is inefficient. Hopkins, also reporting tangentially on the subject, comments:

> For personnel of state departments of education to perform effective services, a working climate, as free from threat, is necessary. Staff members need a continuous opportunity to conceptualize the role indicated by the analysis of effective behavior.

Hopkins goes on to say that a permissive climate is best effected when the state department personnel can redesign internal structures.

---

30 Hallberg, *loc. cit.*
and the organization of the department in terms of problems to be solved in the schools of the state. It is his belief that good communications are needed to effect any changes.

Directing his study entirely to an analysis of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction among supervisors in Virginia, Shew tallies four major factors as most significant:

1. Male supervisors tend to be more dissatisfied with the professional position of supervisor than females.
2. Factors in the job environment are more important as sources of job satisfaction than personal characteristics.
3. The feeling of achievement is the most frequent source of satisfaction.
4. The school system's policy and its administration are the most frequent sources of dissatisfaction.

Reasons for staying on the job as supervisors, or for leaving it, appear, in consequence, to be as varied as the aspects of the role itself. Apparently, however, the supervisor is most likely to feel satisfied with his job when he knows what he is supposed to do, is given considerable latitude in his performance, and has an agreeable environment in which to work.

On the basis of the literature as reviewed above, one can come to some general conclusions concerning the position of state supervisor. Even though all the studies do not deal exclusively with the state level, the basic functions of the local and state supervisors

---

would be quite similar with respect to the individual teacher, with
the obvious difference being that the state supervisor, because of
a much larger territory, would be likely to come in contact with the
individual teacher somewhat less often. It is seen that the state
supervisor is needed as a person who can act as consultant and
coordinator for a particular subject area within his state, one
whose job is not always clearly delineated nor understood, and one
who, in order to remain in the position, needs to be allowed a good
deal of flexibility in the interpretation of his role. Clearly, the
literature strongly supports the use of effective supervision within
the educational system, and by implication, at the state level as
well as at the local level.

Procedure

The gathering of data to fulfill the stated objectives has been
implemented through the use of three different questionnaires, one to
the state supervisors, one to their immediate superiors, and one to
former state foreign language supervisors. (See Appendices A, B, and
C). The questionnaire as the basic instrument to gather data was
chosen because of the relatively small population's being scattered
over a very large geographical area.

The three questionnaires are designed largely on a non-disguised
structured basis to provide some uniformity in response, but pro-
vision is made to allow for free response within the areas indicated.
The basic questionnaire to the state supervisors, now some 51 in
number, is the longest, consisting of six pages. Four general areas
are covered in this questionnaire: a personal profile of the individual and his position; his functions at the state level, including liaison with higher education and other groups within the state; his work on the local level with the classroom teacher and local foreign language supervisor; and his contributions nationally.

The basic questionnaire for the state foreign language supervisor was sent to every state supervisor believed to be on the job—55 in all. Replies came from every state where there is a state foreign language supervisor except Delaware, a total of 48 respondents representing 43 states and 3 territories.

The four Texas supervisors filed a composite questionnaire which is considered in the discussion as one questionnaire only. Additionally, one supervisor each in California (of 2), Illinois (of 4), and Massachusetts (of 2), did not respond. The Illinois supervisors who did respond (3) completed separate questionnaires reflecting different information; accordingly they are considered separately.

The supervisor from Alaska had been on the job one week when she completed the questionnaire; consequently, only the information from Section A of this questionnaire is used, in Chapter II. Chapters III, IV, and V do not include Alaska, and so have 47 respondents.

Further, it should be noted that the Acting Supervisor of Kentucky, who was very cooperative, completed the questionnaire, but wished to stress that he does not hold the position and has no training in foreign languages or foreign language education. Presently his function is to act as a kind of stop-gap measure until a qualified person can be located. For this reason, certain information in reference to
Kentucky is noted, as appropriate.

Included as part of the total number of respondents are the former state supervisors of Iowa, Nevada, and Vermont (thought to be on the job when the questionnaire was mailed), who returned completed questionnaires based on their own performance in the position which they have recently vacated. No one has yet been appointed in these three states to fill the positions open.

States not included among the respondents of the basic questionnaire are the remaining ones where a vacancy presently exists: Hawaii, Louisiana, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Utah.

The questionnaire to the state supervisor's immediate superior, one page in length, is designed to determine whether he has the same view of the functions of the supervisor as the supervisor himself, and to discover the estimate of the superior about the relative worth of the position and the desirability and/or likelihood of its being continued. This questionnaire was sent to the immediate superior of each state foreign language supervisor presently on the job, and to the individual who would fill that position in states where there is presently a vacancy—50 states and 3 territories in all. Replies were received from 42 respondents, 9 from states with a vacancy. Those states and territories not responding are as follows: California, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The questionnaire designed to be sent to those individuals who were previously, but are not now, state foreign language supervisors, is an effort to identify historical continuity and/or any changes
in implementation of the supervisor's role over the years. One page
in length, this questionnaire was sent to all former supervisors who
could be located, 48 in all. (Of the total number of 66 known former
state foreign language supervisors, 7 are known to be deceased, and
11 are not locatable. Of these last 11, 6 are from the state of New
Mexico, which has had the post since 1944. New York's supervisors
prior to 1958 were not listed by the present supervisor, and are not
included in the total number of 66; that position dates to 1912).
Replies were received from 26 respondents representing 20 states.
(Sixteen states and 3 territories have not had any foreign language
supervisors prior to the incumbents).

It should be noted here that in the case of all three question­
naires, repeated efforts were made to achieve a high percentage of
returns. In many cases a second letter was sent, and even a third.
Potential respondents were not contacted after a third try, the feel­
ing being that there was little use to persist to the point of annoy­
ance to the recipient.

Data received from the respondents has been tallied and analyzed
on the basis of percentages. Analysis of the data was designed pri­
marily to meet the terms of the objectives, but also has provided
indices to identify the five broad areas of general application men­tioned above.

It is expected that the information obtained from the question­
naires, in addition to the use for forming the basis of this dis­
sertation, will be reported in summary form in the professional jour­
nals. Further, the summary can be reported to those in a policy­
making position, both on the federal and the state levels, to aid in any decisions concerning the importance and/or continuance of the office of state foreign language supervisor.

Moreover, information obtained from the questionnaires may be expected to suggest further research to be undertaken, indications for pre-service and in-service training, as well as indicating what training may be desirable for one planning to enter into supervisory positions above the local level.
CHAPTER II
JOB BACKGROUND

Introduction

Section A of the questionnaire sent to the state foreign language supervisors deals rather generally with three areas: (1) factors concerning the position which do not relate directly to the functions performed by the supervisor, (2) something of the supervisor's attitude toward his position in terms of his total career, and (3) personal qualifications brought by the supervisor to his job. Questions 1, 2, 5, and 19 through 23 of Section A relate to the first area; questions 3 and 4, to the second; and questions 7 through 18, to the third. Question 6, because it was included only as a means to aid in sending out Questionnaire Three (see Chapter VII), has been omitted from the discussion which follows.

Factors Concerning the Position of State Foreign Language Supervisor

The influence of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is made quite evident as one reviews when the position of state foreign language supervisor was established in the various states and territories. Prior to 1958 only New Mexico, New York, and Pennsylvania had established the position, and by the end of 1959, 27 more states and Puerto Rico had initiated the post. The remainder of the states, Guam, and the Virgin Islands followed suit in the succeeding decade, with Wyoming, in 1968, the last to create the position. (See Table
One, page 27). Four states have more than one individual serving in the capacity of state foreign language supervisor—Illinois and Texas, 4; California and Massachusetts, 2—and three states have associate or assistant supervisors: New York, 4; Pennsylvania and Virginia, 2; and North Carolina, 1.

Since qualified personnel were not always readily available, vacancies existed in several states following the establishment of the post, from one or two years to as much as ten, in one case. Presently eleven of the 61 established positions are vacant: Hawaii, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts (one of two positions), Nevada, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, and Vermont. Of these only Hawaii, Kentucky (which presently has an Acting Supervisor not trained in foreign language education), Louisiana, and Massachusetts have any plans for filling the vacancies in the near future. The most common reason for the position's discontinuance is the lack of funds (see Chapter VI).

Personnel turnover in the position appears to be relatively high; only nineteen of the present state supervisors of foreign languages (about 40%) have been in their job for a period of more than five years, and of these only six (about 13%) have held the job for ten or more years. (See Table Two, page 28). The greatest number of supervisors having held the post for the same number of years is six, or 13%, for three years. The maximum number of years that any one supervisor has been a state supervisor of foreign languages is 12; the minimum is one week.

Interesting in this connection are the number of different
TABLE 1

DATE OF FOUNDING OF POSITION OF STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR, BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Arkansas</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>31. New Mexico</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. California</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>32. New York</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hawaii</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>38. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1920a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Illinois</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>40. South Carolina</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Iowa</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>42. Tennessee</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Kentucky</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>44. Utah</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Louisiana</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>45. Vermont</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Minnesota</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>50. Wyoming</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Missouri</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52. Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Nebraska</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aEstablished in Pennsylvania in 1920, the position was vacated in 1922 and remained so until 1958.

bThe position was recommended in 1961 by South Dakota's State Foreign Language Curriculum Committee, but it has never been filled, and the present plans are to omit it altogether.
TABLE 2

NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS
STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS HAVE HELD OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7²</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3²</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1²</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Includes Kentucky's Acting Supervisor
supervisors who have filled any one position: eighteen respondents (about 36%) are the only ones in their states or territories to have held the post. (Massachusetts, which has maintained at least two full-time positions and, at one time, three, has now one vacant position and one incumbent who has had no predecessor). Thirteen state supervisors (about 27%), on the other hand, report one predecessor, while seven (15%) show two predecessors, and five states (10%) list three. The remaining three states (6%) report an astonishing twenty-four predecessors among them, although twenty of these are more easily understood when one considers that fourteen of the predecessors are reported by Illinois, which maintains four full-time supervisors simultaneously, and six are reported by New Mexico, which established the position in 1944. (New York, in which state the post was founded in 1912, lists predecessors for the previous decade only). The remaining four are reported by a single state, small both in size and population.

The location of the position of state foreign language supervisor within the State Department of Education, also referred to as the State Department of Public Instruction, varies from state to state, as might be expected, but it appears to be most frequently in the sub-division known as "Division of Instruction"—23 of the states and/or territories (almost half) so list it. In other states and territories it can be found variously in the Division of Secondary, or Elementary and Secondary, Education (5 states); in the Division of Curriculum, Curriculum and Instruction, or Curriculum Development (8 states and one territory); in the Division of General Education,
Educational Services, or Instructional Services (4 states); in NDEA, Title III Division (2 states); and then variously in the Divisions of Subject Area (1 state); Program Development (1 state); Languages (1 state); and English Section (1 territory).

The title of the individual immediately superior to the state foreign language supervisor seems to vary as frequently as the name of the division in which he works. One finds thirteen directors, six assistant superintendents, five associate commissioners, four assistant commissioners, three chiefs, two superintendents, and one each of the following: commissioner, executive director, deputy superintendent, associate superintendent, chairman, and administrator.

The salary of the position varies from one end of the scale provided in the questionnaire ($8,000 or below) to the other ($18,000 or above). (See Table Three, page 31). In composing the scale, this writer had provided what he believed to be a comfortable leeway between two points ($8,000 and $18,000) which he supposed might well represent a reasonable salary range for a position which might be assumed to have some importance in state programs of foreign language education. It was, then, with considerable surprise that he found that as many as nine states and territories (about 18%) report a starting salary for the position of less than $8,000! This is little more than the starting salary in many school systems today of beginning teachers who hold only the bachelor level degree.

Conversely, it was not expected that there would be any supervisors who earn more than $18,000, because, as one respondent notes, many state superintendents themselves make little more than that.
### TABLE 3

**SALARY RANGE OF THE STATE SUPERVISORS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Starting Salary: Number of States</th>
<th>Present Salary: Number of States</th>
<th>Maximum Salary: Number of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 or below</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 to $10,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $12,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 to $14,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,000 to $16,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000 to $18,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,000 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The three supervisors from Illinois report different salary scales, and they are therefore recorded separately.
However, four states (8%) pay a maximum of over $18,000 to their state foreign language supervisors, and two state supervisors are currently in this salary bracket. Obviously, only the large, wealthy states can afford to pay this handsomely.

Tabulations reveal that the majority of present state supervisors of foreign languages (30 or 63%) have an income between $10,000 and $14,000. Eight supervisors (17%) earn less than $10,000, while nine (20%) earn more than $14,000.

Besides their base salary, all state supervisors are allowed some kind of travel-food-lodging allowance in connection with the discharge of their duties, although states will often limit the amount of travel when funds are low. Most states appear to distinguish between an allowance for in-state travel and out-of-state travel, with the former always the lower of the two. The schedules for reimbursement are complicated and vary widely from state to state. There is, for example, a range of 6 cents to 13½ cents per mile which state supervisors are reimbursed for use of their private cars, with the most common amount (15 states) being 10 cents. Various schedules, however, include amounts based on distance alone, or on both time and distance involved. Other transportation costs (air, for example), are usually reimbursed actual cost, though prior approval for such travel is often required.

As for food and lodging, amounts range from $6 to $35 in-state, and $12 to $35 out-of-state, per day. Some 1½ states reimburse actual cost up to an established maximum, but again, the schedules are complicated and have little in common. One respondent, from a small
state, remarks caustically that the schedule "is so involved I never bother with it." Some states, anxious to keep costs to an absolute minimum, reimburse by the hour, or by the "quarter", a period of six hours. The large, wealthy states, as one might expect, are the most generous in such allowances, yet it is the supervisor of just such a state, drawing a salary in excess of $18,000, who is most bitter in his comments about being able to obtain a "sufficient" travel allowance!

The Position of State Supervisor of Foreign Languages as a Career

Some insight into reasons for personnel turnover in the position of state foreign language supervisor becomes apparent when analyzing the responses to questions 3 and 4 of Section A of the questionnaire. When asked whether they intend to make foreign language supervision at the state level their life's work, 20 supervisors (about 42%), of whom 11 are men, say "yes"; 20, of whom 13 are men (including the Acting Supervisor for Kentucky), say "no"; 4 (8%), 3 of whom are men, respond "probably"; 3 (6%), all men, say "uncertain"; and 1 (2%), a woman, replies with "retiring this year".

Responses given to the question asking what reasons might impel the supervisor to leave his present position can doubtlessly be extrapolated to reasons why former state supervisors have left (see Chapter VII). In addition, they give a fairly good index to the supervisors' own perspective of their position. The responses fall rather generally into six categories: (1) Administrative Reasons, (2) Other Job Offers, (3) Salary, (4) Personal or Attitudinal Reasons,
(5) Retirement, and (6) No Criticism.

The first of these categories, Administrative Reasons, is by far the most comprehensive, and most frequently mentioned (30 comments, or nearly 37% of the total of 82). Perhaps a less tactful heading for the category might be "Interference from Higher Up", since the comments are almost all complaints in some fashion concerning the arbitrary nature of higher state officials and/or legislatures. A sampling of these comments shows that much of what a state foreign language supervisor can do is dependent upon the whims of higher authority. There is, for example, frequent mention of the possibility of federal and/or state funds being cut off to maintain the position, or for some program that the supervisor has worked hard to develop. Complaints are made, also, that sufficient funds are not available for adequate support personnel and staff, and for travel to attend key meetings. Politics, change of administration, or lack of administrative support are other reasons given which would provoke the supervisor's changing his job. Other comments refer to limitation on professional freedom to perform their duties, or "bureaucratic red-tape".

The second category deals with another job offer, and has the second highest number of comments (20, or about 24% of the total). A number of the supervisors are staying in their jobs only until a more attractive job offer appears, or for some indefinite period before the return to teaching, usually on the college level. Some are desirous of more administrative authority within the state hierarchy and are planning to move in that direction; some are
interested in more time to pursue research, work on innovative programs, or travel; and a number are interested in a job which has broader education involvement beyond the confines of foreign language education.

Salary, the third category, draws fewer comments than one might expect (9, or nearly 11%), considering that more than half of the state supervisors earn less than $12,000. Not surprisingly, in each case the comment is to the effect that the salary is not high enough, yet about one-third of these comments are from states where the salary for the position of foreign language supervisor, at $14,000 or above, is considerably above the average.

The fourth category, Personal or Attitudinal Reasons, accounts for eight of the comments (10%), and is a sort of miscellaneous category. Three supervisors have plans to return to graduate school, and one suffers from a disabling disease which will eventually force his retirement. Two supervisors complain of overwork; two, of frustration; and another, in an isolated area geographically, of boredom.

Category five, Retirement, includes seven supervisors (9% of total comments, and 15% of the responding supervisors) who plan to remain on the job until they retire.

The last category, No Criticism, is made up of seven supervisors (supplying 9% of the total comments) who have no plans to leave their job and can supply no reasons which might impel them to do so.

Personal Qualifications of the State Foreign Language Supervisors

The composite picture of the state foreign language supervisor
discloses a well-educated, cosmopolitan individual. All forty-eight respondents hold the bachelor's degree, thirty-nine of which (81%) are the bachelor of arts, with the remaining nine (20%) bachelor of science in education. In addition, all but four possess the master's degree, a total of 92%. Three of the four not holding the master's degree have done work toward the degree. Thirty-eight supervisors (81%) hold a master of arts degree (not necessarily from the same thirty-nine who have a bachelor of arts); eight (17%), a master of education; and one (2%), a master of science degree. Three supervisors have earned two master's degrees, one each in arts and in education. Only one of the respondents possesses the doctorate (Ed. D.), although six supervisors (13%) have post-master's work.

Concerning prior experience, thirteen of the supervisors (27%) had been supervisors on the local level for periods ranging from three to twelve years, prior to assuming the post at the state level. Six of these (13%) had supervisory responsibilities K-12; five (10%) were secondary supervisors only; and two (4%), supervisors of foreign languages in the elementary schools (FLES). One had been a secondary school principal. All respondents (except Kentucky's Acting Supervisor) had taught foreign languages or English as a foreign language prior to their becoming a supervisor, the greater part of these (26, or 54%) on the secondary level only. Fifteen supervisors (31%) had taught on all three levels. In addition, two supervisors had taught adult courses, and one had taught at NiAi Summer Institutes.

Number of years as a teacher varies from two to forty-two, with the number for individual supervisors fairly well scattered along
that time continuum. The greatest number of supervisors who had taught for the same number of years before becoming a supervisor is seven (15%) for five years. The next nearest numbers are four for twelve years, and three each for three and four years, with the rest scattered in ones and twos over the years. It is interesting to note that seven supervisors (15%) had each taught twenty-five or more years before becoming a supervisor.

Languages taught were limited only by the curriculum in many cases, for many of the supervisors are proficient in more than one foreign language. Twenty of the supervisors (about 42%) had taught only one language: nine, Spanish; seven, French; three, German, and one, English as a foreign language. Nearly the same number, nineteen, had taught two languages. Of these, the most common combination is French and Spanish, with eleven supervisors (23%) who had taught these two languages. Other combinations include two who had taught German and Spanish; two who had taught English as a foreign language and Spanish; two who had taught French and Latin; and one who had taught the combination of French and German. Five supervisors (10%) had taught three languages: two, the combination of French, German, and Latin; French, German, and Spanish; and French, Russian, and Spanish. Only one supervisor (2%) had taught as many as four languages, which in his particular case were French, German, Italian, and Spanish.

The supervisors, as a group, however, appear well qualified to be able to teach many more languages than the six mentioned above. Languages spoken by the supervisors, in alphabetical order, are as
follows: Dutch (1 supervisor, or 2%); French (33 supervisors, or nearly 69%); English, not the native tongue (4, or 8%); German (13, or 27%); Hungarian (1, or 2%); Italian (6, or 13%); Japanese (1, or 2%); Norwegian (1, or 2%); Portuguese (1, or 2%); Rumanian (1, or 2%); Russian (2, or 4%); Spanish (35, or 73%); and none (Kentucky, 1, or 2%). In various combinations, supervisors are often able to read one or more of these languages, as well as Indonesian, Latin, and Swedish. Twenty of the supervisors (42%) are able to speak one language only in addition to their native tongue; sixteen (33%) can speak two; six (13%) are able to speak three; three (6%) can speak four; two (4%) speak five; and one (2%) can speak seven: French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish!

It would appear that the supervisors have put their knowledge of languages to good use: thirty-eight of them (79%) have lived and/or studied abroad for periods of time varying between three weeks and ten years. The most common period of time spent abroad at any one time, as one might easily suppose, is two or three months during the summer scholastic vacation period. Three supervisors are natives of countries other than the United States, coming to this country from Canada, France, and Jamaica. In addition, the supervisors of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are native to their lands.

The thirty-eight countries in which the supervisors have lived and/or studied circle the globe. Countries most commonly visited are Canada, France, Germany, and Mexico, but a number of the others are listed several times. A complete alphabetical listing of the countries visited by the supervisors is as follows:
1. Algeria
2. Argentina
3. Austria
4. Belgium
5. Canada
6. Colombia
7. Costa Rica
8. Cuba
9. Denmark
10. Ecuador
11. England
12. France
13. Germany
14. Greece
15. Greenland
16. Guam
17. Guatemala
18. Indonesia
19. Italy
20. Jamaica
21. Japan
22. Luxembourg
23. Mexico
24. Morocco
25. Near East (countries not specified)
26. Netherlands
27. Panama
28. Panama Canal Zone
29. Peru
30. Phillipines
31. Portugal
32. Puerto Rico
33. Rumania
34. Ryukyu Islands
35. Spain
36. Switzerland
37. United States of America (as a foreign country)
38. Venezuela

In addition to being linguists and travelers, the supervisors are also writers: thirty-three of the state supervisors (69%) have published something, most commonly an article. Twenty of the supervisors (42%) have published articles in publications within their own states; sixteen (33%) have written articles for national publications; and three (6%) have published articles in regional publications. Three
of the supervisors (6%) have published books. Other endeavors include
publishing the state foreign language newsletter/bulletin, preparing
curriculum bulletins, writing scripts for educational television and
language series, and the preparation of tapes and slides for instruc­
tional purposes.

The supervisor is also a "joiner"—an individual with a membership
in numerous professional organizations. Among them, the super­
visors belong to a total of fifteen national language organizations,
seven regional language organizations, and twenty-seven individual
state language organizations, as well as four national non-language
educational organizations and seventeen state groups. (For a com­
plete listing see Appendix D). In the national language organizations,
state supervisors hold one presidency, three vice-presidencies, and
nine positions on committees or boards; in the regional language
associations, they have one president and one executive committee
member; in the state language groups, there are six presidents, one
vice-president, and three executive committee or board members.
Among the non-language educational organizations, the supervisors
have two presidents on the state level. Many of the supervisors,
in addition, are former officers of the organizations.

Conclusions

In establishing the job background of the state foreign lan­
guage supervisor, three different facets of the position have been
examined. In the first, one sees something of the position itself:
that for most states and territories, the position has been functioning
for less than a decade; that roughly one-fifth of the positions are presently vacant; and that the personnel turnover in the position is rather high. The salary for the position ranges widely from below $8,000 to above $18,000, with expense allowances varying proportionately according to complicated schedules.

The second facet points up that state supervisors are almost equally divided as to whether to remain in the job for the duration of their careers. Factors which might induce them to leave their jobs include administrative pressures, other job offers, a better salary, personal or attitudinal reasons, or, simply, retirement.

The third facet reveals that the state foreign language supervisor is, compositely, well prepared for his job. He holds a master's degree, has had teaching experience, and is proficient in one or more foreign languages. The composite supervisor has lived and studied abroad, contributed to the professional literature, and supported the various professional organizations in foreign languages and education, often taking a leadership role in them.

These factors establish the background against which to examine in further detail just what it is the state foreign language supervisor does as he carries out his responsibilities. To begin, attention will be directed to what the supervisor does within his own state—his functions, in effect, state-wide.
CHAPTER III
STATE-WIDE FUNCTIONS

Introduction

Section B of the questionnaire was designed to focus upon what the state foreign language supervisor does within his state, as well as to gauge rather generally some reactions from others to what he does in the state, from the point of view of the state supervisor himself. Questions 2, 3, 4 and 11 of this section are used as a basis for the discussion of the supervisor's functions; the remainder of the questions in Section B relate to a consideration of other factors within the state related to his position, but not directly a part of his job performance. (As noted previously, this and succeeding chapters does not include responses from the state supervisor of Alaska).

The State Foreign Language Supervisor at Work

Asked to explain the work that they do, the state foreign language supervisors respond with a wide variety of functions and services which can be grouped somewhat broadly into seven categories, to be considered in the following order: (1) Chief Functions; (2) Liaison Activities; (3) Teacher Education; (4) Curriculum, Materials and Research; (5) Evaluation; (6) Local and National Functions; and (7) Other Services.

The chief functions of the state supervisors are really two:
consultant and supervisor. By far the greater part of the super­
visors—31, or 66%—prefer to be thought of as a "consultant" rather
than a "supervisor". In this capacity, the supervisor is a person
whose chief function is to counsel, guide and advise concerning for­
egn language education on all levels within his state. His advice
may be directed in a wide range from the classroom teacher to the
state legislator, depending upon the need of the moment, but the
state supervisor must be versatile enough to handle the questions
and problems concerning the teaching of foreign languages within his
state by any individual or agency which comes to him for help. Only
secondarily is he a "supervisor" in the antiquated sense that he may
enforce definitive policies or play an administrative role for his
state; just six of the state supervisors (13%) consider this to be
their chief job, while most avoid this aspect entirely. Nationwide,
the consultant aspect of the supervisor's job is by far the more
important.

A second important function of the state foreign language super­
visor is his work as a liaison person in the coordination and articu­
lation of foreign language programs within his state. In this con­
nection, the supervisor performs a variety of services: he acts as
a liaison between his state and foreign language organizations, or
between the state and higher education (see Chapter IV); he arranges
state and district meetings; he works on state articulation or liaison
committees for the purpose of providing articulation in foreign lan­
guage programs in his state from FLES through the university; he
makes many speaking engagements; and he handles many facets of public
relations for his state in connection with foreign language education.

The area of Teacher Education is a third significant function of the state supervisor. In this area, the state supervisor is frequently the individual in the state who disseminates new ideas and information concerning foreign language methodology and research to the various educational levels in his state, with a view to the improvement of instruction. He is a major catalyst in the planning and development of workshops and conferences held within his state for purposes of in-service education (see Chapter IV); he often assists in the planning and preparation of teacher training programs in the universities of his state, and not infrequently participates in them; and he occasionally helps in the placement of teachers and student teachers.

A fourth area of participation for the state foreign language supervisor is the comprehensive category of Curriculum, Materials, and Research. The state supervisor works closely with all levels in matters of curriculum. In twenty-four states and territories (53%) there is a foreign language program with objectives defined according to grade level designation, some more specifically than others. Only four of the state supervisors (8%), including the respondent from Kentucky, report that they do not help in the development and/or the revision of curriculum guides. Twenty-six supervisors (55%) are involved in both aspects, development and revision; ten (21%) report working in the area of development only, while six (13%) state that they are concerned with revision only. Two supervisors volunteer comments that they are not completely convinced as
to the worth of such curriculum guides.

Other facets of curriculum development with which the supervisor is associated include such varied activities as the following: the development of new foreign language programs; educational television programs; the teaching of English as a second language (to immigrants or cultural minorities); bilingual education; migrant worker education; and social studies and language arts programs incorporating some aspect of foreign language education.

Instructional materials are closely identified with curriculum functions. A number of supervisors cite their involvement in the development and dissemination of instructional materials; a few serve on state textbook committees in an advisory capacity.

Research activities of the state foreign language supervisor include empirical research studies, as well as statistical research studies on teachers and pupils. Several state supervisors comment that their office is a sort of "clearing-house" for all information in or out of the state that deals with foreign languages and foreign language education.

Another function of the state foreign language supervisor is that of evaluation. The chief responsibility for the supervisor here is the review and evaluation of various projects and materials in foreign language education within the state, often to determine whether or not they should receive state support. A portion of the evaluation area for a few supervisors consists of visiting schools and evaluating teachers for the purpose of accreditation, often in conjunction with regional agencies such as the North Central Association
(see Chapter IV). A few supervisors also work in the areas of teacher
certification and state examination programs such as New York's
Regent Examinations.

The category of Local and National Functions, as apart from
State Functions, is discussed more completely in later chapters, and
is touched upon only briefly here in order to make the listing of the
supervisor's functions complete. Local functions consist chiefly in
school visitations and an effort to develop local leadership in vari­
ous programs (see Chapter IV). National participation has largely
to do with making recommendations on projects which come under the
National Defense Education Act, 1958; the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act, 1965; and, to a limited extent, the Education Pro­
fessions Development Act, 1967. There is also a degree of interstate
coordination among the state supervisors (see Chapter V).

The last descriptive category of the supervisor's state-wide
functions, Other Services, describes a number of miscellaneous
functions of the state supervisor which are not necessarily directly
related to teaching. Among these varied services are such items as
international education and student overseas projects; assistance to
the State Department of Education's library service; editorial work
for the Division of Instruction; guidance services; county services;
work with disadvantaged groups; work with school plant specifications
(such as the installation of language laboratories); and miscella­
naeous services for the governor's office or the state legislature as
discussed below.
The position of state foreign language supervisor is funded entirely by the state in four states and two territories, entirely by the federal government in seven states, and equally by the state and federal governments in twenty-four states. One position receives 95% of its funding from the state, another position receives 90% of its funds from the territory, and one other position is funded with 60% state and 40% federal funds. (See Table 4, page 48). It is interesting to note that when a comparison is made between the salaries paid for the position by those states funding the position 100% with those states in which the position is funded entirely by federal money, salaries in both groups range from below $8,000 to above $18,000.

Information from the respondents indicates that the state foreign language supervisory position is viewed as necessary by the State Department of Education of thirty-nine states and territories (87%). Four state supervisors (9% of the states) feel the position is not viewed as necessary, while two (4% of the states) reply that they are uncertain. A number of comments are added by those in the first group, however, qualifying their opinion that the position is felt to be necessary. Typical of these comments, revealing that the position does not always enjoy undisputed support, are the following: "With present personnel, yes." "By some—there are two 'camps.'" "But not indispensable." "But not high priority." One comment is of a more reinforcing nature: "Position required because
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>States:</th>
<th>Territories:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of state policy." A couple wagish comments are of this type:

"Obviously, here I am!"

Although only three respondents (6%) report any opposition to the continuance of the position of state foreign language supervisor in their states, eleven others (23%) add notes of qualification. The single most important threat to the continuance of the position, if one is to judge by these comments, is not lack of funds (although ultimately it is probably a matter of economy), but the "trend to generalists" which is mentioned by ten of the respondents (21%). These ten respondents are geographically scattered across the continental United States, representing states ranging in size from small to large. The most direct and critical comment comes from the supervisor of one of the larger states, who writes:

Opposition is from the field of professional education, which prepares the "generalists" who resent the intrusion of subject matter specialists. It is the old vicious circle of education schools.

The supervisor from a smaller state also suggests, "finger-to-the-wind":

Not overtly, although there have been rumblings about "specialists" and the need for "generalists"—this from regional supervisors, visiting consultants on organization and supervision, and a few administrators.

Another, from a middle-sized state, says quite candidly:

No, but the trend is toward "generalists". Those who resign will probably not be replaced.

With eight of ten vacancies now existing among the states not likely to be filled again under present policies, one might speculate that this last comment has some significance, particularly when he considers
that most of these vacancies have occurred within the past five years.

One of the more interesting comments in this connection comes from a state supervisor who, in referring to an adjacent state's revamping of state agencies, writes that it "... has decided to hire 'generalists' instead of 'specialists'. Many foreign language teachers from that state have been requesting my assistance." Such a statement is all the more meaningful when one examines the response of that same state's officials, who are convinced that "task-force" consultants (short-term guest consultants) can do the same job as the former full-time supervisor! (See Chapter VI).

Other reasons for curtailing the office of state supervisor include budget cutting, noted by four respondents, and a possible reduction of staff (one respondent).

The typical state foreign language supervisor seems to have little contact with other state governmental agencies outside the department of education. Twenty-two supervisors (47%) report no contact at all, while ten (21%) report a small amount, casually or indirectly. The chief contact for the state supervisor outside the state department of education seems to be in the nature of providing translation services for the governor's office or other state departments, with consultative services for legislators who are preparing legislation touching on foreign language education next in frequency. Other contacts consist of a wide variety of activities which include the following: work with the State Bureau of Engineering for language laboratory specifications; work with the Department of Commerce, Travel Bureau, in foreign language publications
distribution; helping the Department of Health prepare materials in Spanish; developing programs in foreign languages for state prisons; meeting with the State Board of Education or Board of Regents; and other miscellaneous contacts of a minor nature.

The intangible areas of prestige and influence of the position were included in the questionnaire for the supervisors' reactions. As expected, most supervisors believe that their position is both prestigious and influential within their states. Thirty-three of the respondents (70%) say that they believe their position has considerable prestige state-wide; only four (8%) believe that it does not. Seven respondents (15%) prefer to say "some" instead of "considerable" prestige; two (4%) believe it to be "doubtful". One supervisor, incidentally one of the best qualified and highest paid, remarks pointedly, obviously unimpressed with the idea of prestige, "Yes, though not that I care a damn bit: I am interested in results, not an image!"

Concerning whether the position has considerable influence within the state, thirty-three (70%) of the respondents believe that it does have, while three (6%) say it does not, and eleven (23%) suggest that the influence is "some" rather than "considerable". Comments here indicate that the state foreign language supervisor is generally on good terms with the various educational levels of his state, and while the individuals with whom he consults are free to reject his advice, many accept what he has to say and try to apply it. Nevertheless, any state supervisor will hasten to mention the frustrations of working hard to interest some individuals in a pet
project, only to have it accepted with little enthusiasm, if, indeed, at all. "Too many teachers," writes one supervisor, "thank you graciously for the gold mine of information and then merrily go their own ways!"

Conclusions

State-wide functions of the state foreign language supervisor are myriad. Primarily he is a consultant, even though he holds the title of "supervisor", with policy-making functions or administrative duties being of secondary importance. He is, further, a key liaison person among educational levels from FLES through the university, as well as between the state and various foreign language organizations. The supervisor is active in the areas of Teacher Education; Curriculum, Materials and Research; and Evaluation. He is called upon to perform a wide variety of miscellaneous services which frequently relate only indirectly to his state's foreign language educational program. His functions on the local and federal levels add further dimension to a position that enjoys no little prestige and influence within his state. What opposition there is to his position comes from an expressed trend toward "generalist" supervisors or from budget cutting.

In short, the state foreign language supervisor is a busy person with many responsibilities—possibly too many to do all he has to do well and efficiently. The questionnaire sent by this writer to the state supervisors, necessarily rather lengthy, was returned with a number of comments to the effect that the respondents could
scarcely find time to fill out the questionnaire satisfactorily. One supervisor, ultimately not included in this dissertation, flatly refused to respond due to lack of time.

Two other areas, heretofore briefly touched upon, also demand much of the supervisor's time: local and national functions. While it often appears a bit arbitrary to attempt to separate state functions from local or national functions—they frequently overlap—there are certain areas of concern in both categories which give them a special status. The first of these two areas, local functions, will be considered next.
CHAPTER IV
LOCAL FUNCTIONS

Introduction

The emphasis of Section C of the questionnaire is on the functions of the state foreign language supervisor with various groups of personnel on a local, rather than state-wide, level. Questions 1 through 6, 9, and 10 pertain to contacts with teachers and local supervisors. These two groups are considered together rather than separately for two reasons: (1) services for both groups are much the same, with the exception of classroom visitation of the teacher; and (2) six states have no local foreign language supervisors, while a number of others have only a very few, with the result that the state foreign language supervisor is often directly in contact with the individual teacher in any case. Questions 7, 8, and 11 deal with relationships between the state supervisor and administrative or college personnel.

Work with the Teacher and Local Supervisor

Time spent by the state foreign language supervisor in classroom visitation of the individual teacher varies greatly from state to state, and appears to be dependent on many different factors such as number of requests for visitation, time and money available for visitation, emphasis placed on job functions by the individual supervisor, and administrative directives. The most common amounts of time
spent by state supervisors in classroom visitation are 25% (10 supervisors, or 21% of the respondents), 10% (7, or 15%), and 50% (6, or 13%). However, as many as seven supervisors (15%) spend 5% or less of their time in classroom visitation, although, conversely, four supervisors (8%) spend 60% or more of their time in this activity. (See Table 5, page 56).

Most respondents hasten to point out that their classroom visitations are for consultative purposes only. Evaluation of the individual teacher's performance, when it is done, is usually through observation at the request of an administrator or of the teacher himself. Seven state supervisors (15%) report that they do no evaluation of the individual teacher at all, but those who do tend to prefer an informal, subjective approach with post-observation consultation. "There is," admonishes one supervisor, "no element of spying!" A few states have the classroom evaluation forms so popular a score of years ago; others have initiated very modern systems of evaluation based on interaction analysis or micro-teaching. One supervisor's approach is to evaluate student performance: "The teacher," she writes, "can draw his own conclusions!"

Apart from a professed desire to aid the teacher to improve, or to help improve a foreign language program, evaluation serves a variety of other uses, such as serving as a part of planned visitation for regional accreditation associations, or for certification purposes; helping to determine workshop needs or summer program needs; discovering promising foreign language teachers and noting innovative practices; and learning the nature of the local program to aid in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75..........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70..........</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65..........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60..........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55..........</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50..........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45..........</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40..........</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35..........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30..........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25..........</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20..........</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15..........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10..........</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5...........</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2...........</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0...........</td>
<td>2°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not reported ........... 1

°Includes Kentucky's Acting Supervisor
consultation.

In those states in which there are local language supervisors, thirty-four of the respondents (72%) report holding periodic conferences with the local supervisor concerning workshops, materials, teacher personnel and a general "how-are-things-going?" session. Local supervisors are usually employed by large city systems or on a county or regional basis, and are the individuals to whom the teacher normally first turns for assistance with a pedagogical problem, rather than going to the state supervisor. This does not mean that the state supervisor has no contact with the teacher served by a local supervisor, but in most cases contact is less frequent or direct. A few state supervisors say that their contacts with teachers served by a local supervisor are almost the same as for those not so served, but this does not appear to be very common. Such contacts are most often in the form of classroom visitation, frequently at the request of, and almost always with the cooperation of, the local supervisor. In addition to visitation, contacts with these teachers evidently comes in a variety of ways, through workshops and meetings, correspondence and bulletins, and educational television programs.

In areas where there is no local supervisor—which means all of six states responding and large areas of most of the others, both those responding and those where a vacancy in the position of state foreign language supervisor exists—the state foreign language supervisor is often the only individual to whom the individual teacher can turn for expert advice in matters pertaining to the teaching of
foreign languages. Initiation of the request for the supervisor's help in a given area can come from a number of different sources, but is most often from the teacher by way of his administrator, or from the administrator directly. Occasionally requests come directly from teachers, but the comment is made over and again by the state supervisors that teachers—and often lower level administrators—must "go through channels" to request their services. Requests also come from the local general supervisor or curriculum director, as well as, less often, department chairmen, regional general consultants, or liaison personnel.

Specific services which the state foreign language supervisor provides for the individual teacher, as well as, where applicable, the local foreign language supervisor, include three broad categories: (1) Teacher Education, (2) Teacher Information, and (3) Teacher Opportunities. The number of these services of which one teacher (or local supervisor) takes advantage will depend, of course, on his own needs and the amount of contact that he has with the state supervisor.

The category of Teacher Education comprises a wide variety of activities designed to help the teacher on-the-job. The most significant of these is the classroom visitation and individual consultation with the teacher already noted above. Next in importance are in-service programs and workshops, both state-wide and local. Thirty-nine supervisors (83%) report regularly scheduled workshops for the teachers in their states, and two of the remaining eight cite workshops on the basis of need rather than on any schedule.
(Significantly, in two states where workshops had been held on a regular basis, and where the position has been vacant for one and three years respectively, there have been no workshops for foreign language teachers during this time.)

The workshops held by the state supervisors vary considerably in frequency and duration, ranging from one workshop biennially on a state-wide basis to thirty annually on a local basis, and lasting from a few hours to several weeks. Many states schedule the local workshop on an "as-needed" basis, so that the number of these workshops may vary markedly from year to year. Size of the state, also, helps to determine the nature and location of the workshops: teachers in a small state can readily travel to a geographical center for a workshop state-wide, but in the larger, more populous states it is often more feasible to hold several workshops in strategic locations—commonly large metropolitan areas—around the state.

Apart from formal workshops, the state supervisor may also lend his expertise to school departmental meetings, simple teaching demonstrations, or provide temporary leadership to get needed projects underway.

Teacher Information, the second category, emphasizes the resource nature of the state foreign language supervisor. In this connection, he performs a whole host of services which include the following: answering the requests of individual teachers or local supervisors; sending numerous materials such as instructional aids, guidelines, courses of study, professional materials, specific language materials, information concerning new trends in foreign language methodology,
resource lists, summaries of research, and the state foreign language news-letter; assisting with the selection of texts and equipment; developing pilot programs; and distributing NDEA materials which are channeled through his office.

The last category of services for the teacher, Teacher Opportunities, demonstrates how the state supervisor can help the individual teacher and local supervisor through the great many contacts on every level which come very naturally as part of his job. He can, for example, aid in obtaining scholarships, both for deserving students, and teachers who wish to do graduate work. He can alert the teacher and local supervisor to summer school opportunities, and provide recommendations for graduate schools or other positions. He may be of help specifically to the local supervisor or administrator by notifying them of opportunities for teacher or program improvement arising from evaluation programs, or by assisting in teacher recruitment.

It is interesting to pause at this point to reflect for a moment on just this one aspect of the state foreign language supervisor's total role, that of providing services for the individual teacher and local supervisor, where one exists. The time and work involved and needed in this one area alone is formidable indeed, and gives one pause to consider how well, after all, the "generalist" evidently now being considered in some areas could assume the duties of this area of services for teachers with anything like the expert skill required. That there are "generalists" who would try is not to be doubted, but whether they might really do the job in foreign
languages as well as other subject areas simultaneously, where similarly specific—and numerous—services would be required, strains one's credulity. Probably no better case in point is to be found than that of the Acting Supervisor of Foreign Languages for one state, an individual who actually holds the title of General Supervisor, but maintains repeatedly in the comments on his questionnaire that he is not qualified to perform any of the special skill services for the foreign language teacher, and is only holding the job open until a qualified person can be found to fill the position. (In subsequent chapters, this area of consideration will be discussed further.)

Work with the Administrator and College/University Personnel

The number of contacts that a state foreign language supervisor has with a school's or school system's administrative personnel are probably at least equal to contacts with the teacher. The first person whom most supervisors see when visiting a school or school district is the administrator—most often the principal, but the whole hierarchy that prevails may be seen at one time or another, if for no other reason than that of protocol. Many supervisors comment that good working relationships with a school or district require a close understanding with administrative personnel. As a result, a good deal of visiting goes on back and forth between the state supervisor and the administrator. The supervisor visits for post-classroom visitation or post-evaluation conferences, through the accreditation procedures of schools, or simply to honor the request
of the administrator, as appropriate. The administrator not infrequently visits the state supervisor in his office in the capital (except Maryland, where the office is located in Baltimore) for counsel; moreover, a good deal of correspondence is carried on between them. In addition, the administrator usually receives a copy of the foreign language newsletter.

Meetings of various sorts are another source of contact between the administrator and the state supervisor: the supervisor may attend administrator's association meetings, and administrators sometimes sit in on the supervisor's workshops or conferences. Only twelve supervisors (25%), however, report holding workshops for administrators, curriculum directors and/or guidance personnel. Additionally, twelve supervisors make a point of commenting that administrators are always invited to all foreign language conferences under their auspices. Two supervisors not wryly that the invitations are seldom acted upon, but such would be perfectly understandable, after all: administrators have only so much time to attend conferences, and there are a great many conferences for him to attend! Other comments by a few supervisors concerning workshops for administrators are to the effect that such workshops are desired or in the planning stage; several comment that while they do not hold formal workshops, they are asked to speak to groups of administrative personnel in an advisory capacity. A number of states, besides, have various educational committees on which both supervisor and administrator are asked to work together.

Rapport is also important in dealing with college and university
personnel. The state foreign language supervisor rarely has any
direct control over college personnel, so that what sort of ambiance
exists between them will largely be the doing of the supervisor him­
self. In this area, the state supervisor is often a liaison person
between higher education and the secondary and elementary programs.
A number of states have formal articulation or advisory committees
formed of college personnel, and usually the state supervisor is a
member. College faculty members, moreover, are often invited by the
state supervisor to take part in workshops or conferences, and there
is commonly a good spirit of cooperation in the promotion and devel­
opment of the state's foreign language organizational meetings.

The state foreign language supervisor is involved, in twelve
states (25% of the respondents), with teacher education and certifi­
cation programs in foreign languages at the college level. As a
kind of adjunct to this aspect, the state supervisor on occasion is
guest lecturer to classes in foreign language methodology, or to
faculty meeting discussions. Two state supervisors are themselves
faculty members of university evening colleges. In one state the
supervisor is a part of the periodical evaluation of college and
university programs; in another, the state supervisor works with col­
lege personnel in the improvement of the state's Regent Examinations
in foreign languages.

Otherwise, many of the services for the college/university per­
sonnel are similar to those for the teacher, local supervisor and
administrator. The supervisor provides the college faculty members
with materials, bulletins, research and survey data; assists in pro-
jects and answers requests; and generally attempts to keep open the lines of communication between his office and the campus.

Conclusions

Possibly the most important part of the state foreign language supervisor's job is his functions on the local level. It is here that the supervisor is in contact with the classroom teacher, who is, after all, the fundamental part of any foreign language program, and consequently the raison d'être of the state supervisor. It is for the classroom teacher, and also, to a degree, for the local foreign language supervisor, that the state supervisor provides a wide variety of consultative services in the areas of Teacher Education, Teacher Information, and Teacher Opportunities. Furthermore, the state supervisor maintains a close relationship with both administrative and college/university personnel, furnishing numerous services in an effort to strengthen the teaching of foreign languages within his state.

Up to this point, the emphasis has been on what the state foreign language supervisor does within the borders of his own state. Relationships do exist, however, between states, on regional bases, and nationwide. The role of the state supervisor as a national figure is the next aspect for consideration.
CHAPTER V
NATIONAL FUNCTIONS, AND SELF-APPRaisal

Introduction

Section D of the questionnaire examines the final facet of the state foreign language supervisor's functions, those which have links with other states and/or the federal government. Questions 5, 6 and 7 deal with the supervisor's work with the various federal programs designed to promote foreign language learning in the states. Questions 1 through 4 and 8 examine more directly diverse connections among the state supervisors themselves, as well as with other agencies or groups through which the supervisor might work outside his own state. Finally, with reference to both state-wide and local, as well as national, functions, question 9 allows the supervisor an opportunity to appraise his own role, compositely and succinctly.

Work with the Federal Programs

A variety of federal legislative acts in the area of education provides for the states and territories to obtain federal funds to assist in developing various aspects of the foreign language program within the state. The program most widely used by the states is the National Defense Education Act, which, in 1958, was the first major source of funds. Subsequent major legislation includes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title V of which is specifically designed to strengthen state departments of education), and the Education
Professions Development Act, from which many states have received funds. (See Table 6, pages 67-68). Additionally, a few states have been able to avail themselves of funds from the Bilingual Education Act, Fulbright-Hays Act, Higher Education Act, and the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities (Humanities Act). One state, besides, has received a grant from the Ford Foundation (a private foundation). Future monies are expected—"hopefully," as most supervisors stress—from the same sources, as well as, in one case, the Educational Media Act. The uncertainty of availability of funds is reflected in the fact that this question (D-7) receives more question marks, or is left unanswered by more respondents than any other single question. (See Table 7, page 69).

Since the state foreign language supervisor is the expert at the state level, he is the logical individual to consult concerning any expenditure of funds that the state receives in connection with foreign language education. Twenty-five state supervisors (52%) report that they are consulted on NDEA Title III or other projects for foreign languages, and can request clarification or change in the proposal to spend funds for acquisition of needed programs and/or materials. Two (4%), in addition, say that they are the individuals in their states who largely control expenditure of such funds. On the other hand, nine supervisors (19%) note that they have no control at all over expenditures, and four (8%) respond with "Very limited." In four states expenditures are controlled by the Division of Instruction, with the foreign language supervisor filing a requisition for whatever funds he needs.
### TABLE 6

NUMBER OF STATES/TERRITORIES RECEIVING FUNDS
THROUGH FEDERAL LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Legislation</th>
<th>Number of States/Territories^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education Act</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Professions Development Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Titles not specified)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title not specified</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullbright-Hays Act (Foreign Language Curriculum Specialist)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Act</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title XII</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title not specified</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation of Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not receiving funds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Legislation</td>
<td>Number of States/Territories&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Reports from the three Illinois respondents are different, and are therefore recorded separately.
### Table 7

**Number of States/Territories Expecting to Receive Funds Through Federal Legislation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Legislation</th>
<th>Number of States/Territories&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education Act</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Professions Development Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title not specified</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Media Act</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title V</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VII</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title not specified</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullbright-Hays Act</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title not specified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No funds expected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Illinois' three respondents are recorded separately.
Interstate Connections

Interstate contacts among the state supervisors of foreign languages range from formal coordination of projects to the more informal sharing of information, ideas and services. In addition, the supervisors have organized themselves into a rather select group known as the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NCSSFL), which attempts to play a significant role in coordination of activities among the state supervisors in order to improve the teaching of foreign languages nationally.

Eight supervisors (17%) report being engaged in some coordination or project with another state at the present time. Two states, for example, are engaged in the coordination of a bilingual education project; two supervisors recently (May, 1969) exchanged places with each other for a month, on special leave from their own states; one state supervisor is developing migrant education materials for other states; one state has an experimental FLES program underway in an adjoining state where the state foreign language supervisor's position is vacant; one supervisor is a teaching participant in the foreign language seminar of a neighboring state; and several state supervisors comment that they are sharing information and extend mutual invitations to state-wide foreign language functions. A number further comment that they are involved in a NCSSFL committee.

The number of supervisors who have in the past participated in out-of-state organizations is, however, at twenty-five (53%), considerably larger than for those presently so engaged. Thirteen supervisors have participated once or twice in some manner in another
state from their own, but four supervisors have participated six or more
times, with one supervisor participating as many as thirteen times.
The nature of such participation is varied, falling rather loosely into
some five areas: (1) International Projects, (2) National Organiza­
tions, (3) Regional and State Organizations, (4) Educational Institu­
tions, and (5) Foreign Language Conferences.

The first area, International Projects, encompasses such endeavors
as the International Education Project, involving five states; work
with foreign institutes; a special project with the Ministry of Edu­
cation in El Salvador; and involvement with the Experiment in Inter­
national Living, in Putney, Vermont.

National Organizations, the second area, includes special work
with the United States Office of Education (9 supervisors, or 19%);
projects involving the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign
Languages (ACTFL) (4, or 8%), the Modern Language Association (MLA)
(3, or 6%), the National Education Association (NEA) (2, or 4%);
invitations for participation by various national language associa­
tions (5, or 11%); and projects derived from the National Defense
Education Act (3, or 6%).

The bulk of the participation occurs in the third area, Regional
and State Organizations. Twelve supervisors (25%) have participated
in regional association programs such as the North East Conference
on the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages, or regional education
laboratories, but state-level organizations involve many more. The
greatest single area of participation for the most number of super­
visors is as guest speakers for out-of-state foreign language
associations (13 supervisors, or 28%). Participation in out-of-state workshops, however, is nearly as great, with nine supervisors (19%). Additionally, supervisors have been invited to participate with out-of-state Departments of Education (6, or 13%), out-of-state Teacher/Educational Associations (5, or 10%), and one city Board of Education (1, or 2%). Moreover, special institutes for the state foreign language supervisors have been held in Indiana and Washington to give the supervisors additional opportunities to exchange ideas and learn about new materials.

Educational Institutions, the fourth area, includes five supervisors who have taught, with special arrangement, in out-of-state universities (10%). One supervisor has helped develop a teacher education curriculum in another state.

The last area, Foreign Language Conferences, comprises two conferences on Portuguese involving three state supervisors (6%) and a conference on levels of language learning, attended by one supervisor (2%).

Asked if they could accept short term appointments (i. e., summer) in colleges, universities, or other agencies (e. g., the United States Office of Education) (USOE), twenty-nine supervisors (62%) say that they can, usually with special approval from superiors, but only eighteen (40%) indicate that they have done so. Such short term appointments as were accepted do not differ greatly from the kinds of participation out-of-state, except that a portion of the appointments were, in this case, within the supervisor's own state.

Work with the USOE has already been mentioned above; other appointments
have largely to do with workshops and institutes. Two supervisors who have not accepted appointment comment that they cannot spare the time from their jobs, and one, located in a remote area geographically, notes rather humorously that he needs all his vacation for travel!

Interstate contact is at its most constant through the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NCSSFL). This organization, the membership of which is composed entirely of the state foreign language supervisors and their assistants, is a small organization founded to give some coherence nationally to what the individual state supervisor is doing. Feelings among the state supervisors about its usefulness vary. In response to the question asking them to assess whether the NCSSFL's influence within the coming decade might be major, eighteen (40%) respond that they believe it will be, fifteen (32%) say that think it will not be, nine (19%) say "Possibly", and the remainder refuse to hazard a guess. Since NCSSFL is the most logical organization which the state foreign language supervisors might use as a base from which to bring about desired changes on a national basis, it is interesting to note what the members themselves think of their organization's potential.

On the positive side there are perhaps three major points put forth by those who believe that NCSSFL will be a major influence in the next decade. The first of these has to do with the development of strong policy statements and position papers on the status of foreign language education, such as the "Twelve Recommendations for Providing Good Foreign Language Instruction in the Elementary and
Secondary Schools of America*, 1963. Because of the concerted effort being made to carry on a program of aiding the profession, some supervisors feel that the NCSSFL will exert considerable influence. Other comments are to the effect that the NCSSFL has, in this manner, helped to organize order out of the prior chaos.

A second point in NCSSFL's favor is its recent policy to assist foreign language education within the individual states. In this capacity it has acted as a national spokesman for the states, providing a means for the majority of the foreign language personnel of the states to express themselves through the state supervisors. Since NCSSFL does have the membership with a personal contact on the state level, a number of supervisors expect NCSSFL to do more to influence programs and organizations in a concerted effort. The problem of the growing number of vacancies within their ranks is recognized by the members of NCSSFL, and it is expected that the organization will take steps to confront the problem.

A third point for NCSSFL is its role as initiator in programs and projects which some feel is important. Comments are made, further, that the newly emerging leadership within NCSSFL and cooperation with ACTFL should give it a boost.

Those who feel that NCSSFL may possibly be of major importance in foreign language education within the next decade advance two qualifications: if the position of state foreign language supervisor

---

does not suffer more vacancies nationally, and if NCSSFL increases its activity. The former point is one expressed by a considerable number, obviously hesitant due to the number of present vacancies and the trend toward replacing "specialists" with "generalists". The point of better salaries to help reduce the turnover in personnel in some states is also cited in this connection.

Concerning the latter idea of increasing its activity, comments are advanced that the state foreign language supervisors must cooperate in a forceful, united effort, perhaps with a permanent secretaryship and/or a recompensed leadership position. One supervisor here sees the necessity of developing strong recommendations for the non-college bound disadvantaged pupil.

Factors cited by those supervisors who feel that NCSSFL will not be of major influence in the next decade have to do with the fact that NCSSFL is a small organization, has a limited scope, poor attendance at its meetings, and a lack of administrative support.

The small size of the membership of NCSSFL, and its lack of funds, are felt to be considerable drawbacks to the effectiveness of the organization. Some supervisors point out that while NCSSFL has a good potential, its membership is too small and too scattered. A couple suggest that it might be better to have an association of state and local supervisors, which might possibly affiliate in an active way with an association like ACTFL.

Comments on the size of the organization evoke comments on its scope. Remarks are made that NCSSFL needs a more effective platform—perhaps ACTFL, as already noted—from which to speak. The feeling is
that NCSSFL does not reach out far enough to involve enough people. Observations are noted that too often the same people are the active people in many organizations simultaneously, such as in ACTFL, MLA, and NEA.

Poor attendance at the annual meetings is also scored against NCSSFL by a number of the supervisors. The chief problem involved seems to be a lack of travel funds on the part of many supervisors to be able to attend the meeting; many states, evidently, do not feel that attendance at a NCSSFL meeting merits the use of state funds. As a result, supervisors who are not in a position financially to use personal funds for travel, cannot attend. This necessitates informing those not in attendance by mail, a slow and cumbersome process, particularly when a point arises needing the "advice or consent" of the whole membership.

Finally, there is the matter of lack of administrative support. One supervisor complains that the majority of administrators "couldn't care less about foreign languages", saying that science, mathematics, reading, driver's education, vocational education and physical education are held to be more important. The point is made, further, that the state foreign language supervisor's base of operation, the Department of Instruction, is not a major influence in educational circles, even though it is felt that the task of attempting to influence must be continued on all levels, from administrators to state Departments of Education. Support from higher education is also deemed necessary for NCSSFL.
The State Foreign Language Supervisor Appraises His Job

How does the state foreign language supervisor see his own role? The final question of the questionnaire was designed to allow the supervisor opportunity to express himself freely on any aspect concerning his role that he might care to. Twenty-eight supervisors (59%) elected to respond to the question, but an examination of their remarks shows that, by and large, they seem here to avoid specifics in favor of more generalized impressions of various aspects of their role. These impressions tend to group themselves into three different categories which, considered as a whole, help to complete the picture of their total role as has been examined thus far: (1) Job Satisfactions, (2) Job Performance, and (3) Job Drawbacks.

A good many of the state foreign language supervisors like their work. In the category of Job Satisfactions, the responses are to the effect that while the supervisor may often work alone, and "uphill" as it were, he finds the results of the job genuinely rewarding personally. One supervisor speaks of his work as an exhilarating experience, another comments that it is exciting, still another says simply that he enjoys it. A number of supervisors make remarks to the effect that the foreign language supervisor's desk is a kind of "crossroads" for what is happening nationwide in foreign language education. The job is seen as having enormous potential if the supervisors are given a free hand by administrators and state Departments of Education.

Responses in the second category, Job Performance, are more extensive, but if there is any one word which sums up the feeling
about how the supervisors see themselves on the job, it is very likely "stimulator". "The supervisor is a catalyst," says one supervisor. Others, continuing the theme, use verbs like "encourage", "stimulate", "promote", "create", and "build". One supervisor's comments, briefly stated, seem best to reflect the tenor of the remarks as a whole:

We give leadership and service. Our job is to inspire, facilitate and inform to involve as many school districts as possible in new and creative approaches to improve the foreign language program.

Job Performance also includes the aspect of coordination-liaison. The remarks in this connection point out that the supervisor has helped to coordinate the foreign language program as never before, that he has helped to bridge the gap between the public schools and higher education, and that he has tried to create a climate on all educational levels for language improvement. Working as evaluator, advisor and resource person, he is the key person in the state to bring individual efforts into one concentrated effort.

A final aspect of Job Performance expressed is that of personal preparation. The supervisor should have superior competence in supervision, in curriculum development, and in in-service and pre-service education. He should be abreast of important research in his field, but he should not lose the larger view of the educational process in his preoccupation with foreign languages. Additionally, and very importantly, he must have flexibility and, understandably, energy!

The comments for the last category, Job Drawbacks, seem to have as their central theme the lengthy processes needed to undergo in
order to achieve a desired goal. Supervisors frequently feel frustrated by too much administrative "red tape", not only on the state level, but at the local and national levels as well. "The selling job," comments one supervisor, "is a long, drawn-out process." This same selling job is mentioned by another supervisor as being as big to educators as to the general public. "Motivating teachers to improve," he writes, "is a constant battle." The feeling is that since supervisors lack legal power, they must depend on personal abilities to achieve any changes, or to influence the total foreign language program. One supervisor offers the suggestion that the USOE should maintain a person in Washington to act as a coordinator on a national basis for the activities of the state foreign language supervisors, as a means of alleviating some of the unnecessary extra work.

Finally there is the comment of one supervisor, on the job a little over a year, who finds that the job requires a great deal of traveling, which keeps him away from his family too much. "Besides," he adds, "the personal rewards of this job are not as great as in teaching."

Conclusions

National functions of the state foreign language supervisor lie in two main areas. In the first, the state supervisor is the individual in his state who most often is responsible for review and approval of foreign language projects to be funded wholly or partially with grants derived from federal legislation. In the second, he maintains
a number of ties on an interstate basis through participation in international projects; national, regional and state organizations; educational institutions; and foreign language conferences; as well as through his national organization, the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, the future influence of which is presently debatable.

Apart from purely national functions, the supervisor assesses his total role as he sees it, providing insight into his feelings toward his job's satisfactions, its nature, and its drawbacks.

At this point, the description of the role of the state foreign language supervisor's various functions—state-wide, local, and national—based on the information which the state supervisor himself has provided, is complete. It is now appropriate to look at the viewpoint of another individual associated with the job, but at enough of a distance from the everyday work of the foreign language supervisor to give him a different perspective about what it is the supervisor does, and how important his work is; the immediate superior of the supervisor. This individual's appraisal of the state foreign language supervisor will be considered next.
CHAPTER VI

JOB APPRAISAL

Introduction

Questionnaire 2, consisting of five questions, was sent to the immediate superior of the state foreign language supervisor, or that person who would be the immediate superior in states where a vacancy exists. This questionnaire is designed to secure a different point of view of the state supervisor's job from one who is familiar enough with the position to be able to give an informed judgment, but, at the same time, far enough removed from the supervisor's daily tasks to be able to give an objective appraisal. Question 3 of the questionnaire asks for the immediate superior's description of what it is that he believes the state foreign language supervisor's job is; questions 1 and 2 request an appraisal of the value of that job; and question 4 attempts to relate the position of state foreign language supervisor to that of other state supervisory positions. The fifth question allows the respondents an opportunity to make any comments that they might wish to, but most respondents merely left it blank. In the few cases where there is a response, the comments are generally pertinent to areas covered in questions 1 through 4; as a result, such comments are included in the discussion of the first four questions, and discussion of question 5, as such, is not included.

In addition to an examination of the responses as mentioned above, the discussion of the questionnaire will be further subdivided...
into responses from those states having a state foreign language supervisor on the job (33 respondent states) and responses from those states where a vacancy exists (9 respondent states). This is done to show a difference in attitude or point of view, where one exists, between the two groups of states.

The Immediate Superior's Description of the State Foreign Language Supervisor's Job

A survey of the comments of the state supervisor's immediate superiors in those states where foreign language supervisors are on the job, indicate that the superior sees the job of the supervisor as three-fold: as a leader, as a consultant, and as a coordinator. Each of the areas includes a variety of factors which serve to yield a composite whole. For a more complete understanding of this composite, it is well to examine each of the parts in some detail.

Fourteen of the immediate superiors (42%) refer to the state foreign language supervisor as a leader, a highly specialized individual who works for the improvement of foreign language instruction within his state. He is, in the words of one respondent, an "agent of change", to initiate and develop. "The foreign language supervisor," maintains another, "is the only person at state level who understands the objectives of foreign language instruction, and what makes a significant program." Still another assents to this point of view firmly, "He has many responsibilities which other state personnel cannot handle."

Some form of the consultative aspect of the state supervisor's role is mentioned by twenty-eight (85%) of the respondents, the aspect
receiving heaviest emphasis. This area encompasses some five different aspects to which the superiors make reference: (1) Informed Spokesman, (2) Program Development, (3) School Visitations, (4) In-service Training, and (5) Instructional Materials.

As an informed spokesman, the supervisor is seen as one whose job it is to interpret the state's foreign language program to agencies and the public as the occasion demands. In order to perform this job effectively, the supervisor must keep abreast of developments in his field so that he can speak with authority. Further, keeping current helps him guide the teachers of his state more competently.

Concerning the aspect of Program Development, the state supervisor is depicted as one who builds new foreign language programs—or rebuilds old ones—from FLES through the university. Here the supervisor is one who encourages more languages earlier in the school years, and works for a logical sequence of study. Additionally, he is seen by five of the respondents (15%) as one who is to evaluate the program objectively.

School Visitations are mentioned as another facet of the supervisor's work with individual teachers and administrators, providing services as they are needed and/or asked for. Strangely, work that the supervisor might do with the individual teacher is not specified, and, in fact, is referred to by only five of the respondents. (This is all the more interesting when one considers the importance attached to this aspect by the supervisors themselves). As far as the school administrators are concerned, the supervisor is viewed by several respondents as recommending minimal competencies for teachers or
advising the administrators on other matters concerning the teachers.

In-service, and to a limited extent, Pre-service, Training is considered as another aspect of the consultative role. Seventeen respondents (51%) refer to demonstrations, workshops, and other in-service training such as instruction in the effective use of media, or the introduction of new methods and techniques. The feeling is generally expressed that this is one of the supervisor's more effective undertakings.

Mentioned by nineteen respondents (58%) is the supervisor's work with Instructional Materials. Here the supervisor is described as helping in the development of guides and materials, and the identification of resources available to local schools for quality programs in foreign languages. Further, he may be asked to help select instructional materials, and frequently, it will be he who disseminates such materials or other information as needed.

In the area of coordination, the supervisor acts as a key figure in a number of ways. In this connection he is seen as one who assists in long-range planning for foreign language programs in the school districts; he also assists in the development and completion of research projects with various groups, both intra-state and inter-state. On the state level, he is seen as coordinating agencies and people involved in foreign language programs. One state expects him to coordinate leadership resources in the state wherever they may be, rather than act as the sole resource. The supervisor, in addition, is depicted as assisting colleges and universities as requested, or helping to improve teacher training in these institutions. The only
mention of his national functions are those in connection of his dealing with programs sponsored by NDEA, Title III funds.

The respondents from those states where a vacancy exists in foreign language supervision on the state level define the job of the state supervisor, either as experienced by the state or expected by it, essentially in the same terms as already discussed. The leadership and coordination areas, although mentioned, are not given as much importance as the consultative area, in which the aspects dealing with Program Development and Instructional Materials are the most frequently detailed.

Job Appraisal by the Immediate Superior

Asked whether the position of the state foreign language supervisor has contributed significantly to foreign language education in his state, thirty, or 91%, of the immediate superiors of active supervisors, answer in the affirmative, even, in a few cases, adding such comments as "Definitely!" The remaining responses include one who says, "Not in basic pre-service. Yes for in-service and program orientation." Another, in a state where the supervisor has been on the job for only a year, comments that it is too soon to tell; a third does not answer the question.

Asked to explain their answer, the respondents were almost eloquent, answering more in detail than at any other point on the questionnaire. Whether consciously or not, the superiors in their comments here provide a more in-depth picture of the supervisor's job as they describe what the supervisor has done, as opposed to what
he is supposed to do. Interestingly enough, the comments in answer to this question are phrased in such a way that they convey considerable feeling of the respondent in what he has to say; there is almost a total absence of this feeling in the responses dealing with job description. The some 56 responses can be considered in four different categories: (1) Increase of Programs, (2) Teacher Education/Information, (3) Leadership and Status, and (4) Coordination.

Fourteen comments (25%) refer to an increase of foreign language programs within their states. They cite that there are more languages being offered by more teachers to more students for longer sequences than was the case prior to the time the state had a foreign language supervisor. One state has even adopted a minimum four-year requirement in foreign language study, and has amended school laws to allow the use of foreign languages in the instructional program on the advice of the state supervisor. Another state offers a dramatic set of figures: 73 teachers with an enrollment of 2,681 in 1958 increased to 369 teachers with an enrollment of 17,833 in 1968. In that same period of time the number of FLES teachers in the state increased from 5 to 100! While other states do not offer statistics to support their assertions, comments such as the following are typical: "She has made a vital contribution to the encouragement and expansion of foreign language education in our state."

In the category of Teacher Education/Information there are some twenty different comments by respondents (36%), seldom less than a paragraph in length, as the accomplishments of the supervisors in this area are extolled. Since the various items listed are by now familiar
to the reader, it will suffice to say that they include the preparation of curriculum guides, school visitation, in-service and preservice programs, workshops, introduction of new methods, dissemination of information, the evaluation of student achievement, and the interpretation of the foreign language education program as appropriate.

Thirteen remarks (23%) are classified under the category of Leadership and Status. In the former aspect, the supervisor is seen as a leader in his state and as a stimulator for better programs, much as has been discussed previously. In the latter phase, the supervisor is described as one who has given status to foreign language education in his state, and one who has created an awareness of the need for his position. The factors of strong rapport and good communication among the state's foreign language personnel, thanks to the efforts of the state supervisor, are explained. Good communication with other states is also mentioned as a factor due the state supervisor. One respondent declares emphatically, "The state foreign language supervisor is being recognized as an important facet of the general education of children and youth."

The last category, Coordination, is made up of nine of the comments (16%). In this respect the supervisor is viewed as a liaison agent among the various educational levels within the state, among various agencies and individuals, and between his state and others. One respondent says unequivocally, "Our foreign language supervisor is the single most important factor in coordinating the efforts of the state's foreign language programs."
What of the states where there is presently no foreign language supervisor? Under the circumstances, one might expect some negative reactions to the question. Significantly enough, however, in EVERY respondent state which has had a foreign language supervisor, the answer is yes, that the contribution had been significant. (The two states which have never had a state supervisor could not, of course, respond). Even more telling are the subsequent comments, of which the following samples are typical:

There was intense interest in our conferences, workshops and publications. The foreign language supervisor was needed and most helpful in the local school systems.

The supervisor contributed a good deal to the development of good foreign language programs in the state through visitations, workshops, in-service training programs, and general enthusiasm.

One respondent explains that in his state all specialists who remain have had to assume generalist roles.

The question asking the respondents whether they feel the position is likely to be continued in their states receives an affirmative response from 30 (91%). One respondent is uncertain, one does not respond, and one says no. In this last, because of a cut in federal funds to support the position, when the present supervisor retires, she will not be replaced. Several others caution that a cut in funds would likely mean the discontinuance of the position. One respondent says testily that the trend toward generalist supervisors makes the future doubtful. "The state legislature," he remarks, "does not support state agencies sufficiently to maintain staffs, and state administrators do not appreciate the need for specialists." On the
other hand, however, a number of states seem to be moving in the opposite direction. One mentions the exploration of adding foreign language supervisory personnel; another says the position will be continued and services increased; a third speaks of strong state support; and two say that the position is considered so important that it will be continued even if federal support is withdrawn.

Among the states where a vacancy exists, the answer to the question, as one might expect, is almost solidly negative. Only Hawaii, Kentucky, and Louisiana of these states expect to continue the position. All the others reply that the vacancy appears to be permanent. The most frequently mentioned reason is lack of funds, evidently unavailable from either federal or state sources. Two of the respondents make a point of underscoring that the need still exists, notwithstanding. One state, already referred to previously, plans short-term consultants. Another state, which has no subject-matter specialists, and does not plan to have any under the present state educational administrator, asserts that "Consensus from the field indicates that such a person is not particularly effective in overall upgrading of programs." He does not, however, specify which field. Such a comment suggests, surely, the need for further research in the general area of supervision.

The Foreign Language Supervisor as a Member of the State Supervisory Team

Question 4 of the questionnaire seems to have caused the respondents the most difficulty. It asks for the subject areas or grade-levels which have supervisors in the state, besides the foreign
language supervisor. Additionally it requests information as to how these other supervisory positions are funded, with federal funds, state money, or a combination of both. Two respondents simply do not reply, and one has no other supervisors. Seven other responses, however, two of which are from states with vacancies, cannot be considered as part of the discussion because of the unanimous error of providing the requested information about the foreign language supervisor only, with no reference to the others. Information about the foreign language supervisor was not needed since it had already been included as part of the first questionnaire (see Chapter II). One must come to the conclusion, then, that busy superiors reading hastily see what they expect to be there rather than what is there. (At least four, in fact, passed the whole questionnaire on to the foreign language supervisor for answer, in spite of the request made in the questionnaire not to consult with that person, necessitating an additional mailing to correct the error). Consequently, valid replies include 25 respondents from states with state foreign language supervisors, and 7 from those with vacancies.

Respondent states list a total of forty-one kinds of supervisory positions, besides foreign languages, some dealing with highly specialized areas, some more general in nature. Most common among the states are those which fall in the traditional academic disciplines, such as English, mathematics, science, and social studies. (See Table 8, pp. 92-96). A complete alphabetical listing of the positions follows:

1. Adult Education
In some cases, one or more of the positions are held simultaneously by one individual in a state (e.g., Health and Physical Education, or Driver Education and Safety).

It immediately becomes apparent that there is a great diversity in kinds of supervision among the states, evidently based on what
TABLE 8

KINDS OF SUPERVISORY POSITIONS MAINTAINED IN THE STATES
WITH PERCENTAGE OF FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS
USED TO MAINTAIN THE POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Supervisory Position</th>
<th>Percentage of Federal Funds</th>
<th>Number of States Listing the Position</th>
<th>Percentage of State Funds</th>
<th>Number of States Supporting the Position</th>
<th>Number of States Without the Position</th>
<th>Number of States with Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual</td>
<td>100 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Education</td>
<td>100 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Supervisory Position</th>
<th>Percentage of Federal (F) or State (S) Funds Supporting the Position</th>
<th>Number of States without</th>
<th>Number of States Listing the Position Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Consumer Education</td>
<td>100 S 1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Driver Education</td>
<td>100 F 1 4 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 S 4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drugs and Narcotics</td>
<td>100 F 1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Economics</td>
<td>100 S 2 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Educational Television</td>
<td>100 S 1 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Elementary Education</td>
<td>100 F 3 5 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 S 5 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. English or Language Arts</td>
<td>100 F 4 75 (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 S 75 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 F 6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 S 6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 7 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75 50 7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gifted Children</td>
<td>100 F 1 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 S 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Guidance</td>
<td>100 F 3 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 S 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 50 2 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Health</td>
<td>100 F 1 5 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 S 5 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Home Economics</td>
<td>100 F 2 3 (1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0 S 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 50 3 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8 - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Supervisory Position&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percentage of Federal (F) or State (S) Funds</th>
<th>Number Supporting the Position&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Number of States Without Position</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Indian Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Individualized Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Industrial Arts</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Instructional Materials</td>
<td>100 S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Intercultural Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Library</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mathematics</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Music</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Outdoor Education</td>
<td>100 S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Physical Education</td>
<td>100 F</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisory Position</td>
<td>Percentage of Federal (F) or State (S) Funds Supporting the Position</td>
<td>Number of States Listing the Position</td>
<td>Number of States Without the Position</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Pre-school Education</td>
<td>100 F 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Primary Enrichment</td>
<td>100 F 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Reading</td>
<td>100 F 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Safety</td>
<td>100 F 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Science</td>
<td>100 F 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 6 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 8 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Secondary Education</td>
<td>100 S 4 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Sex Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Social Studies</td>
<td>100 F 5 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 5 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Special Education</td>
<td>100 F 2 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 3 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Speech and Drama</td>
<td>100 F 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Supervisory Position¹</td>
<td>Percentage of Federal (F) or State (S) Funds Supporting the Position²</td>
<td>Number of States without Percentages</td>
<td>Number of States Listing the Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Technical Education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language supervisor only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response invalid</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Figures reflect only the information reported, yet the number of state supervisors in vocational areas is known to be greater than indicated here. Respondents may have omitted such information under the assumption that "academic" areas only were to be included.

²Combinations are reported as one position under the first one mentioned in the title. Thus "Physical Education and Health" is reported as "Physical Education."

³The percentage of federal funds only is reported in cases where the figure is less than 100%. The remainder is always state funded.

⁴Figures in parentheses refer to states which have a foreign language supervisor vacancy, and are not included in the column without parentheses.
each state sees as its needs. For example, a state like Montana, with a sizable Indian population, may well need a supervisor of Indian education, but such a position in Ohio would be absurd. Nevertheless, certain disciplines are common to the curricula of all the states—language arts and mathematics, for example—and it would seem justifiable to explore whether such disciplines may not, indeed, need expert supervision for the programs to flourish.

Apparently foreign languages as a supervisory position—at least, in the "academic" areas—has fared better than most at the state level. Of the 25 respondents with active foreign language supervisors considered in Table 8, only 20 have supervisors of social studies; only 19 have supervisors of science; and just 18 have supervisors of mathematics. One wonders why a teacher of mathematics would need less help than one of English or foreign languages. Would, say, a generalist supervisor do an adequate job for the "missing" subjects? Or, worse, would the teacher be left to flounder on his own? The area is ripe for investigation.

The matter of funding requires the judgment of a Solomon. A great many positions are supported entirely by state funds, but a quick survey of Table 8 shows that federal money is heavily relied upon. The regulations for receiving federal funds, and the rules governing their duration, are complex, but it may well be that some states have not fully explored all the possibilities for receiving funds under legislation subsequent to NDEA. In any case, most federal programs are designed to stimulate the state programs, not to support them indefinitely. When a state undertakes to build good programs
only to abandon them when federal money expires, it does a disservice
to the teachers and pupils of that state. Ultimately if the states
wish to control their own educational programs as the U. S. Constitu­tion envisions, then they should be willing to support them ade­quately.

Conclusions

Job appraisal by the immediate superior of the state foreign
language supervisor results in a delineation of three major areas
of activity: leadership, consultation, and coordination. The job
is seen as a vital and necessary one yielding an increase in quality
and quantity of foreign language educational programs in the state,
with a comparable rise in status of the supervisor in his profession.

The state foreign language supervisory position is one of some
forty-two state supervisory positions reported by respondents.
There are apparently more state foreign language supervisors pres­ently on the job than any one other supervisory position, possibly
due to the highly specialized nature of the profession and the
original impetus of funds available from NDEA, Title III. The status
of the specialized supervisor, in general, should bear investigation
more fully.

Having seen something of the viewpoint of the state foreign
language supervisor's immediate superior, the discussion will turn
next to focus upon the viewpoint of still another individual—the
former state foreign language supervisor—as a means of determining
how he evaluates the job, and the reasons why he left it.
CHAPTER VII
JOB EVALUATION

Introduction

The third of the three questionnaires, entitled "Survey of Former State Foreign Language Supervisors", consists of six questions. This questionnaire, designed mainly to provide data on the past history of the position of state foreign language supervisor with a view to obtaining his personal evaluation of the job, was sent to all former state supervisors of foreign language who could be located. Question 4 deals with the chief functions of the job which were performed by the supervisors while they held the position. Question 2 serves to indicate the length of time they were on the job, and question 3 asks for reasons why they left the job. Question 5 asks for an educated guess: by asking the former supervisor, who has now been away from the job long enough to look at its role somewhat objectively, what he believes the future holds for foreign language supervision at the state level, one gets a viewpoint about the direction of state supervision biased only by the individual's past experiences on the job; he has, in effect, no self-interest to serve in the projection of an image. Question 1, which identifies the state of the respondent, has already been detailed in the Preface. Question 6, allowing for free response on the part of the respondent, yields no comments that are not more appropriately discussed with questions 3, 4, or 5; consequently, question 6 is not considered alone.
The description by the former state supervisors of what it is that they did while on the job does not differ greatly from those of the current supervisors or their immediate superiors, but there is something of a shift in emphasis on the various aspects of the total role, possibly the most noticeable being the stress in favor of the coordination aspect as opposed to the others. In all, there are some seven areas of activity delineated by the former supervisors: (1) Coordination, (2) Consultation, (3) Teacher Education, (4) Curriculum, (5) Evaluation, (6) Research, and (7) Public Relations. A closer look at these areas gives a better understanding of the role developed.

The area of Coordination reveals a good deal about the early days of foreign language supervision. The newly-appointed supervisor, often the first one ever in the state, had a monumental task of organization on his hands. Frequently there was little or no communication among the various educational levels or foreign language organizations of the state. In some states, indeed, there were no foreign language organizations apart from the various national language organizations (the so-called "AAT'S", because of the number of organizations which are named "American Association of Teachers of ____, e.g., French, German, Spanish, etc.). Hence, a major task of the new supervisor was precisely that of coordination, in all areas of foreign language education.

As a part of coordination, the leadership role so often mentioned by the respondents in the preceding chapter assumed primary
status. In this connection, the supervisor worked on articulation of programs from K-8 through the university level (5 respondents, or 19%), helped improve or found state foreign language organizations (5, or 19%), established a state supervisory committee or a "center" for foreign language teachers (2, or 8%), acted as a liaison person for foreign language teachers at all levels in the state (2, or 8%), was successful in establishing a minimal four-year sequence in foreign languages in all high schools in the state (1, or 4%), and helped to bring some semblance of order state-wide to foreign language education (5, or 19%).

Hand-in-glove with coordination activities are those of the second area, Consultation. In this area, the most important aspect, mentioned by sixteen respondents (60%), is classroom visitation and individual consultation with the teacher, an activity also listed by the present supervisors as one of primary importance (Chapter IV). Conferences with administrators, often to urge them to take advantage of NDEA funds which had recently become available when most former supervisors had first assumed their posts, accounts for comments by twelve of the respondents (46%). The consultative aspect also includes advice to the administrator or teacher concerning needed program improvements.

The third area, Teacher Education, includes activity of a sustained nature by the supervisor. The early years of foreign language supervision overlapped a great national movement in teaching technique from the so-called "grammar-translation" method of teaching foreign languages to the "audio-lingual" method. Teachers who had been on the
job for some years found themselves ill-informed and unequipped to use the audio-lingual method. As a result, the supervisor launched, with the help of NDEA funds, many in-service programs including workshops, conferences, and demonstrations, designed to help them adjust to new methods, techniques, and materials. Fifteen of the respondents (58%) report this as a major area of activity. In addition, efforts were made to acquaint the state's teachers, whether involved in workshops or not, of the new methods and materials which could be utilized (15, or 58%). The dissemination of materials and information, often through a newly-created state-wide newsletter, was undertaken (12, or 46%). Moreover, teachers were encouraged to take advantage of further study opportunities provided by the NDEA Institutes.

The major activity in the fourth area, Curriculum, appears to have been the development of guidelines and courses of study for schools in the state, according to seven of the respondents (27%). The development and encouragement of FLES programs, together with the introduction of unusual languages in the early grades (e.g., Japanese in Alaska), was another facet of curricular endeavors (4, or 15%). Former supervisors also helped to develop innovative programs (2, or 7%), bilingual programs among Indians and Eskimos (1, or 4%), and the preparation of materials for use on educational television (1, or 4%).

The fifth area, Evaluation, attests to the important influence, historically, of NDEA on the work of the foreign language supervisor. Thirteen supervisors (50%) mention that one of their major tasks
was the evaluative review of project applications for NDEA funds, several noting that, since the new projects were then so numerous, such a process consumed a good deal of their working time. The present-day supervisor, while still involved with this activity to a degree, has far less to do with it, proportionately, than did the supervisor of the early 1960's.

Also in the area of Evaluation is the function of evaluation of instructional programs in the local schools (7, or 27%), the evaluation of teaching materials and equipment (1, or 4%), and the evaluation of staff qualifications, with administrators (2, or 8%).

Research, the sixth area, mentioned by seven respondents (27%), includes the compilation of statistics, the gathering and reporting of information on the status of foreign languages in the state for the U. S. Office of Education and other regional and national agencies, as well as more formalized research projects in foreign language education.

The final area, Public Relations, is another which demanded a good deal of the supervisor's time a decade ago. Because of the newness of the methodology and technology which was characterizing the field of foreign language education at the time, it was the job of the supervisor to interpret much of what was taking place for those not trained in foreign languages (7 respondents, or 27%). Besides, the supervisor was called upon to draft "position" papers in foreign language education, translate foreign language correspondence, and even, in one case, to act as a "ghost writer" for the Superintendent of Public Instruction when he had to make a speech about foreign
Critical Evaluation: Job Change

Of the 26 responding former supervisors of foreign languages, 18 (69%) held their jobs no more than three years (see Table 9, page 105). (One former supervisor held the job two years in one state and one year in another). The longest any reporting former state supervisor occupied that position was seven years (1, or 4%). Why did these people leave their jobs? The answers provided seem to echo those provided by the current state supervisors as reasons which might impel them to change jobs (Chapter II), although again, emphasis appears to be placed on other aspects of these reasons.

The critical evaluations of their job by the former supervisors in terms of their personal careers seem to lie within the confines of five different areas: (1) Other Job Offer, (2) Post-graduate Work, (3) Funding, (4) Politics, and (5) Job Drawbacks.

In the first area, Other Job Offer, foreign language supervision lost out, for the most part, to other kinds of work. Five respondents (19) cite "attractive" or "challenging" offers in business or higher education. Seven supervisors (27%) returned to university jobs—four after having had leaves of absence from their schools in order to establish the post and look for a qualified person for a full-time appointment, and the other three returned to the university to train language teachers there, finding the life of the campus less hectic than the pressures of the state position. Only two supervisors stayed in state supervision: one because her job, which had included supervision of several subject areas, was divided
TABLE 9

NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS
FORMER STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS HELD OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Number of Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Figures for these years include one person listed twice, the only former supervisor responding to have held the post in two different states: two years in Indiana and one year in Hawaii.
to allow another person to take on the responsibilities of the foreign language area, and the other because, as she says, she was "lured" to a similar post in another state—a move later regretted due to lack of cooperation from her superiors. Another assumed the post of Regional Language Supervisor for the Department of State, in Mexico.

Post-graduate Work, the second area, was the reason six supervisors (23%) left that position: four went to work towards the doctorate, and two, for the master's degree. One of those pursuing the doctorate cites the desire to have more time to do research in foreign language education as a principal motivating force in his returning to school.

A third major cause for job change is the area of Funding. At least three of the respondent supervisors (12%) (as well as a number of those from whom no questionnaire was returned) lost their jobs because of lack of funding. For most, the original term of NDEA Title III funds expired, and state legislatures were unwilling to provide the necessary funds to continue the position.

A surprisingly high number of respondents—5, or 19%—cite the fourth area, Politics, as the reason for their leaving their jobs. Four of these individuals, now widely separated geographically, give a good example of state politics at its worst. These four all tell the same story: at work on the job when a new chief administrator took office, they were told to support that administrator's political party or leave. The four chose to leave, and even now show considerable bitterness concerning the incident. "Politicians," snaps
one caustically, "should not deal in professionals!"

The fifth area, Job Drawbacks, is the most comprehensive, and includes many of the secondary and tertiary comments of the respondents as reasons for having left the job. Overwork is designated by nine (35) as a major reason for leaving. The words "exhausted" and "worn-out physically" reappear frequently; a number complain of the endless clerical work that a secretary should have done which kept them from getting "into the field". Others cite the frustrations of too many demands—being pulled in too many directions at once, or the broad job requirements which mean having a ready knowledge on a host of subjects, instructional and technical.

Salary is another factor; five respondents (19%) say they left because the pay was too low. Two others (8%) mention the lack of promotional opportunities as reasons for leaving.

Since the state supervisor does a great deal of traveling as part of his job, one might expect to find some resistance to so much travel. The fact is, however, that only three (12%) point to travel as a factor. One, a young, unmarried woman at the time, found that she traveled too much to develop any social life. Another, a married man, felt it kept him away from his family too much. The third, a man who worked in a large state, cites the amount of travel as "too extensive".

The restrictions of either the State Department of Education or administrators superior to the state foreign language supervisor provide a number of the other causes for changing jobs (8 respondents, or 31%). One supervisor complains of having had "too many
bosses"; another complains of a lack of administrative support for his programs. One cites the frustration of having her suggestions "challenged, evaded, or ignored" by State Department of Education officials. Other remarks point to unnecessary regulations set up by the State Department of Education, a lack of leadership in the Department, and a lack of travel funds to make necessary visits. One respondent throws up his hands altogether. "The job description and reality," he says dryly, "were in extreme discrepancy."

Prognostic Evaluation: What's Ahead?

The former state foreign language supervisors do not hesitate to give an evaluation of what they believe the future of the position may be. Drawing upon their own past experiences, as well as having maintained an interest in developments in the field since their retirement from it, the former supervisors provide some 50 different categories: (1) Need for the Position, (2) Money Factors, (3) Factors Possibly Causing Decline, and (4) Factors Possibly Causing Growth.

Fourteen of the comments (28% of the total) fall in the first category, Need for the Position. The general tone of the comments is to the effect that there will continue to be a need for the position as the years go by, even to the extent of increasing services. A qualified, well-paid state supervisor of foreign languages is seen as necessary to act as a spokesman for the state foreign language program in the national picture, to provide state leadership from within, to aid in professional cohesion and improvement, to guide both people and institutions seeking his guidance, and to assist
the work of the individual teacher, particularly in the rural and semi-rural areas where supervisory help on a local basis is often unavailable. The comments of one respondent, from a state which presently has no state foreign language supervisor, point up the need graphically. Now teaching in one of his state's universities, he notes,

I and my colleagues have sadly noted that foreign language teaching in the state has slipped badly in recent years. Many foreign language teachers ask me often why I don't take up again my former position.

Money Factors, the second category, is discussed apart from the third and fourth categories, of which it might easily be a part, because of the importance of its role; without funds, the position will not be maintained, regardless of other factors. Six of the comments (12%) refer to the money problem. There is general agreement that the position could expand and flourish if funds were made available by Congress, but without NDEA or similar funds, the feeling is that the position will decline because of the lack of state willingness to support the position on its own. Adequate financing affects the number of staff available to perform services, and affects the variety of functions that can be performed. The problem is especially acute in smaller states where local resources are few, and a dependency on help from the state level is great. One respondent, however, does not believe that money is always a problem:

In my state the position has been vacant for two years, though money is available. The State Department of Education gives one excuse after another for the vacancy.
Factors Possibly Causing Decline, the third category, accounts for fifteen of the comments (30%), in which a wide variety of items which may contribute to a weakening of the state foreign language supervisory position and its effectiveness are shown. A paramount problem is that of the vacancies in the position nationwide. *"NDEA accomplishments which moved states ahead in foreign languages,"* one respondent remarks, *"are now being weakened if not erased where vacancies occur."* Another feels that additional federal impetus will be needed to require the position at the state level for it to be sustained—an occurrence highly unlikely given the traditional control by states over their own Departments of Education. As a corollary to the phenomenon of occurring vacancies is the trend toward *"generalist"* supervisors mentioned by several respondents, one of whom, from a state where such a movement took place, deplores the whole idea:

Teachers need and want specialist services that generalist supervisors cannot provide. Teachers cannot go it alone.

State Department of Education administrators are singled out as another reason for the decline of the position. The supervisor is handicapped if the Department of Education is not itself a strong organization. Administrators who constantly change the organization of the Department, or set up elaborate rules that inhibit more than they help, are factors against success. One respondent who had the opportunity to work closely with the Departments of Education of four states notes that all at one time had a rule that the supervisor could not visit a school unless invited. *"A supervisor should not*
have to wait to be invited," he says critically, "there is too much to do." Administrators who hire supervisors on the basis of political rather than educational qualifications are also viewed as undesirable.

The effectiveness of the state foreign language supervisor is taken to task by a number of respondents. One remarks that he feels that there has been a decline in interest in foreign language study, and maintains that the foreign language supervisor must take an active interest to encourage foreign language study in order to keep his job. Another suggests that supervisors might be more popular with more qualified individuals; a third says only top-notch people should be in the post. One former supervisor, on the job for a year, says that most supervisors are not very effective because they stay at their desks too much. (This last comment would draw forth stout remonstrance from another who states firmly, "It was not a desk job. I drove 60,000 miles and flew 10,000 in 21 months!") A lessening of effectiveness of the position is cited by one respondent as being due to a drop in personal dynamism. State supervisors, he asserts, have become entangled in expanding state bureaus, and have become less crusading in spirit as the years go on. Moreover, he continues, the state supervisors are no longer among a few knowledgeable people, so are not as necessary as sources of information.

Replies in the last category, Factors Possibly Causing Growth, take a more optimistic point of view. The fifteen comments (30%) seem to envision the further development of role facets already in
operation. The aspect of leadership in foreign language education, for example, is stressed, as opposed to the great amount of remedial work characteristic in the past. Notwithstanding, the workshop and/or conference as a successful device of the state supervisor is predicted as becoming more popular, particularly in the area of preservice and inservice education. The state foreign language supervisor is viewed as becoming more important in the consultant capacity, not only with local teachers and administrators, but in developing specialized relationships with such individuals as foreign language curriculum specialists. The supervisor, further, can be expected to build among the foreign language teachers an increased awareness of their position in the profession.

The area of coordination is mentioned by the greatest number of respondents as most important in the future. In this capacity, the function of the state supervisor will be increasingly working to achieve articulation between public schools and higher education, and to help to coordinate teacher training programs, certification procedures, and student teaching. The office of the state foreign language supervisor should become increasingly a communications center, coordinating the various foreign language elements within the state.

Conclusions

The former state foreign language supervisor, giving a candid evaluation of the job which he, in many cases initiated, cites the functions of his job as being concerned with various aspects of coordination, consultation, teacher education, curriculum, evaluation,
research, and public relations. Factors which caused him to abandon the job resulted from other job offers, a desire to continue his education, or various job drawbacks, including poor funding of the position and disturbing political influences. His evaluation of the position's future prospects establish a need for the position, although the certainty of adequate funds being available to do so is questionable. Factors are indicated which show trends that could cause either a decline or growth in the strength of the position, depending upon where future emphasis lies on the part of State Departments of Education and the state supervisor himself. One respondent's summary statement seems to reflect the general feeling of many, in spite of adverse comments advanced at various points in the discussion, as she writes, "It was a rewarding and worthwhile job."
CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions

In order to establish conclusions concerning the role of the state foreign language supervisor, it will be well to recall the objectives of this study as stated in Chapter I. It has been the primary purpose of this dissertation to identify and define the present role of the state foreign language supervisor as a means of giving coherence to that role, both intra-state and nationally. Additionally, the investigation undertaken to determine that role has yielded expected information to be applied to the five broad areas of concern delineated as part of the discussion on objectives. It will, then, be appropriate to examine conclusions pursuant to the primary objective and the five areas of concern individually.

Conclusion One: The Present Role of the State Foreign Language Supervisor

The present role of the state foreign language supervisor is composed of three frequently overlapping facets, dealing with functions on the state-wide level, on the local level, and on the national level. At the state-wide level, the state foreign language supervisor sees himself primarily as a consultant, then as coordinator. His immediate superior also emphasizes the consultant aspect, but, in addition, lays stress on the supervisor's functions as a leader in foreign language education within his state. The former state
supervisors include both the consultant and leadership aspects of
the role in their comments, but tend to underscore the area of co-
ordination as the one receiving the greatest emphasis during their
personal tenure on the job. Further, the state-wide functions are
seen to include work in the areas of teacher education, curriculum,
materials, research, and evaluation. A variety of other miscella-
neous services are also performed by the state supervisor.

Functions on the local level are described in two major areas:
work with the individual teacher and the local supervisor, and work
with administrators and college/university personnel. The chief
aspect of the former is of a consultative nature; to the latter, in
addition, is added the important role of liaison agent.

National functions are generally of two types. On the one hand,
the supervisor handles the work dealing with implementation of
federal legislation such as NDEA, ESEA and EPDA. On the other hand,
the supervisor maintains a number of interstate connections of a
cooperative or consultative nature, as well as through his national
organization, the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign
Languages.

The state foreign language supervisor is, then, an individual
who is active in the stimulus, implementation, and evaluation of
quality programs in foreign language education on the local, state-
wide, and national levels.

**Conclusion Two: The Relevance and Value of Continuing the Foreign
Language Supervisor's Position at the State Level**

On the basis of the information received from respondents as
detailed in the discussion in Chapters II through VII, it is concluded that continuing the foreign language supervisor's position at the state level is both relevant and of value. On the national level he is the knowledgeable individual in his state to deal with federal programs in foreign languages, and is the one who coordinates interstate programs and communication in foreign language education. Within his state, both on the state and local levels, the state foreign language supervisor performs highly specialized services of a leadership, consultative, and coordinative nature not easily administered by short-term consultants or "generalist" supervisors. His training and experience alone give the supervisor a distinct advantage over the generalist, and if any sense of continuity or articulation in programs within the state is to be achieved, they must be guided by an individual on a full-time basis, something the guest consultant, however well qualified otherwise, simply does not have the time to do. While one might expect the supervisor himself to point out these factors, and he does, both the immediate superior group and the former supervisor group indicate, repeatedly, the same ideas. Moreover, if more proof were needed, one could come to the same conclusion by indirection, merely by analyzing the job descriptions of the state foreign language supervisor as provided by the three groups; the functions performed by the foreign language supervisor are so diverse and so many that only a highly skilled individual trained in foreign language education could perform them competently.

Further substantiating the tenets of the conclusion is the fact
that, according to the state supervisors themselves (persons likely to be sensitive to any threat to their jobs), 87% of the states and territories represented among the respondents regard the position as necessary. Of the same group, 70% believe the position has considerable prestige and influence within the state. The job is seen by the immediate superior, for a more objective viewpoint, as having contributed significantly to the state's foreign language education by 91% of respondents where the state supervisor is active, and 100% of the respondents where the position is vacant! Former state supervisors (28%), besides, volunteer comments about the need for the continuance of the position.

In large areas of the United States where there are no local foreign language supervisors, the state foreign language supervisor is the only individual of his kind to whom the teacher can turn for aid. If a position becomes vacant, the teacher is left to "go it alone", and the level of excellence in the foreign language programs often slips lower. State administrators who, for one reason or another, allow the position to go unfilled, must accept a large share of the blame for lack of quality within the area of foreign languages, and the erosion of the structure built by the efforts of the former supervisor while on the job. It is probably not an exaggeration, however, to suppose that such state administrators are likely to care very little one way or the other unless for some reason a spotlight on their foreign language programs results in unfavorable publicity such as came after Sputnik in 1958. If the position is to be continued generally, it must, therefore, be concluded that the job
of the profession of foreign language educators to urge support of the position's continuance for higher quality programs.

Conclusion Three: Practices or Policies Which Appear to Work Well

A number of practices or policies indicated by respondents in the preceding discussion appear to work well. Some are more widely implemented than others; they are presented here so that those not using them may consider them for their own states.

First would appear to be the hiring of well qualified individuals for the position of state foreign language supervisor. The present group of supervisors as a whole, all factors considered, seem to be well prepared on the basis of education and experience, and show a continuing interest in self-improvement through travel, writing, and the support of professional organizations.

Secondly, the state foreign language supervisor has evinced success in the wide variety of services performed, as already considered with the discussion of role description. Most important of these services seem to be consultative, with emphasis on visitation of teachers and administrators, and the coordinative efforts involving college/university personnel. It has apparently worked well to have the foreign language supervisor as the individual in charge of the federally funded programs for his state; many of the supervisors have been successful in obtaining federal funds for desired programs.

Thirdly, the position appears to be most solidly established in those states which provide 100% of the funds for the position. This appears to be true because the supervisor in such states does not
have to worry what will happen to his position when federal funds expire. Further, those states which support the position entirely with state funds give evidence of recognizing the position's importance and a willingness to continue its support. In the case where the position is established wholly or in part with federal funds, it would seem advisable to decide at the position's inception how it will be maintained if federal funds are cut off, in order to ensure program continuity.

Fourthly, an area which has not as yet been greatly explored is that of cooperative efforts among state supervisors of foreign languages. Successful ventures like the recent exchange for a month between the supervisors of Minnesota and Delaware might be attempted. The National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages, already active in this area of interstate cooperation, might wish to help foster more projects of a regional or national nature.

Conclusion Four: Deficiencies Presently Existing in State Foreign Language Supervision

The overriding deficiency in present-day state foreign language supervision is the problem of existing and occurring vacancies in the position. Of the present eleven vacancies among the states, only three appear likely to be filled, and another, a twelfth vacancy, is promised in the near future with the retirement of the supervisor. The reasons given for vacancies are monetary—expiration of federal funds and/or budget cutting by state administrators—and an announced trend toward the hiring of "generalist" supervisors among the states. In those states with no state foreign language supervisor, the
leadership characteristic of states with a supervisor is lacking, and the foreign language program tends to fall into disarray.

Another deficiency presently existing is the relatively high turnover in the position, attributable in large measure to the following four factors:

1. Salary. The wide range of the salary scale nationwide is too great. Starting salaries begin below $8,000 and extend to between $16,000 and $18,000; maximum salaries range from between $8,000 and $10,000 to $18,000 or above—in both cases the gap between the one end and the other seems to be inordinate. Presently an almost equal number of state foreign language supervisors earn less than $10,000 as earn over $14,000. Supervisors on the job, however, do not cite salary as a major reason for their contemplation of leaving the job, although it is certainly a consideration. Roughly one-quarter of the former supervisors cite low salary as a reason for having left the job.

2. Travel allowance schedules. The schedules by which state supervisors are reimbursed for travel, food, and lodging as part of their job seem to vary widely and to be unnecessarily complicated. Because these schedules apply to all state personnel, however, the task to attempt to simplify them or make them more equitable, given the cumbersome machinery of state legislatures, seems to lie well beyond the sphere of influence of the state supervisor. Moreover, there is frequent reference on the part of both active and former supervisors to the difficulty in obtaining necessary permission and funds to attend meetings, conferences and the like, particularly out-
of-state. In order to strengthen cooperation and coordination among the states, more time and money for travel are needed to allow supervisors an opportunity to participate in programs and exchange ideas.

3. Administration. Both active and former supervisors point to administrative problems. The general tone of complaint is of not having enough freedom to develop his role as the supervisor would like, having to contend with too many directives and too much "red-tape". Further, in some states the specter of the administrator who plays politics is also a factor which detracts from job effectiveness. It should be pointed out, however, that administrative restraints are mentioned by only about one-third of the present supervisors and about one-fourth of the former supervisors, so that the others apparently do not consider them strong enough to be a major factor.

4. Overwork. The state foreign language supervisor is a very busy individual—often too busy to accomplish all that he needs or wants to. Besides the stack of paperwork to be done, requests and calls constantly pour in for help from individuals and agencies all over the state. In establishing priorities, some matters must be delayed or omitted. Often the addition of clerical and/or para-professional staff would free the supervisor to take care of matters which he alone is qualified to handle. The fact that 34% of the present supervisors spend 20% or less of their time in classroom visitation and teacher consultation is evidence of the pressure of responsibilities.
Conclusion Five: Services of the State Foreign Language Supervisor
Which May Be Utilized by the Local Supervisor and Teacher

The work of the state foreign language supervisor with the local foreign language supervisor and individual teacher has been discussed in some detail in Chapter IV; consequently, it will suffice to give a general resume of those services at this point. The state foreign language supervisor provides services in the area of teacher education, including classroom visitation, in-service programs, and workshops; he is responsible for the dissemination of information and materials to the local level; and alerts teachers, local supervisors and administrators to opportunities for teachers which arise. Additionally, the supervisor is often engaged in some phase of program evaluation. The state foreign language supervisor is usually the single source of foreign language consultation for teachers in areas where there is no local foreign language supervisor.

Conclusion Six: Services of the State Foreign Language Supervisor Which Appear Necessary for an Effective Program in the Event of Vacancy

In those states where the position of state foreign language supervisor has become vacant, by and large the foreign language program is left, like Topsy, to "just grow". State administrative matters are handled by generalist supervisors in some cases, other generalists provide information on such matters as the effective use of media, but that appears to be the extent of state help. As a number of respondents comment, the universities of the state are too occupied with running their own programs to have any time left over to devote to helping the public schools. Consequently, it seems advisable and
appropriate to identify those services which the state foreign language supervisor would ordinarily perform that should be continued in order to ensure an effective program in foreign language education state-wide.

An examination of the total role of the state foreign language supervisor indicates the following areas of service which seem to be necessary:

1. Consultative services. The major aspect of the state supervisor's role presently, such services need to be maintained to the teacher, the local supervisor, the administrator and college/university personnel. Of these the teacher is the most important.

2. Coordination. An effort should be maintained to coordinate the work of the various state foreign language personnel and organizations. Liaison should be maintained between the public schools and higher education in the interest of better articulation.

3. Teacher education. Workshops and in-service programs sponsored by qualified personnel should be held on a regular basis to ascertain that teachers will be kept informed on latest methodology. Some qualified agency or individual should be responsible for the publication of the state foreign language newsletter in order to keep the state's teachers informed of late research, recent developments, and pertinent information concerning meetings and materials.

4. Curriculum, Materials and Research. Qualified individuals will be needed by school systems to help in the development of current guides in foreign language education. Someone qualified must help to develop, select, demonstrate, and distribute materials as
needed. Some knowledgeable person should direct data gathering and related informal research activities in foreign languages and compile needed statistics.

5. Evaluation. Qualified personnel should be secured to evaluate current programs in foreign languages within the states for remedial purposes. Additional qualified personnel should be available to assay the merits of proposed programs involving the use of federal monies.

It appears self-evident that the dispersal of so many services would result in monumental inefficiency, with one individual, working on his own, entirely uninformed of what someone else may be doing in the performance of a related service. What happens, of course, is that almost none of the services are, in fact, performed without the state foreign language supervisor, and ipso facto the state's foreign language program is no longer as effective.

Recommendations

The recommendations which follow grow out of the conclusions, and seem to the writer to be relevant in the light of the foregoing discussion. It is understood, of course, that implementation of the recommendations is a matter dependent upon many factors, but most often, the attitude of state legislatures and administrators within the State Department of Education. It may be, notwithstanding, that influential individuals, or active groups such as NCSSFL, perhaps can use some or all of the recommendations as the basis for future positive action in order to strengthen the status of the position
nationwide. Accordingly, the following recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. The position of state foreign language supervisor should be retained in those states where the position is currently active, and re-established in those states where it is vacant.

2. Only well-qualified individuals should fill the position. The supervisors themselves have established qualification guidelines which may be used by prospective state employers. (See Chapter I, footnote 2).

3. The position of state foreign language supervisor should be funded, desirably, entirely by the state. Where it is necessary to use federal funds, plans should be made at the outset for the state to assume the funding of the position when federal funds expire.

4. A more equitable pay scale should be developed and implemented, probably no less than $10,000 to start. The state foreign language supervisory position demands a highly qualified individual; he should be paid accordingly. Ideally, guidelines for such a pay scale should be worked out by the supervisors themselves, possibly through the aegis of NCSSFL.

5. Reasonable and uncomplicated guidelines for travel-food-lodging allowances should be developed, again, preferably by the supervisors themselves, since they are the ones most directly involved. Using the forum of NCSSFL as the base of operation, such allowances as devised could be recommended to states for adoption. Members could then, in turn, give it an additional push in their home states. Additionally, fewer restrictions on travel would be a boost to be
able to accomplish more over long distances.

6. Adequate help, in the form of clerical or para-professional staff, should be available to the supervisor in order to free him from routine jobs and allow him to devote his attention to the tasks requiring his special expertise. Some states, in addition to providing such help, have even hired more than one foreign language supervisor; where the need is great and funds permit, additional supervisory personnel may be deemed advisable.

7. The position of state foreign language supervisor should not, under any circumstances, be made a political ploy. It should be given special professional status, similar to civil service, outside political control.

8. The U. S. Office of Education should consider the creation of a national coordinator for the activities of the state foreign language supervisors, or help to fund an Executive Secretary position for NCSSFL who could work at coordination full-time.

9. It is recommended that further research be undertaken in the following two areas:

a. The role of the "generalist" supervisor as contrasted to that of the "specialist" supervisor at the state level. There is presently a wide diversity among the states on the kinds of state supervisors and the means of funding these positions. An investigation is needed to determine the role of other types of state supervisors and the need for them. Can, say, the teacher of mathematics function independently and well without services of the nature provided by the state foreign language supervisor to foreign language
b. The effect of vacancy of the position of state foreign language supervisor on the quality of the foreign language program within that state, as compared to those states where the position is active.

Implications

The foregoing discussion lends itself to some interpretations and suggests some implications, are not necessarily based directly on the collected data. These implications have occurred to the writer in the course of the investigation, from the vantage point of the outsider, and reflect not only the data involved, but information derived through informal conversation and correspondence as well. In this respect, two principal areas of interest manifest themselves: (1) the impact of the state supervisor of foreign languages to date, and (2) the optimal role of the state foreign language supervisor.

The impact that the state foreign language supervisors have had in the field of foreign language education is not always easily discerned, because of the multitude of changes generally in foreign language education during the past decade, and because of the federal legislation which made programs possible that otherwise probably would not have developed so rapidly; indeed, the very position of state supervisor in most states owes its existence to the impetus provided by NDEA money. Yet, in looking back over what the state supervisors have done—and are doing—the salient feature is the fact
that the state foreign language supervisor, more than any one other individual in his state, has been providing direction. This is not to say that he has been a trail-blazer in the development of new methodology necessarily, but he has been rather the individual who has been able to perceive the latest in trends and ideas, to synthesize the best of these, and to pass these ideas on in practical form to the teachers in his state.

The early years of state foreign language supervision, necessarily devoted as they were to tasks of organization of the state's foreign language program, and to developing the role identity of the state supervisor's job, did not produce an immediate major impact on the teaching field. Nonetheless, as the years went by and the state foreign language supervisor had familiarized himself with the problems in his state, he began to act to upgrade foreign language programs in his state.

The success of the state foreign language supervisor at work can be evaluated in two ways: (1) tangible results, such as in the increase in the number of teachers, classes, and course offerings in foreign languages, the number of curriculum guides developed, workshops held, materials disseminated, and publications prepared; and (2) intangible results, dealing with inter-personal relationships, teacher satisfactions, leadership and "selling" activities, and evidence of cooperation with the profession at large, especially in his home state.

Applying these two criteria to the record of the state foreign language supervisors so far, one can see that much has been
accomplished in both areas. The tangible accomplishments are the more obvious, and in the case of most of the states where a state foreign language supervisory program has been in effect on a continuous basis for a number of years, the record is impressive; foreign language education has grown and flourished as never before.

The intangible results are not readily measured, but will frequently show up as part of the tangible results. The personality of the state supervisor is probably one of the most important factors contributing to the area of intangible results, and obviously some supervisors have been possessed with a more persuasive or pleasing personality than others, but almost all have been sincere in their efforts to improve foreign language education within their states.

Although the success of the individual supervisor may depend largely on his own abilities to discern the problems and attack them, there is another important element to the supervisor's success which cannot be ignored: time. No supervisor, regardless of personal abilities, can expect to effect changes immediately, and for this reason, those supervisors in any one state who have been on the job for more than three years are the ones who are likely to be able to point to the most successes. The reason appears obvious: the supervisor on the job for one or two years will have his hands full simply in orienting himself to the state's needs, special problems, and traditions. The supervisor must meet hundreds of people and learn how best to use their abilities in his efforts to improve the state's foreign language program. In those states where the state supervisor
is on the job a year or two before being replaced by another for a similar period of time, there is not time for a sense of continuity to develop nor a chance to bring special projects to fruition. The career supervisor is the one who, ultimately, will do the most for his state's foreign language program.

The impact, then, of the state foreign language supervisor over the previous decade has been considerable, on the whole. Some states, because of more favorable conditions than others, have seen the greatest benefits from the position's establishment. This is especially true of those states which have had the same supervisor incumbent for more than three years. In those states where the position was filled for a period of time and then vacated, the impact of the state supervisor has been considerably less, and of course, the longer the position has been vacant, the more diluted by time have been any achievements of the supervisor while he was in office.

Even though the impact of the state foreign language supervisor has been considerable over the past decade, it is possible that his future impact may be even greater if his role can be developed to optimal performance. What, after all, should be the role of the state foreign language supervisor? Is the role as it has been developed thus far a sound one? Are changes needed?

In order to discuss points raised by these questions, it is necessary first to remark that such a discussion relates to role performance under the best conditions: this necessarily precludes problems external to role implementation, such as administrative interference, over which the supervisor himself will have no control. No
A supervisor will ever be able to perform his job to optimal advantage if he is prevented from doing so by outside factors.

A consideration of the supervisory role developed completely would probably best begin with a look at the professional preparation of the supervisors themselves. While most state supervisors on the job are very capable individuals, it is also true that many came to their positions without prior supervisory experience, so that a period of adjustment was necessary for them to explore what it is that a supervisor does. If the supervisor can have the opportunity to supervise first on a local level, he will have some insight already into the kinds of responsibilities that are peculiar to the supervisory position. Additionally, because of the great amount of work with pre-service and in-service teachers, it would seem advisable to have special training in the areas of teacher education and curriculum development. The supervisor should also be someone who deals easily with many people, and one who can speak well to groups as the occasion demands.

In the implementation of the supervisory role itself, some new directions or new emphases may be developed. The role of the state foreign language supervisor as it has emerged over the past decade is, for the most part, sound. Yet this same role is so diversified and demands so much of the individual, that he cannot possibly do everything that is asked of him or all that he wants to do. Many of the state supervisors complain of overwork, of too much travel, or of failing to get results in proportion to the amount of time invested. What can be done? It would appear that the state foreign
language supervisor should stress the "state" functions of his role, particularly if he is located in a large or populous state.

Stressing "state" functions means emphasizing the factors over which the supervisor, as a member of the State Department of Education, is best able to effect some control. A good example is in the area of teacher education. It is the state which sets up requirements for certification of its teachers; if, in the area of foreign language teacher certification the state supervisor believes that his state's program will be upgraded by revising the regulations for certification, he can best spend his time working to that end, thus ensuring certain minimum standards among his state's teachers before they enter the classrooms. Further, he can work with colleges and universities in the establishment or revision of requirements for receiving a degree in foreign language education from that institution. Proficiency tests for teachers, such as those developed by the Modern Language Association,\(^\#\) might be instituted at either the university or state levels, or both. Thus it is that the state foreign language supervisor can be conscious always of upgrading the quality of his state's foreign language program, in addition to increasing the number of offerings.

The role of stimulator at the state level can be further developed. This means, much as is being tried now in Texas, that the

state supervisor can attempt to stimulate the development of adequate consultant and supervisory services on a local level throughout the state, taking advantage of materials, centers, and personnel which may be available. The state supervisor—except in the case of some of the very small states—can hardly hope to do an adequate job with any one teacher on a continuous basis simply because of the great numbers of teachers involved. Yet a state supervisor could do an effective job on a continuous basis if he were dealing on the local level exclusively with the local supervisor. His visits to classrooms, as a result, would become many fewer in number, thus freeing him for other duties. In those areas where the establishment of a local supervisor is not practicable or possible for some reason, the state supervisor might explore new methods of supervision other than time-consuming travel to visit teachers personally. Such a new method, for example, has been advanced only recently by Dr. Lila C. Murphy, state supervisor of Home Economics in New Hampshire. Dr. Murphy tried, on an experimental basis, supervision by telephone. After an initial visit by the state supervisor to meet the teacher and become acquainted with the area, the teacher requesting help sent an audio-tape of any class selected by her to Dr. Murphy for her evaluation and comment. Dr. Murphy, then, as she could, listened to the tape, made notes, and telephoned comments to the teacher. Results of the experiment showed that the teachers felt less threatened by using the tape-telephone method than by a personal visit, and that the method was valuable in stimulating self-evaluation on the part of the teachers. Teachers found the method acceptable,
efficient, and effective.\footnote{Lila C. Murphy, "The Feasibility of Audiotape-Telephone Supervision of High School Teachers", unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1969.}

In addition to stimulating the development of local supervision, the state foreign language supervisor can move in the direction of consultant-coordinator at the state level more exclusively. This means that the state supervisor can work to develop working relationships among the various levels of foreign language education within the state, in order to encourage reciprocal consultations among the levels for more effectively coordinated programs.

The effective state foreign language supervisor appears to be the one who can pick out the problems which ultimately will be of most significance to his state's foreign language program in order to deal with them first. The effective supervisor manages to avoid getting bogged down in time-consuming detail of a minor nature; he learns to delegate and relegate responsibility in order to pursue the more important tasks. He is an organizer, a stimulator, a leader, and an achiever.

**A Closing Remark**

One cannot undertake the study of such a position as that of the state foreign language supervisor without ultimately being impressed by the scope of its service, and the dedication of the individuals who presently fill that position. This writer is convinced of the merits of continuing and expanding the functions of the state
foreign language supervisor; whether such will be the case in the future remains to be seen. It is not without justification, however, to say that the cause of foreign language education in the United States during the past decade, 1959-1969, owes no small measure of its success to the state foreign language supervisors, who have helped to develop guidelines in unfamiliar areas, and who, by their efforts, have helped to lay the foundations for excellence.
APPENDIX A

STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR SURVEY

Section A.

1. In what year was your position established?

2. How many years have you been a state supervisor (co-ordinator)?

3. Do you presently plan to make state foreign language supervision your life's work?

4. What factors might impel you to leave your present position?

5. How many predecessors have you had?

6. If you can supply the names and addresses of those for the last decade (where applicable), I should like to contact them.

7. Did you teach foreign languages prior to becoming a state supervisor?

8. If so, please indicate subjects taught, levels, and number of years.

9. Were you a foreign language supervisor on a local level prior to becoming a state supervisor?
Section A—continued

10. If so, which level, and for how many years?

11. Please list the college degrees you hold.

12. Which foreign languages do you speak?

13. Which foreign language, in addition, do you read?

14. Have you studied or lived abroad?

15. If so, in which countries and for how long?

16. To which professional organizations do you belong? (Initials sufficient if a national organization. Please mention any office held).

17. Have you published any books or articles, or prepared any commercially distributed materials (e.g., tapes, slides), dealing with foreign languages or education?

18. If so, please list.
Section A.-continued

19. In which division of the state Department of Education do you work?

20. Who is in charge of this division? (Only title of the office needed).

21. In the list provided, please place "S" to indicate the starting salary for your position, "P" to indicate your present salary, and "M" to indicate maximum salary for your position.

   A. _____ $ 8,000 or below
   B. _____ $ 8,000 - $10,000
   C. _____ $10,000 - $12,000
   D. _____ $12,000 - $14,000
   E. _____ $14,000 - $16,000
   F. _____ $16,000 - $18,000
   G. _____ $18,000 or above

22. How much are you reimbursed (per mile) for driving your own private automobile within your state?

23. How much are you reimbursed for food, lodging, and other travel expenses (e.g., a per diem rate or actual cost)?

Section B.

1. Approximately what percent of the funds to maintain your position come from the state?

2. In what capacity do you serve your state foreign language program?

3. In your state foreign language program are there objectives defined according to grade level designation?
Section B.—continued

4. Do you help in the development of new curriculum guides and/or the revision of old ones? Please specify which.

5. What contact with the state government (other than the Department of Education) do you have?

6. Do you believe that your position has considerable prestige within your state?

7. Do you believe that your position has considerable influence within your state (academically)?

8. Do you feel that your position is viewed as a necessary one by the state Department of Education?

9. Do you find any opposition to the continuance of the position of a state foreign language supervisor in your state?

10. If so, from what sources?

11. Please describe any other functions which you perform within your state as a whole.

Section C.

1. Do you hold periodic conferences with foreign language supervisors at the local level?
Section C.—continued

2. What percentage of your time do you spend visiting language class-rooms?

3. How and for what purpose do you evaluate teacher performance?

4. What specific services does your office provide for the local foreign language supervisor and the individual language teacher?

5. In areas where there is no local foreign language supervisor, who initiates the request for your help?

6. In areas where there is a local supervisor, what contact do you have with the foreign language teacher?

7. What contact do you have with school administrators?

8. What contact do you have with university or college teaching personnel?

9. Do you hold regularly scheduled workshops for foreign language teachers in your state?

10. If so, how many, how often, and where?
Section C.—continued

11. Do you hold workshops for guidance personnel, curriculum directors, and school administrators? Please explain.

Section D.

1. Are you engaged in any foreign language coordination or project with another state or states? Please specify.

2. With which out-of-state organizations have you been asked to participate as a consultant?

3. Are you able to accept short term appointments (i.e., summer) in colleges or universities, or other agencies (e.g., U.S.O.E.)?

4. Have you done so? Please explain.

5. To what extent do you control expenditures of funds for acquisition?

6. Under what Acts have you received federal monies for foreign language programs in your state?

7. Under what Acts do you expect to receive money?
Section D—continued

8. Do you envision the NCSSFL as a major influence nationally within the next decade? Why (not)?

9. Please give any comments you may care to on your conception of the role of the state foreign language supervisor.

If you have a personal vita sheet on hand for reference purposes or publicity release, will you enclose it, please? And once again, THANK YOU!
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE (TO THE IMMEDIATE SUPERIOR)

1. Have you found that the position of the state foreign language supervisor has contributed significantly to foreign language education in your state? Please explain.

2. Do you envision that the position will be maintained on a continuing basis? If not, please explain.

3. What do you as the superior to your state's foreign language supervisor envision his/her job to be? (Please do not consult with him/her to arrive at your answer).

4. What subject areas or grade-levels have a state supervisor in your state, besides foreign languages? Please enclose an "S" in parentheses after those supervisory positions which are funded wholly by the state; an "F", for those funded wholly by the federal government; and "S___%", "F___%", with approximate percentage of support for those jointly supported.

5. Please feel free to make any additional comments.
APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF FORMER STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS

1. In which state were you a state foreign language supervisor (co-ordinator)?

2. During which years?

3. What factors caused you to leave that position?

4. Would you please list briefly what you consider to be the chief functions of your job during the time you were a state foreign language supervisor (co-ordinator).

5. What do you see as the future for foreign language supervision at the state level?

6. Please add any additional comments you may care to, and THANK YOU VERY MUCH!
APPENDIX D
STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR ORGANIZATIONAL MEMBERSHIP

I. National Modern Language Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. American Association of Teachers of French</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. American Association of Teachers of German</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. American Association of Teachers of Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. American Dialect Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. American Name Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Chinese Language Teachers Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Modern Language Association</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. National Association of Language Lab Directors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. National Council of Teachers of English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Spanish Honor Society</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. National Modern Language Associations - continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Regional Modern Language Associations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Central States Modern Language Teachers Association</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greater Washington Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. New England Foreign Language Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. North East Conference on the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pacific Northwest Conference on Foreign Language Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. South Atlantic Modern Language Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Southwest Council on Bilingual Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. State Modern Language Associations

Membership in the following organizations is one each, except for two in the Illinois organization.

1. Alabama Association of Foreign Language Teachers
2. Arkansas Foreign Language Association
3. Colorado Congress of Foreign Language Teachers
4. Connecticut Council of Language Teachers
5. Georgia Modern Foreign Language Association
6. Idaho Foreign Language Teachers' Association
7. Illinois Foreign Language Teachers' Association
8. Indiana Foreign Language Teachers' Association
9. Kansas Foreign Language Association
10. Maryland Foreign Language Association
11. Massachusetts Foreign Language Association
12. Michigan Foreign Language Association
### III. State Modern Language Associations - continued

13. Minnesota Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages
14. Mississippi Modern Language Association
15. Foreign Language Association of Missouri
16. Montana Modern Language Teachers Association
17. Nebraska Modern Foreign Language Teachers Association
18. Nevada State Foreign Language Teachers' Association
19. New Hampshire Association for the Teaching of Foreign Languages
20. New Jersey Foreign Language Teachers Association
21. New Mexico Foreign Language Teachers Association
22. Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association
23. Oklahoma Foreign Language Teachers' Association
24. Pennsylvania Modern Foreign Language Association
25. Rhode Island Foreign Language Association
26. Texas Foreign Language Association
27. Modern Foreign Language Association of Virginia

### IV. National Educational Organizations, Non-Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. American Association of University Professors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. National Education Association</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. State Educational Organizations, Non-Language

Membership in the following organizations is one each.

1. Alabama Division of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction
2. Arkansas Education Association
3. Connecticut Education Association
4. Illinois Education Association
5. Indiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
6. Indiana State Teachers Association
7. Kansas Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
8. Kansas State Teachers Association
9. Kentucky Education Association
10. Massachusetts Teachers Association
11. Mississippi Education Association
12. Montana Education Association
V. State Educational Organizations, Non-Language – continued

13. Nebraska Education Association
14. New Jersey Education Association
15. New Mexico Education Association
16. Oklahoma Education Association
17. Pennsylvania State Education Association
18. Texas State Teachers Association
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