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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Instructional supervision as a functional entity operating within the parameters of the school setting has been the subject of seemingly opposing definitions. Numerous reports, speeches, journal articles, as well as textbooks and survey studies generally support the assumption that instructional supervision could be defined as an emergent function within the school. Mosher and Purpel have indicated that despite the abundance of definitions, many educators are somewhat confused and/or ambivalent as to the purposes of instructional supervision as well as about their feelings about it.

Esposito and Burback attempted to explain one probable cause for this apparent prevailing dysfunction associated with attempts to define supervision:

... the major factor ... has been a lack of in-depth study into the nature of the supervisory role. Prominent writers in the field (Harris, Purpel, Mosher, Frymier, Wilhelms) have stated that there is a lack of research on the supervisor and supervisory programs and practices in education. Furthermore, research contributions to the area have come from the field of group dynamics, not from those directly concerned with supervision.

Harris has declared that the paucity of research related to supervisory behavior could be the result of (1) the relatively small numbers of supervisors of any typology in any given school district; (2) the
inability to specify precise and universal role functions of instructional supervisors of varied geographical and situational diversity; and (3) the nature of professional privacy which often inhibits free access to some of those charged with supervisory responsibilities.

An expanded and enhanced analysis of the expectations for the tasks and orientations of instructional supervision could provide a more foundational premise for the field in the face of much apparent uncertainty. As public school systems within the larger population areas, especially, face the tumultuous challenge for instructional maintenance and change, including demands for relevance and accountability, research focused upon supervision tasks and orientations could enlighten efforts to create more viable supervisory programs. Frymier embraced this theme when he noted that more detailed, in-depth study into the practices of supervisory functions may assist concerned educators in improving the status of instructional supervision as an ongoing effort.

Prescriptive statements telling supervisors what they ought to do have been readily available. Descriptive statements about what supervisors actually do have been in short supply. There has been nothing in the area of supervision comparable to the descriptions of teaching or descriptions of administering which have helped us understand the nature of supervision with the depth of insight and with the precise awareness that has moved us to the verge of a "breakthrough" in our understanding of these other fields.

Concerns similar to those which have been expressed here served as the initial catalyst for the conceptualization of this investigation.

Purpose of the Study

This investigation was an attempt to examine the task expectations for the role of the instructional supervisor working at the elementary school level as expressed by selected groups of (elementary) teachers
and supervisors. In order to provide a tenable parameter for the tasks of supervision within a behavioral framework, deployment of the Harris categorizations was made. Specific focus for this study was geared to analyses of the following: (1) to determine whether disagreement existed among sub-groupings of elementary teachers and supervisors in relation to their respective task expectations for the supervisor role; (2) to ascertain the nature of the views which elementary teachers and supervisors maintained for the supervisor role; and (3) to establish the nature by which these supervisory tasks should be actualized (orientations).

The investigation also attempted to determine whether a significant disagreement existed within subgroupings of elementary teachers and supervisors as to the task expectations for the supervisor role. In order to address the latter objective of the study, several factors related to the personnel status of each of the two subgroupings were used in the analyses of the data.

A. Supervisors: general and special area supervisors; supervisors with and without administrative experience; and supervisors with different levels of academic preparation.

B. Teachers: primary (K-3) as opposed to intermediate (4-6) elementary teachers; new and experienced teachers; and teachers with different levels of academic preparation.

These personnel differentiations within the two subgroupings of the sample enhanced the interpretations of and generalizations from these data which were collected.

Another purpose of this study was to conduct an operational replicative investigation employing the instrument as developed by Cardenas and used in his earlier study. The instrument consisted of a series of eight vignettes, followed by five responses to be ordered according to preference, and were used to ascertain the task expectations by the
Cardenas developed this semi-projective instrument on which each respondent was presented a problem situation, and action performed toward the solution of the problem could be evaluated. The finalized instrument consisted of eight vignettes related to supervision, each one followed by five definite responses which a supervisor could perform.

The actions listed in the choices for each vignette relate to four different tasks of supervision. In arranging the choices in order of importance, the testee automatically indicates the relative importance which he gives to the four areas listed.

The fifth choice in each vignette is matched with another choice representing the same task in the orientation represented. In arranging them in order of importance the testee indicates his preference between two opposed orientations.

While Cardenas postulated two main hypotheses, along with ten minor ones (detailed discussion in Chapter II, Part III), "the disparity of viewpoints toward the supervisor position found in the review of the literature could not be verified in this study."

However, "enough disagreement was identified to prevent the acceptance of the opposing viewpoint that disagreement does not exist," as indicated by the disparity of variance between subgroupings of the subjects according to the tasks and orientations involved. This observation of the degree of disagreement was supported by comparing the ranking of the tasks and the amount of consensus for the tasks of supervision. Cardenas recorded that the data tended to support the idea that teachers, administrators and supervisors were more in agreement as to what was not, rather than in agreement as to what should be, the tasks of supervisors.

One implication from the Cardenas study tends to be in agreement with similar observations as realized from the research activities by
The observation has been made that in studies in which teachers, administrators, and supervisors order responses according to preference, concerning supervisory functions a continuum often develops with less significant agreement between teachers and supervisors leaving administrators to occupy the middle category.

Due to this apparent continuum, the current investigation was focused toward elementary teachers and supervisors. This more limited research focus was selected in order to analyze the expectations for the elementary supervisor role in more detail. As indicated by the research questions for this study, there is an assumption that the examination of supervisory task expectations at this organizational level should enhance the knowledge base about supervision in relation to elementary education.

**Framework for the Study**

Instructional supervision was conceptualized in this investigation as an instruction-related function of the school. In agreement with Harris, this definition tended to be oriented toward the achievement of goals (tasks), the use of the related processes (activities), along with the proper requisites (competencies) as needed by those individuals charged with supervisory leadership responsibilities.

This reflects a very simple rationale, namely if instructional supervision services are to influence teaching, certain instruction-related tasks must be accomplished as a result of certain supervision activities, implemented by competent people--instructional leaders.

Kaufman has noted that supervision tasks should be expressed in operational terms which reflect other predominantly instruction-related tasks in specific important areas. In order to conduct this study, the Harris categorization of tasks of supervision were used, since these
tasks have been projected in behavioral terms. In agreement with the Cardenas study,

The duties of supervisors are identified in this study as the tasks of supervision, and factors determining the ways in which these duties may be performed are identified as supervisory orientations.

The following tasks of instructional supervision provided the framework for this investigation. A more detailed examination of these task areas was presented in Chapter III:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arranging for In-Service Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relating Special Pupil Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Developing Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orientations of Instructional Supervision

Cardenas observed that the apparent diversity in the literature as to viewpoints concerned with supervisory tasks could also be a manifestation of the varied manner in which these tasks are performed.

A lack of consensus as to the nature of supervision can also lead to misunderstandings between personnel in education. Four pairs of conflicting viewpoints on supervision which determine the ways in which tasks are performed have been selected for study. These viewpoints are cited in the literature on supervision as causes of problems.

The following four pairs of opposing orientations of supervision reflected what Cardenas has recorded as the main four methods of supervisory (task) functioning.

1-A **Tractive supervision**: "Certain supervisory endeavors geared to continuity are those that are intended simply
to maintain the existing level of instruction, to ac­cept only minor changes in program, to enforce or sup­port existing relationships, and to resist pressures for change."\(^{24}\)

1-B **Dynamic supervision:** "Supervisory endeavors that are directed toward changing instructional practices may be thought of as dynamic. Here the emphasis is on discontinuity, the disruption of existing practices, and the substantiation of others."\(^{25}\)

2-A **Subject-centered supervision:** This orientation is fo­cused on the improvement of the instructional program of the school by assisting teachers in better comprehending the particular subject matter which is being instructed.

2-B **Methods-centered supervision:** This orientation is fo­cused on the improvement of the instructional program of the school through increased teacher comprehension and use of instructional methodology and strategies.\(^{26}\)

3-A **Permissive supervision:** "Supervision is viewed as a program in which the teacher can make significant contributions to the improvement of instruction. Teacher activity plays a dominant role; the supervisor plays a minor role, restricted to providing leadership, motivation, and initiative for teacher growth."\(^{27}\)

3-B **Directive supervision:** "Supervision is viewed as a pro­gram in which the supervisor plays a dominant role in supervisory activities. These activities are usually supervisor centered, such as giving lectures, demonstrating teaching methods, formulating policies, rules, and regulations."\(^{28}\)

4-A **Goal-oriented supervision:** This orientation is focused on the realization of specific, pre-determined objectives and/or goals. Supervisory behavior could be viewed as the incorporation of those activities which will achieve specified long-range goals.

4-B **Pressure-responsive supervision:** "Supervision is viewed as a program with loosely set goals, and most of the supervisor activities are designed to alleviate problem situations as they arise."\(^{29}\)

**Research Questions for the Study**

In order to provide a precise framework for this investigation the
following research questions were formulated. As was true in the Cardenas study, the development of minor research questions was completed in order to facilitate the focus, analysis and interpretation of data recorded in this investigation. The data collected on the questionnaire was analyzed according to the following research questions:

**Major Question I**

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors?

**Major Question II**

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroupings of two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors?

**Minor Research Questions**

In order to guide the research efforts with respect to Major Question II, several minor questions were developed. These minor research questions were adopted for the elementary focus of this investigation from the findings of the Cardenas study, as well as an initial review of the related supervision literature.

**Minor Question II-A**

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors?

**Minor Question II-B**

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience?

**Minor Question II-C**

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation?
Minor Question II-D

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by elementary teachers with different levels of academic preparation?

Minor Question II-E

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced elementary teachers?

Minor Question II-F

Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary (K-3) elementary teachers and intermediate (4-6) elementary teachers?

Research Procedures

In order to identify the supervisory population for the study, attention had to be given to the specific problem in the identification of supervisors. As recorded in many other research efforts of this nature, those charged with supervisory duties often occupy positions with such titles as: director of instruction, assistant superintendent, curriculum coordinator, and coordinator of instruction in addition to "general supervisor" and "elementary supervisor." The following definition provided the criteria for selecting the entire elementary supervisory population in Virginia: those personnel whose major duties include the coordination, evaluation, planning, development and/or direction of people and things in the attainment of the instructional goals of the school through interaction with teachers. The supervisory population identified was established by analysis of the supervisory personnel listings in the Virginia Educational Directory along with further identification of the selected population with the Virginia Department of Education. The finalized supervisor population included 230 individuals. Included were all those professional
personnel listed by the *Virginia Educational Directory*, 1974-75, as occupying supervisory positions at the elementary level.

Teachers were identified as those personnel whose major duties included the coordination, evaluation, planning, development and/or direction of instructional experiences for pupils in the elementary school. Within this operational definition of "teachers" attention was accorded the fact that whether one interacted within a self-contained classroom or within an "alternative" structure was of no significance for this study.

In order to identify the teacher sample for this study the investigator first classified each of the public school districts in Virginia according to student size, as determined by the Virginia State Department of Education: small, medium and large. Two public school districts were randomly selected from the large district classification while one district each were selected from the medium and small categories. In one of the identified large districts four elementary schools were randomly selected. In the other large district one elementary school was selected for participation. Two elementary schools were randomly selected from the total elementary schools in the medium sized district, while one elementary school was selected from all of the elementary schools within the identified small sized district.

The cluster teacher sample included all of the classroom primary and intermediate teachers within each building selected. A total of eight elementary schools from across the state were involved with a total cluster sample of 166 teachers.

**Statistical Methods**

The following methods and procedures were utilized in the analyses of
those data which were gathered. For each of these procedures a detailed discussion was included in Chapter III, while Chapter IV contained the tabular results of these methods.

Mean Ranking of the Supervision Tasks. The computation of the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision was conducted in order to illustrate the degree of importance of each task, as expressed by sub-groupings of elementary teachers and supervisors in Virginia.

Rank-Ordering of the Supervision Tasks. The rank-ordering for the tasks of supervision was conducted after the overall mean rankings had been computed.

Hotellings' Multivariate $T^2$ test. This procedure was used since ten non-independent tests of the difference between the means within two independent groups were made in the analysis of each null hypothesis. The values for the Hotellings' $T^2$ were tested against the critical value of .05 by converting it to an $F$ value which gave an exact test of the $T^2$ value.

Variance for the Supervision Tasks. For each task the variance was computed by squaring the standard deviation of each overall task mean for each sub-grouping. This procedure was conducted in order to determine the extent of agreement and/or disagreement concerning the tasks of supervision for each sub-grouping, as illustrated by the dispersion of the means. Analyses of the variance were made by conducting an $F$-test. In each case the $F$ values were tested at the .005 level of confidence in order to avoid committing a Type 1 error.

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. This procedure was used in order to measure the degree of consistency with which individuals in each
of the research sub-groupings ranked all ten of the supervision tasks together. The degree of consistency was indicated by the values reported for Kendall's $\bar{W}(s)$ in association with each null hypothesis.

**Mean Score Index for the Orientations.** In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervision orientations a difference scale was constructed. This scale was based upon the assumption that each of the four paired orientations represented polar opposites. In each case the first orientation was given a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. Accordingly, the mean ranking for the first orientation of each pair was subtracted from that for the second, separately for each sub-grouping. The difference between these two rankings represented the mean score index for that sub-group. Chapter III contained a detailed description of the development of this continuum.

**Variance for Orientations.** The variance for the paired orientations is a measure of the dispersion of the index scores around the overall mean index score for each sub-group. It was computed by squaring the difference between an individual index score and sub-group mean index score, summing over all individuals within the sub-group, and dividing by the number of individuals within a sub-group minus one. Hartley's $F$ test was used to test the difference between variances across sub-groups with $p = .01$.

**Plan of the Study**

Chapter II: Review of the Literature. The purpose of Chapter II was to provide a selected orientation into the nature of the professional and/or research literature related to instructional supervision from education and other disciplines. This selection would ideally substantiate the acceptance
of the Harris conceptualization of supervision tasks. The following sections provided the major categories for the presentation and analyses of the literature review:

Part I Instructional Supervision Defined: Supervisory Behavior

Part II Supervisory Leadership and Group Behavior

Part III The Cardenas Study

Chapter III: Methods and Procedures. This chapter was oriented toward a discussion of the research methodology and procedures used in this study. The discussion included attention to the instrumentations, test reliability, the procedures for the collection of the data, sampling procedures and the tabulation of the data. Chapter III also contained a listing of the null hypotheses in association with which the analyses of the data were made.

Chapter III also contained the demographic and situational factors associated with both the teacher and supervisor samples in tabular form. These data were included in order to provide a knowledge of selected factors related to the two groupings studied.

Chapter IV: Presentation of the Findings. This chapter contained a presentation of the data in statistical form. Subsequent discussion related to the acceptance or rejection of each of the null hypotheses as determined by the analyses of the data was also included.

Chapter V: Summary and Conclusion. The summation and conclusion of the research study was presented in Chapter V. Within this chapter was included any pertinent generalizations and/or observations gleaned from the study, as these related to the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role.
Definition of Terms

Assessing: "The process of studying the status quo to secure data for use in determining needs for change."

Competencies: "A supervisory competency is any combination of knowledge and skill that is adequate for accomplishing some specified outcome related to a supervisory task."

Coordinating: "The process of relating people, time, materials, and facilities to form a functional unit for accomplishing change."

Directing: "The process of influencing practices to conform with those essential and appropriate to accomplish change."

Prioritizing: "The process of arranging goals, objectives, and activities in order of importance."

Supervision: "Supervision is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the instructional operation of the school in order to facilitate the learning process."
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Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE: INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

The purpose of this chapter will be to provide a review of the professional and research literature related to supervision. The following sections will provide the major categories for the presentation and analysis of the literature: instructional supervision defined; supervisory behavior: research studies; leadership studies and supervisory behavior; and supervisory behavior as it relates to the orientations of supervision.

1. Instructional Supervision Defined:
   Supervisory Behavior

A. Historical Perspectives

Instructional supervision has been the subject of controversy and/or confusion in much of the professional literature representing the conventional wisdom of the field. Beegle has noted that the supervisory function has indeed assumed various forms and dimensions during different historical periods. "Even contemporary writers in the field of instructional supervision differ in their definition of supervisory behavior and processes."¹

Historically, changes in the definition and scope of instructional supervision have been seemingly associated with changes in the socio-cultural ethos of the different periods.² Starting with the Colonial
period in the American civilization and existing during the Civil War era, enhanced emphasis was placed upon the inspection of schools by religious leaders, special citizen committees and/or educational trustees. Instructional supervision tended to be equated with the realization of established rules and a priori standards of conduct.

Instructional supervision as official inspection continued to exist throughout the nineteenth century. Beegle has noted that professional personnel associated with schools, such as state, county and local superintendents and principals, increasingly assumed greater professional authority for the instructional programs under their domain. The use of direct classroom visitation and observation now became the paramount vehicle for the assessment and/or improvement of instructional behavior. Dysfunctions associated with teacher performance became the focal point for instructional improvement efforts. Wilson, et al., offer the following evolutionary summary of early supervisory efforts:

Growth in the size of schools created the position of "head teacher" at an early date, but the non-teaching duties involved were clearly more clerical than supervisory...with still more growth, this early administrative service turned toward fiscal management and began developing as a function in its own right, not just an off-shoot of teaching. A permanent division of labor was thus created. But, more importantly, so was an authority structure, as indicated by the next shift in emphasis from simple business management to a type of quality control. This was the beginning of program regulation at all levels, particularly at the state level—the establishment and enforcement of the first minimum standards, and a general manipulation of the physical environment and financial resources in a deliberate effort to professionalize the schools. Personnel administration, control of the "people" as well as the "things" of teaching, inescapably came next because of the teacher's strategic position between pupils and all other resources. Its forms were many and varied, ranging from the definition of employment policies to the refinement of teaching methods. The important thing, however, was the focus on the teacher and the equating of quality with her performance (e.g., believing that the school is no better than the teacher). The fallacy was in
the non-separation of teaching and learning, the equating of teachers with their environment. At this point the first discernible phase of supervision, institutional control, reached its culmination, with its four emphases--(1) simple administration, (2) fiscal management, (3) quality control, and (4) personnel administration--representing crude sequential steps in the building of an institutional structure for public education.4

A turning point in the conceptualization of instructional supervision seemed to exist during the first two to three decades of the twentieth century. Guided by the "cult of efficiency" and influences from industry instructional supervision was oriented toward the scientific improvement of the conditions which surrounded learning. Burton has noted that supervisory behavior (at this time) tended to focus upon the improvement of teaching, differentiation of supervision and administration, as well as the furtherance of improved conditions under which learning could transpire.5

**Supervision Must Be Scientific.** This should find expression through:

(a) A common scientific background for principals, teachers, and supervisors.
(b) The development of definite, well understood objective standards for judging and improving the quality of instruction (where standards are used should be known in advance by the one where teaching is being judged).
(c) An experimental and laboratory study of instructional problems.
(d) Interpretative measurements of results.6

Professional (supervisory) behavior during this second major period in the development of instructional supervision tended to be associated with the use of tests, rating scales, and observation guides as supervisors focused upon measuring teachers' professional and personal methods, as well as the collective content of the school. The earlier writings of Ayer and Barr,7 as well as Barr and Burton,8 offer insight into the seemingly prescriptive nature of supervisory behavior which all too often
focused upon control and regulation. Beegle has noted that such humanistic educational leaders as Harold Alberty and V. T. Thayer wrote a text in 1931 oriented toward "supervision which had strong 'efficiency' overtones and tended to correlate this approach with 'scientific' supervision. This scientism was reflected in both the testing and measurement movement and in curriculum development efforts . . . ."9

Toward the middle of the 1930s and into the 1940s various professional writers within the field have recorded that the human relations movement in business influenced the educational establishment. Specifically, this was achieved by the incorporation of group processes with attention to instructional improvement through study groups, committee experiences, small conferences, and workshops.10 Supervisory behavior no longer centered around the scientific observation and/or measurement of the teaching situation but expanded to include a more collegial relationship in group focused problem solving activities.

Wilson, et al., have noted that the initiation of the group process movement ushered in a phase which has persisted in various dimensions until the present, the institutional growth process movement.11

Beegle12 and Wilson, et al.,13 observed that while supervisory behavior was oriented toward the process of redeveloping of the subject areas as well as the total curriculum, supervisory leadership was also involved with efforts to achieve comprehensive models for school improvement. Wilson, et al., observed that one product of the initial process approach has been the planning function in supervisory behavior:

Group processes now had a purpose but it was one which, as success was realized, produced a new kind of problem, that of inter-disciplinary competition and perpetual curriculum imbalance. The answer to this development was a renewed search for the common denominators of content (i.e., the structures of
Table 1
STAGES IN THE EVOLUTION OF SUPERVISORY CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES 1

Increasing Rate of Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
<th>Phase III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Definition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Growth Processes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Administration</td>
<td>Fiscal Management</td>
<td>Group Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Administration</td>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>Subject Area Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Comprehensive Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple Personnel</td>
<td>Curriculum Structure and Design</td>
<td>Curriculum Teaching Aids and Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Testing and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Change</td>
<td>Predictable Products</td>
<td>Predictable Processes (but not products)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Role</td>
<td>Current Role</td>
<td>Emergent Role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
knowledge) and the rebuilding of total curriculum designs around larger concepts and processes. The means of achieving this broadened perspective was comprehensive planning by the supervisor.\textsuperscript{15}

Since the early 1950s several writers have noted attempts to reorganize supervisory theory from the Human Relations approach toward a Revisionist or Structuralist framework.\textsuperscript{16} This approach combined the earlier Scientific Management tenets with the Human Relations approach.

They recognize that the individual goals and the organizational goals must be fused through commitment and leadership activity; and they hold the view that external economic factors must be considered along with productivity and formal status, but not to the exclusion of the human elements that the Scientific theorists neglected.\textsuperscript{17}

Although Argyris and McGregor could be considered illustrative of Revisionist thought, Lucio has noted that the work of Chester Barnard\textsuperscript{18} was perhaps germinal to much contemporary Revisionist ideology.\textsuperscript{19}

Argyris\textsuperscript{20} has attempted to treat the individual within the organization with the declaration that man-organization are not compatible. Argyris has stressed the importance of individual actualization for the worker through job enlargement and employee-centered leadership. In order to resolve the inherent conflict between man-organization, this approach would incorporate improving the diagnostic skills of management and the use of staff specialists which could assist in the realization of such goals.\textsuperscript{21}

McGregor has viewed organizational theory from the perspective of the tension produced by the conflict between the individual (need disposition) and organizational goals. Conceptualized as the Theory X-Theory Y continuum, McGregor viewed the tenets of Theory Y as a more realistic approach by which to interpret organizational dysfunctions as well as the integration of the individual.\textsuperscript{22}
The relationship of Revisionist thought to the tasks and functions of supervision could be viewed as follows:

... that the supervisory function should be defined not in terms of any one single doctrine or comprehensive, normative theory but in terms of various situational parameters in schools. Efforts should be addressed to defining better the purposes of schooling, the relation and application of individual talent to tasks, and the consequences of methods applied to particular problems and situations.

One contemporary outgrowth stemming from this emergent nature of supervision as a "process" function has been what Stephen Corey terms action research. If instructional supervision may be conceptualized as a special type of leadership with attention to achieving instructional improvement, the following behaviors would provide one framework for understanding this method:

A. Identifying problems.
B. Analyzing problems and determining some pertinent causal factors.
C. Formulating tentative ideas about the crucial factors.
D. Gathering and interpreting data to sharpen these ideas and to develop action hypotheses.
E. Formulating action.
F. Evaluating the results of action.

Neagley and Evans have noted a special relationship between action research, as an entity, and supervisory behaviors envisioned as tasks in this study.

Most of the study of what should be kept in the schools and what should be added must be done in hundreds of thousands of classrooms. The studies must be undertaken by those who may have to change the way they do things as a result of the studies. Our schools cannot keep up with the life they are supposed to sustain and improve unless teachers, pupils, supervisors, administrators, and school patrons continuously examine what they are doing. Singly and in groups, they must use their imaginations creatively and constructively to identify the practices that must be changed to meet the needs and demands of modern life, courageously try out those practices that give better promise, and methodically and systematically gather evidence to test their worth. This is the process I call action research.
The particular definition of instructional supervision depends upon the broader educational philosophy embraced by the specialist. Cogan has chosen to develop his rationale around "clinical supervision" as distinct from "general supervision."²⁷

General supervision . . . denotes activities like the writing and revision of curriculums, the preparation of units and materials of instruction, the development of processes and instruments for reporting to parents, and such broad concerns as the evaluation of the total educational program.

In contrast, clinical supervision is focused upon the improvement of the teacher's classroom instruction. The principal data of clinical supervision include records of classroom events: what the teacher and students do in the classroom during the teaching-learning process. These data are supplemented by information about the teacher's and students' perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge relevant to the instruction . . . The clinical domain is the interaction between a specific teacher or team of teachers and specific students, both as a group and as individuals.²⁸

Cogan has declared further that, "Clinical supervision may therefore be defined as the rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance."²⁹

It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the students' learning by improving the teacher's classroom behavior.³⁰

Cogan has referred to the interaction between teacher and supervisor as "colleagueship" attempting to achieve some objective(s).³¹ Employing both task-oriented and person-oriented behavior, Cogan has placed significant importance upon the role of the supervisor as a status position leader in the coordination of the instructional efforts of teachers.³² Through the interconnections and interdependence of all its parts, clinical supervision would seek to foster a sense of professional dignity in all teachers oriented toward maintaining and developing specific instructional competencies.³³
The following supervision cycle was noted by Cogan as illustrative of the eight phases of clinical supervision:

Phase 1. Establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship

Helps the teacher to achieve some general undertakings about clinical supervision and a perspective on its sequences.

Phase 2. Planning with the teacher

Plans commonly include specifications of outcomes, anticipated problems of instruction, materials and strategies of teaching, processes of learning, and provisions for feedback and evaluation.

Phase 3. Planning the strategy of observation

The supervisor plans the objectives, the processes, and the physical and technical arrangements for the observation and collection of data. The teacher joins in the planning of the observation and takes a role in it as he becomes more familiar with the processes of clinical supervision.

Phase 4. Observing instruction

The supervisor observes the instruction in person and/or by way of other observers and other techniques for recording classroom events.

Phase 5. Analyzing the teaching-learning processes

... the teacher and supervisor analyze the events of the class. Initially they usually perform this task separately. Later in the program they may do so together or with other participants.

Phase 6. Planning the strategy of the conference

... the supervisor alone generally develops the plans, alternatives, and strategies for conducting the conference with the teacher.

Phase 7. The conference

The conference participants are generally the supervisor and teacher.

Phase 8. Renewed planning

At this point the cyclical nature of the supervisory process
asserts itself, and the teacher and supervisor stop the analysis and discussion of the previous lesson to begin planning the next lesson and the changes the teacher will attempt to make in his instruction.

The Cogan format for clinical supervision tends to place emphasis upon behavior which Lucio (Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions) called the newer dimensions in the field: objective supervision, joint teacher-supervisor responsibility, as well as differentiated supervision.

The specific supervisory functions espoused by Cogan seem to be subsumed under what Harris has termed as organizing for instruction, developing curriculum, and evaluating instruction with varied degrees of emphasis in each of these areas. While the Cogan format purports to substantiate the individual classroom teacher's instructional efforts, little mention was given to some of the broader supervisory task expectations, especially as interpreted by Harris.

B. Contemporary Perspectives: Supervisory Behavior

Supervision, as a complex of reasonably distinct behaviors within an even more complex enterprise, may be conceptualized as a special form of leadership. Although these leadership behaviors are closely related they tend to remain somewhat distinct from general administrative behaviors. As a supportive service which is only indirectly related to pupil learning, supervisory behavior exists within the school situation in order to provide various services to enhance the teaching function in a highly instruction-related manner. The following diagram illustrates this distinctive arena of supervisory tasks associated with the educational complex.

With reference to the supervision function area, Harris has made the following observation:
This functional area includes those highly instruction-related but only remotely pupil-related endeavors. The work of supervisors, coordinators, consultants, curriculum specialists, principals, and classroom teachers as they influence instruction is included. These endeavors are distinguished from teaching by their indirect impact on pupil learning. Supervision provides supporting services to the teaching function of highly instruction-related kinds.

In order to further analyze contemporary supervisory behavior Harris has noted that two characteristics exist simultaneously, the tractive and the dynamic. Tractive supervision, according to Harris, could be conceptualized as those activities which are focused toward the maintenance of
"the existing level of instruction, to accept only minor changes in pro-
gram, to enforce or support existing relationships, and to resist pres-
sures for change." In this sense tractive supervisory behaviors could
be associated with routine faculty meetings, the orientation of new teach-
ers, policy development, issuing directives for standard operational pro-
cedures as well as dissemination of information and approved procedures.

Harris defined dynamic supervision as, "Supervisory endeavors that
are directed toward changing instructional practices . . . Here the em-
phasis is on discontinuity, the disruption of existing practices, and the
substitution of others." Supervisory activities associated with dynamic
supervision could include the selection of new content, schedules, instruc-
tional practices and/or group arrangements when these or other changes con-
ote attractions in pupil or teacher behavior.

According to the Harris framework for interpreting supervision, the
combination of tasks, processes, and skills provide the foundation for
analyzing supervisory behavior.

An array of task areas might be considered as reasonably
instruction-related. Certainly the development of curriculum,
the development of media and materials, the provision of in-
service education opportunities, and the evaluation of instruc-
tion are clearly of this type. Similarly, teaching, staffing,
and organizing for instruction are tasks which are instruction-
related. Other tasks which might have important instructional
implications include the development of public relations, the
orientation of new staff, the provision of special pupil ser-
vices, and the development of facilities.

In order to view supervisory behavior in terms of task-oriented typo-
logies, Harris has noted that the separation must be made between the for-
mer definition of supervision as behavior and general supervision prin-
ciples, concepts and rules. Supervisory competencies would include those
differentiated knowledge and skill areas needed to implement task
expectations in different educational situations. "Competencies of supervisory personnel might best be defined, then, as any combination of knowledge and skill that is adequate for accomplishing some specified outcome, even though insufficient for the completion of an entire task. This definition would provide the operational base for the realization of any supervisory task as espoused in the Harris rationale.

The following competencies by Harris provide the activating component in the achievement of the ten task areas of supervision discussed in Chapter 1.

**Planning and Designing**

The supervisor has special competencies as a program planner. This is planning which is different from that required for program implementation. The requirements for planning, when new and unusual program elements must be put into designs for instruction, include special skills and abilities. Divergent thinking and conceptualizing abilities are important. The possession of flow-charting skills makes a difference. The ability to remain open to strange ideas and to identify common elements in rather diverse approaches is essential to this kind of planning. Of great significance is the ability to synthesize --to give new form to a plan using unfamiliar components or unique combinations of the familiar.

**Observing and Analyzing**

Competence of this kind is essential for supervisors whether evaluating instruction or working with in-service or curriculum development groups. The supervisor must be able to stimulate, influence, coordinate, and lead. This is possible only when the behavior of people is systematically observed and usefully analyzed. The supervisor must be able to use a variety of classroom observation systems, be skilled in discerning the most relevant events transpiring, exercise self-control over the predisposition to judge, and dispel the "halo" effect in interpreting observed behavior. Supervisors should know the dynamics of group process and be able to employ both systematic and informal group process analysis procedures. Skill in recording and analyzing data on observed behavior is essential for the competent supervisor.

**Face-to-Face Communicating**

The supervisor is a communicator in a variety of ways, but
face-to-face communication in the in-service or small-group setting is most important. The supervisor must not only know about the variety of face-to-face arrangements which are useful, but he must also be skilled in making appropriate uses of them. This implies skill as a discussion leader, an interviewer, an organizer of buzz sessions and panels, a debater, a leader of brainstorming sessions, and other skills.

Idea Presenting

The supervisor must be able to present extremely complex ideas to other people in ways that stimulate thinking, clarify misunderstandings, and impart new knowledge. This requires knowledge of an array of presentational media and their relative value for various purposes. The supervisor must be skilled in expository and analytical writing, formal lecturing, and the use of visualizing techniques.

Searching and Abstracting

The supervisor must be able to conduct searches of appropriate sources and abstract the most relevant information for use in approaching instructional improvement problems. This requires that a supervisor be knowledgeable about a great variety of information sources. The supervisor must be skilled in efficient library utilization techniques. Most important is the ability to read rapidly, interpret research findings, and critically assess information for significance and relevance.

Viewed in this perspective, instructional supervisory behavior consists of special task areas, but can be accomplished by a variety of school personnel. Harris defined this totality as follows:

Supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to promote pupil learning. Supervision is highly instruction-related but not highly pupil-related ... if instructional supervision services are to influence teaching, certain instruction-related tasks must be accomplished as a result of certain supervision activities, implemented by competent people—instructional leaders.

Lucio and McNeil have observed that, "The common dimension of supervision—found in all positions of leadership—is the ability to perceive desirable objectives, and to help others contribute to this vision and to act in accordance with it."
surveying, exploring as well as mapping new terrain in the field, the authors suggested that an atmosphere of non-specificity exists in association with the field of supervision. Lucio and McNeil concluded that a dimension of "super-vision" was needed by educational leaders in order to provide interpretation and clarification rather than the production of prescriptive assistance to teachers.

The authors predicated their conceptualization of instructional supervision as a "synthesizing process" upon special insight and skill in approaching instructional matters. Transcending what some authors have called the human relations approach to supervisory behavior, Lucio and McNeil concluded that direct involvement by supervisors should involve the "method of reason" and the "method of practical intelligence." 47

Beegle has noted that the realization of the synthesizing process would include a combination of inputs from such sources as "the reinforcement theory of learning, theories of personality, phenomenological views of individual behavior, legal and political institutions and beliefs, contemporary philosophy, theories of knowledge, theory of group dynamics, social anthropology and theories of change, role theory, theory of organizations, and theory of communications." 48 This observation tends to support Lucio and McNeil's notation of the following six responsibilities which they recognized as fundamental supervisory behavior (tasks):

1. **Planning.** Individually and in groups; he helps to develop policies and programs in his field.

2. **Administration.** He makes decisions, coordinates the work of others, and issues necessary decisions.

3. **Supervision.** Through conferences and consultations, he seeks to improve the quality of instruction.

4. **Curriculum development.** He participates directly in the
formulations of objectives, selection of school experiences, preparation of teaching guides, and selection of instructional aids.

5. **Demonstration teaching.** He gives and arranges for classroom demonstrations of teaching methods, use of aids, and other direct help to classroom teachers.

6. **Research.** Through systematic surveys, experiments, and studies, he explores current conditions and recommends changes in practice. Franseth viewed instructional behavior as tantamount to "a leadership service that helps schools do their work." This interpretation of supervision tends to focus upon the interaction between the supervisor and teacher in cooperative efforts, using subject matter content and any related methodology to this content as the main focal point for instructional improvement.

... supervision is generally seen as leadership that encourages a continuous involvement of all school personnel in a cooperative attempt to achieve the most effective school program... Good supervision is a helping kind of activity. Burton and Brueckner have observed that "modern supervision" would include divergence from more "traditional" prescriptive supervisory behavior toward the cooperative, mutually influencing efforts of all school personnel to solve general and/or specific problems. By definition, Burton and Brueckner have written that, "Supervision is an expert technical service primarily aimed at studying and improving co-operatively all factors which affect child growth and development." Burton and Brueckner have criticized the more "traditional" conceptions of supervision as only elaborate definitions of everyday practices and techniques stated as mere statements of isolated, specific functions. Conceptualizing instructional supervision as a dynamic interaction between all school personnel, the authors underline the omnipotence of the development
and maintenance of the democratic process throughout. The authors underscored the importance of viewing the social processes and administrative organization as the Gestalt through which cooperative supervisory behavior could be made manifest. The following characteristics illustrate the social nature of the cooperative supervisory function involving group process: appraisal of the educational product, the study of the learner, the analysis, evaluation and improvement of instruction, curriculum evaluation and development, assessment and provision of materials and environment and public relations.

The spirit of modern supervision stresses not merely teacher growth but teacher participation in the study and improvement of the total teaching-learning situation . . . supervision, though still suggesting techniques when necessary, will always strive to develop in all workers the basic understandings underlying the various aspects of the entire educational organization and process.

Wiles conceptualized instructional supervision as centered around the creation of an environment—either within a local school or the entire school system—in which improvement in curriculum and instruction could occur. Defining supervisory behavior as shared, cooperative endeavors, Wiles noted that:

Supervision is not limited to any one person or to individuals who carry the title of "supervisor." Any number of the school staff may assist teachers in producing a better learning environment for other teachers. Probably most supervision is provided by teachers for other teachers.

Wiles has operationalized instructional supervision around skills associated with leadership as a shared, emergent entity, the dynamics of interpersonal interaction, group processes, communication theory, and the influences of cooperative community influence upon the school. Specifically, the following points summarize the general supervisory behaviors which could be termed task areas in Wiles' analysis:
A. Curriculum design and development
B. Developing instructional media
C. Improving instruction: maintenance, change and/or innovation
D. Providing for in-service experiences
E. Location of and provision of materials for instruction
F. Research and evaluation
G. Community facilitation (public relations and planning)
H. Organizing for instruction and/or instructional improvement

Elsbree, McNally and Wynn have delineated selected differences between "the older and the newer types of supervision" with reference to "purpose, scope, and nature."

Under the philosophy now obsolescent (though still prevalent), the best way to improve the learning program was to improve the teachers. Supervision was therefore focused on the teacher... The purpose of modern supervision... is to supply the leadership to help the staff to improve the instructional situation... it concerns itself with the improvement of the total teaching-learning situation.

In order to achieve this concept of broader, more cooperative, experimental type of supervision, Elsebree, McNally and Wynn have noted the importance of a "peer relationship" among the instructional staff and personnel charged with supervisory duties. Organizing for instruction, curriculum development and redevelopment, dissemination of information to the public, selection and provision of instructional materials and supplies, provision for continual professional development of the staff and evaluation as diagnostic feedback comprise the central supervisory task behaviors as espoused by Elsbree, McNally and Wynn.

In order to provide some charting of the field, Crosby analyzed sixty articles which were published by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development during the decade of the 1960s. Crosby observed: "Of the five categories of interests in supervision revealed in the sixty articles the subjects rank from highest to lowest in terms of number of articles..."
published in the following order: the potential of supervision (17), leadership (15), the functions of supervisors on the job (13), professionalization (10), and research (5). The author noted that the paucity of research in the field could be considered a dysfunction. Crosby noted the following "common threads" which were observed throughout this literature:

1. That supervision is a team process which usually includes teacher, supervisor, and principal.

2. That supervision is a peer relationship with each member of the team assuming leadership, depending upon the situation and the appropriateness of the unique talents of each at a given time.

3. That the concept of the supervisor as a change agent is interpreted as a function which requires the creation of a supportive environment which frees the teacher to express creative attributes and talents conducive to teaching and learning...

If instructional supervisory behavior may be conceptualized as a changing, emergent task focused toward the enhancement of the totality of the instructional program, it should approach what Beegle has termed a state of self-renewal. Placing an emphasis upon change as well as maintenance within the educational facility, Beegle recognized the functionality of instructional supervision in leading and coordinating the behavior of school people in this renewing cycle of instructional growth and development. The author noted further that his criticism was associated with:

1. an internal apparatus to maintain that which is good in an organization,

2. appropriate mechanisms to bring about renewal where change is needed.

The above observation is in agreement with what Harris has called the dual nature of supervision--the tractive and the dynamic. Harris further held that supervisory behavior must realize that change and/or continuity
were not necessarily good in and of themselves. "They become appropriate or inappropriate orientations for supervision as they relate to the values we hold and the educational goals established."^65

Frazier has provided a parallel approach to interpreting supervisory behavior.^^ Specifically, Frazier has stated that supervisory behavior associated with schools exists for the purpose of: (1) the maintenance of teaching competence, (2) the maintenance of the instructional program, (3) the renewal of teaching competence, and (4) the renewal of the instructional program.^^
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**Figure 2**

*Change for Instructional Supervision - Alexander Frazier*

Sergiovanni and Starratt have attempted to provide a contemporary framework for viewing supervision as an entity, and supervisory behavior in particular.^^ These authors stressed "a synthesizing theory of supervision" in which tenets from organizational theory, personnel, industrial, and development psychology as well as business administration and educational theory were incorporated.^^

The theory identifies and describes three sets of variables. One set, the organizational success variables, represents the output which results from school efforts and activities. Another set, the initiating variables, represents those assumptions, actions, belief patterns, and modes of operation which
are but described as administrative and organizational. The third set, the mediating variables, constitutes the fabric of the human organization of any school.\textsuperscript{70}

This assessment allows the individual reader to develop particular supervisory strategies which would be in congruence with the particular situation. Sergiovanni and Starratt stressed the need for viewing supervisory behavior not as pre-determined task expectations necessarily, but as emergent functions developing as the total staff interacts in a collegial manner. "Emerging patterns of supervision are based on the premise that consistent and long-term achievement of school success is dependent upon the positive presence of the mediating variables."\textsuperscript{71}

The following postulations offered by Sergiovanni and Starratt conceptualize supervisory behavior and its relationship to the social processes existent within schools:

A. Supervision as a process is a more meaningful mode of analysis than viewing supervision as a role or the supervisor as a particular role incumbent.

B. Supervision is a process used by those in schools who have responsibility for one or another aspect of the school's goals and who depend directly upon others to help them achieve these goals . . . a crucial aspect which differentiates supervisory behavior from other forms of organizational behavior is action to achieve goals through other people.

C. Since behavior is a significant part of the supervisory process, it is often useful to focus on this aspect of supervision as a primary analytical method for increasing understanding of the process as a whole.

D. Behavior by administrators and others in school organizations which is characterized by action toward achievement of school goals but is not dependent upon others for success is described as administrative rather than supervisory.

E. Depending upon the circumstances, one may choose to behave in an administrative way--directly--or in a supervisory way--through people--to achieve school goals.
F. When administrators and others choose to operate in an ad-
ministrative way to achieve school purposes, their actions
may or may not involve change; but when they choose to
operate in a supervisory way, their actions invariably in-
clude some aspects of change in behavior.  

This last statement would seem to place most supervisory behavior, as
Sergiovanni and Starratt tend to view it, in agreement with Harris' dynamic
orientation. Although routine and/or maintenance expectations involving
supervisory behavior is not negated, these authors preferred to stress the
significance of change in association with supervisory behaviors.

II. Supervisory Leadership and
Group Behavior

A. Organizational Influences Upon Supervision and Supervisory Behavior

That instructional supervision exists within an organizational frame-
work has been a paramount observation of this study. If the school could
be defined as the organization and effectiveness would be interpreted as
significant maintenance and/or improvement of the instructional program,
some attention should be given to the dynamics of organizational theory as
well as the nature of the educational organization. This realization is
posited since instructional supervision, as a special form of leadership,
does exist within specified parameters of the school, and these limitations
may have a relationship on the actualization of specific tasks as well as
the employment of particular orientations by supervisory leaders.

Bidwell has stated that studies related to the school as an organi-
zation tend to be somewhat disjointed. He made several observations associ-
ated with a characterization of public schools, three of which appear to
be relevant in establishing the parameters in which supervisory leadership
exists.
First, it was assumed that school systems are client serving organizations... Second, it was assumed that the role structure of a school system contains a fundamental dichotomy between student and staff roles... Third, it was assumed that school systems are to some degree bureaucratic.

The implications from the latter two declarations (above) will provide the framework for the following discussion.

That "bureaucracy" as a concept could be equated with "organization" was stated by Etzioni. In his treatment of organizational theory Etzioni developed a conceptualization which provided for both the formal and informal structures within organizations.

"Formal organizational structure" was noted to have been the result of the classical administration theory, otherwise known as the scientific management theory. As influenced by the efforts of Taylor, Fayol and others, this perspective interpreted individual worker benefits as tantamount to organizational benefits. Little attention was given to the dysfunctions and/or potential for role conflict within organizational structures. Rigid hierarchical levels of authority and responsibility were integral components of classical theory, along with the differentiation of labor.

The human relations approach to organizational theory tended to be a repudiation of the rigidity and impersonality of the classical model. As noted earlier in Part I of this chapter, the human relations movement focused upon informal group activities, leadership and the import of different channels of communication. It could be interpreted that these emphases provided for the emergence of the conceptualization of the informal organization as a tenable aspect of the total organizational structure.

Revisionist theory has been primarily an attempt to redefine the interrelationship between formal and informal organization within
institutions. This orientation has tended to seek some viable theoretical congruence between the needs of organizations as entities and the individuals within organizations as personalities. Interpreting the writings of Max Weber as one initial effort to bridge the chasm between informal and formal organization, revisionist thought has recognized that some form of conflict within organizational settings should be expected. The analysis offered in this investigation of the implications of organizational theory upon instructional supervision center around the tenets of the revisionist ideology as it is related to leadership behavior.

Based upon a review of the literature "organization" will be defined for this study according to Blau and Scott's typology. These authors conceptualized organizations as related to one of the following types: mutual benefit, business concerns, service organizations, and commonweal organizations. A public school, accordingly, would approximate a service organization operated for the benefit of its members in any of many potential arrangements of time and space.

Etzioni made the following notation as to the nature of organization with explicit mention of the phenomenon of power:

Corporations, armies, schools, hospitals, churches, and prisons are included; tribes, classes, ethnic groups, friendship groups, and families are excluded. Organizations are characterized by: (1) divisions of labor, power, and communication responsibilities, divisions which are not random or traditionally patterned, but deliberately planned to enhance the realization of specific goals; (2) the presence of one or more power centers which control the concerted efforts of the organization and direct them toward its goals; these power centers also must review continuously the organization's performance and re-pattern its structure, where necessary, to increase its efficiency; (3) substitution of personnel, i.e., unsatisfactory persons can be removed and others assigned their tasks.

The analysis of "power centers" within organizations by Etzioni could be interpreted as analogous to Weber's use of the concept of power.
Although the Weberian model has been associated primarily with studies of the formal organization with its tendency toward bureaucratic consistency, Weber did provide a definition of power and authority which approximates the criteria of the informal organization as espoused by the revisionist theoreticians. Bidwell as well as Lucio and McNeil have depicted the school as tantamount to the bureaucratic model noted by Weber. Etzioni has summarized Weber as follows:

He used power to refer to the ability to induce acceptance of orders; legitimation to refer to the acceptance of the exercise of power because it is in line with values held by the subjects; and authority to refer to the combination of the two...

He referred to authority as traditional when the subjects accept the orders of superiors as justified on the grounds that this is the way things are always done; and as rational—legal, or bureaucratic, when the subjects accept a ruling as justified because it agrees with a set of more abstract rules which they consider legitimate... Finally, Weber pointed to charismatic authority in which the subjects accept a superior's orders as justified because of the influence of his personality with which they identify.

Etzioni's treatment of these Weberian tenets provide an indication of the structure of organizational authority as it could relate to leadership behavior within the organizational environment.

Argyris observed that any concept of the total organization would inevitably include both the informal and formal dimensions:

1. Organizations are grand strategies individuals create to achieve objectives that require the effort of many....
2. The strategy derived from these roots leads to a pyramid-shaped formal organization defined by such principles as chain of command, unity of direction, span of control, and task specialization.... Unfortunately, the formal organizational strategy hits some snags—the primary one being the individual human being.
3. Mutual adaptations take place where the organization modifies the individual's personality and the individual, through the informal activities, modifies the formal organization. These modifications become part of the organization.
4. A total organization therefore is more than the formal organization.
March and Simon conducted an exhaustive analysis of the professional and research literature associated with organizational theory. Although much of the text of *Organizations* tended to focus upon formal organization, this work has been noted in much of the contemporary research dealing with organizational theory.

March and Simon observed that efficiency in the realization of organizational objectives of the management group was viewed by the "scientific management" theoreticians as an accepted fact, rather than an entity subject to alteration. These authors noted that the concepts of conflict and motivation could better be understood in terms of the individual's interaction within and/or adaptation to the formal goals of the organization. Rational decision making was observed to have been a requisite for all individuals within the organization who were to interact in a state of compliance with the given goals, according to the specific reward systems in operation. The following tenets, developed by Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson, provided a framework for analyzing the rewards discussed by Simon and March:

1. An organization is a system of interrelated social behaviors of a number of persons who we shall call the participants in the organization.
2. Each participant and each group of participants receives from the organization inducements in return for which he makes to the organization contributions.
3. Each participant will continue his participation in an organization only so long as the inducements offered him are as great or greater (measured in terms of his values and in terms of the alternatives open to him) than the contributions he is asked to make.
4. The contributions provided by the various groups of participants are the source from which the organization manufactures the inducements offered to participants.
5. Hence, an organization is "solvent"--and will continue in existence--only so long as the contributions are sufficient to provide inducements in large enough measure to draw forth these contributions.
Of particular interest was the significance of the interrelationship of the organizational and individual objectives as stressed here. Explicit inference was made by Simon, Smithburg and Thompson to the lack of attention to the dynamics of the informal organization with its attendant human perspectives. It should be observed that through concerted study of the interface between the formal and the informal organizations, those charged with supervisory leadership duties could effect more adequate realization of instructional supervisory tasks and functions in educational environments.

Selected Research Investigations: Organizational Influences. The related literature in the field tends to substantiate the notation that many efforts to correlate instructional supervisory behavior with the concept of a line-staff dichotomy has been frequent. Funk declared that while administrator roles within school settings were primarily oriented toward the management function, the supervisor role tended to be understood as one of a specialist as well as subject area authority. In relation to the line and staff interface, Funk associated two independent roles for decision-making. The premise for the decision-making role by administrators was predicated upon legal and traditional authority, while the supervisory decision-making role was based upon his individual authority association with his specialized competence and expertise.

Burton and Bruecker discussed the line-staff dichotomy in conjunction with "vertical supervision" and "horizontal supervision." Stressing democratic cooperation as one tenable alternative to the line-staff orientation, these authors declared that this would provide a more adequate conceptualization of the interrelationship between administration and supervision.
Instructional supervision as a special form of leadership would seem to demand that status supervisors (and others enacting supervisory roles) possess competencies in what has been traditionally defined as administrative dimensions. Morphet, Johns and Reller have stated that, indeed, the nature of contemporary educational organizations requires that those in leadership positions function in a collegial orientation which would transcend the traditional line-staff breakdown.

Lucio and McNeil have addressed some of the apparent dysfunctions of interpreting leadership behavior of supervisory personnel within rigid line and staff differentiations:

We believe it is not always desirable to sharply distinguish the supervisor from teacher and administrator on the basis of staff classification and employment of influence. Supervisors are sometimes delegated power to be exercised authoritatively, and when they themselves are held responsible for results, they must hold others responsible for carrying out instructions.

Perhaps one of the most direct attempts to provide a firmer foundation for the leadership function as it related to supervision was that offered by Mann. The skill areas noted by Mann could be subsumed within what Harris has termed "processes and skills" of instructional supervision.

Administrative skill or competence refers to the ability of the supervisor to think and act in terms of the total system within which he operates. Administrative skills include planning, programming, and organizing the work.

Human-relations skills, then, refer to the ability to use pertinent knowledge and methods for working with people and through people. They include an understanding of general principles of human behavior, particularly those principles which involve the regulation of interpersonal relations and human motivation, and the skillful utilization of this understanding in day-to-day interaction with others in the work situation.

Technical skill, or competence, as used here, refers to the ability to use pertinent knowledge, methods, techniques, and equipment necessary for the performance of specific tasks and activities, and for the direction of such performance.

The search efforts by Mann concluded with the generalizations that
while human relations and technical skills were purportedly of greater significance within the lower levels of organizations, administrative skills were of increased importance at higher levels. Mann generalized that although the particular combination of skill competencies were relative for each supervisor, as well as the particular organization and the specific phase of organizational development, supervisors in general should have some degree of expertise in all three areas.\textsuperscript{93}

Katz,\textsuperscript{94} who has been cited repeatedly by Harris,\textsuperscript{95} also focused research efforts upon the identification of specific operational skills required by educational leaders. The skills, grouped as conceptual skills, technical skills, and human skills, could be viewed as fundamental dimensions in leadership behavior for those enacting supervisory roles in education.

This section on organizational theory would seem to have very direct implications for those enacting leadership roles in supervision. That the public school could be characterized as an entity with both formal and informal organizational structures existent in continuing interaction could have tacit as well as explicit ramifications in the particular "orientation" chosen by supervisors. In addition, these tenets could well temper which "tasks" of supervision preferred by supervisors as well as the degree of commitment supervisory leaders could give to the realization of such task areas in instructional supervision.

B. Role Theory and Supervisory Leadership

In addressing some of the factors associated with organizational theory as it related to Instructional supervision the need to interpret the phenomenon of roles was inferred. Supervisory leadership, as one form
of human interaction within an organizational structure, has more often than not been subject to a diversity of viewpoints due to professional expectations. Harris provided substantiation for this observation with the following declaration:

The long established practices associated with supervision as a shared function have generated many issues, conflicts, and uncertainties among staff personnel. Frequently, supervisors' identity and effectiveness are at issue. Conflicts between principals and supervisors often emerge from undifferentiated responsibilities for supervision.

Harris has noted that careful attention must be given to the notion of "supervisory role" as a unique position, in that the individual recipient of such a status position "tends to shape the position, whatever the title may be."97

Corwin has observed that the term "role" has been used in seemingly conflicting and often confusing ways.98 One of the major difficulties which Corwin noted was that reference often tends to be made to specific expectations of individuals "in interpersonal reciprocal relationships, while at other times it refers to only general standards or ideals . . . in this usage the specific interpersonal relationships are secondary."99

Allport differentiated four delineations of the term role as a patterned manner of interaction within a social situation:

1. Role Expectations. Role expectations are located in the social system. They are what the culture or subculture prescribes for the father, the mother, the pupil, the physician. They constitute the rules of the game and are what most people in a society come to expect of any member that occupies a certain position in any current social system.
2. Role-Conception. The picture a given father or given teacher has of his role may or may not correspond to the role-expectations.... He defines his role in his own way.... One teacher conceives of good teaching as a matter of strict drill and severe punishment, another favors individual project work and permissive methods.
3. Role-Acceptance. People sometimes love their roles (whether defined in terms of the expectations of others or in terms
of their own conception); some people are indifferent to them; others hate "the station in life to which they have been called." And some like their own conception of their roles but resent the expectancies that others have of them. Until we know the answers we cannot decide whether the role is warm and central (appropriate) to the personality or whether it is merely a peripheral and disagreeable cultural prescription.

4. **Role-Performance.** What the individual actually does with his role assignment depends on all these foregoing conditions. Role-expectations alone will not tell us. The expectations are uniform and prescribed, but the variation that occurs through differing conceptions, degrees of acceptance, and all attendant features and traits of personality modifies greatly the eventual role-performance.¹⁰⁰

The concept of role was further interpreted by Parsons and Shils to be of significant importance in comprehending the realities of social system interaction.¹⁰¹ Roles were viewed as,

... that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process. It involves a set of complementary expectations concerning his own actions and those of others with whom he interacts. Both the actor and those with whom he interacts possess these expectations.¹⁰²

Analysis of the preceding discussion would tend to substantiate the realization that roles do exist within organizations as social systems. As noted by Corwin, such roles usually have associated behavior expectations for the individual(s) who may enact such a specified position.

However, as indicated by Parsons and Shils, as well as Newcomb and Allport, the behavior associated with any particular role position within a social system could be subject to parallel or conflicting expectations.

A member's role defines the responsibility and authority he is expected to exercise by virtue of the functions and status of his position, the demands made upon him by changing group operations, and the kind of person he is perceived to be.¹⁰³

According to this line of thought, if divergent expectations have been associated by school people with the supervisory position, role conflict could be one result. Such role conflict could be predicated upon (1) the
diversity of behavior expectations different role incumbents hold for a specified role position or (2) conflict which a particular role incumbent has between the expectations of self and those of significant others for said role position.

A further expansion of role theory was developed by Getzels and Guba. This expanded analysis of the institutional dimension in relation to role theory included a focus upon the need-disposition of individuals occupying role positions within social systems. The nomothetic dimension would reflect the organizational goals and expectations for the (supervisory) role in order to allow maximum (organizational) predictability and continuity. The ideographic dimension, moreover, is similar, yet it is oriented toward the individual goals and need-dispositions of the actors occupying roles.

The two dimensions of the social system are assumed to be in constant interaction. Nomethetically, the organization strives to socialize the individual to its own image and ends, while ideographically, the individual strives to socialize the organization to his own image.

In addressing the concept of role conflict within the parameters of the nomothetic dimension, Getzels and Guba noted that:

Role conflicts occur whenever a role incumbent is required to conform simultaneously to a number of expectations which are mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent, so that adjustment to one set of requirements makes adjustment to the other impossible or at least difficult. Role conflicts in this sense are institutionally given and are independent of the personality of the role incumbent.

The implications for associated types of role conflict that could be experienced by supervisors in the school situation could include the following:

1. Disagreements within the referent group defining the role.
2. Disagreement among several referent groups, each having a right to define expectations for the same role.
3. Contradictions in the expectations of two or more roles which an individual is occupying at the same time.  

Figure 3 depicts this theoretical orientation to roles in social systems. Getzels noted that of the potentialities for role conflict within the educational setting the following conflict areas tended to be most apparent: (1) conflicts between cultural values and institutional expectations; (2) conflict between role-expectations and personality dispositions; and (3) conflicts between roles and within roles.  
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Of particular interest to the current research project was the observation by Getzels that conflict in the perception of role expectations among incumbents in similar roles could be envisioned. This notation could be analyzed with respect to how different instructional supervisors, for example, perceive the expectations of the supervisory role:

The relevant concept we should like to apply here is "selective perception." We may conceive of any publicly prescribed role relationship as enacted simultaneously in two separate private situations, one embedded in the other. On the one hand is the prescribed relationship as perceived and organized by the one role incumbent in terms of his goals, experiences, and information. On the other hand is the same relationship as perceived and organized by the other role incumbent in terms of his goals, experiences and information. These private situations are related through those aspects of the existential objects, symbols, values, and expectations that overlap in the perceptions of both individuals.  

Sergiovanni and Starratt have expanded upon the Guba-Getzels design
to incorporate the following four "styles" of administrative and/or supervisory behavior within schools as social systems. This analysis could be related to supervisory role behavior in association with potential areas for conflicting role expectations.  

1. **Nomothetic style.** Administrative and supervisory behavior which focused primarily on the institutional dimension as it seeks to achieve school goals.

2. **Ideographic style.** Administrative and supervisory behavior which focuses primarily on the individual dimension as it seeks to achieve individual goals.

3. **Compromise style.** Administrative and supervisory behavior which focuses "realistically" on achievement of school goals and individual goals in a satisfactory manner.

4. **Transactional style.** Administrative and supervisory behavior which operates not from the assumption that the two dimensions are in conflict, but rather from the position that they are interdependent.

In an attempt to come to terms with the realities of role conflict in organizations, Corwin has made the following observations which reflect the tenets of Getzels and Guba, as well as Sergiovanni and Starratt.

Role conflict could be conceptualized as (1) a function of the number and magnitude of incompatible expectations placed upon or held by the actors; (2) the greater the intensity of the actor's involvement in role conflict, the greater his relative ineffectiveness in at least one of the roles; and (3) the intensity of an actor's involvement in role conflict is systematically related to personal and attitudinal characteristics.

Stogdill has proposed that role conflict can occur when different reference groups entertain opposing or incongruent expectations for the particular occupant of a given position. This implication would tend to further one dimension of the Getzels-Guba model, specifically the group for whom the supervisor is acting out his professional role. Stogdill's treatment would focus attention on the dynamics of institutional-individual role conflict, especially when personal values and/or viewpoints are
inconsistent with each other. When a role is not well defined (i.e., authority and responsibility), Stogdill would attribute much of the conflict to the role itself.

If the role expectations of the instructional supervisor were not well delineated, according to the Stogdill model, it would be understandable, then, to attribute any attendant role conflict to this dysfunction. This observation would further substantiate the declaration of Corwin that:

... a role is not merely part of one position, but it is related to two (or more) positions, all of which must be considered if the true role is to be comprehended ... to fully understand the role of the "supervisor" in the school, it is not only necessary to analyze the teacher's role conceptions, but those of students, parents, the administration, the school board, etc....

In the abovementioned discussion about role theory and conflict, attention was primarily oriented toward either the social position of a role in its totality or some particular role components, such as supervisor-teacher or administrator-supervisor interaction. Moreover, in any analysis of role theory as it would apply to instructional supervision, attention should also be given to the concept of role segments, which are those norms of a similar typology but not of a similar content. Role segments refer to those particular normative elements associated with parts of the total role expectations for any given position.

Seeman has analyzed this concept of role segmentation (dimensions) in relation to role conflicts which developed due to inconsistencies within role segments. The status dimension type of conflict would occur between the success ideology and the equality ideology. "The dilemma creates a 'leadership guilt' because the leader has a place of special privilege that is alien to the democratic expectations."
Seeman noted a second dimension of conflict in relation to what was termed the authority segment. "The conflict here involves the anomaly of dependence and independence...many teachers and administrators want to have more voice in the system, but they are reluctant to accept the responsibility that goes along with it." 119

A third potentiality for conflict was noted in the institutional dimension, which would involve a choice between objective as opposed to particularistic criteria in relation to evaluation. 120 The literature has supported the notion that instructional supervisors should employ positive human relations in developing enhanced interpersonal relationships with teachers. However, supervisors must also maintain objective professional standards in the evaluation of teachers which Seeman has noted as one potential arena for conflict.

Another area of concern for Seeman was the means-end dimension, which focused upon the potential for conflict between the achievement of a task and the degree of quality of the finished product. "...leaders in groups must not only pay attention to the task that they are supposed to accomplish, but also to the matter of morale, to interpersonal relations and to the personal problems of the members of the group." 121

This research study has been focused on the expectations for the elementary supervisory role as expressed by teachers and supervisors. These role expectations could be interpreted as tantamount to specific behaviors which supervisory leaders would enact within the school as a social system. Organization and role theory provide a broader perspective with which to view the potential for a diversity of role expectations for the supervisory position, especially as these divergent views may relate to role conflict.

It would seem imperative that instructional supervisors realize the
significance of the potential for conflict in defining their roles along with the potential dysfunctions created when teachers are thrust into situations for which they hold contradictory supervisory expectations.

This discussion has noted the importance of roles within organizations as significant components of the whole institution. Increased awareness of the nature of roles as well as the nature of role conflict could, therefore, provide enlightenment for improved functioning of the school. This understanding of the dynamics of roles within organizational structures could facilitate supervisory leaders as they interact with various groups of school people for the realization of instructional goals.

C. Supervisory Behavior and the Orientations of Supervision

The review of the related literature associated with instructional supervision tends to support a generalization by Harris that the "activities of supervision are many and varied." Harris has noted further that different supervisory personnel with varied levels of professional autonomy may interpret the various tasks of supervision in somewhat different ways. Whether one interprets any supervisory task as a mandate for change or as a demand for the maintenance of the status quo depends upon one's supervisory "style" or orientation.

Change is, of course, inevitable. Time changes everything. However, change per se is neither desirable nor undesirable. The value assigned to a change tends to be determined by the directions, quality, rate, and side effects that characterize the change. Although the literature tends to document an enhanced current emphasis upon instructional change in relation to the tasks of supervision, the particular supervisory orientation or "mode of operating" appears to be most significant in the realization of supervisory goals—whether or not
these are related to change.

**Tractive vs. Dynamic Supervision**

The particular manner in which a supervisory leader approaches the realization of any task(s) of supervision could be interpreted through a reference to the phenomenon of change, as discussed previously. Harris noted that change within the instructional arena could not be equated with more positive or negative influences upon the realization of school goals. The author further noted that although change itself tends to be an inevitable force, the particular focus and/or use of the change is more significant.

Rather than interpreting dynamic supervision as being opposed to tractive supervision, Harris has conceptualized these two dimensions as guidepoints along a continuum.

The deceptively simple notion of dynamic versus tractive supervision is dangerous. It is more accurate to view these as ends of a continuum ranging from one extreme to the other. Whether the efforts at change are massive or minute they entail at one extreme radical departures from existing practices with unknown elements and concomitant risks. At the other extreme, tractive-ness involves not only maintenance of current practice but active efforts to prevent change by opposing forces for change.¹²⁵

Harris labeled the other extreme of the supervisory orientations continuum as "dynamic." As such, "Supervisory endeavors that are directed toward changing instructional practices may be thought of as dynamic. Here the emphasis is on discontinuity, the disruption of existing practices, and the substitution of others."¹²⁷ This differentiation between tractive and dynamic supervisory behaviors tends to classify those tasks which are conducted in such a manner as to involve the innovative, new, and/or redeployment of the existent as being more dynamic, by definition.
Perhaps the most striking examples of dynamic supervision are to be found in those schools in which extensive individualization of instruction programs has been initiated. In these instances, content, materials, schedules, teaching practices, group arrangements, and evaluation endeavors have all undergone change. Every person associated with the school, from pupil and parent to school board president, has been called upon to change in some ways.128

Subject Matter vs. Methods-Centered Supervision

The second major orientation associated with supervisory behavior has been noted as the differentiation between supervision with focuses toward either the particular subject matter or more praxeological methodology. Cardenas stated that the question as to whether supervisory functions should be considered either subject matter centered or methods centered "has been a perennial problem for school personnel."129

The literature concerned with instructional supervision tends to support the differentiation between these two orientations. Harris has noted some operational definitions for various supervisory functions and his pronouncements would include supervisory efforts oriented toward either of these two formats.130

Spears has recorded that during the "evolution" of the position designated "supervisor" two avenues of approach have been observed at the elementary level.131

At the elementary school level two types of positions emerged ... one was the special subject supervisor. This was especially true of art, music, and physical education... The other common type of position was the general elementary school supervisor. The scope of help here consisted of all the curriculum not covered by the specialists.132

This differentiation in orientation could be further documented upon the work of Reeder.133 While Reeder did provide extensive review of the content or subject matter specialization by instructional supervisors, this
specialization was noted to have direct implications upon the kind (orientation) of supervision with which these personnel may be more in agreement.\textsuperscript{134}

A somewhat opposing viewpoint to that espoused by Reeder was noted by Melchior.\textsuperscript{135} This author adopted a position similar to that offered by Barr, Burton and Brueckner that the techniques which are utilized by supervisors could be considered the omnipotent factor in the actualization of supervisory behavior.\textsuperscript{136}

Cardenas offered the following summation based upon his investigations:

Descriptions of supervisory services in school districts invariably show the employment of subject matter and method specialists. Perhaps a problem exists in this area. Teachers participating in an in-service program may be disappointed in a subject matter approach if their primary interest is in techniques, or disappointed in techniques if their interest is in acquiring more knowledge of the subject.\textsuperscript{137}

\section*{Directive vs. Permissive Supervision}

What shall be the method of supervision? Shall it be directive and scientific or shall it be permissive and teacher centered... it is quite apparent that each concept of supervision can make a very definite and worthwhile contribution.\textsuperscript{138}

This quotation drawn from the writings offered by Bartky seem to underline the need to examine this third so-called orientation dichotomy between directive and permissive supervision practices. Lucio and McNeil have observed that, "Many new teachers demand guidance when the novelty of the situation precludes their ego involvement in particular procedures. For them, direction is not interpreted as a criticism of ability. One of the findings concerning leadership techniques is that morale is sometimes higher when supervisors are less permissive."\textsuperscript{139}

This declaration by Lucio and McNeil could be considered analogous to
the frame-of-reference followed by Cardenas; specifically, he recognized the importance of the directive vs. permissive orientations due to the following conclusion:

All of the recent books in supervision list supervision as a permissive process, yet make little allowance for the teacher that because of inexperience, humbleness, or personality seeks an authoritative figure to provide leadership necessary for teacher growth.140

Sergiovanni and Starratt have presented a detailed summary of the related literature from organizational theory to role theory as these may relate to a broader interpretation of "enlightened supervision."141 Although these authors have sought to illuminate a synthesis approach in their conceptualization of "emergent" supervisory behavior, many of the older tenets which were rigidly separated under the labels "directive" or "permissive" remain obvious and traceable in Sergiovanni and Starratt's more contemporary conceptualization of supervision.142

Goal-Oriented vs. Pressure-Responsive Supervision

Perhaps more than any other single author within the arena of instructional supervision Spears has noted the distinctions between goal-oriented and pressure-responsive supervisory behavior.143 Goal-oriented supervision could be interpreted as a broad, total supervision program. Spears has stated that goal-oriented supervision could better be thought of as a goal seeking effort, one more focused toward the long-range terminal goals and objectives of a comprehensive supervisory program.

It deals with general principles, with the idea that school operation calls for continuous study and improvement. . . . Curriculum planning and in-service training are the popular vehicles of this movement.144

Pressure-responsive supervision, moreover, could be interpreted as those supervisory activities which would be "oriented toward the solution
of minor problems, often a trouble shooting type of situation. Cardenas has summarized the approach espoused by Spears, especially as this interpretation is focused toward task expectations for the supervisor role:

Although Spears indicates that both approaches are necessary, perhaps the use of the two approaches creates a problem for the supervisor. Which is the most important to the supervisor? If the administration or the supervisor emphasizes the pressure response approach, a supervisor can devote so much time to the elimination of each little problem as it arises that time is never found for working toward the original goals. In discussing the effects of precarious values, Harris pictures a common reaction on the part of supervisors when faced with resistance to change. In attempting to eliminate conflict the supervisors discard the original goals, and turn their attention to purely routine or clerical activities, and wait for administrators to identify activity that they are to undertake. Since administrators are continuously besieged by pressures, the role of the supervisor becomes assisting the administrator by eliminating problem situations as they arise -- pressure responsive.

III. The Cardenas Study

Cardenas conducted an investigation "to provide more evidence of the disparity of viewpoints on the role of the supervisor, disparity of viewpoints on the tasks which a supervisor should perform, and the manner of performing the, as expressed by 65 administrators, 49 supervisors, and 232 teachers." In order to study these role expectations Cardenas conceptualized supervisory functions for the research effort according to Harris' ten tasks of supervision. Noting that the professional and/or research literature indicated that supervisory task expectations were not the only basis for disagreement among school personnel, Cardenas also attempted to discover the disparity school personnel held with respect to the "orientations" of supervision. These orientations were illustrated by four pairs of opposing viewpoints on supervision which reflected
different behavioral styles for the execution of the supervisory tasks:
dynamic-tractive supervision; subject matter centered-methods centered supervision; permissive-directive supervision; goal oriented-pressure responsive supervision.

Measurement was obtained by the development of a semi-projective instrument which consisted of eight short vignettes, each one dealing with a common supervisory problem situation. Each vignette was followed by a series of five specific behavior responses (related to four different tasks of supervisors) which the supervisor could implement. Each respondent ranked the responses according to his preference thus indicating the relative importance of each task.\textsuperscript{150} The fifth choice in each of the vignettes was related to the orientation being treated in that particular vignette (e.g., tractive-dynamic). In this manner data was gathered concerning how the sample viewed the nature of supervisory behavior. The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:

**Major Hypothesis A**

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position within groups of three types of school personnel: supervisors, administrators, and teachers.

**Major Hypothesis B**

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between groups of three types of school personnel: supervisors, administrators, and teachers.\textsuperscript{151}

Cardenas noted that, "Anticipating a lack of consensus to be found ... an attempt was made to identify the basis for this lack of consensus. It was hypothesized that differences in experience and work situations might produce different viewpoints on the supervisory role."\textsuperscript{152} The following minor hypotheses were formulated to reflect this anticipated disagreement:
Minor Hypothesis A-1

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between general and special area supervisors.

Minor Hypothesis A-2

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between supervisors with administrative and supervisors without administrative experience.

Minor Hypothesis A-3

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between new and experienced teachers.

Minor Hypothesis A-4

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between elementary and secondary school teachers.

Minor Hypothesis A-5

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisory position between teachers in wealthy and teachers in poor school districts.

Minor Hypothesis A-6

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers at the various grade levels in elementary school.

Minor Hypothesis A-7

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers of various subjects in secondary schools.

Minor Hypothesis A-8

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers with varying amounts of preparation.

Minor Hypothesis A-9

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers exposed to varying qualities of supervision.
Minor Hypothesis A-10

There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers exposed to varying amounts of supervision.153

Cardenas analyzed the data by using mean rankings for the tasks of supervision (including orientations) as well as rank order correlation and analysis of variance for the data gathered as it related to each hypothesis.154

Major Hypothesis A. Major Hypothesis A was found not tenable in that, "None of the three groups studied shows a significant disagreement on the expectations for the supervisor position. Supervisors show a lesser amount of disagreement than administrators and teachers."155 While each of the three groups favored dynamic, method-centered, directive, and goal-oriented supervision, comparisons of the ranking of the responses (to tasks) and the amount of consensus for the tasks indicated a tendency for each of the three groups within the sample to have been in agreement as to what was not the task of the supervisor.156

As illustrated by Table 24 (Appendix B), although the supervisor variance did not differ significantly from the total variance of the total sample, two of the tasks (In-service education and Public relations) as well as four of the orientations (Tractive, Subject-centered, Goal-oriented, and Pressure-responsive) showed a significantly smaller variance. The most disagreement for the supervisor grouping was observed in Staffing, Relating special services, and Organizing for Instruction. While supervisors tended to favor Dynamic, Method-centered, Directive, and Goal-centered orientations the degree of variance indicated amounts of disagreement in accepting these orientations.157 In relation to the responses for the supervisor group Cardenas observed:
On the basis of these findings there is not sufficient evidence to accept this portion of the hypothesis, that there is a lack of consensus on role expectations for supervision, though there appears to be some consensus on which role expectations are rejected. 158

Administrator responses in relation to Major Hypothesis 1 also tended to indicate a slight tendency for agreement by this grouping on those tasks not considered consistent with supervisory functions. (See Table 35 Appendix B.) 159 While Staffing, Orienting new staff, Providing materials, and Organizing for instruction depicted the most disagreement, Curriculum development, Public relations, and In-service education showed the most agreement. 160 "Tractive, Subject-centered, and Directive supervision, ranked low, show some consensus, though in all cases that the consensus was not significant at the .05 level. Little distinction is made by administrators in the ranking of the Goal-oriented and Pressure-responsive orientations." 161 As true with the supervisor group, the lack of any significant difference between the variance for the administrators and the total variance (entire sample) inhibited the acceptance of this portion of Major Hypothesis 1.

Analysis of Table 36 (Appendix B) would indicate that teachers preferred Dynamic, Method-centered, Directive, and Goal-oriented supervision. 162 With respect to the tasks of supervision, Cardenas noted that, "A comparison of rank-order mean ratings and rank-order variance produces a rank-order correlation coefficient of -.02, indicating a lack of relationship between the two variables." 163

Table 2 illustrates the rank order of the tasks by position.

Major Hypothesis B. Cardenas did not find significant support in order to substantiate Major Hypothesis B. 164 As indicated by Table 37 (Appendix B) the data tended to establish no significant differences in
Table 2
RANK ORDER OF TASKS BY POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for instruction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing for instruction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing materials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting new staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating special services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the ranking of the tasks by supervisors and administrators with rank-order correlation of the two groups .85. One obvious difference in ranking for this group was the importance awarded Relating special services. While supervisors ranked it fourth, the administrators ranked it eighth. "Extremely high consensus is found in the identical rank-order given Organizing for instruction, Providing facilities, Orienting new staff, and Public relations."167

The administrators and supervisors also illustrated similar viewpoints as to the orientations. "The mean differences in the Tractive-Dynamic continuum are identical and very similar in the Subject-Method centered and Permissive-Directive categories . . . supervisors appear . . . more goal-oriented than the administrator group, though the differences are not significant at the .05 level."168

The data for administrator-teacher analysis indicated that no significant differences existed (task expectations) with the rank-order correlation between the two groups .87.169 "Curriculum development is ranked second by teachers, fifth by administrators; Evaluation is ranked fifth by teachers, second by administrators."170 Cardenas noted that although some slight differences (non-significant at .05 level) were found between administrators and teachers with respect to the orientations, "Teachers view supervision as slightly less directive than administrators, and administrators view supervision as slightly less goal-oriented than teachers."171

Table 37 (Appendix B) also contains data related to the supervisor-teacher responses. Cardenas noted that the low coefficient of rank-order correlation (+.55) indicated that there was a significant difference (.05 level) between supervisor task expectations as expressed by teachers and
those preferences expressed by supervisors. Although this indicated a low correlation, it justified acceptance of this portion of the hypothesis.

Teachers rank Curriculum development as second, supervisors rank it seventh. Relating special services, ranked sixth by supervisors, is ranked ninth by teachers. Evaluation ranked first by supervisors is ranked fifth by teachers.

The orientation ratings indicate small disagreement between the two groups. Teacher orientation is less dynamic, method-centered, and directive, as shown by a comparison of mean differences... Supervisor orientation is slightly less goal-oriented than the teacher group.

Minor Hypotheses. Minor Hypothesis A-1: Cardenas did not find significant evidence to support the hypothesis that there was a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between general and special area supervisors. Table 38 (Appendix B) illustrates that on the basis of the mean rankings for the tasks neither group of supervisors differed significantly (rank-order correlation for the two groups was +.87) for the tasks of supervision.

Analysis of this group's resources to the orientations would indicate slight differences.

... Both groups display similar preferences for dynamic over attractive, permissive over directive, and goal-oriented over pressure-responsive types of supervision.

General area supervisors show a strong preference for method-centered over subject-centered supervision, whereas special area supervisors indicate only a slight preference for method-centered over subject-centered supervision.

Minor Hypothesis A-2: The evidence recorded in the study failed to support the acceptance of the following hypothesis: "There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between supervisors with administrative experience and supervisors without administrative experience." Analysis of Table 39 (Appendix B) would tend to indicate that specific differences for the two groups could be observed in
the mean rankings accorded In-service education and Organization for instruction. "The supervisors with administrative experience rank In-service education 4.5 places higher, and supervisors without administrative experience rank Organizing for instruction 3 places higher." Rank-order correlation for the tasks between these two groups was +.79.

Analysis of the orientation rankings for these two groups show small differences. Both groups display similar preferences for dynamic and tractive, method-centered over subject-centered, directive over permissive, and goal-oriented over pressure-responsive supervision.

Minor Hypothesis A-3: Cardenas did not observe any significant differences in the role expectations for the supervision position between new and experienced teachers. The rank-order correlation for the responses of these two groups was +.85. "The only apparent difference is the higher ranking (6th) given Organizing for instruction by experienced teachers, as compared to a rank of 9th given by new teachers." Cardenas noted that with the exception of Evaluation, Staffing, and Relating special services, "experienced teachers displayed more variance than new teachers in each of the tasks. Only Providing facilities differed significantly, differing at the .05 and .01 level." (See Table 40 Appendix B.)

Analysis of the mean rankings and mean ranking difference for the orientations indicated that experienced teachers showed more preference than new teachers for dynamic as opposed to tractive supervision, as well as preference for method-centered over subject-centered and directive as opposed to permissive supervision. The large variance in the Tractive orientation for new teachers as differentiated from experienced teachers was indicative of more disagreement for that group and was significant at the .01 level. "New teachers' variance in the Dynamic
orientation differed from the variance for experienced teachers at the .05 level."  

Minor Hypothesis A-4: With a rank-order correlation of +.82 (mean ranking) no significant difference was found between the task expectations of elementary and secondary teachers. While few small differences were observed in the rankings for Evaluation, Organizing for instruction, and Relating special services, Staffing, Providing facilities, and Orienting new staff, complete agreement was observed for Providing materials, In-service education, and Public relations. (See Table 41 Appendix B.) No significant differences were reported for the orientations as expressed by these two groups.  

Minor Hypothesis A-5: Analysis of Table 42 (Appendix B) would seem to indicate that the mean rankings given to the tasks illustrate small differences between the supervisor task expectations between teachers in wealthy and poor school districts. While the rank-order correlation for these two groups was +.83, only one task, Orienting new staff, was overtly different in its ranking with a rank-order difference of 4. However, Providing facilities recorded a significantly lower variance for teachers in the poor school district (.05 level) while In-service education was found to have a significantly lower variance for this same group at the .01 level.  

The only significant difference observed for this group in relation to the orientations was noted for the Goal-oriented—Pressure responsive dimension. "Rankings in this area show that teachers in the wealthy school district expect supervisory behavior to be goal-oriented. Though consensus on this is low, the teachers show high consensus in rejecting pressure-responsive behavior, significant at the .01 level."
Minor Hypothesis A-6. Cardenas did not observe significant differences (in order to reject) for Minor Hypothesis A-6: lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers at the various grade levels in elementary schools. However, those significant differences which were observed between grade levels were noted by the researcher as "indicating a tendency for higher agreement between teachers in the higher than in the lower elementary grades."193

With respect to the orientations of supervision, "In all cases teachers in the various grade levels favor the same orientation..."194

Minor Hypothesis A-7: The data failed to substantiate the acceptance of this hypothesis that, "There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers of various subjects in secondary schools."195 However, attention to the rank-order correlation for the tasks between teachers of various secondary level subjects did produce some significant differences:196

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td>+.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational &amp; Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Significant differences are found between language arts and science teachers, language arts and business education teachers, social studies and music teachers, and science and music teachers."197

Cardenas observed that in all cases the Dynamic orientation was preferred to the Tractive dimension, although differences in ranking were noted. Method-centered, Directive, and Goal-oriented orientations were preferred by the total group with some degrees of difference noted for certain subject area (teacher) groupings.198
Minor Hypothesis A-8: "There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between teachers with varying amounts of preparation" as Minor Hypothesis A-8 was "rejected." Cardenas did not observe any significant differences for the tasks of supervision (although small differences in ranking were noted) for the teachers with different levels of academic preparation. (See Table 43 Appendix B.) The rank-order correlations between the five groups failed to identify a lack of consensus.

While some non-significant (.05 level) differences were noted in the mean rankings for the orientations, this group tended to prefer Dynamic dimension, while no significant differences were observed for the other orientation dimensions.

Minor Hypothesis A-9: This hypothesis was not accepted in that no significant lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position was observed, as expressed by teachers exposed to varying qualities of supervision. Analysis of Table 44 (Appendix B) would indicate that although some of the correlations are in the .60s and .70s, "the correlation between teachers exposed to excellent and teachers exposed to extremely poor supervision (+.50) is the only one falling outside the critical range and thereby indicating a significant lack of consensus at the .05 level.

Analysis of the orientations shows one large discrepancy. Whereas teachers have consistently demonstrated a preference for method-centered supervision, teachers exposed to extremely poor supervision reject method-centered in favor of subject-centered supervision.

Minor Hypothesis A-10: Cardenas noted that no significant lack of consensus for the role expectations for the supervisor position could be identified between teachers exposed to varying amounts of supervision.
Table 45 (Appendix B) substantiated this observation in that no great diversity can be observed for the tasks of supervision, as expressed by this group.

"In their orientations toward supervision, no significant differences can be identified between the four categories."205
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Chapter III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Overview

The purposes for and the background of this research investigation were stated in the first chapter and supported by the literature review in Chapter II. In brief the purpose of this study was to establish whether a significant relationship existed in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor as expressed by selected elementary teachers and supervisors in Virginia. Related research studies concerned with instructional supervision as well as selected tenets espoused by those usually considered "authorities" within the field have also been cited. This was done in order to provide a rationale and focus for this study.

Chapter III is oriented toward a discussion of the methods and procedures used in this investigation.

Instrumentation

In some earlier investigations concerned with the role and/or task expectations for instructional supervision, especially as depicted by the work of Guss\(^1\) and Ferneau,\(^2\) "a lack of proven valid instruments for the measurement of role expectations" was noted as a matter of concern.\(^3\) The use of the instrument developed and employed in the Cardenas study was selected since it was developed around the Harris conceptualization of supervisory tasks.
The tasks of instructional supervision:

TASK 1. Developing Curriculum. Designing or redesigning that which is to be taught, by, when, where, and in what pattern. Developing curriculum guides, establishing standards, and developing instructional units or courses.

1) Relating needs of pupils to societal needs.
2) Defining goals and objectives in "local" terms.
3) Articulating goals and objectives among school organizations.

TASK 2. Organizing for Instruction. Making arrangements whereby pupils, staff, space, and materials are related to time and instructional objectives in coordinate and efficient ways. Grouping of students, planning class schedules, assigning spaces, allocating time for instruction scheduling, planning events, and arranging for teaching teams are examples of the endeavors associated with this task area.

1) Specifying requirements to accomplish goals.
2) Assessing the changing time and space needs for various instructional purposes.
3) Assigning students to appropriate space and time units.
4) Allocating time and space according to need priorities.

TASK 3. Providing Staff. Assuring the availability of instructional staff members in adequate numbers and with appropriate competencies for facilitating instruction.

1) Recruiting and selecting instructional personnel.
2) Assigning or reassigning instructional personnel.
3) Recommending staff (including screening) for re-employment, promotion or dismissal.

TASK 4. Providing Facilities. Designing or redesigning and equipping facilities for instruction. The development of space and equipment specifications is included in this task area.

1) Assessing the changing needs for material and equipment to facilitate instruction.
2) Allocating available equipment according to instructional need.
3) Guiding the redesign of instructional facilities to serve instructional needs better.
TASK 5. **Providing Materials.** Selecting and obtaining appropriate materials for use in implementing curricular designs. Previewing, evaluating, designing, and otherwise finding ways to provide appropriate materials are included in this task area.

1) Identifying and selecting needed instructional materials.
2) Coordinating the development of new instructional media.
3) Allocating available materials to facilitate instruction based upon instructional need.

TASK 6. **Arranging for In-service Education.** Planning and implementing learning experiences that will improve the performance of staff in instruction-related ways. This involves workshops, consultations, field trips, and training sessions, as well as formal education.

1) Relating teacher and student performance measures to goals of instruction in defining in-service needs of the district.
2) Assessing individual teacher needs for in-service education related to district goals.
3) Planning and coordinating regional, district, school, and individual teacher activities for in-service education.
4) Leading teachers and other staff members in group or individual in-service experiences for improving instruction.

TASK 7. **Orienting Staff Members.** Providing staff members with basic information necessary to carry out assigned responsibilities. This includes getting new staff members acquainted with facilities, staff, and community, but it also involves keeping the staff informed of organizational developments.

TASK 8. **Relating Special Pupil Services.** Arranging for careful coordination of services (to children) to ensure optimum support for the teaching process. This involves developing policies, assigning priorities, and defining relationships among service personnel to maximize relationships between services offered and instructional goals of the school.

1) Assessing the changing need for non-instructional services to support instruction.
2) Organizing service delivery to optimize instructional goal attainment.
TASK 9. Developing Public Relations. Providing for a free flow of information on matters of instruction to and from the public while securing optimum levels of involvement in the promotion of better instruction. This task is concerned with informing, securing assistance, and avoiding undesirable influences from the public in relation to the instructional program.

1) Communicating with school constituencies about needs and goals.
2) Communicating with school constituencies about instructional problems and achievements.
3) Providing information to parents, employees, and appropriate agencies about pupil preferences.
4) Communicating with the professional staff about the feelings, desires, and needs of the constituencies.

TASK 10. Evaluating Instruction. Planning, instrumenting, organizing, and implementing procedures for data gathering, analysis, and interpretation and decision making for improvement of instruction.

1) Assessing the performance of teachers, using objective measures of behavior most relevant to student learning.
2) Assessing the situational factors that most directly influence pupil learning, other than teacher behavior.
3) Analyzing the relationships between teacher performance, situational factors, and pupil learnings as a basis for planning instructional improvement activities.

These task areas tend to be broad, yet inclusive, and provide a seemingly tenable categorization by which to conceptualize instruction-related behaviors defined as supervisory tasks for this investigation.

Cardenas offered this explanation for the development of the instrument, which was based upon the above task areas of supervision:

The use of a questionnaire or check list was immediately rejected because of weaknesses commonly found in this type of an instrument, where the testees give what they consider the expected response, rather than express their true opinions. . . . It was felt by this researcher that a partially projective device could be formulated, where the respondent would
be presented a problem situation, and action performed toward
the solution of the problem could be evaluated. To facil-
itate the scoring of the performance it was decided to allow
for objective, and preferably machine, scoring.

An instrument was developed to evaluate action in re-
sponse to a problem situation in supervision described in a
series of short vignettes. The vignettes were presented to
groups of school personnel who were asked to select appro-
priate actions in order of importance. These school personnel
were asked to identify and state weaknesses in the instrument.
Items found to be undesirable due to ambiguities, excessive
duplication, or other weaknesses identified by this study were
eliminated.

The finished instrument consisted of eight vignettes,
each one dealing with a common problem situation, in which
specific action responses had to be selected by the testee.
Each of the vignettes was followed by five definite actions
which a supervisor could perform, and it was up to the testee
to arrange the five actions in rank order according to impor-
tance.

The actions listed in the choices for each vignette re-
late to four different tasks of supervision. In arranging
the choices in order of importance, the testee automatically
indicates the relative importance which he gives to the four
areas listed.

The fifth choice in each vignette is matched with an-
other choice representing the same task in the orientation
represented. In arranging them in order of importance the
testee indicates his preference between two opposed orienta-
tions. Tasks and orientations represented in each vignette
are given in /Appendix A/.

Cardenas offered the following explanation for the organization of
the vignettes which comprised the semi-projective instrument:

An example of action choices can be given by analyzing
the five choices in the first vignette. Choice "a" repre-
sents action through curriculum development. Choice "c"
approaches a solution by providing facilities. Choice "d"
attempts to solve the problem through in-service education
and choices "b" and "e" take a public relations approach.
In arranging these four choices in order of importance,
the testee indicates a preference for curriculum develop-
ment, providing facilities, in-service education, or public
relations approaches. Choice "b" presents a directive ap-
proach in the public relations task area. Choice "e" repre-
sents a permissive approach in the same task area. If "b"
is ranked higher than "e", it may be concluded that the tes-
tee's preferred orientation in public relations is directive.
If choice "e" is ranked higher, the testee indicates a
preference for the permissive orientation.
The vignettes themselves represent a variety of problem situations.

Vignette number one describes a reading problem in an elementary school with a district supervisor initiating action. Vignette number two concerns a problem in the teaching of elementary science. Vignette number three deals with arithmetic instruction and possible efforts by a general supervisor to eliminate problems in this area. Vignette number four deals with a district elementary supervisor and her work in the opening of a new school. Vignette number five concerns a problem situation faced by physical education and athletic supervisors. Vignette number six deals with the teaching of language arts in the elementary schools and the efforts of a district supervisor in eliminating a problem situation. Vignette number seven presents a vocational education supervisor in a secondary school situation. Vignette number eight concerns the work of a district general supervisor in the social studies at the ninth grade level.

As can be gathered by the description given above, a variety of problems in a variety of curriculum areas at different grade levels are hypothetically presented to different types of supervisors. The inventory as finally developed is presented /in Appendix A/. The organization of the vignettes is presented /there also/.6

For the purposes of the current study no alterations or changes were made on the instrument as developed by Cardenas.

Data Cover Sheet(s)

In order to ascertain appropriate sample situational and/or demographic information to guide the analyses of the data two separate data cover sheets were developed by this investigator. One data cover sheet was attached to each questionnaire mailed to supervisors and the slightly different second form was attached to the same questionnaire which was mailed to each teacher in the study. Appendix A includes examples of both data cover sheets.

Test Reliability

Cardenas noted the following with reference to the reliability of the instrumentation:
The instrument was administered to a group of 22 teachers enrolled in a graduate class in educational measurement. The same test was re-administered eight weeks later. Correlation between the first and second administrations computed by the Pearson Product-Moment Formula was +.90 for the tasks and +.99 for the orientations. Rank-order correlation for the tasks was +.88.

The initial test-retest reliability appraisal was attained for the total tasks and orientations as measured by the instrument. Since this investigator intended to make analyses and generalizations from the data about each task or orientation of supervision a second reliability appraisal was done. This was achieved by administering the instrument initially to a cluster sample of 58 students enrolled in two separate graduate level education courses at The Ohio State University at the third class meeting. Thirty-two students were enrolled in an educational measurement class, while 28 students were enrolled in an instruction class. The re-test appraisal was conducted during the final class meeting of the Spring quarter. Guilford and Fruchter have observed the following notation concerning the phenomenon of correlation:

No single statistical procedure has opened up so many new avenues of discovery in psychology, and the behavioral sciences in general, as that of correlation. This is understandable when we remember that scientific progress depends upon finding out what things are co-related and what things are not. A coefficient of correlation is a single number that tells us to what extent two things are related, to what extent variations in the one go with variations in the other. Without the knowledge of how one thing varies with another, it would be impossible to make predictions. And wherever causal relationships are involved, without knowledge of covariation we should be unable to control one thing by manipulating another.

The results of the computation of the rank order correlation for the supervisory tasks and orientations for the second reliability test were reported in Table 3.

Rank order correlation was determined by the use of the Spearman
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Rank-order Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>+.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>+.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Staff</td>
<td>+.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>+.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>+.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>+.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>+.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>+.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Public Relations</td>
<td>+.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Instruction</td>
<td>+.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th>Rank-Order Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tractive</td>
<td>+.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>+.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered</td>
<td>+.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Centered</td>
<td>+.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>+.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>+.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented</td>
<td>+.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure Responsive</td>
<td>+.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
formula,

$$R = 1 - \frac{6D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

where $R$ represented the rank order correlation, $D$ represented the difference in rank order, and $N$ represented the number in the sample.\(^9\)

**Sampling**

It was a fundamental intention of the investigation to provide an operational replicative study involving the responses of selected elementary supervisors and classroom teachers employed in Virginia public schools.\(^10\)

Whereas Cardenas involved administrators, teachers, and supervisors (K-12) in his investigation the current study was oriented toward elementary supervisors and teachers only. This decision was predicated upon a generalization based upon other similar role expectation investigations as previously cited by Stewart,\(^11\) Dull,\(^12\) and Neville\(^13\) along with the findings presented by Cardenas.\(^14\) This decision was also due to the observation that in similar task-role studies the responses of teachers and supervisors tend to be more significantly different than do comparisons made for the responses of any other combination of the three personnel groups. The further restriction of the study to the elementary level was decided upon in an attempt to provide more indepth research into the supervisory task expectations by teachers and supervisors employed at this level alone.

**Supervisor Sample**

The original intention to utilize a smaller, randomly selected supervisor sample from the total Virginia population was discarded early in the study due to logistical and/or administrative dysfunctions. Within the different public school districts in Virginia various differentiations by
supervisory position title tended to be made depending upon organizational and/or traditional precedents of the individual school district. Cardenas observed similar dysfunctions in his efforts to identify the supervisory sample:

... In the various school systems used for the sampling, supervisors were identified by a variety of titles ... "Curriculum Coordinator" was commonly used to designate a supervisor. In other school systems the term "Director" was preferred ... In some school districts, the supervisors were called "Consultants," or some other title including the use of this word. For this study any person, regardless of title, whose duties were in keeping with a commonly accepted definition of supervisor was identified as such. In other words, persons whose major duties as described by their superintendents consisted of working with teachers for the improvement of the instructional program were classified as supervisors.15

In order to incorporate the total population of instructional supervisors in Virginia, identification of all personnel whose salaried duties were geared toward the elementary level was made with the use of the Virginia Educational Directory.16 After the appropriate names were classified and organized by corresponding school districts from the Directory, further written and telephone inquiries were made to officials at the Virginia State Department of Education in the attempt to include all supervisory personnel at the elementary level. This supervisory population was defined as those persons whose professional duties included a primary focus upon the coordination, evaluation, planning, development and/or direction of people and things in the attainment of the instructional goals of the school(s) through interaction with classroom teachers. The final supervisory population associated with elementary education in Virginia included 230 respondents.

Since these 230 supervisor respondents comprised the entire elementary supervisor population, each of the 129 public school districts in
Virginia was represented in this grouping. Table 4 contained the demographic and/or situational data associated with the 139 supervisor respondents.

**Teacher Sample**

In order to provide for the geographic and demographic differentiations in Virginia the investigator sought to include teachers in the sample from various areas of the Commonwealth. Classification of the Virginia public school districts by student population was observed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size classification</th>
<th>No. of pupils in district per classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small district</td>
<td>100-2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium district</td>
<td>3,000-9,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large district</td>
<td>10,000-25,000†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to identify the specific school districts for use in the teacher sample the investigator first classified all of the public school districts in Virginia according to the above pupil demographic criteria. Using a table of random numbers the investigator randomly selected the Richmond City School District and the Roanoke County School District as representative of two large school districts in the Commonwealth. The same table of random numbers was used to identify one public school district within the small district and medium district classifications from the total public school districts in Virginia. Albemarle County School District was subsequently selected to represent the medium size school districts and the Lancaster County School District was identified as representative of the small school districts, as determined by pupil size.

Using a table of random numbers the investigator then selected four elementary schools from a total universe of 36 elementary schools in the city of Richmond. This same table of random numbers was used to select
### TABLE 4
Supervisor Sample Data
N=139*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Total Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. General Area Supervisors (K-6)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Special Area Supervisors (K-6)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Official Titles by Position for General Area Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. General Area Supervisors (K-6)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assistant/Associate Superintendent for Elementary Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Director of Instruction (Elementary)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Director of Elementary Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coordinator for Elementary Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Coordinator for Instructional Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Elementary General Supervisor</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Special Area Supervisors (K-6)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Language Arts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Mailed = 230; Total Usable (returned) = 139; Percent Usable (returned) = 60%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

III. Previous Professional Experience

A. Supervisors Without Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Superintendent</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assistant/Associate Superintendent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elementary Principal</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elementary Vice-Principal</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Secondary Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Secondary Vice-Principal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Central Office Administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Supervisors With Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Superintendent</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Demographic Analysis

A. Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Males</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Females</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total White</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Situational

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Urban</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Suburban/Small Town</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Rural</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one school building unit in the Roanoke County District, as well as two
units in the Albemarle County School District and one unit in the Lan-
caster County School District. A total of eight school building units
from these different school districts formed the cluster units for the
teacher sample.

Table 5 contained the demographic and/or situational data associated
with the teacher sample.

Procedures

Collection of the Data

Prior to the mailing of the instrument to the supervisory sample two
explanatory letters were addressed to each public school district superin-
tendent in Virginia, one by Professor Jack R. Frymier and one by the inves-
tigator. After a week and one-half intermission the instrument was mailed
to each of the 230 selected supervisors, along with introductory letters
addressed by Professor Charles M. Galloway, as well as the investigator.
Copies of these letters can be found in Appendix C.

The original intention of this investigation was to conduct an inten-
sive follow-up communication series with the supervisor sample. A decision
was made to accept a 60% return rate for the supervisor sample as the mini-
mum level upon which to analyze these data. Within a three week period, a
60% return rate for the supervisor sample had been achieved. The final
usable response rate was recorded at 60% (169 respondents).

In order to collect the data from the teacher sample a different
approach was decided upon. After the school building units which formed
the bases for the cluster teacher sample had been identified, an intro-
ductive letter, along with a copy of the research instrument, was mailed
TABLE 5
Teacher Sample Data
N=133

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Total Sample N=133</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Teachers with one year or less classroom experience (new teachers)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Teachers with more than one year classroom experience (experienced teachers)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Total Primary Teachers (K-3) N=71</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. All Kindergarten Teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All First Grade Teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All Second Grade Teachers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. All Third Grade Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other Primary Grade Teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Total Intermediate Teachers (4-6) N=62</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. All Fourth Grade Teachers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All Fifth Grade Teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All Sixth Grade Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other Intermediate Grade Teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Educational Levels: Highest Degree Held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. All Undergraduate Degrees N=86</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All Graduate Degrees N=47</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total Mailed = 166; Total Usable (returned) = 133; Percent Usable (returned) = 83%*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Master's Degrees</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Advanced Specialist Degrees</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Doctoral Degrees</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Demographic Analysis

A. Sex
1. Total Males
2. Total Females

B. Race
1. Total Black
2. Total White

C. Situational
1. Total Small Districts
2. Total Medium Districts
3. Total Large Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=133</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Males</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Females</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Black</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total White</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Small Districts</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Medium Districts</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Large Districts</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to each of the respective superintendents of the involved school districts, as well as the identified building units. A representative sample of this written communication between the investigator and the school districts was illustrated by the literature from the Richmond City Schools (Appendix C).

Telephone communications were established between the investigator and each of the principals of the participating schools. These communications allowed the investigator to establish the total number of faculty in each building who wished to participate in the study. In every school unit all of the teachers agreed, initially, to participate. The 166 instruments were then promptly mailed to the principal of each school.

After a two-week period of time, telephone communication was made between the investigator and all participating school principals whose faculties had not returned the instruments. A final follow-up telephone communication was made after an additional two-week period had lapsed to the principals of the remaining schools which had not returned the completed teacher instruments.

Analyses of the Data

The purpose of the study was to determine if significant disagreement existed in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by selected elementary supervisors and classroom teachers in Virginia. In order to conduct the statistical analyses of the data the research questions were changed into null hypotheses. The following null hypotheses provided the framework for the subsequent analyses of the data:

Major null-hypothesis 1

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors.
Major null-hypothesis II

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroupings of two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors.

Minor null-hypotheses

The development of the null-hypothesis was completed in order to guide the research analyses of the subgroupings within each group of personnel: teachers and supervisors.

Minor null-hypothesis II-A

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors.

Minor null-hypothesis II-B

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience.

Minor null-hypothesis II-C

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation.

Minor null-hypothesis II-D

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation.

Minor null hypothesis II-E

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced teachers.

Minor null-hypothesis II-F

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary (K-3) teachers and intermediate (4-6) teachers.
Mean Ranking of the Supervision Tasks

The computation of an overall mean ranking for each task of supervision was completed in order to roughly indicate the degree of importance of each task, as expressed by each subgrouping of respondents. Within each of the respondent subgroupings, an individual mean ranking was obtained by summing the rankings given to a task and dividing by the number of questionnaire items (4) used for that task. For each individual in a subgroup, then, a mean rank for each task was computed in a similar fashion. An overall mean ranking for each task was computed by summing the mean rank for each task across all individuals in a subgroup and dividing by the number of individuals in that subgroup. This procedure was followed for each task giving ten overall mean rankings.

Rank Ordering of the Supervision Tasks

The rank ordering for the tasks of supervision was conducted after the overall mean rankings had been computed. The largest overall task mean ranking was given a rank of 10 and the smallest mean ranking was given a rank of 1. Chapter IV contained the tabular summation of these efforts in association with each of the null hypotheses.

Hotellings' Multivariate $T^2$ test

The Hotellings' $T^2$ is the multivariate analogue to the two group $T$ test. It was used since ten non-independent tests of the difference between means within two independent groups were made in the analysis of each null hypothesis. Since the ten tests are nonindependent, committing a Type I error is more likely. The Hotellings' $T^2$ eliminated the
posibility of committing a Type 1 error. In all cases (for the tasks and orientations) the values for the Hotellings' $T^2$ were tested against the critical value of .05 after converting it to an F value to give an exact test of the $T^2$ value. The following formula for this test was used:

$$T^2 = \frac{(\bar{x}^1 - \bar{x}^2)^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \cdot \frac{(n_1 + n_2)}{n_1 n_2}$$

$$\frac{n_1 + n_2 - p - 1}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} T^2 = F_{n_1 + n_2 - p - 1}$$

In all cases for the tasks the values for the Hotellings' $T^2$ were tested against the critical value of .05 by converting it to an F value to give an exact test of the $T^2$ value, while for the orientations, they were tested at the .01 level of confidence.

Variance for the Tasks of Supervision

For each of the tasks of supervision a variance of the mean rankings was computed by squaring the standard deviation of each overall task mean in each subgroup. F tests of the difference between variances across pairs of subgroups were computed for each task of supervision with the Hartley test. In each case the F values were tested at the .005 level of confidence in order to avoid committing a Type 1 error. Since the task variance in each subgroup indicated a measure of the dispersion of ranks that individuals in each subgroup gave to that respective task, the F test determines whether the dispersion of ranks for each task across groups are significantly different. The substantive interpretation of a variance computed for a task is related to the degree of agreement or disagreement in the rankings given by individuals of a subgroup to that task. Thus, if Staffing had a variance of .6532, as expressed by respondents in hypothetical subgroup A, and Curriculum Development had a variance of .2532, as expressed by the
same respondents, then the conclusion could be made that these particular subgroup respondents agreed more in their rankings of the Curriculum Development task than in their rankings of the Staffing task. In short, as the ranks of a task increases, the amount of disagreement increases among individuals in the rankings of that task.

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance

In order to measure the degree of consistency with which individuals in a subgroup ranked all ten of the supervision tasks together the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was computed (for each subgroup). A Kendall's $W$ of $0.00$ would indicate that there was no agreement in the rankings of the tasks, across all the individuals for that subgroup. A Kendall's $W$ of $1.00$ would indicate perfect agreement in the rankings of the tasks among all individuals for that subgroup.

$W$ is related to the variance associated with each task, since the variance consists of the dispersion of the rankings given to a task by all individuals within a subgroup. Therefore, if all of the variances for each task were high, then the conclusion could be made that there is little agreement among individuals in their rankings of each task. Subsequently, the prediction could be made that $W$ would be small for this same subgrouping. In like manner, if the variances for each task were all small, then the prediction could be made that $W$ should be large.

The formula for the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was observed as follows:

$$W = \frac{5}{1/12 K^2 (N^3 - N)}$$

Mean Score Index for Orientations

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among
the rankings of the supervision orientations, a difference scale was constructed. Since each of the paired orientations were considered to be polar opposites, the scale was designed as a continuum. The difference continuum was developed with the values of -4.0 and +4.0 as the extremes. In each case the first orientation of each of the four paired orientations was given a value of -4.0, and the second a value of +4.0.

The continuum extremes were developed as follows. Since each orientation in a pair, e.g., tractive and dynamic, could receive a maximum rank of 5 and a minimum ranking of 1, then the difference of 4 between the maximum and the minimum rankings given to each orientation in a pair represented the extremes of the continuum. For example, if one subgroup had a mean ranking of 2.00 for the tractive and a mean ranking of 3.00 for dynamic, then the difference score is 1.00, which represented a position along the continuum.

Subsequently, the mean ranking for the first orientation of each pair was subtracted from the second, separately for each subgrouping. The difference between these two rankings represented a position along the continuum for each of the subgroupings.

These different scores were then used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations, across subgroupings, by the Hotellings' $T^2$ test. In every case the resultant $T^2$ values were tested at the .05 level of confidence after being converted to an $F$ value.

Variance for the Orientations

The variance for the paired orientations is a measure of the dispersion of the index scores around the overall mean index score for each subgroup. It was computed by squaring the difference between an individual index score
and subgroup mean index score, summing over all individuals within the subgroup, and dividing by the number of individuals within a subgroup minus one. Hartley's F test was used to test the difference between variances across subgroups with \( p = .01 \).

**Discriminant Analysis**

A significant Hotellings' \( T^2 \) would indicate that differences existed between the dependent variables across the groups. To determine which dependent variables were contributing to the difference between groups, a two group discriminant analysis could be used when intercorrelations existed between the dependent variables. Since an ipsative measure was used intercorrelations among the variables were expected. As noted by Tatsuoka, one advantage of a discriminant analysis procedure rather than separate t tests is that it would result in a more accurate interpretation of the differences between groups since the intercorrelations were accounted for in the computation of the discriminant function. The basic strategy in discriminant analysis was to define a linear combination of the dependent variable such that the distance between group centroids would be maximized. The discriminant analysis is interpreted by examining the magnitude and signs associated with vector of standardized Beta weights and by examining the magnitude and sign of the correlation between individuals' discriminant scores and individual scores on each variable. These correlations are analogous to a factor structure given by factor analysis and are interpreted in a similar way.

**Limitation**

The particular instrument used in this study required the participant to rank order five responses representing five task orientations to
a stimulus situation. Since there were ten supervisory tasks upon which mean rankings were computed, each respondent repeated the above ranking procedure eight times with each time consisting of a different combination of supervisory tasks. Such a ranking procedure results in nonindependent scores for the ten supervisory tasks since the rank a respondent gives to one supervisory task changes the probability of the ranks that can be given to the remaining responses when all ranks have to be used. Because this procedure violates the assumption of response independence required by parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures, their use, strictly speaking, is unjustified. However, rather than resorting to subjective judgments about whether one mean or variance differs from another beyond chance expectations, both parametric and nonparametric tests were used. In view of the unknown effects of the violation of the independence assumption upon making Type I and II errors, the results of the statistical tests must be accepted with a great deal of caution, and any substantive interpretations made on the basis of these procedures are to be viewed as highly tentative.

Instrument Validity

In order to account for some degree of content validity, the original instrument was subjected to twelve revisions. Each revision was made after the instrument had been submitted to different panels of judges constituted by university professors, public school administrators, supervisors and teachers.
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Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

The intent of this chapter was to present and examine those data collected in this research investigation. The chapter was organized into sections, each one containing data and analyses which were relevant to the individual hypothesis under consideration.

The primary aim of this study was to determine whether there was significant disagreement between the expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed by elementary teachers and supervisors in Virginia. The data was obtained from the administration of an instrument organized into eight vignettes, each one of which was followed by five responses which were to be rank-ordered according to preference. A five-point scale (1-5) ranging from (1) highest priority to (5) lowest priority was used to obtain individual responses to each item related to each vignette in the test. This information was used for the analyses discussed in this chapter.

Major Hypothesis I

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed by elementary teachers and supervisors in Virginia. Reject. The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was 74.4013, with $p < .05$, which indicated significant disagreement in the task expectations. Table 8 contained the mean rankings for the tasks of
supervision upon which the Hotelling's $T^2$ was computed. Inspection of the mean rankings, as well as the significant $T^2$ value of 74.4013 at the .05 level of confidence supported the observation that there were significant differences among the mean rankings for the supervision tasks, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors in this study. The Hotelling's $T^2$ test did not indicate, however, between which specific mean rankings the significant differences were found.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision were computed using the Hartley test, and none were found significant at the .005 level of confidence. This procedure indicated that supervisors and teachers were more in agreement than disagreement, as depicted by the dispersion of the rankings for each task taken separately.

Computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was conducted in order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean rankings within the teacher group and the supervisor group. This assessed the degree to which individual respondents within these two groups agreed in their ranking of the tasks. At the bottom of Tables 6 and 7 the Kendall's $W(s)$ were included for all teachers and all supervisors. The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall's $W$ tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 contained the results of the aforementioned statistical analyses.

Discussion

The Hotelling's $T^2$ value of 74.4013, $p < .05$, supported the observation that significant disagreement existed in the supervision task expectations, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors in this study.
### TABLE 6

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by All Teachers

**N** = 133

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( W = 0.31; p < .01 \) (significant)
TABLE 7

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by All Supervisors
N = 139

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>All Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.4295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W = 0.28; p < .01$ (significant)
TABLE 8
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Elementary Teachers and Supervisors
All Teachers, N = 133
All Supervisors, N = 139

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>All Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.5062</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.3408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.4603</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.4629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.5532</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.6816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.4974</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.5026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.5164</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.3869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.4097</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.3354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.4728</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.3921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.3525</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.4295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.5155</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.4014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.5153</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.3287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 74.4013$, $p < .05$ (significant)

$F = 1.52$  $p = 0.005$, d.f. 138, 132
Examination of Tables 6 and 7 indicated that while teachers rank-ordered Providing Materials first, supervisors ranked Evaluating first. The greatest difference in the rank-ordering of the tasks was observed in Organizing for Instruction; supervisors rank-ordered this task fifth, while teachers rank-ordered this task ninth. Both groups rank-ordered Public Relations tenth.

Computation of individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision found none significant at the .005 level of confidence. Analysis of Tables 6 and 7 indicated that the greatest amount of variance was noted for the Staffing task, which supported the observation that both supervisors and teachers were more in disagreement than agreement in the ranking of this task. While the differences between variances were not found significant, the amount of variance for Curriculum Development, Providing Materials, and Evaluating between these two groups was the most different, as noted in Table 8.

While it was noted in the Cardenas study that supervisors ranked Relating Special Services higher than did teachers, this was not observed in the current investigation. Disagreement between supervisors and teachers shows that teachers give more importance to Curriculum Development as a task of the supervisor than do supervisors. In the current investigation, teachers rank-ordered Curriculum Development fifth, and supervisors rank-ordered it sixth.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance resulted in $W = 0.31, p < .01$ for all teachers and $W = 0.28, p < .01$ for all supervisors. The Kendall $W$ is a numerical indication of the degree to which both groups (separately) consistently ranked the tasks. The
magnitude for the Ws for both groups indicated modest agreement within both groups in the ranking of the tasks.

Since the Hotelling's $T^2$ value for the difference between task means across the all supervisor and the all teacher group was significant ($p < .05$), a discriminant analysis was performed to determine the variables upon which the two groups differed. This procedure was more appropriate than separate t-tests when the variables upon which the t-tests were being made were intercorrelated.

In a two group discriminant analysis, one discriminant function is given. In this case, the discriminant function was significant ($p < .01$, d.f. 10, 261). To assess the magnitude of the difference or the total discriminatory power given by the discriminant function a multivariate extension of $w^2$ was used. For this problem, $W^2$ multi was equal to .213. This meant that about 21% of the total variability of the discriminant function was attributable to differences between groups.

In order to isolate the variables which accounted for the difference between groups, the correlations between individuals' discriminant scores and individuals' scores on each task variable were examined. Thus, there were ten correlations which were analogous to a factor structure given by factor analysis. The task variables which had correlations with discriminant scores of .30 or larger (indicating significance) were curriculum development (+.42), organizing for instruction (-.52), providing materials (+.49), and evaluating instruction (-.49). All other task variables had correlations of .13 or less. Positive correlations indicated that the task means for the all supervisor group were larger than the task means for the all teacher group. The negative correlations indicated just the opposite effect.
Orientations of Supervision

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervision orientations between all teachers and all supervisors a difference scale was constructed. The rationale for the construction of this scale was based upon the assumption that each of the four paired supervision orientations constituted polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was created as a continuum ranging from -4.0 to +4.0. In each case the first orientation of each pair was given a value of -4.0, while the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. The overall mean ranking score for the first orientation was subtracted from that mean ranking score for the second orientation. This resulted in an index score which represented a position along the continuum. These scores were used to test whether there were significant differences in the expectations for the supervision orientations, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors and assessed by the Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ test. The computation of the Hotelling's $T^2$ test yielded a $T^2$ value of 5.1686 with $p = 0.28$, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence.

These data tended to support the observation that there were no significant differences in the expectations for supervision orientations, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors.

In order to compute the variance for each of the paired orientations for both groups, each respondent's individual difference score was subtracted from the mean difference score, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for the teacher group and the supervisor group. There was no significant difference in the variances for the orientations as
TABLE 9
Orientations of Supervision as Expressed by All Teachers and All Supervisors
All Teachers, N = 133
All Supervisors, N = 139

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th>All Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean Index</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
<td>1.4151</td>
<td>1.0216</td>
<td>1.8328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Centered/Methods-Centered</td>
<td>1.2143</td>
<td>1.1752</td>
<td>1.0216</td>
<td>1.1226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive</td>
<td>0.3083</td>
<td>1.4876</td>
<td>0.5072</td>
<td>1.4347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal-Oriented/Pressure-Responsive</td>
<td>-0.5489</td>
<td>0.9615</td>
<td>-0.6547</td>
<td>1.0211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T^2 = 5.1686, p = 0.28 (not significant)

F = 1.50     p ≤ 0.01 d.f. 138, 132
assessed by individual F-tests, which were expressed by all teachers and all supervisors ($F = 1.50; p < 0.01; d.f. 138, 132$).

Table 9 contained the tabular presentation of these data.

**Discussion**

The computation of the Hotelling's $T^2$ test yielded a $T^2$ value of $5.1686, p = 0.28$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. These data supported the observation that no significant disagreement existed between teachers and supervisors in the orientation expectations. In agreement with the Cardenas study teachers and supervisors tended to favor the Dynamic as opposed to the Tractive orientation, Methods-Centered as opposed to Subject-Centered, Directive as opposed to Permissive, and Goal-Oriented as opposed to Pressure-Responsive orientations of supervision.

Individual F-tests were computed upon the variances for the mean index scores, and none were found significant at the .01 level of confidence.

**Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-A**

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors. **Fail to reject.** The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was $6.857$ with $p = 0.78$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Table 12 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon which the Hotelling's $T^2$ was computed. Inspection of the mean rankings would tend to indicate that there were no significant differences among mean rankings for each of the tasks for both general and special area supervisors at the .05 level of confidence.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision
were computed using the Hartley test, and none were significant at the .005 level of confidence. This procedure indicated that general and special area supervisors were more in agreement than in disagreement, as illustrated by the dispersion of the rankings for each task.

In order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean rankings within each supervisory sub-group (general and special areas), a Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was computed. This assessed the degree to which individual respondents within each of these two supervisor sub-groups agreed in their ranking of the tasks. At the bottom of Tables 10 and 11 the Kendall's W(s) were included for general and special area supervisors, respectively. The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall's W tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks.

Tables 10, 11, and 12 contained the results of the aforementioned statistical analyses.

Discussion

Examination of Table 38 (see Appendix B) would indicate that in the Cardenas study, "mean rankings given to the tasks of the supervisor show little difference between general and special area supervisors." An examination of Tables 10, 11, and 12 from the current study would tend to substantiate the finding that no significant disagreement existed between the groups of general and special area supervisors for the expectations of the elementary supervisor role as indicated by the non-significant $T^2$ value computed on the mean rankings of the tasks.

Further analyses of the aforementioned Tables would suggest that general area supervisors in the current study rank ordered the tasks of
### TABLE 10

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by General Area Supervisors
General Area Supervisors, N=81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>General Area Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W = 0.31, p < .01$
### TABLE 11

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Special Area Supervisors
Special Area Supervisors, N=58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Mean Rankings</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.6853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.4264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W = 0.26, p < .01$
TABLE 12
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role
as Expressed by General Area Supervisors and Special
Area Supervisors
General Area Supervisors, N=81
Special Area Supervisors, N=58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Gen. Area Supervisors</th>
<th>Spec. Area Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.2750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.4859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.6815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.4531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.3980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.3674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.3863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.4353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.4437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.3545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 6.857, p = 0.78$ (not significant)

$F = 2.10 \quad p = .005, d.f. 92, 45$
supervision with almost the identical priority as the general area supervisors in the Cardenas study. Supervisors in the current study tended to rank-order the supervision tasks somewhat differently than did those in the Cardenas study with the greatest differences occurring in the ranks given to Orienting Staff Members, Relating Special Services, and Organizing for Instruction.

In this study, although the computation of individual F-tests between the variances for each task area for general and special area supervisors found none significant at the .005 level of confidence, one observation could be made with respect to the Staffing task. While Harris has placed this task area among the six essential tasks for any supervisory program, Staffing was rank-ordered eighth by general area supervisors, and seventh by special area supervisors. Since the variances associated with the Staffing task in the current study were the largest of all task variances in these two supervisor sub-groupings, there was more disagreement in the ranking of this task than any of the other tasks.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance resulted in $W = .26, p < .01$ for special area supervisors, and $W = .31, p < .01$ for general area supervisors. The Kendall $W$ is a numerical indication of the degree to which both sub-groups (separately) consistently ranked the tasks. The magnitude for the $Ws$ for both sub-groups indicated a modest agreement within both sub-groups in the rankings of tasks. Since the $Ws$ for both groups were significant (.01 level) it was noted that within the general area and special area supervisor sub-groups the agreement on the rankings of the tasks was greater than that which could be attributed to chance.
Orientations of Supervision

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervisory orientations between general area and special area supervisors a difference scale was constructed. The rationale for the construction of this scale was predicated upon the assumption that each of the four paired supervision orientations constituted polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was developed as a continuum ranging from -4.0 to +4.0. In every case the first orientation of each of the four pairs was given a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. Subsequently, the mean ranking for the first orientation of each pair was subtracted from the second, separately for the general area and special area supervisors. These two scores represented a position—the mean index score—along the continuum for both supervisory sub-groups for each of the four paired orientations.

These mean index scores were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations, as expressed by general area and special area supervisors and assessed by a Hotelings' multivariate $T^2$ test. The results of the computation of this test indicated a $T^2$ value of 0.7803 with $p = 0.94$, for general area and special area supervisors, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data indicated that there were no significant differences between general area and special area supervisors with respect to their respective expectations of the orientations of supervision.

Variance for general and special area supervisor sub-groups was computed by squaring first then subtracting each individual respondent's
TABLE 13

Orientations of Supervision as Expressed by General Area Supervisors and Special Area Supervisors

General Area Supervisors, N=81
Special Area Supervisors, N=58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th>General Area Supervisors</th>
<th>Special Area Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index Score</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>1.0802</td>
<td>2.0779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Method Centered Continuum</td>
<td>1.0617</td>
<td>1.1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.5185</td>
<td>1.5778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive Continuum</td>
<td>-0.6235</td>
<td>0.9345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 0.7803; p = 0.94$ (not significant)

$F = 1.81; p = .01; d.f. 80, 57$
difference score from the mean difference score, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for that respective supervisor sub-group. Table 13 contained the means and variances for the paired orientations for both general area and special area supervisor sub-groups.

Discussion

An examination of Table 38 (see Appendix B) would tend to support the following observation as to the expectations for the supervision orientations, as noted in the Cardenas study:

... Analysis of the orientation rankings for these two groups show small differences. Both groups display similar preferences for dynamic over tractive, permissive over directive, and goal-oriented over pressure-responsive types of supervision.

General area supervisors show a strong preference for method-centered over subject-centered supervision, whereas special area supervisors indicate only a slight preference for method-centered over subject-centered supervision.6

Based upon the utilization of the aforementioned continuum formula for analysis of the orientation mean index scores in this study, general area and special area supervisors were more dynamic than tractive, methods-centered than subject-centered, directive than permissive, and goal-oriented than pressure-responsive in their respective expectations for the orientations. For the first three paired orientations discussed above, general area supervisors expressed slightly stronger preferences than did special area supervisors, as indicated by their respective mean index scores along the continuum scale. However, special area supervisors did illustrate a higher preference for goal-oriented as opposed to pressure-responsive supervision with a mean index score of -0.6983, while general area supervisors favored the goal-oriented orientation with a mean index score of -0.6235.
While the Cardenas study concluded that general and special area supervisors were more permissive as opposed to directive, it was observed in the current study that general and special area supervisors were more directive, as opposed to permissive.

**Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-B**

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience. Fail to Reject. The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was 6.7576 and $p = 0.78$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Table 16 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon which the Hotelling's $T^2$ was computed. Inspection of the mean rankings and the non-significant $T^2$ value of 6.7576 supported the observation that there were no significant differences among mean rankings for each task of supervision as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience.

Individual F-tests were computed between the variances for each task using the Hartley test, and none were found significant at the .035 level of confidence. These data tended to support the observation that supervisors with and without administrative experience were more in agreement than in disagreement, as indicated by the dispersion of rankings for each task taken separately.

In order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean rankings within each supervisory sub-group, a Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was computed separately for supervisors with and without administrative experience. This statistical procedure was attempted in order to assess the degree to which individual respondents within each of these
TABLE 14

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Supervisors With Administrative Experience (N = 97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Administrative Experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Ranking</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.2896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ W = 0.28; \ p < .01 \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.3033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( W = 0.31; \ p < .01 \)
TABLE 16
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Supervisors With and Without Administrative Experience
Supervisors with administrative experience, N=97
Supervisors without administrative experience, N=52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Administrative Experience</th>
<th>Supervisors Without Administrative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.2896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.4762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.6561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.5085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.4136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.3896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.4994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.4473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.3745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 6.7576; \ p = 0.78$ (not significant)

$F = 2.06; \ p = 0.005; \ d.f. 96, 41$
two sub-groups agreed in their respective rankings of the tasks of supervision. The Kendall's Ws were included at the bottom of Tables 14 and 15. The amount of agreement indicated by Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance tended to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks of supervision, as expressed by both of these supervisory sub-groups.

The results of the statistical analyses were illustrated in Tables 14, 15, and 16.

Discussion

It was noted in Chapter II that the evidence recorded in the Cardenas study failed to support the acceptance of one of his minor hypotheses, that, "There is a significant lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervisor position between supervisors with administrative experience and supervisors without administrative experience."^7

Analyses of Tables 14, 15, and 16, would tend to support the observation that within the current study, no significant disagreement existed as to the expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience. However, further analysis of the rank orderings for the tasks in this study would indicate that while supervisors with administrative experience ranked Evaluating first and Orienting Staff Members third, supervisors without administrative experience ranked Orienting Staff Members first, and Evaluating third. Identical agreement in the rank orderings for the tasks for these two supervisory sub-groups was noted for Providing Facilities (ninth), Providing Materials (second), In-Service Education (fourth), and Public Relations (tenth).
Examination of Table 39 (see Appendix B) and Table 16 would also support the observation that supervisors without administrative experience from the Cardenas study and supervisors with administrative experience in this current investigation were in close agreement as to their respective rank ordering of the tasks of supervision. This was supported by identical rank ordering for seven of the ten tasks for these particular two sub-groupings from the two separate studies.

Although the computation of individual F-tests on the variances related to each task area, separately for supervisors with and without administrative experience found none significant at the .005 level of confidence, the Staffing task, again, recorded the greater degree of variance for both of the sub-groupings in this study. The observed variance for Staffing of .6561 for supervisors with administrative experience and .7560 for supervisors without administrative experience would tend to indicate that the greater dispersion of the mean rankings within both of these respective sub-groupings was indicative of more disagreement than agreement in ranking this task area in the current study.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for each of these two supervisory sub-groups resulted in $W = 0.28$, $p < .01$ for supervisors with administrative experience, and $W = 0.31$, $p < .01$ for supervisors without administrative experience. These data indicated that for both supervisors with and without administrative experience, there existed significant consistency in the ranking of the supervision tasks within each of the two sub-groups, greater than that which could be attributed to chance.
Orientations of Supervision

A difference continuum was constructed in order to determine whether there was significant differences among the rankings of the supervisory orientations as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience. In the construction of this continuum each of the four paired orientations were considered to have been polar opposites (see Chapter II). The continuum ranged from -4.0 to +4.0.

In every instance the first orientation of each pair was given a value of -4.0 and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. The mean ranking score for the first orientation in each pair was subtracted from the mean ranking score of the second orientation. This resulted in a mean index score which represented a position along the continuum. These mean index scores were used to test whether there were significant differences in the expectations for the supervision orientations, as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience, and determined by a Hotellings' multivariate $T^2$ test. The computation of the Hotellings' $T^2$ test yielded a $T^2$ value of 3.1451, $p = 0.55$, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data support the observation that there were no significant differences in the expectations for supervision orientations, as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience.

In order to compute the variance for each of the paired orientations for both supervisory sub-groups, each individual respondent's difference score was subtracted from the mean difference score, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for that respective sub-grouping. There was no significant difference in the variances for the orientations of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Administrative Experience</th>
<th>Supervisors Without Administrative Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index Score</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>1.0825</td>
<td>2.0921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Methods Centered Continuum</td>
<td>1.0567</td>
<td>1.1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.4381</td>
<td>1.5690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive Continuum</td>
<td>-0.6701</td>
<td>0.8276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T^2 = 3.1451; \ p = 0.55 \text{ (not significant)} \]

\[ F = 1.90; \ p \leq 0.01; \ d.f. 96,41 \]
supervision as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience, as indicated by $F = 1.90$, d.f. 96, 41, $p = .01$.

Table 17 contained the results of these statistical analyses.

**Discussion**

Chapter II contained a discussion of the orientation rankings for supervisors with and without administrative experience, as recorded in the Cardenas study. While no significant differences were noted in the orientation rankings in the Cardenas study, "Both groups display similar preferences for dynamic over tractive, method-centered over subject-centered, directive over permissive, and goal-oriented over pressure-responsive supervision."

Based upon the aforementioned continuum difference formula for the orientation rankings, it was observed in the current study that both supervisors with and without administrative experience favored Dynamic over Tractive, Methods-Centered over Subject-Centered, Directive over Permissive, and Goal-Oriented over Pressure-Responsive supervision orientations. Further analysis of the mean index scores in Table 17 would indicate that supervisors with administrative experience tend to favor all of the above orientations more strongly than supervisors without administrative experience with one exception. With respect to the directive orientation, supervisors with administrative experience recorded a mean index score of 0.4381, while supervisors without administrative experience had a mean index score of 0.6667 for this same paired orientation.

**Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-C**

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for
the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation. **Fail to Reject.** The Hotellings' multivariate $T^2$ value was 12.336 and $p = 0.33$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Table 20 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon which the Hotellings' $T^2$ was computed. Inspection of the mean rankings and the non-significant $T^2$ value supported the observation that there were no significant differences among the mean rankings for each task of supervision as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation.

Individual F-tests were computed between the variances for each task using the Hartley test, and none were found significant at the .005 level of confidence. These data tended to support the observation that supervisors with different levels of academic preparation were more in agreement than in disagreement, as indicated by the dispersion of the rankings for each task taken separately.

In order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean rankings within each of these two supervisory sub-groupings, a Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance was computed. This assessed the degree to which individual respondents within each of these two supervisory sub-groups agreed in their rankings of the tasks. At the bottom of Tables 18 and 19 the Kendall's Ws were included for supervisors with the M.A. degree and less preparation, as well as for supervisors with the Specialist degree and higher academic preparation. The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall's W tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks.

Tables 18, 19, and 20 contained the results of the aforementioned statistical analyses.
TABLE 18
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Supervisors With Master's Degrees or Less Academic Preparation (N=93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Master's Degrees or Less Academic Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = 0.28; p < .01
TABLE 19
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as
Expressed by Supervisors With the Advanced Specialist
Degree and Higher Academic Preparation
\((N=46)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Advanced Specialist Degree or Higher Academic Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(W = 0.30; p < .01\)
TABLE 20

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Supervisors with Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Supervisors with Master's degrees or less, N = 96
Supervisors with Advanced Specialist degrees or higher, N = 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors with Master's or Less</th>
<th>Supervisors with Specialist or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.3653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.4651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.7031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.4993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.4030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.3482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.4252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.4320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.3860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.2991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 12.336; \ p = 0.33$ (not significant)

$F = 2.06 \quad p = .005; \ d.f. 92, 45$
Discussion

An examination of Tables 18, 19, and 20 would substantiate the finding that no significant disagreement existed between the supervision task expectations, as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation, as determined by the non-significant $T^2$ value ($T^2 = 12.336; P = 0.33$).

Of the ten task areas, both supervisors with the Master's degree and less academic preparation, as well as supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree and higher degrees agreed in the rank ordering of these task areas: Evaluating (first); Orienting Staff Members (third); Staffing (eighth); Providing Facilities (ninth); and Public Relations (tenth).

Neither of these two subgroupings rank-ordered curriculum development (sixth for supervisors with M.A. and lower degrees; seventh for supervisors with Advanced Specialist and higher degrees) nor Staffing (eighth for both sub-groups), within the top five rank-orderings for either subgroup. These were the only tasks of the five essential task areas for any supervisory program, as defined by Harris, not rank-ordered within the top five for both of these two sub-groupings.

Individual $F$-tests were computed between the variances for each task area for both of the two supervisory sub-groupings, and none were found significant at the .005 level of confidence. However, the variances associated with the Staffing task were the largest of all task variances valid for these two supervisory sub-groupings. Examination of Table 20 indicated that variance for the Staffing task for supervisors with the Master's degree and less was 0.7031, while that for supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree was 0.6525. These levels of variance for the
Staffing task for both of these two sub-groupings indicated that more disagreement existed in the ranking of this task than for any of the other tasks for these supervisor sub-groupings.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance for supervisors with different levels of academic preparation resulted in \( W = 0.28, p < .01 \) for supervisors with the Master's degree or less, and \( W = 0.30, p < .01 \) for supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation. These data indicated that for both of these two supervisor sub-groups there existed a modest degree of consistency in the respective manner in which the supervision tasks were ranked. Since for both of these two sub-groups \( W \) was significant at the .01 level of confidence, the degree of agreement was greater than that which could be attributed to chance.

**Orientations of Supervision**

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervisory orientations between two sub-groupings of supervisors with different levels of academic preparation a difference scale was constructed. The rationale for the construction of this scale was based upon the tenet that each of the four paired supervision orientations constituted polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was developed as a continuum ranging from \(-4.0\) to \(+4.0\). In every case the first orientation of each of the four pairs was awarded a value of \(-4.0\), and the second orientation was given a value of \(+4.0\). Subsequently, the mean rankings for the first paired orientation was subtracted from the second, separately for both of these two supervisor sub-groupings. The resulting two mean index scores represented a position
along the continuum for both supervisor sub-groups for each of the four paired orientations.

These mean index scores were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations, as expressed by two sub-groupings of supervisors with different levels of academic preparation, and assessed by a Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ test. The results of the computation of this test indicated a $T^2$ value of 2.809, $p = 0.60$, for the two sub-groupings of supervisors with different levels of academic preparation, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data indicated that there were no significant differences between sub-groupings of supervisors with the Master's degree or less preparation and supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation, with respect to their respective expectations of the orientations of supervision.

Variance for both of these supervisor sub-groupings was computed by squaring first, then subtracting each individual respondent's difference score from the mean difference score, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for that respective supervisor sub-group. Table 21 contained the means and variance for the paired orientations for both sub-groups: supervisors with the Master's degree or less preparation and supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation.

Discussion

The data included within Table 21 supported the finding that supervisors with the Master's degree or less preparation, as well as supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation both favored Dynamic over Tractive, Methods-Centered over Subject-Centered,
### TABLE 21

Orientations of Supervision as Expressed by Supervisors With Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Supervisors with Master's degrees or less academic preparation, N = 93
Supervisors with Advanced Specialist degrees or higher academic preparation, N = 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors With Master's or less</th>
<th>Supervisors With Specialist or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index Score</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>0.9677</td>
<td>1.9338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Methods Centered Continuum</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.5591</td>
<td>1.4828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive Continuum</td>
<td>-0.6021</td>
<td>1.0138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ T^2 = 2.8099, \ p = 0.60 \] (not significant)

\[ F = 1.92 \quad p = 0.01; \ d.f. 92, 45 \]
Directive over Permissive and Goal-Oriented over Pressure-Responsive supervision orientations. However, further analyses of the mean continuum scores in Table 21 would indicate that supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation more strongly favored the above orientations with one exception. Supervisors with Master's degree or less preparation had a mean continuum score of 0.5591 in favoring the Directive orientation, while supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation had a mean continuum score of 0.4022 in favoring the Directive orientation.

Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-D

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation. **Fail to Reject.** The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was 8.6723, $p = 0.62$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Table 25 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon which the Hotelling's $T^2$ was computed. An inspection of the mean rankings as well as the non-significant $T^2$ value of 8.6723 at the .05 level of confidence would support the observation that there were no significant differences among mean rankings for each task for teachers with an undergraduate degree and less academic preparation, as well as for teachers with the Master's degree and higher academic preparation.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision were computed using the Hartley test, and none were found significant at the .005 level of confidence. The use of this F-test procedure indicated that teachers with different levels of academic preparation were
more in agreement than in disagreement as depicted by the dispersion of
the rankings for each task taken separately.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was con­
ducted in order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean
rankings within each of the respective teacher sub-groups. This proce­
dure measured the degree to which individual respondents within each of
these two teacher sub-groups agreed in their ranking of the tasks. At
the bottom of Tables 20 and 21 the Kendall's W were included for both
sub-groups of teachers with different levels of academic preparation.
The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall's W
tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the
tasks.

Tables 22, 23, and 24 contained the results of the aforementioned
statistical analysis.

Discussion

No significant disagreement existed in the task expectations for the
elementary supervisor role, as expressed by teachers with different
levels of academic preparation. This statement was predicated upon a
Hotellings' $T^2$ value of 8.6723, $p = .62$, which was not significant at
the .05 level of confidence. Examination of Tables 22 and 23 indicated
that both of these sub-groups rank-ordered the tasks of supervision in
an identical manner. Both sub-groups in this investigation ranked Pro­
viding Materials first, while only two of the five sub-groups of teachers
in the Cardenas study ranked this task first. Curriculum Development
and Organizing for Instruction were both ranked lower in this investiga­
tion than they were ranked by the teacher sub-groups in the Cardenas
### TABLE 22

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Teachers with Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Teachers with undergraduate degrees, N=86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Teachers with Undergraduate Degrees</th>
<th>Mean Rankings</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W = 0.30; p < .01$
TABLE 23

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Teachers with Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Teachers with Graduate degrees, N = 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Teachers with Graduate Degrees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.3964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.6544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.4422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.4170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = 0.32; p < .01
TABLE 24

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Teachers with Different Levels of Academic Preparation

Teachers with Undergraduate Degrees, N=86
Teachers with Graduate Degrees, N = 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Teachers with Undergraduate Degrees</th>
<th>Teachers with Graduate Degrees and Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.5717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.4924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.5035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.5330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.4943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.4547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.4305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.3194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.5580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.5205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 8.6723, p = 0.62$ (not significant)

$F = 2.00, p = .005; d.f. 85, 46$
In-Service Education (second), Orienting Staff Members (third), and Relating Special Services (sixth) were all ranked higher in the current study than in the Cardenas investigation. Public Relations was ranked tenth by both subgroups in this study, which was also ranked tenth in the Cardenas study.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision found none significant at the .005 level of confidence. Examination of Table 22 indicated that teachers with graduate degrees were in most disagreement as to the ranking of the Staffing task, as indicated by a variance of .6544. However, variances for Evaluating (.5578), Orienting Staff Members (.5372), and Providing Materials (.5610) indicated some disagreement for teachers with graduate degrees in the rankings for those tasks.

Teachers with undergraduate degrees were in most disagreement in the ranking of Curriculum Development, as indicated by the amount of variance of all ten tasks (.5717). The greatest amounts of variance associated with Evaluating (.5205), Public Relations (.5580), Staffing (.5035), and Providing Facilities (.5330) indicated that different levels of disagreement existed in the ranking of these tasks by teachers with undergraduate degrees.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance resulted in $W = 0.32$, $p < .01$, for teachers with graduate degrees, and $W = 0.30$, $p < .01$, for teachers with undergraduate degrees. The Kendall $W$ is a numerical indication of the degree to which both of these teacher subgroups (separately) consistently ranked the tasks of supervision. The magnitude of the $W$s for both groups indicated modest agreement in the task rankings within each sub-group. As the $W$s for both groups were
significant the agreement on the rankings of the tasks by both sub-groups of teachers with different levels of academic preparation was greater than that which could be attributed to chance.

Orientations of Supervision

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervision orientations, as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation, a difference scale was constructed. The basis for the development of this scale was the assumption that each of the paired supervision orientations represented polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was created as a continuum ranging from -4.0 to +4.0. In all cases the first orientation of each of the four paired orientations was given a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. As discussed in other orientation sections of this chapter, the overall mean rankings for the first paired orientation was subtracted from the second, separately for both teachers with undergraduate and graduate degrees for each of the four paired orientations, which resulted in a mean index score.

These continuum values—mean index scores—were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations, as expressed by both of these teacher sub-groups. The results of the computation of the Hotelling's $T^2$ test yielded a $T^2$ value of 0.8252, $p = 0.94$, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data indicated that there were no significant differences in the orientations of supervision, as expressed by teachers with the undergraduate degree, and teachers with graduate degrees.

Variance for both of these sub-groups of teachers was computed by
TABLE 25

Orientations of Supervision as Expressed by Teachers with Different Levels of Academic Preparation
Teachers with undergraduate degrees, N = 86
Teachers with graduate degrees, N = 47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations of Supervision</th>
<th>Teachers with Undergraduate Degrees</th>
<th>Teachers with Graduate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index Score</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>0.8488</td>
<td>1.2239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Method Centered Continuum</td>
<td>1.2035</td>
<td>1.2316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.2442</td>
<td>1.2631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive Continuum</td>
<td>-0.5233</td>
<td>0.9523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T2 = 0.8252, p = 0.94 (not significant)
F = 1.70, p = 0.01; d.f. 85, 46
squaring first, then subtracting, each individual respondent's difference score from the overall mean difference index, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for that respective teacher sub-group.

Table 25 contained the means and variance for the paired orientations for teachers with the undergraduate degree, and teachers with graduate degrees.

Discussion

There was no significant disagreement in the expectations for the orientations of supervision, as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation, and assessed by a Hotelling's $T^2$ value of 0.8252, $p = 0.94$ (not significant at the .01 level of confidence). Examination of Table 25 indicated that in each case teachers with graduate degrees were more strongly in favor of the following orientations than were teachers with undergraduate degrees: Dynamic over Tractive, Methods-Centered over Subject-Centered, Directive over Permissive, and Goal-Oriented over Pressure-Responsive.

Cardenas observed the following results in his study with respect to sub-groups of teachers with different levels of academic preparation:

In the Dynamic-Tractive continuum, non-degree teachers are less dynamic oriented than others. Teachers with bachelor and graduate degrees in subject area show a stronger preference for dynamic supervision than non-degree teachers, but not as strong as teachers with bachelor and graduate degrees in Education. None of these differences were significant at the .05 level.

In the Subject-Method-centered continuum, teachers with bachelor degrees in subject areas favored method-centered supervision more strongly than any other type of teacher represented, though differences are below the .05 level.

Non-degree teachers show less acceptance of directive supervision, and teachers with bachelor degrees in subject areas show the strongest preference for directive supervision.

Teachers with bachelor degrees in Education express a
stronger preference for goal-oriented supervision, and teachers
with graduate degrees in Education make very little distinction
between the two. 15

**Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-Ê**

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for
the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced teach-
ers. *Fail to Reject.* The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was 7.928,
with $p = 0.69$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence.
Table 28 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon
which the Hotelling's $T^2$ was computed. An inspection of the mean rank-
ings, and the non-significant $T^2$ value of 7.928 at the .05 confidence
level would support the notation that there were no significant differ-
ences among mean rankings for each task for both teachers with one year
and/or less classroom teaching experience (new) and those with two or
more years of classroom teaching experience.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervi-
sion were computed using the Hartley test and none were found significant
at the .005 level of confidence. The use of this F-test procedure indi-
cated that new and experienced teachers were more in agreement than in
disagreement as depicted by the dispersion of the rankings for each task
taken separately.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was con-
ducted in order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean
rankings within each of the respective teacher sub-groups. This proce-
dure assessed the degree to which individual respondents within each of
the two teacher sub-groups agreed in their ranking of the tasks. At the
bottom of Tables 26 and 27 the Kendall's $W$s were included for new teachers
TABLE 26

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by New Teachers (with one or less years of experience)
(N=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>New Teachers: 1 yr. or less classroom teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = 0.33; p < .01
TABLE 27

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Experienced Teachers (with two or more years of classroom teaching) (N=95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Experienced Teachers: 2 or more yrs. classroom teaching experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.5149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = 0.31; p < .01
TABLE 28

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by New and Experienced Teachers

New Teachers, N=37
Experienced Teachers, N=96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>New Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.5787</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.4326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.4357</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.4733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.6464</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.5149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.4526</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.6729</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.4147</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.4029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.4930</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.4685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.3262</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.3661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.4734</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.5359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.7145</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.4451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 7.9289; p = 0.69$ (not significant)

$F = 1.98$ $p = .035; \text{ d.f. 95, 35}$
and experienced teachers, respectively. The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall's \( W \) tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks.

Tables 26, 27, and 28 contained the results of the aforementioned statistical analyses.

Discussion

An examination of Tables 26 and 27 indicated that the rank-ordering of the means for the tasks of supervision for both new and experienced teachers was similar. The slight differences for these two sub-groups in the rank-ordering of the tasks was noted in the rankings for In-Service Education (new teachers, second; experienced teachers, third); Staffing (new teachers, eighth; experienced teachers, seventh); Orienting Staff Members (new teachers, third; experienced teachers, second); and Providing Facilities (new teachers, seventh; experienced teachers, eighth).

Cardenas observed in his study that no significant "lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervision position between new and experienced teachers" existed.\(^{16}\)

Tasks.--Mean rankings given to the tasks of the supervisor show little differences between experienced and new teachers. . . . The only apparent difference is the higher ranking (6th) given Organizing for instruction by experienced teachers, as compared to a rank of 9th given by new teachers. Experienced teachers ranked Orienting new staff two places higher than new teachers, and In-service education and Relating special services two places lower. The two groups expressed agreement in the ranking of Providing facilities, Public relations, and Evaluation. Spearman rank-order correlation between the two groups was + .85.

With the exception of Staffing, Relating special services, and Evaluation, experienced teachers displayed more variance than new teachers in each of the tasks. Only Providing facilities differed significantly, differing at the .05 and .01 level.\(^{17}\)
Table 28 contained the variances for each task for both new and experienced teacher sub-groups in this study. Individual F-tests between the variances of each task for these two sub-groups found none significant at the .005 level of confidence. However, the amounts of variance for new teachers in association with Staffing (.6454), Curriculum Development (.5787), Providing Materials (.6729), and Evaluating (.7145) would indicate that new teachers were in different degrees of disagreement in the rankings of these tasks.

Further analysis of Table 28 would indicate that the differences in the variances for the following tasks between the new and experienced teacher sub-groups would suggest different amounts of disagreement and/or agreement for these two sub-groups in the ranking for these tasks: Providing Materials (new teachers, .6729; experienced teachers, .4550); Staffing (new teachers, .6454; experienced teachers, .5149); and Evaluating (new teachers, .7145; experienced teachers, .451).

Orientations of Supervision

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervisory orientations between new teachers and experienced teachers a difference scale was constructed. The rationale for the construction of this scale was based upon the tenet that each of the four paired supervision orientations constituted polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was developed as a continuum ranging from -4.0 to 4.0. In every case the first orientation of each of the four pairs was awarded a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of 4.0. Subsequently, the mean rankings for the first paired orientation was subtracted from the second, separately
TABLE 29

Orientations of Supervision as Expressed by New Teachers and Experienced Teachers

New Teachers, N = 37
Experienced Teachers, N = 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations of Supervision</th>
<th>New Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th>Experienced Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Mean Index</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>0.7297</td>
<td>1.8276</td>
<td>0.9362</td>
<td>1.2647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Methods Centered</td>
<td>1.2162</td>
<td>1.0074</td>
<td>1.2135</td>
<td>1.2512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.0811</td>
<td>1.6320</td>
<td>0.3958</td>
<td>1.4205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive</td>
<td>-0.5811</td>
<td>1.0348</td>
<td>-0.5355</td>
<td>0.9434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ r^2 = 2.6878, p = 0.62 \text{ (not significant)} \]

\[ F = 1.80 \quad p = 0.01; \text{ d.f. 85,35} \]
for both of these two teacher sub-groupings. The resulting two scores represented mean index scores which were positions along the continuum for both teacher sub-groups for each of the four paired orientations.

These continuum values were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations as expressed by new teachers and experienced teachers and as assessed by a Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ test. The results of the computation of this test indicated a $T^2$ value of $2.6878$, $p = 0.62$, for the two sub-groups of teachers, which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data indicated that there were no significant differences in the orientation expectations for supervision as expressed by new and experienced teachers.

Variance for both new teachers and those with experience was computed by squaring first, then subtracting, each individual respondent's difference score from the overall mean difference index, summed, and divided by one less than the total $N$ for that respective teacher sub-group. Table 29 contained the means and variance for the paired orientations for both new teachers and experienced teachers.

Discussion

An examination of Table 29 indicated that while both sub-groups favored the same orientations, new teachers were slightly more strongly in favor of the Methods-Centered over Subject-Centered and Goal-Oriented over Pressure-Responsive orientations as opposed to the experienced teachers. The experienced teachers were more strongly in favor of the Dynamic over the Tractive orientation, and the Directive over the Permissive orientation than were the new teachers.
Cardenas observed the following:

**Orientations.**—Analysis of the orientation rankings for these two groups shows small differences. Experienced teachers show a stronger preference than new teachers for dynamic over tractive supervision, and a slightly stronger preference for method-centered over subject-centered and directive over permissive supervision. The two groups had an identical higher ranking for goal-oriented supervision.

**Major Null Hypothesis II: Minor Null Hypothesis II-F**

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary teachers (K-3) and intermediate teachers (4-6). **Fail to Reject.** The Hotelling's multivariate $T^2$ value was 9.3783, $p = 0.56$, which was not significant at the .05 level of confidence. Table 32 included the mean rankings for the tasks of supervision upon which the Hotelling's $T^2$ value was computed. An inspection of the mean rankings, and the non-significant $T^2$ value of 9.3783 at the .05 level of confidence would support the observation that there were no significant differences among the mean rankings for each task for both primary and intermediate teachers.

Individual F-tests between the variances for each task of supervision were computed using the Hartley test and none were found significant at the .005 level of confidence. The use of this F-test procedure indicated that primary and intermediate teachers were more in agreement than in disagreement as depicted by the dispersion of the rankings for each task taken separately.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance was conducted in order to further assess the degree of agreement of the mean rankings within each of the respective teacher sub-groups. This procedure
TABLE 30
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role
as Expressed by Primary Teachers
(N=71)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Primary Teachers (K-3)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.4522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.4897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.4017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$W = 0.31; \ p < .01$
TABLE 31
Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Intermediate Teachers (N=62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Intermediate Teachers (4 - 6)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Rank Order</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.5085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.6347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.3711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.4277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W = 0.33; p < .01
TABLE 32

Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Primary Teachers (K-3) and Intermediate Teachers (4-6)

Primary Teachers, N = 71
Intermediate Teachers, N = 62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Primary Teachers (K-3)</th>
<th>Inter. Teachers (4-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Rankings</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.5039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.4522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.4887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.4017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.5844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Education</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.4870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.3312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.5792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.5350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 9.3783, p = 0.56$ (not significant)

$F = 1.70$ $p = 0.005; d.f. 70, 61$
assessed the degree to which individual respondents within each of the two teacher sub-groups agreed in their ranking of the tasks. At the bottom of Tables 30 and 31 the Kendall's Ws were included for primary teachers and intermediate teachers, respectively. The amount of agreement or disagreement indicated by the Kendall Ws tends to be supported by an examination of the variance for each of the tasks.

Tables 30, 31, and 32 contained the results of the above mentioned statistical analyses.

Discussion

Examination of Tables 31 and 32 indicated that although the rank ordering for the task means for both primary and intermediate teachers for Providing Materials was first, some differences were observed. Primary teachers ranked Organizing for Instruction ninth, while intermediate teachers ranked it third. Staffing was ranked seventh by primary teachers and ninth by intermediate teachers. Both of these sub-groups ranked Providing Facilities eighth and Public Relations tenth. There were no significant differences (.05 level) in the mean rankings for the tasks between these two sub-groups, as assessed by a Hotelling's $T^2$ value of 9.3783, $p = 0.56$.

In the Cardenas study data gathered on different teacher sub-groups which related to a similar hypothesis in that study were analyzed according to the rankings given by teachers in the various elementary school grades.

Minor Hypothesis A-6: There is a lack of consensus in role expectations for the supervision positions between teachers at the various grade levels in elementary schools. REJECT Tasks.--Mean rankings given to the tasks of the supervisor by teachers at the various grade levels show some variation. . . . Providing facilities was ranked second by 5th grade teachers, with all other groups of teachers in the
elementary level ranking it 7th or higher. Orienting new staff was ranked sixth by 2nd grade teachers and second by 1st and 3rd grade teachers. Relating special services was ranked sixth by 6th grade teachers, and eighth and ninth by all other groups. . . .

The following significant differences between variances in ranking the tasks of the supervisor were identified for elementary school teachers.

B. Organizing for instruction
   1st and 5th grade teachers (.05 level)
   5th and 6th grade teachers (.01 level)

D. Providing facilities
   2nd and 4th grade (.05 level)
   2nd and 5th grade (.05 level)
   5th and 6th grade (.05 level)

F. In-service education
   1st and 5th grade (.05 level)

H. Relating special services
   1st and 3rd grade (.05 level)
   1st and 4th grade (.05 level)
   1st and 5th grade (.05 level)

I. Public relations
   2nd and 4th grade (.05 level)
   4th and 5th grade (.05 level)
   5th and 6th grade (.05 level)

J. Evaluation
   2nd and 3rd grade (.05 level)
   2nd and 4th grade (.05 level)

Although the computation of individual F-tests between the variances for each task in the current study for primary and intermediate teachers found none significant at the .01 level of confidence, some observations were noted. The variance for the Staffing task for intermediate teachers was .6347, while the variance for the same task for primary teachers was .4887. This tended to indicate that for the Staffing task, intermediate teachers were in more disagreement in their ranking of this task, while primary teachers were more in agreement. The variance for the Providing Facilities task for the intermediate teachers was .6093, while it was recorded at .4017 for the primary teachers. These data would suggest that intermediate teachers were, again, in more disagreement in ranking this task, while the primary teachers were more in agreement with respect
to the ranking of this task.

The computation of the Kendall Coefficient of Concordance resulted in \( W = 0.31, p < 0.01 \) for the primary teachers, and \( W = 0.33, p < 0.01 \) for the intermediate teachers. The magnitude of the KendallWs for both of these teacher sub-groups indicated modest agreement within this two sub-groups in the rankings of the tasks.

**Orientations of Supervision**

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervisory orientations as expressed by primary and intermediate teachers a difference scale was constructed. The rationale for the construction of this scale was predicated upon the assumption that each of the four paired supervision orientations constituted polar opposites. (See Chapter II.) The difference scale was developed as a continuum ranging from -4.0 to +4.0. In all cases the first orientation of each of the four pairs was awarded a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. As was noted in the prior mentioned orientation sections of this Chapter, the overall mean rankings for the first paired orientation was subtracted from the second, separately for both primary and intermediate teacher sub-groups for each of the four paired orientations.

These continuum (mean index scores) values were used to determine whether there were significant differences among the paired supervision orientations, as expressed by the primary and intermediate teacher sub-groups and as assessed by a Hotelling's \( T^2 \) test. The results of the computation of this test indicated a \( T^2 \) value of 5.5410, \( p = 0.25 \), which was not significant at the .01 level of confidence. These data indicated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations of Supervision</th>
<th>Primary Teachers (K-3)</th>
<th>Inter. Teachers (4-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Index Score</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractive-Dynamic Continuum</td>
<td>0.7605</td>
<td>1.5205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Centered-Methods Centered Continuum</td>
<td>1.2394</td>
<td>1.0633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive-Directive Continuum</td>
<td>0.3944</td>
<td>1.4230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive Continuum</td>
<td>-0.7042</td>
<td>0.9611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$T^2 = 5.5410; p = 0.25$ (not significant)

$F = 1.63$  $p = 0.01; d.f. 70, 61$
that there were no significant differences in the expectations for the orientations of supervision, as expressed by primary and intermediate teachers.

Variance for both the primary and intermediate teacher sub-groups was computed by squaring first, then subtracting each individual respondent's difference score from the overall mean difference index, summed, and divided by one less than the total N for that respective teacher sub-group. Table 33 contained the means and variance for the paired orientations for both primary and intermediate teacher sub-groups.

Discussion

An examination of the mean index scores contained in Table 33 would indicate that intermediate and primary teachers were most strongly in favor of the Methods-Centered over the Subject-Centered orientation of all the four paired orientations. While both sub-groups of teachers favored the Dynamic over the Tractive orientation, intermediate teachers only slightly favored the Goal-Oriented over the Pressure-Responsive orientation. Further analysis of the mean index scores in Table 33 would indicate that both primary and intermediate teachers only slightly favored the Directive orientation over the Permissive orientation. The Hotelling's $T^2$ value of 5.5410, $p = 0.25$, for the orientations as expressed by primary and intermediate teachers was not significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Cardenas observed the following results in his study with respect to elementary teachers' expectations of the supervision orientations by different grade levels:
Orientations.--Analysis of the orientation rankings indicate the following characteristics. In all cases teachers in the various grade levels favor the same orientation, but some differences in degree can be noted. Third and fifth grade teachers show a stronger rejection of tractive supervision, while sixth grade teachers indicate small differences between dynamic and tractive supervision. Sixth grade teachers make almost no distinction in their preference for the two. The Permissive-Directive continuum shows a similar characteristic. In this case, first grade teachers strongly reject permissive supervision, while third and fifth grade teachers come close to accepting it.

Fifth grade teachers differ from others in their decisive preference for goal-oriented supervision.20
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Chapter V

SUMMARY, INTERPRETATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this exploratory investigation was to examine the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed by selected elementary teachers and supervisors in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Specifically, this study attempted to determine whether significant disagreement as to certain supervision task expectations existed between elementary teachers and supervisors, as well as among sub-groups of teachers and supervisors.

A secondary purpose of this investigation was to conduct an operational replicative study using the research instrument developed by and initially employed in an investigation by Dr. Jose A. Cardenas.

Assumptions

This research effort was predicated upon the assumption that instructional supervision should be conceptualized as an instruction-related function of the school. As such, this definition tended to be oriented toward the achievement of goals (tasks), through the deployment of related processes (activities), along with the appropriate requisites (competencies) as needed by those individuals charged with supervisory leadership responsibilities in the schools.
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As in the Cardenas study, those factors which could determine the manner in which supervisory duties could be actualized were identified as supervisory orientations.  

The Harris categorization of the tasks of instructional supervision were used in order to provide a framework for the study. (See Chapter III for a detailed discussion of each task.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizing for Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arranging for In-Service Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Orienting Staff Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cardenas noted that any apparent disagreement in the professional literature as to viewpoints related to supervision tasks could well have been a manifestation of the varied way in which these tasks could be actualized. The following four pairs of opposing orientations of supervision reflected what Cardenas has noted as the most significant classifications for defining methods of supervisory (task) functioning. These orientations were defined in Chapter III.

1 A Tractive supervision
1 B Dynamic supervision

2 A Subject-centered supervision
2 B Methods-centered supervision

3 A Permissive supervision
3 B Directive supervision

4 A Goal-oriented supervision
4 B Pressure-responsive supervision
Research Questions for the Study

Based upon an initial review of the related supervision literature research questions were developed in order to provide a framework for this investigation.

**Major Question I.** Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors?

**Major Question II.** Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroups of two Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors?

**Minor Research Questions**

The development of minor research questions was made in order to guide the research efforts with respect to Major Question II. As noted in Chapter I, the particular focus for each of the minor research questions was predicated upon an initial review of the supervision literature as well as the findings from the Cardenas study.

**Minor Question II-A.** Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors?

**Minor Question II-B.** Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience?

**Minor Question II-C.** Is there significant disagreement in the task
expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation?

Minor Question II-D. Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by elementary teachers with different levels of academic preparation?

Minor Question II-E. Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced elementary teachers?

Minor Question II-F. Is there significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary (K-3) and intermediate (4-6) elementary teachers?

Methods and Procedures

Teacher Sample Identification

The investigator first classified all of the public school districts in the Commonwealth of Virginia according to student size, as determined by the Virginia State Department of Education: small, medium, and large. Two public school districts were randomly selected from the large district listing, while one public school district was randomly selected from the medium and small district listings.

In one of the large districts four elementary schools were randomly selected; in the remaining large district one elementary school was randomly selected from the total elementary schools. Two elementary schools were randomly selected from the identified medium size school district, while one elementary school was randomly selected from all of the public elementary schools in the small size district.
The cluster teacher sample consisted of all of the classroom primary and/or intermediate teachers within each building (k-6). A total of eight elementary schools from different areas of Virginia were involved in the study. A total cluster sample of 166 teachers were associated with these eight schools; the total teacher respondent sample used in the study included 133 teachers (83%).

**Supervisor Sample Identification**

The entire elementary level supervision population in Virginia was identified for participation in this investigation through the assistance of the Virginia Educational Directory, as well as telephone communications to the Virginia State Department of Education. The finalized supervisor population included 230 individuals, all of whom were listed in the Directory as occupying professional supervisory positions at the elementary level. The returned, usable supervisor respondent group included 139 individuals, which represented 60 percent of the total population.

**Collection of the Data**

Before the research instruments were mailed to either members of the teacher sample or the supervisor population, two introductory letters were addressed to each public school district superintendent in Virginia, one by Professor Jack R. Frymier and one by the investigator. After a period of a week and one-half the instruments were mailed to all of the identified personnel in the study, along with introductory letters addressed by Professor Charles M. Galloway and the investigator.

Within a three week period, a 60 percent usable return rate for the supervisor population had been achieved. Telephone communications were
established between the investigator and the principals of the participating elementary schools in order to facilitate the return of the instruments mailed to the teacher sample. Within a period of six weeks a total of (usable) 133 instruments had been returned from the teacher sample. This represented an 83 percent return rate for the teacher sample.

Analyses of the Data: Statistical Methods

Mean Ranking of the Supervision Tasks. In order to determine the degree of importance of each task, as expressed by sub-groupings of teachers and of supervisors, the computation of the mean rankings for the supervision tasks was conducted.

Rank-Ordering of the Supervision Tasks. The rank-ordering for the tasks of supervision was completed after the overall mean rankings had been computed.

Hotelling's Multivariate $T^2$ test. Use was made of this statistical technique since ten non-independent tests of the difference between the means within two independent groups were made in the analysis of each null hypothesis. (See Chapter IV.) In each case the values for the Hotelling's $T^2$ were tested against the critical value of .05 by converting it to an $F$ value which gave an exact test of the $T^2$ value.

Variance for the Supervision Tasks. In order to compute the variance for each of the tasks of supervision the standard deviation was squared for each of the overall task means for each sub-grouping. This procedure was conducted in order to ascertain the extent of agreement and/or disagreement with respect to the tasks of supervision for each sub-grouping, as illustrated by the dispersion of the means. Analyses of the variance
for each task were made by conducting the Hartley F test. The F values were tested at the .005 level of confidence in order to avoid committing a Type 1 error.

Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance. This procedure was used in order to measure the degree of consistency with which individuals in each of the sub-groups in the study ranked all ten of the tasks together. The degree of consistency was measured by the values reported for the Kendall's Ws for each of the sub-groups associated with each of the null hypotheses.

Mean Score Index for the Orientation. A difference scale was developed in order to ascertain whether there were significant differences among the rankings of the supervision orientations. The scale was predicated upon the assumption that each of the four paired orientations constituted polar opposites. In every case the first orientation was given a value of -4.0, and the second orientation was given a value of +4.0. Subsequently, the mean ranking for the first orientation of each pair was subtracted from the mean ranking for the second, separately for each sub-group. This procedure resulted in a mean index score, which represented a position along the continuum.

Variance for Orientations. The variance for the orientations of supervision was computed by squaring the difference between each individual mean index score and the sub-group mean index score, summing over all individuals within the sub-group, and dividing by the number of individuals within that sub-group minus one. The Hartley F-test was used in order to test the difference between variances across sub-groups with $p = .01$. 
**Discriminant Analysis.** A significant Hotelling's $T^2$ would indicate that differences existed between the dependent variables across the groups. To determine which dependent variables were contributing to the difference between groups, a two group discriminant analysis could be used when intercorrelations existed between the dependent variables. Since an ipsative measure was used intercorrelations among the variables were expected. As noted by Tatsuoka, one advantage of a discriminant analysis procedure rather than separate $t$ tests is that it would result in a more accurate interpretation of the differences between groups since the intercorrelations were accounted for in the computation of the discriminant function. The basic strategy in discriminant analysis was to define a linear combination of the dependent variable such that the distance between group centroids would be maximized. The discriminant analysis is interpreted by examining the magnitude and signs associated with vector of standardized Beta weights and by examining the magnitude and sign of the correlation between individuals' discriminant scores and individual scores on each variable. These correlations are analogous to a factor analysis and are interpreted in a similar way.

**The Null Hypothesis**

The following null hypotheses were developed in order to guide the research analyses. Major Hypothesis II stated that no significant disagreement existed in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroupings of elementary teachers and of supervisors. For purposes of research clarity Major Hypothesis II was divided into six minor null hypotheses. The data for each of the six minor null hypotheses was gathered, analyzed, and presented, separately, in order to
test the validity of Major Hypothesis II.

Minor null-hypothesis I

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors. Reject.

Major null-hypothesis II

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroupings of two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-A

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-B

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-C

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-D

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-E

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced teachers. Fail to Reject.

Minor null hypothesis II-F

There is no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary
(K-3) teachers and intermediate (4-6) teachers. Fail to
Reject.

Conclusions: Tasks of Supervision

Curriculum Development

The Curriculum Development task has been cited in much of the con-
temporary supervision literature as one of the main functions of instruc-
tional supervisors. Every author reviewed in Part I of Chapter II indi-
cated that curriculum development was one of the primary duties of in-
structional supervisors. While the initial review of the literature
would suggest that teachers as well as supervisors should have somewhat
similar task expectations for the elementary supervisor role with respect
to Curriculum Development this condition was not found in this study.

Analyses of these data presented in (Chapter IV) in the discussion
of Major Null Hypothesis I noted that significant disagreement existed
between the all teacher group and the all supervisor group with respect
to the Curriculum Development task. Since the Hotelling's $T^2$ value for
the difference between task means across supervisor and teacher groups
was significant ($p < .01$), a discriminant analysis was performed to
determine the variables upon which the two groups differed. Of the four
task variables which had correlations with discriminant scores of .30 or
larger, one was the Curriculum Development task (+.42). The positive
correlation indicated that the task means for supervisors was larger
than the task mean for teachers. Substantively, this finding indicated
that all the respondents in the all supervisor group placed less impor-
tance upon the Curriculum Development task than did the respondents in
the all teacher group.
Further analysis of the data presented in Chapter IV revealed that while the all supervisor group ranked the Curriculum Development task sixth, the all teacher group ranked this task fifth. While this moderate ranking given the Curriculum Development task was not in harmony with the significance accorded it in the literature, it was somewhat in keeping with the relatively modest preference for the Dynamic as opposed to Tractive orientation, as expressed by the all supervisor group (mean index score 1.0216). Significant disagreement between task means was not found for the Curriculum Development task among any of the six sub-groups in the study.

In the Cardenas study, although significant differences were not found for the task between administrators, supervisors, and teachers, Cardenas made the following observation:

Though every author on supervision included in the review of the literature was in agreement that this task is an important aspect of the work of the supervisor, all school personnel studied do not share this agreement. This task was ranked high (2nd) in importance by teachers, medium (5th) in importance by administrators, and relatively low (7th) by supervisors.

Organizing for Instruction

As indicated in the discussion for Major Null Hypothesis I (Chapter IV), the Hotelling's $T^2$ value for the difference between task means across the all supervisor and all teacher groups was significant ($p < .01$). A discriminant analysis was performed to determine the variables upon which the two groups differed. The Organizing for Instruction task ($- .52$) was one of the four task variables which had correlations with discriminant scores of .30 or larger indicating significance. The negative correlation indicated that the task means for the all supervisor group were
smaller than those for the all teacher group. On the basis of the factor structure and an inspection of the means for both groups, it could be tentatively concluded that the all supervisor group was distinguished from the all teacher group on the basis of the greater importance the supervisors gave to the Organizing for Instruction task.

Further analysis indicated that the respondents in the all supervisor group ranked the Organizing for Instruction task fifth, while it was ranked ninth by the respondents in the all teacher group. Based upon analyses of all of these data it could be concluded that not only did the all supervisor group disagree significantly from the all teacher group as to their respective expectations for the Organizing for Instruction task, but the supervisors placed considerably more emphasis upon this task than did the teachers.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks for each sub-group for each of the six minor null hypotheses associated with Major Null Hypothesis II were not significant. Therefore, no significant disagreement existed among any of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors as to their respective expectations for the Organizing for Instruction task. However, it was noted that while this task was ranked ninth by all but one of the teacher sub-groups, intermediate teachers ranked Organizing for Instruction third, the latter ranking having been higher than any ranking given by any of the supervisor sub-groups for this task. It could be interpreted from this ranking that the intermediate teachers could have placed more emphasis upon the managerial components associated with this task than did any of the other teacher or supervisor sub-groups.

Cardenas concluded in his study that, although Organizing for
Instruction was ranked almost equally in importance by teachers (seventh), administrators (sixth), and supervisors (sixth) some differentiation was observed.

It was ranked higher by teachers exposed to supervision they evaluated as excellent in quality than other categories of teachers in that section. This higher ranking may imply that this task is viewed by teachers exposed to supervision they evaluate as excellent as a task requiring a high degree of competency. The exceedingly low ranking (9th) given this task by teachers exposed to supervision evaluated as extremely poor is in keeping with this concept.

**Staffing**

Although a significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the task expectations for the tasks as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor group (Major Null Hypothesis I), a discriminant analysis was performed and yielded a correlation with a discriminant score of less than .30 for the Staffing task. This finding indicated that despite the fact that significant differences existed between the means for the all teacher and all supervisor groups on the tasks, the Staffing task was not one of the task variables which accounted for this difference. Based upon this finding it could be tentatively concluded that no significant disagreement existed between the means for the Staffing task, as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor group.

Examination of those data which were gathered, analyzed, and presented for each of the six minor null hypotheses in association with Major Null Hypothesis II indicated that no significant disagreement existed in the Staffing task expectation, as expressed among any sub-groups of elementary teachers or supervisors. However, further examination of the variances associated with the Staffing task in the data presented (Chapter IV) for each of the sub-groups in relation to each minor
null hypothesis indicated that disagreement did exist in the ranking of this task by sub-groups of teachers, as well as supervisors. The Staffing task was consistently associated with the highest amount of task variance for the all supervisor group, as well as for any of the supervisor sub-groups. These findings indicated that within any grouping of supervisors in this study, there was consistently more disagreement in the ranking of this task than there was for any other task ranked by any grouping of supervisors.

Although none of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors in this study consistently ranked the Staffing task with an identical low level of priority, it was ranked low (seventh) by the all teacher group, and lower (eighth) by the all supervisor group. This finding was generally supported by the low rankings given the Staffing task by all of the teacher and supervisor sub-groups.

It could be tentatively concluded from these findings that although no significant disagreement existed for the Staffing task as expressed by any grouping of teachers or supervisors in this study, there was considerable disagreement in the ranking of the task. In addition, the Staffing task was given a low level of priority in relation to the other supervision tasks.

Cardenas observed the following findings in his study with respect to the Staffing task:

**Staffing.**—Though school personnel did not disagree in the ranking given this task, the low rank given by the three groups, 8th by supervisors, 7th by administrators, and 5th by teachers, indicates relatively low importance given to it. This is not inconsistent with the infrequent mention of this task in the review of the literature.
Providing Facilities

Those data presented in Chapter IV indicated that there was no significant disagreement in the expectations for the Providing Facilities task, as expressed by the all teacher group and the all supervisor group (Major Null Hypothesis I). Although a significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the tasks for the all teacher and all supervisor groups, a discriminant analysis was performed and yielded a correlation with a discriminant score of less than .30 for the Providing Facilities task. This finding indicated that, despite the existence of significant differences between the means for the all teacher and all supervisor groups on the tasks, the Providing Facilities task was not one of the task variables which accounted for this difference. Thus, it could be tentatively concluded that no disagreement existed between the means for the Providing Facilities task as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors. The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks in relation to the sub-groups by analyzation of the data according to each of the six minor null hypotheses were not significant. Further analysis of the rank orderings for this task by all groups indicated that a very low level of importance was given to the Providing Facilities task by either the all teacher group (eighth), or the all supervisor group (ninth). Providing Facilities was consistently ranked ninth within all of the supervisor sub-groups, and it was ranked eighth within all but one of the teacher sub-groups; new teachers ranked Providing Facilities seventh. Based upon analysis of all of the data presented in association with the Providing Facilities task, there was consistent and significant agreement within and across all of the groups and sub-groups of teachers.
and supervisors in the (low) ranking given to this task. These findings suggested that this task was not valued with high priority by the groups and sub-groups in this study.

The findings of the current study were not inconsistent with the findings noted in the Cardenas study:

Providing Facilities.--The agreement between supervisors, administrators, and teachers in the exceedingly low importance given to this task is not inconsistent with the small number of authors cited in the review of the literature who list this task as a supervisor responsibility. Providing Materials

Analysis of the significant $T^2$ value ($p < .01$) for the difference between the task means across the all supervisor and all teacher group indicated that significant disagreement existed between these two groups. A discriminant analysis was conducted to identify the task variables upon which the two groups differed. The Providing Materials task ($+.49$) was one of the four task variables which yielded a correlation with a discriminant score larger than $.30$. The positive correlation indicated that the task mean for the all supervisor group was larger than the mean for the all teacher group. Based upon the factor structure and an inspection of the means for both groups, it could be tentatively concluded that the all teacher group was distinguished from the all supervisor group on the basis of the greater importance the teachers placed upon providing materials as a supervision task than did the supervisors.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks in relation to the sub-groups by analyzing of the data according to each of the six minor null hypotheses (associated with Major Hypothesis II) were not significant. Therefore, it could be stated that no significant
disagreement existed among any of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors for the Providing Materials task. Further analysis of the data presented in Chapter IV indicated that there tended to be consistent agreement within sub-groups in the ranking of this task. While all of the teacher sub-groups consistently ranked this task first, there was almost consistent agreement in the rankings in Providing Materials by all the supervisor sub-groups; the lowest ranking for this task was noted for supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher academic preparation (fourth).

Throughout the professional literature the Providing Materials task has received repeated citation as an important function of instructional supervisors. Although there was a significant difference between the means for this task for the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, both groups ranked this task quite highly. The all teacher group ranked it first, while the all supervisor group ranked it second. Based upon these findings it could be concluded that the degree of significance accorded the Providing Materials task in the literature was supported by the high level of priority given it in this study.

Cardenas observed the following implication from his study with respect to the Providing Materials task:

This task, commonly cited by authors in the field of supervision as a task of supervision, is ranked high in importance by each of the three groups studied. Language arts teachers ranked this task much lower than any other group. Music, physical education, and math teachers ranked this task first in importance. The importance given to this task may be proportional to the quantity of materials used by the teachers ranking it.
Arranging for In-Service Education

The task of Arranging for In-Service Education has been cited in the related supervision literature as a fundamental supervisory task by most of the authors noted in Part I of Chapter II. Traditionally, the accepted authorities writing within the field of supervision have noted this task as essential to the development and/or maintenance of any viable instructional supervision program.

Although a significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the tasks of supervision, as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor groups (Major Null Hypothesis I), a discriminant analysis was conducted and yielded a correlation with a discriminant score of less than .30 for the Arranging for In-Service Education task. This finding indicated that the Arranging for In-Service Education task variable was not one of the tasks which accounted for this significant difference. Thus, the conclusion could be made that no significant difference existed between the means for the Arranging for In-Service Education task, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks in relation to the sub-groups by analyzation of the data according to each of the six minor null hypotheses were not significant. Thus, no significant disagreement existed for the Arranging for In-Service Education task among any sub-groups of teachers or supervisors. Further analysis of these data suggested that the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, as well as the various teacher and supervisor sub-groups, were in relatively close agreement as to the ranking for this task as indicated by the rank orderings. All teachers ranked Arranging for In-Service
Education third, while all supervisors ranked this task fourth, which indicated that both of these groups accorded relatively high importance to this task.

Therefore, it could be concluded that the apparent significance placed upon Arranging for In-Service Education as a supervision task was generally supported by the findings from this study.

Cardenas, however, noted in the findings of his investigation that some inconsistencies in the ranking of the Arranging for In-Service Education task were apparent in that study.

Inconsistencies in the ranking of this item was found between supervisors with administrative and supervisors without administrative experience. Since this task is listed by all authors in supervision, it is interesting to note this one group disagreeing with the literature. Perhaps supervisors without administrative experience view this task as an administrative responsibility rather than a supervisory responsibility. The difficulty of explaining this difference is indicative of a need for further study in this area.

Orienting Staff Members

A significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the tasks of supervision, as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor groups (Major Null Hypothesis 1). Subsequently, a discriminant analysis was conducted and a correlation with a discriminant score of less than .30 was obtained for the Orienting Staff Members task. This finding indicated that despite the fact that significant differences existed between the means for the all teacher and all supervisor groups in the tasks, the Orienting Staff Members task was not one of the tasks which accounted for this significant difference. The conclusion could be made that no significant disagreement existed between the means for the Orienting Staff Members task as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors.
The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks in relation to the sub-groups by analysis of the data for each of the six minor null hypotheses were not significant. Therefore, it could be stated that no significant disagreement existed among any of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors with respect to their expectations for the Orienting Staff Members task.

The Orienting Staff Members task has been closely associated with the Arranging for In-Service Education task in some of the supervision literature. The apparent rationale for this association by various authors has been that through in-service activities (i.e., workshops, study groups, faculty meetings, etc.) the orientation of staff members would be facilitated. The apparent recognition of this relationship was observed in this investigation as the all supervisor group ranked the Orienting Staff Members task third (In-Service was ranked fourth), while the all teacher group ranked Orienting Staff Members second (In-Service was ranked third).

While the following supervisor sub-groups consistently ranked this task third: general area, supervisors with administrative experience, and both supervisor sub-groups with different levels of academic preparation, Orienting Staff Members was ranked first by supervisors without administrative experience, as well as special area supervisors. This observation could suggest that the latter two supervisor sub-groups held a particular vested interest in this task due to the specialization of their instructional fields, with respect to the special area supervisors. It could also suggest that supervisors without administrative experience tended to place a higher priority upon the manner and routine by which new teachers, especially, were introduced initially into school systems,
functions which supervisors with administrative experience could have associated more readily with teacher training programs and/or institutions.

While Orienting Staff Members was consistently ranked third among the following teacher sub-groups—new teachers, both teacher sub-groups with different levels of academic preparation, and primary teachers—this same task was ranked second by experienced teachers and intermediate teachers.

A somewhat different classification scheme was used in order to identify the teacher sub-groups in the Cardenas study and significant differences were found in the expectations for this task by some of those sub-groups of teachers.

Significant disagreement between groups of teachers in the ranking of this task is evident. Teachers in the wealthy school system ranked it first; teachers in the poor school system ranked it fifth. Perhaps this may be due to a greater need for action in this task in the wealthy system because of the larger amounts of materials, facilities, and organization one would expect to find. In any case, this finding is consistent with the less dynamic preference identified in the wealthy school system and the slightly stronger preference for dynamic supervision found in the poor district.

Natural science and business education teachers ranked this task considerably higher than others in the group.

It is interesting to note that non-degree teachers did not rank this task higher than teachers with other types of preparation, and teachers with a bachelor degree in Education ranked this task higher in importance than any other group. Perhaps this may imply that college teacher education programs develop a sensitivity in the new teacher to the work situation. On the other hand non-degree teachers might be more recent school graduates, basing their orientations on more recent experiences as students in the type of school situation in which they are now teaching.16

While no specific implications between the Cardenas study and this investigation could be made with respect to this task due to the different criteria used in the identification of the teacher sub-groups, these
findings would suggest that further research efforts should be conducted concerning the Orienting Staff Members task.

**Relating Special Services**

Few of the authors reviewed in Part I, Chapter II specifically included Relating Special Services as a functional task of instructional supervision. However, such writers as Harris, Lucio and McNeil, Melchoir, as well as Wiles and Lovell did indicate the importance of interpreting the interdependent nature of many diverse supervisory functions, many of which could be subsumed under this task area. Harris has stated that it was due to this Relating Special Services task that ensured the coordination of varied supervisory efforts in meeting pupil needs. "This involves developing policies, assigning priorities, and defining relationships among service personnel to maximize relationships between services offered and instructional goals of the school."

Although a significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the tasks of supervision, as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor groups, a discriminant analysis was conducted and a correlation with a discriminant score less than .30 was obtained. This finding indicated that the Relating Special Services task was not one of those tasks which accounted for the significant difference. Thus, it could be concluded that no significant disagreement existed between the means for the Relating Special Services task, as expressed by all teachers and all supervisors.

The Hotelling's $T^2$ values which were determined for the tasks in relation to all sub-groups by analysis of the data for each of the six null hypotheses were not significant. These findings indicated that no significant disagreement existed among any of the teacher or supervisor
sub-groups with respect to the expectations for the Relating Special Services task.

Further analyses indicated that the all teacher group ranked the Relating Special Services task sixth, while the all supervisor group ranked this task seventh. While the amount of variance related to this task for all supervisors was .4295, which indicated that some degree of (non-significant) disagreement existed in the ranking of this task for all supervisors, Relating Special Services received the lowest amount of variance (.3525) of all ten tasks for the all teacher group. This observation would suggest that of the two total groups, all teachers were in most agreement in the ranking of Relating Special Services of all the ten tasks, and in more agreement in the ranking for this task than were all supervisors.

Cardenas noted the following findings with respect to the Relating Special Services task in his study:

Relating Special Services.--This task was not commonly listed by authors in supervision as a task of the supervisor. Supervisors ranked it 4th in importance, administrators ranked it 8th, and teachers ranked it 9th, indicating some amount of disagreement. Perhaps guidance and health personnel, therapists, and other special service personnel influence the work of the supervisor more than administrators and teachers realize.21

Public Relations

A significant $T^2$ value was obtained ($p < .01$) for the supervision tasks, as expressed by the all teacher and all supervisor groups (Major Hypothesis I). Therefore, a discriminant analysis was conducted and a correlation with a discriminant score of less than .30 was obtained for the Public Relations task. This indicated that the Public Relations
task was not one of those task variables which accounted for this significant difference. Thus, no significant disagreement existed between the means for the Public Relations task for the all teacher and all supervisor groups.

The Hotelling’s $T^2$ values were not significant for the tasks as analyzed for the sub-groups in relation to each of the six null hypotheses associated with Major Hypothesis II. Therefore, it could be stated that no significant disagreement existed among any of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors with respect to their expectations for the Public Relations task.

The Public Relations task was consistently ranked tenth by the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, as well as by all of the respondents in each of the teacher and supervisor sub-groups. This indicated unanimous agreement between both groups and among all sub-groups in the ranking of this task. Cardenas observed a similar finding for the Public Relations task in his study.

Personnel involved in this study consistently ranked this task as the least important aspect of the supervisor’s duties. It was ranked last by every group and sub-group in the study.22

This low ranking given to the Public Relations task was not in total agreement with the significance placed upon it in the literature. Harris has noted that in order to enhance instructional improvement to all educators must be attuned to the influenced upon the school of the prevailing socio-cultural milieu.23 Neagley and Evans observed that:

Without public acceptance of a school district’s philosophy and curriculum, the finest supervisory program will be of little value. Therefore, all administrators and supervisors need to be vitally concerned with public relations as an aspect of the improvement of instruction.24
Harris has suggested that educators within the public schools have placed too much significance upon the traditional parent-teacher format for school-community interaction. Harris also stated that in order for dynamic leadership to emerge within the educational setting, supervisory personnel should recognize the limitations of employing only this form of public relations. "The formal structure and limited scope of parent-teacher association activities are not particularly conducive to the emergence of leadership."\(^\text{125}\)

**Evaluating**

The majority of the authors cited in Part I of Chapter II noted that the evaluation of instruction should be considered as one of the paramount functions of instructional supervisors. In the current study the all teacher group ranked this task fourth, while the all supervisor group ranked it first. However, since the Hotelling's $T^2$ value for the difference between the task means across the all supervisor and all teacher groups was significant ($p < .01$), a discriminant analysis was performed in order to determine the task variables upon which task variables the two groups differed. Of the four task variables which had correlations with discriminant scores of .30 or larger, one was the Evaluating task ($-.49$). The negative correlation indicated that the task means for the all teacher group were larger than those for the all supervisor group with respect to the Evaluating task. On the basis of the factor structure and inspection of the task means it could be tentatively concluded that the all supervisor group could be distinguished from the all teacher group due to the greater importance that the supervisors gave to the Evaluating task. While both of these groups ranked
this task high the respondents in the supervisor group gave it highest priority, while the respondents in the all teacher group gave it somewhat less priority.

Further examination of the data presented for each of the six minor null hypotheses in association with Major Hypothesis II indicated that no significant differences existed between the means for the Evaluating task for any of the sub-groups in the study. Therefore, it could be concluded that no significant disagreement existed among any of the sub-groups of teachers or supervisors as to their respective expectations for the Evaluating task.

Cardenas noted the following in his study with respect to this task in his study:

Though all authors agreed in the importance of evaluation as a task of supervision, some disagreement was expressed by personnel involved in this study. Supervisors ranked this task 1st in importance, administrators ranked it 2nd, and teachers ranked it 5th.26

Conclusions: The Orientations of Supervision

Tractive-Dynamic Orientation

Those data reported in Chapter IV indicated that there was no significant disagreement between the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, as well as between all of the teacher and between all of the supervisor sub-groups in favoring the Dynamic over the Tractive orientation. As indicated by the mean index scores in Table 9 in Chapter IV, the all supervisor group (mean index score 1.0219) tended to be slightly more Dynamic with a higher mean index score than did the all teacher group (mean index score 0.8571).
While all of the supervisor sub-groups favored the Dynamic over the Tractive orientation, general area, supervisors with administrative experience, and supervisors with Advanced Specialist degrees or higher preparation were slightly more in favor of the Dynamic orientation than were special area supervisors without administrative experience, and supervisors with the Master's degree, as indicated by their respective mean index scores.

Analyses of the mean index scores for the teacher sub-groups presented in Chapter IV indicated that all of these sub-groups were slightly in favor of the Dynamic orientation. Intermediate teachers (mean index score 0.9677) and experienced teachers (mean index score 0.9062) were the two teacher sub-groups most in favor of the Dynamic orientation.

These data could suggest that the supervisors in this study were more receptive to the notion of instructional change as implied by the Dynamic orientation than were the teachers.

Cardenas noted the following finding in his study with respect to the Tractive-Dynamic orientations:

Dynamic-Tractive Orientation. All personnel expressed a preference for dynamic supervision. Math and science teachers show the least preference for dynamic supervision, and music teachers indicate the strongest preference in this sub-division. It was inferred that music teachers see a greater need for change than other teachers in this category.

Subject-Matter—Methods-Centered Orientation

Analyses of those data presented in Chapter IV indicated that there was no significant disagreement between the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, as well as between all of the sub-groups in the study in favoring the Methods-Centered as opposed to the Subject-Centered Orientation. Examination of Table 9 in Chapter IV indicated that the
all teacher group had a slightly higher mean index score of 1.2143, while the all supervisor group had a mean index score of 1.0216. These findings suggested that the all teacher group was slightly more in favor of supervisory behavior which stressed methodology than supervisory behavior which was more oriented toward the subject matter.

Examination of the mean index scores of the supervisor sub-groups indicated that supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher academic preparation (1.0652), supervisors with administrative experience (1.0567), as well as general area supervisors (1.0617) had slightly higher mean index scores along the Subject Matter-Methods Centered continuum than did special area supervisors (0.9655), supervisors with the Master's degree (1.000), or those without administrative experience (0.9405). These findings suggested that the former supervisor sub-groups described in the previous sentence were slightly more in favor of supervisory behavior which emphasized instructional methodology, than were the latter supervisor sub-groups.

Examination of the mean index scores for the teacher sub-groups presented in Chapter IV suggested that little differentiation in the degree of endorsement for the Methods Centered over the Subject Centered orientation was noted between new teachers (1.2162) and experienced teachers (1.2135), primary teachers (1.2394) and intermediate teachers (1.1855), as well as teachers with undergraduate degrees (1.2035) and teachers with graduate degrees (1.2340).

These findings could suggest that while all groups in this study favored supervisory behavior which was oriented toward instructional methodology, the teacher respondents were slightly more in favor of the
Methods Centered orientation.

Cardenas observed the following implication in his study with respect to the Subject Matter-Methods Centered orientations:

Supervisors, teachers, and administrators favored method-centered supervision over subject-centered. Differences in the sub-groups were noted. General area supervisors showed a very strong preference for method-centered supervision as compared to special area supervisors who expressed only a very mild preference for method-centered supervision. This preference should be taken into account in the preparation of supervisors. The application of these findings would indicate that all supervisors should have some training in methods. In the same light competency in subject matter should not be overlooked.

**Permissive-Directive Orientation**

Examination of those data reported in Chapter IV indicated that there was no significant disagreement between the all teacher and the all supervisor groups, as well as between all of the teacher and between all of the supervisor sub-groups in favoring the Directive, as opposed to the Permissive, orientation. As noted in Table 9 in Chapter IV, although the all teacher (0.3083) and all supervisor (0.5022) groups favored the Directive orientation, it was a very low degree of endorsement, as measured by the respective mean index scores. These data suggested that the supervisor respondents in this study were slightly more oriented toward supervisory behavior which was direct than were the teacher respondents.

Although all of the supervisor sub-groups slightly favored the Directive over the Permissive orientation, examination of the mean index scores for general area supervisors (0.5185), supervisors without administrative experience (0.6667), and supervisors with the Master's degree (0.5591) indicated a slightly stronger preference for the Directive
orientation, as opposed to special area supervisors (0.4914), supervisors with administrative experience (0.4381), as well as supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree and higher academic preparation (0.4022). The findings suggested that the degree of endorsement for the Directive over the Permissive orientation was slight for all of these supervisor subgroups, as indicated by their respective mean index scores.

Analyses of the mean index scores for the different teacher subgroups presented in Chapter IV indicated that all of these subgroups were in only incidental endorsement of the Directive orientation. Further examination of these mean index scores resulted in the observation that all of the teacher sub-groups recorded the lowest continuum scores of the four parallel orientations in the acceptance of the Directive orientation with new teachers expressing the lowest degree of endorsement (mean index score 0.0811). These data suggested that while the teacher respondents preferred the Directive over the Permissive orientation, this was a very modest degree of endorsement.

Cardenas noted the following finding in his study with respect to the Permissive-Directive orientation.

Supervisors, administrators, and teachers indicated a strong preference for directive supervision. This preference is not consistent with the literature favoring permissive supervision as a more modern and effective approach.

One implication from these findings would be the need for further research with respect to teachers' and supervisors' expectations concerning this orientation. The literature reviewed in Chapter II suggested that teachers as well as supervisors would have strongly favored a more permissive, non-directive approach to supervisory behavior. This condition was not found in this study.
Goal Oriented—Pressure Responsive Orientation

Those data reported in Chapter IV indicated that there was no significant disagreement between the all teacher group and the all supervisor group, as well as between all of the teacher and between all of the supervisor sub-groups in favoring the Goal Oriented over the Pressure Responsive orientation. The mean index scores contained in Table 9 in Chapter IV suggested that the all teacher group (-0.5489) was slightly less in favor of this orientation than the all supervisor group (-0.6547). However, the difference between the mean index scores for both of these groups for the Goal Oriented orientation was so slight as to imply that very little differentiation in the degree of modest endorsement for this orientation was expressed by either of these two groups.

Examination of the mean index scores for the supervisor sub-groups indicated that supervisors with the Advanced Specialist degree or higher preparation (-0.7609), supervisors with administrative experience (-0.6701), and special area supervisors (-0.6983) were slightly more in favor of the Goal Oriented orientation than were supervisors with the Master's degree (-0.6021), supervisors without administrative experience (-0.6190), as well as general area supervisors (-0.6235).

Further analyses of the teacher sub-group data presented in Chapter IV indicated that while all of the sub-groups compared were in agreement in their respective endorsement of the Goal Oriented orientation, the most obvious differentiation in the degree of endorsement existed between primary teachers (mean index score -0.7042) and intermediate teachers (mean index score -0.3710). These findings could suggest that while the primary teacher respondents expressed modest acceptance of goal oriented
supervisory behavior, the intermediate teacher respondents almost made no distinction between the Goal Oriented and Pressure Responsive orientations.

Cardenas observed a similar finding in his study with respect to Goal Oriented-Pressure Responsive orientations.

**Goal-oriented-Pressure-responsive Orientation.**—Administrators differed from supervisors and teachers in that they were only slightly in favor of goal-oriented supervision. This is not inconsistent with the literature which notes that the school administrator is frequently found in a high pressure type of school situation.30

**Summary**

Based upon the statistical analyses of those data reported in Chapter IV the following conclusions of this study were stated.

A. There was significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors.

1. All supervisors could be distinguished from all teachers on the basis of the greater importance that the all supervisor group gave to the organizing for instruction and the evaluating instruction tasks, and somewhat lesser importance given to the curriculum development and the providing materials tasks.

2. All teachers could be distinguished from all supervisors on the basis of the greater importance the all teacher group gave to curriculum development and the providing materials tasks, and the somewhat lesser importance placed
upon the organizing for instruction and the evaluating instruction tasks.

B. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among sub-groupings of two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and supervisors.

C. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by general and special area supervisors.

D. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with and without administrative experience.

E. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by supervisors with different levels of academic preparation.

F. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by teachers with different levels of academic preparation.

G. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by new and experienced teachers.

H. There was no significant disagreement in the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed by primary teachers (K-3) and intermediate teachers (4-6).
IMPLICATIONS

It would be most difficult to terminate this investigation without specifying some of the potential implications the findings could have upon the field. Instructional supervision has been characterized as a highly instruction related entity within the public schools. As a supportive service oriented toward the realization of the professional as well as instructional goals of school people and schools, supervisory behavior should be viewed in behavioral terms. Such a visualization of supervisory behaviors as tasks or functions could better assist educational leaders in the design and/or implementation of supervisory programs at all levels of instruction. This research effort has interpreted the functions of instructional supervisors in terms of behavioral tasks which could be actualized by those personnel so designated with leadership responsibilities.

One observation from this study was the conclusion that teachers and supervisors, as two distinct professional groups, did seem to differ in their respective expectations for the tasks of supervision. Specific task areas upon which these two groups differed were Curriculum Development, Organizing for Instruction, Providing Materials, and Evaluating Instruction. The majority of the supervision literature reviewed in Part I, Chapter II indicated that these four task areas could be considered as essential supervisory functions. The fact that teachers in this study placed greater emphases upon the Providing Materials and Curriculum Development tasks than did supervisors was not in total agreement with the literature.
Most contemporary authorities in the field have tended to equate both of these tasks in importance for both of these groups of professionals. Supervisors, moreover, tended to place greater emphases upon the Organizing for Instruction and Evaluating Instruction tasks than did the teachers. This observation was in general agreement with similar expectations as noted in the professional literature. If teachers do, in fact, place greater emphases upon Providing Materials and Curriculum Development as tasks, specification of which materials, deployment of resources, the nature and direction of what curricular activities, as well as many related questions could provide the bases for further research. In addition, upon what rationale, for what purposes, and in which manner do supervisors conduct and/or implement the Organizing for Instruction and Evaluation tasks? While these questions are not exhaustive they do provide initiating points for related research efforts based upon this study.

The findings from these suggested research studies could provide an enhanced data base upon which more viable supervision programs could be envisioned and/or maintained.
Recommendations

It would be very difficult to terminate this study without offering recommendations for further investigations related to the examination of supervision tasks.

A. A limitation of the study was associated with the instrument, the use of which resulted in non-independent data. This condition violated a basic assumption for the use of parametric and non-parametric tests. In order to avoid violation of this assumption the scoring methodology for the instrument should be refined.

B. Although there were no significant differences found between sub-groups of teachers and of supervisors, different sub-group classifications could yield significant differences. In future research studies examining the task expectations for the supervisor role these changes in sub-group classifications should be made to determine whether if, in fact, significant differences do exist between various sub-groups of these personnel.

C. It is suggested that a study be conducted to determine the degree to which the tasks of supervision utilized for this investigation do exist in the actualization of supervisory behavior. This could best be attempted through the observation of various supervision programs currently existing in different locations.

D. The particular supervision skills and competencies which are indicated and/or implied in the Harris categorization of tasks should be further defined in specific behavioral terms. This
could foster the development of programs and activities which would enhance the attainment of desired levels of competency in these skill areas by those charged with supervisory leadership roles.
FOOTNOTES

1 Jose A. Cardenas, "Role Expectations for Instructional Supervisors as Expressed by Selected Supervisors, Administrators and Teachers" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Texas, 1966).
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12 Ibid., pp. 65-66.
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C. PERIODICALS


APPENDIX A
Instructions:

Attached is a series of problems designed to evaluate the relative importance of various aspects of a supervisor's work. Each problem is divided into two parts: a short vignette describing a supervisory problem situation, followed by five statements describing some type of action the supervisor might take in working to solve the problem.

Read each vignette, think about ways the supervisor might appropriately work in such a situation, then rank each of the five alternative actions.

Indicate, by numbering "1", the action most appropriate for the supervisor to take. The second most appropriate action should be labeled "2". Continue numbering the actions until each item has been ranked from "1" to "5" with the least appropriate action numbered "5". Do not use the same number more than once.

**Appropriateness** should be determined by the extent to which the action described should be undertaken by the supervisor in order to make a maximum contribution to the school, consistent with his position. The sequence in which the various activities should be performed should not be considered.

We are interested in what you believe supervisors should do, not necessarily in what they actually do.

**Supervisor defined**: A supervisor is a professional staff member who works with teachers and other staff members toward the improvement of the instructional program. In some school districts the supervisor is identified by other traits such as Curriculum Director, Curriculum Coordinator, or some type of instructional consultant. In each of the cases presented the supervisor should be considered as a full-time employee, working at the district level, with responsibilities in more than a single school.
1. Teachers in the five Whitehall elementary schools have been concerned over the number of poor readers in grades 4, 5, and 6. The results of the standardized tests suggest that too many students are poor readers. The knowledge of the number of students seriously retarded in reading skills has led to the decision to organize remedial reading classes in the fifth and sixth grades. One full-time teacher will be assigned to this program. The superintendent has requested the district supervisor to help implement this program.

The supervisor should: (number from 1-5 in order of the importance of each supervisor responsibility)

_____ help all teachers develop or revise courses of study for the teaching of reading.

_____ plan to appear before the next PTA meeting and explain to the parents the reasons and purposes of the remedial reading program.

_____ identify and recommend to the principal a classroom or other instructional area best suited for remedial reading instruction.

_____ schedule an in-service meeting to discuss the development of new and better methods for the teaching of reading to prevent this type of problem from growing.

_____ plan to appear at the next PTA meeting and request suggestions from the parents for the improvement of the reading program.
As Anita Jones concluded the initial in-service meeting at Jefferson Elementary School she was more aware than ever that the teachers needed help in the teaching of elementary science. The two new teachers needed help in the basic planning of a science program. Experienced teachers complained about too much duplication from grade to grade and about the lack of laboratory equipment for the teaching of science.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

____ recommend to the teachers that they meet with the district counselor and obtain his suggestions for a science testing program, aimed at identifying the weaknesses in the teaching of science.

____ make suggestions for remodeling a classroom in each school as a laboratory room for the teaching of science, if space could be made available.

____ plan a series of observations of science instruction throughout the district to identify other teachers with serious problems in teaching science.

____ recommend to the principals that the district counselor make plans for a testing program in the elementary grades to assist in identifying further weaknesses in the teaching of science.

____ check with the new teachers to see if they have science guides, know what materials are available, and recognize the importance placed on science in the curriculum in this district.
3. The superintendent has requested that Mrs. Hunter, district elementary supervisor, assist the principal of Cole Elementary School with a problem he is experiencing. Parents have complained to the superintendent about the poor quality of arithmetic instruction in the school. Several parents have indicated that they do not feel that the "backward" curriculum of the school prepares their children for modern mathematics. Some parents further feel that their children, though making satisfactory grades, are not being adequately challenged to learn arithmetic due to the inexperience of several new teachers.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

___ develop a curriculum guide to acquaint the elementary school teachers with modern mathematical theory.

___ plan to observe several classes at the school in order to identify specific factors contributing to the problem.

___ develop for the elementary school teachers a curriculum guide stressing methods of teaching arithmetic.

___ suggest to the principal that the district counselor readminister standardized arithmetic achievement tests to compare student achievement and growth against national norms.

___ meet with the new teachers and assist them in solving any problems related to the teaching of arithmetic that the teachers may identify.
Mrs. Wilson, elementary district supervisor, has been requested by the superintendent to meet with the principal and vice-principal of the new elementary school. Mrs. Wilson was specifically instructed by the superintendent to give assistance to the school administrators in planning the opening of the new school. The new principal has already stated that he intends to use a unique method of curriculum organization in his school based on problem solving approaches.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of importance of each supervisory responsibility:

1. Work with the new staff to develop new instructional materials especially adapted to the new program.
2. Assist the administrators in grouping and assigning students to classes.
3. Meet with the new staff to determine which instructional materials should be purchased for the new school.
4. Develop new curriculum guides for use in the new program.
5. Interview prospective staff members and inform the principal about those who are best acquainted with teaching methods conducive to the success of the new program.
Mr. Rogers, physical education and athletic supervisor, was recently informed by the superintendent that school patrons have been very critical about the physical education program in the district. Mr. Rogers is sure that most of the criticism is a result of an exceptionally poor football season. The football coach quit immediately after the last game, and since a replacement has not been selected, his two physical education classes are still being taught by an inexperienced substitute teacher. All of the other physical education classes are receiving usual instruction. Nevertheless the superintendent wants some special attention given to this matter.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

1. help locate a football coach who can inspire the confidence of the school patrons.
2. conduct a survey of the teaching going on to see if any changes are needed in the physical education program.
3. schedule an in-service education meeting with physical education teachers to discuss comments and criticisms.
4. assist the substitute physical education teacher by reviewing with him district policies for the teaching of physical education.
5. help locate a promising, well-qualified applicant for the vacant position of physical education teacher.
#6. With the assistance of the district supervisor, teachers at Westfield School have developed a program designed to minimize the problems created by an increase in the number of non-English speaking children in the community.

At the first grade level the plan calls for one of the four first grade teachers to teach the students with the most severe English language handicaps. The other first grade teachers will continue the first grade program. The language handicapped group will follow a special curriculum emphasizing oral language development.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

1. plan a program for evaluation of the new teaching methods over a period of years.
2. help the teachers classify students according to language ability.
3. identify and make available instructional materials especially suited to the teaching of the non-English speaking group.
4. explain to parents who express concern over the situation the reasons for segregating non-English speaking students.
5. inform all parents of the proposed program at a PTA meeting.
#7. Wilson High School will initiate a vocational training program during the next school year. This is in response to numerous community requests for this type of program to meet the needs of graduates seeking jobs in the growing number of local industrial establishments. The school board has approved the construction of a new building on the high school campus to house the vocational program. A vocational educational supervisor was employed early this year to assist in the development of the new program.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

1. plan a summer workshop for the teachers in order to acquaint them with district policies and procedures.
2. work with the principal in developing criteria for the selection of students to participate in the vocational program.
3. make recommendations in the planning of a vocational building based on building plans currently in use throughout the country.
4. help vocational teachers locate and prepare materials necessary to the program.
5. develop a unique plan for a vocational building based on the local program and its needs.
#8. Due to recent state legislation the principal of Wertz Junior High School is faced with the problem of introducing a civics course at the ninth grade level. The principal met with the district general supervisor to discuss the addition of this course and the question of additional staff and new schedules that will be needed and the grouping of students for the civics classes. The supervisor is asked to assist in these three areas.

The supervisor should: (number from 1 to 5 in order of the importance of each supervisory responsibility)

1. meet with the teachers and review methods of teaching the new controversial issues and the use of resource people and field trips to supplement the instructional program.

2. arrange for a visiting government professor from the university to work with the teachers assigned to this course.

3. recommend prospective teachers with strong backgrounds in social science to be considered by the principal.

4. help the school counselor and the teachers involved develop acceptable criteria for grouping the students for placement in civics classes.

5. work with the principal in revising class schedules. Encourage him to try block scheduling, flexible scheduling, or other promising innovations.
## Task Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Vignette &amp; Choice N°</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curr. Dev.</td>
<td>1a, 3a, 3c, 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. for instruction</td>
<td>4b, 6b, 7b, 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>4c, 5c, 5a, 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Facilities</td>
<td>1c, 2b, 7c, 7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing Materials</td>
<td>4a, 4c, 6c, 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice educ.</td>
<td>1d, 5c, 8a, 8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienting New Teachers</td>
<td>2c, 3c, 5d, 7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating Special Services</td>
<td>2a, 2d, 3d, 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1b, 1e, 6d, 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>2c, 3b, 5b, 6a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tractive</td>
<td>4c, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>4a, 7e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject centered</td>
<td>3a, 8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods centered</td>
<td>3c, 8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>1e, 2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>1b, 2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal oriented</td>
<td>5e, 6e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure responsive</td>
<td>5a, 6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Problem Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School Opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Problem Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Civics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXHIBIT D**

**Teacher Data Cover Sheet**

**DIRECTIONS:** Please provide all of the following information. This information will be treated with strict confidence in the analyses of the data only. Your time and cooperation are sincerely appreciated.

Describe your position as accurately as possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade levels you teach</th>
<th>Subjects you teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special responsibilities and/or duties included in your professional role as teacher

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years as a classroom teacher (total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years of administrative and/or supervisory experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary principal</th>
<th>Secondary principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of academic preparation: (please check the highest level of preparation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a college graduate</th>
<th>Bachelor degree in (specify major field or area)</th>
<th>Graduate degree in (specify the degree: M.Ed., i.e., and area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what type of school situation do you now teach: rural, small town or suburban, urban

What kind of supervision do you receive as a teacher:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Department head</th>
<th>General Elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Special Subject Supervisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age | Race | Sex
DIRECTIONS: Please provide all of the information requested below. This information will be used only to guide the analyses of the data. Thank you for helping in this research effort.

What is the title of your position? __________________________________________________________

Which of the following would you classify yourself as: (please check the appropriate line)

1. General Area Supervisor (responsible for all curriculum areas K-6): ________________________

2. Special Area Supervisor: ________________________

Language Arts_________________ Mathematics_________________
Reading__________________ Science_____________________
Physical Education_________ Social Studies_________
Music______________________ Art_____________________
Other (specify area)________________________________________

Would you classify your school district as: ________________________

Urban_________ Rural_________ Suburban_________
Small town_________ Other_____________________
(specify)

What is the highest academic degree which you now hold (please state areas):

B.A. in subject field ________________________
(specify)

B.A. in Education ________________________
(specify any areas of concentration)

Master's degree in ________________________
(specify)

Advanced Specialist degree in ________________________
(specify)

Doctoral degree in ________________________
(specify)

Other degree(s) ________________________
(specify)

Number of years as a classroom teacher:

Elementary________________ Secondary________________

Number of years as a supervisor: ________________________

Have you had any type of public school administrative experience? ______Yes ______No; please check lines to indicate the types of experience which you have had.

____ elementary principal ______ central office administrator
____ elementary vice-principal ______ program director
____ secondary principal ______ superintendent
____ secondary vice-principal ______ assistant superintendent
____ other (please specify)________________________________________

Sex_________ Age_________ Race________________________
EXHIBIT F

Scoring Keys:

A. Curriculum development
   \[ A = \frac{1a + 3a + 3c + 4d}{4} \]

B. Organizing for instruction
   \[ B = \frac{4b + 6b + 7b + 8e}{4} \]

C. Staffing
   \[ C = \frac{4e + 5a + 5e + 8c}{4} \]

D. Providing facilities
   \[ D = \frac{1c + 2b + 7c + 7e}{4} \]

E. Providing materials
   \[ E = \frac{4a + 4c + 6c + 7d}{4} \]

F. In-service education
   \[ F = \frac{1d + 5c + 8a + 8b}{4} \]

G. Orient new staff
   \[ G = \frac{2e + 3e + 5d + 7a}{4} \]

H. Relating special services
   \[ H = \frac{2a + 2d + 3d + 8d}{4} \]

I. Public relations
   \[ I = \frac{1b + 1e + 6d + 6e}{4} \]

J. Evaluation
   \[ J = \frac{2c + 3b + 5b + 6a}{4} \]
K. Tractive orientation

\[ K = \frac{4c + 7c}{2} \]

L. Dynamic orientation

\[ L = \frac{4a + 7e}{2} \]

M. Subject-centered orientation

\[ M = \frac{3a + 8b}{2} \]

O. Method-centered orientation

\[ O = \frac{3c + 8a}{2} \]

P. Permissive orientation

\[ P = \frac{1e + 2d}{2} \]

Q. Directive orientation

\[ Q = \frac{1b + 2d}{2} \]

R. Goal oriented orientation

\[ R = \frac{5e + 6e}{2} \]

S. Pressure responsive orientation

\[ S = \frac{5a + 6d}{2} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Mn ranking</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Variance in Mn ranking</th>
<th>Variance rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gr. new staff</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>092</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Tractive</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td></td>
<td>579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dynamic</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Subj. cent.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Meth. cent</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Permissive</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Directive</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goal orient.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Pres resp.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by administrators (N = 65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Mean ranking</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance rank order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dr. new staff</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientations**

| G. Tractive          | 3.23         | 892        |
| L. Dynamic           | 2.43         | 691        |
| M. Subj cent         | 3.55         | 851        |
| O. Meth. cent        | 2.96         | 740        |
| P. Permissive        | 4.08         | 488        |
| Q. Directive         | 3.32         | 635        |
| R. Goal orient.      | 3.75         | 731        |
| S. Press resp.       | 3.92         | 632        |
### TABLE 36

Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by teachers (N = 232)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Mean ranking</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Rank order of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A  Curr. dev.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B  Org. for inst.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Staffing</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  Prov. fac</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E  Prov. mat</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F  In-serv. ed</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G  Or new staff</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H  Rel. sp serv</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I  Public rel</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J  Evaluation</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Orientations

| K  Tractive              | 3.26         | .950      |
| L  Dynamic               | 2.51         | .892      |
| M  Subj. cent            | 3.22         | .873      |
| O  Meth. cent.           | 2.71         | .838      |
| P  Permissive            | 3.88         | .605      |
| Q  Directive             | 3.33         | .588      |
| R  Goal orient.          | 3.33         | .855      |
| S  Press. resp.          | 3.84         | .833      |
### Role Expectations for the Supervisor Position as Expressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Supervisors (Mean Ranking)</th>
<th>Administrators (Mean Ranking)</th>
<th>Teachers (Mean Ranking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Sample (Variance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors (Rank Order)</th>
<th>Administrators (Rank Order)</th>
<th>Teachers (Rank Order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Task of Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task of Supervision</th>
<th>Supervisors (Mean Ranking)</th>
<th>Administrators (Mean Ranking)</th>
<th>Teachers (Mean Ranking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 37

Teachers, N = 222; Total Sample, N = 366

(Supervisors, N = 69; Administrators, N = 63; Teachers, N = 232)
TABLE 38
Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by general and special area supervisors (General, N = 27; Special area, N = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>General Supervisors</th>
<th>Mean ranking</th>
<th>Special area Supervisors</th>
<th>Mean ranking</th>
<th>Gen. Supervisors</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Special area Supervisors</th>
<th>Rank order</th>
<th>Diff. in rank order</th>
<th>Gen. Supervisors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Special area Supervisors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr dev.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.386</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.295</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dr. new staff</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Tractive</td>
<td>3.574</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dynamic</td>
<td>2.666</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Subj cent.</td>
<td>4.018</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Meth cent</td>
<td>3.148</td>
<td>3.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Permissive</td>
<td>3.851</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Directive</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>3.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goal orient</td>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Press. resp.</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td>4.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Var. (w/ adm. exp.)</td>
<td>Var. (w/o adm. exp.)</td>
<td>Rank order (w/ adm.)</td>
<td>Rank order (w/o adm.)</td>
<td>Rank order diff. (w/ adm.)</td>
<td>Rank order diff. (w/o adm.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sales rep.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Manager</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assistant manager</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Account executive</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General manager</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Tasks of supervision

With, N = 16; without, N = 33

Supervisors with and without administrative experience

Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance (new)</th>
<th>Rank order difference (new)</th>
<th>Mean ranking difference (new)</th>
<th>Variance (experienced)</th>
<th>Rank order difference (experienced)</th>
<th>Mean ranking difference (experienced)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press, test</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, Goal orient.</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, Directive</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, Permissiveness</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, Math. cent.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, Subj. cent.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role expectations for the supervisor position are expressed by new and experienced teachers.

Table 40
TABLE 41
Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by elementary and secondary school teachers
(Elementary, N = 133; Secondary, N = 87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Min ranking (elementary)</th>
<th>Max ranking (secondary)</th>
<th>Min ranking (secondary)</th>
<th>Max ranking (elementary)</th>
<th>Rank order (elementary)</th>
<th>Rank order (secondary)</th>
<th>Rank order difference</th>
<th>Variance (elementary)</th>
<th>Variance (secondary)</th>
<th>Min ranking difference (elementary)</th>
<th>Max ranking difference (secondary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Curr dev</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Org. for inst</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Staffing</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Prov. fac.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Prov. mat.</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F In-serv. ed</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Or. new staff</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Public rel</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Evaluation</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orientations

<p>| K Tractive          | 3.26                    | 3.32                    | .806                    | 1.04                    |                          |                         |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| L Dynamic           | 2.53                    | 2.53                    | 826                    | .782                    | 73                       | .79                     |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| M Subj cent.        | 3.22                    | 3.33                    | 820                    | .832                    |                          |                         |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| N Meth. cent        | 2.70                    | 2.82                    | 808                    | .811                    | .52                       | .51                     |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| P Permissive        | 3.89                    | 3.85                    | .508                   | .581                    |                          |                         |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| Q Directive         | 3.38                    | 3.27                    | .590                   | .475                    | 51                       | .58                     |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| R Goal orient.      | 3.24                    | 3.51                    | .893                   | .681                    | 58                       | 47                      |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |
| S Press. resp       | 3.82                    | 3.98                    | .752                   | 818                     |                          |                         |                        |                      |                     |                            |                            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of Supervision</th>
<th>Wealthy (N = 155)</th>
<th>Poor (N = 175)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No ranking difference (wealthy)</td>
<td>2.05  1.75</td>
<td>2.50  2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (wealthy)</td>
<td>6.24  5.24</td>
<td>6.86  7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order difference (wealthy)</td>
<td>0.64  0.64</td>
<td>0.75  0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ranking difference (poor)</td>
<td>2.25  2.25</td>
<td>2.50  2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (poor)</td>
<td>6.24  6.24</td>
<td>6.50  6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank order difference (poor)</td>
<td>1.00  1.00</td>
<td>1.25  1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by teachers from wealthy and poor school systems.
Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by teachers with different levels of preparation (Non-degree, N = 30; BA in subj, N = 96; BA in ed, N = 68; Grad in subj, N = 7; Grad in ed, N = 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Non-degree</th>
<th>BA in subj</th>
<th>BA in ed</th>
<th>Grad in subj</th>
<th>Grad in ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>2.658</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>2.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>3.110</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>3.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>3.121</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>3.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>3.226</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>3.392</td>
<td>3.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>2.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>2.731</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>2.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Or. new staff</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>2.529</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>2.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>4.075</td>
<td>4.002</td>
<td>3.869</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>3.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>2.871</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>2.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L. Dynamic</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>2.578</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>2.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Subj. cent.</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>3.395</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>3.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Meth. cent.</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>2.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Permissive</td>
<td>3.933</td>
<td>3.890</td>
<td>3.941</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>3.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goal orient.</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>3.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Press. resp.</td>
<td>3.816</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>3.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank order for tasks of supervision as expressed by teachers with different levels of preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Non-degree</th>
<th>BA in subj</th>
<th>BA in ed</th>
<th>Grad in subj</th>
<th>Grad in ed</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Or. new staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 44
Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by teachers claiming to have been exposed to varying qualities of supervision (Extremely poor, N = 7; Poor, N = 14; Fair, N = 59; Good, N = 94; Excellent, N = 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>2.597</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>2.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>3.428</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>3.072</td>
<td>3.018</td>
<td>3.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.317</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>3.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. nat.</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.392</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>2.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>2.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Or. new staff</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>2.696</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>2.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>3.178</td>
<td>3.142</td>
<td>3.131</td>
<td>3.295</td>
<td>3.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.089</td>
<td>3.953</td>
<td>3.970</td>
<td>2.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>2.843</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>2.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Tractive</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>3.525</td>
<td>3.239</td>
<td>3.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dynamic</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>2.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Subj. cent.</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>3.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Meth. cent.</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>2.635</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>2.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goal orient.</td>
<td>3.214</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>3.466</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>3.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Press. resp.</td>
<td>3.785</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>3.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank order for tasks of supervision as expressed by teachers claiming to have been exposed to varying qualities of supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>Extremely poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>All teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Or. new staff</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role expectations for the supervisor position as expressed by teachers exposed to varying amounts of supervision

(None, N = 13; Very little, N = 68; Some, N = 93; Quite a lot, N = 43; A great deal, N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>2.788</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>2.494</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>3.115</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>3.145</td>
<td>3.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. Fac.</td>
<td>2.961</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>3.174</td>
<td>3.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>2.507</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>2.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>2.423</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>2.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Gr. new staff</td>
<td>2.942</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>2.744</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>3.134</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>3.185</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>3.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>3.942</td>
<td>3.970</td>
<td>3.908</td>
<td>4.011</td>
<td>4.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Tractive</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.360</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>3.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dynamic</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>2.647</td>
<td>2.483</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>2.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Subj. cent.</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>3.236</td>
<td>3.162</td>
<td>3.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Meth. cent.</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>2.654</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>2.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Goal orient.</td>
<td>3.576</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>3.252</td>
<td>3.372</td>
<td>3.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Press. resp.</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>3.941</td>
<td>3.779</td>
<td>3.883</td>
<td>3.950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank order for tasks of supervision as expressed by teachers exposed to varying amounts of supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks of supervision</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a lot</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curr. dev.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Org. for inst.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Staffing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Prov. fac.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prov. mat.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. In-serv. ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Or. new staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Rel. sp. serv.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Public rel.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
At The Ohio State University in the Faculty of Curriculum and Foundations, we have a Ph. D. candidate, Robert Evans, who plans to do some exciting and important research in the area of supervisory practice. As a native of Virginia, Bob wanted to return to his home state to do this work.

As chairman of his research committee, I am asking for your assistance and help. For some time we have needed more information and data about the actual practices and operations within the field of supervision. We believe this research project represents a beginning effort towards this end.

I trust that you will find the time to respond to this research work. We do appreciate your willingness to help, and let me thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Galloway
Professor
For many years the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development has been concerned about and tried to focus attention on supervisors in the field of education and what they do. There is a young man here at The Ohio State University now who is very concerned about the same things. His name is Robert Evans.

During the past year and a half Bob Evans has been involved in research and other academic pursuits leading toward a doctoral degree in curriculum and supervision. At the present time he is engaged in a research project in the area of supervision.

Bob Evans wants very much to do a comprehensive study of the task expectations of supervisors in Virginia, but he needs your help. Would you be willing to encourage the supervisors in your district, whose names are listed below, to complete the instrument that he has mailed to them? I hope that you might be able to help him in that way. We know how very busy professional educators are, but we feel that this research project holds real promise in helping all of us understand more precisely and more completely how supervisors see their role.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. If I can provide further information, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

Jack R. Frymier
Professor of Education and Past President, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

JRF:j1
I would like to take this opportunity to seek your help in a research study concerning instructional supervision in the Commonwealth of Virginia. As a native of Virginia, I completed the Master of Education degree in supervision and curriculum under the direction of Dr. Charles W. Beegle of the University of Virginia, who has given much assistance in this dissertation project. I am seeking your cooperation as one charged with supervisory leadership in my research, entitled, "Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Selected Elementary Teachers and Supervisors in Virginia". Implications and generalizations from this effort should be of interest to all of us who are interested in the design and/or development of more approximate supervision programs and activities.

Enclosed, please find the research instrument, which I sincerely hope that you shall take a few moments to complete and return in the envelope provided. All of the information which is requested on the cover sheet will be treated with strict confidence, as this information will guide the analyses of the data. This particular type of instrument was selected so as to not be time consuming. All individuals whose names have been selected for inclusion in the sample will receive a detailed research abstract, once the dissertation has been completed.

I have previously addressed a similar letter to the superintendent of your school district, as did Dr. Jack R. Frymier, Past President of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development on my behalf. Since this request for your participation probably will arrive at a most harried time of the school year, I shall appreciate your taking a few moments to complete the questionnaire and return it within the stamped envelope.

Please feel free to contact me if you should desire additional information concerning this research. I trust that you will pause long enough to assist me in this research effort. Your time and participation, if granted, will be most sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

Robert L. Evans, Jr.
Graduate Teaching Associate
I would like to solicit your help in a study of instructional supervision in Virginia. Within the next few weeks I will be mailing a short questionnaire to the supervisory personnel selected from your district, as named in Dr. Jack Frymier's letter. I would like to anticipate your support if these respondents make an inquiry to your office concerning the study.

The instrument is based upon an earlier study by Dr. Jose Cardenas. Eight short vignettes are presented which are based upon Dr. Ben Harris' conceptual task areas of supervision: curriculum development, organizing for instruction, providing staff, providing facilities, providing materials, inservice education, orienting new staff, relating special pupil services, developing public relations, and evaluating instruction.

Each vignette is followed by five responses which the respondent will order (by preference in descending order) from one to five.

While all of the task functions of supervision are not covered by this instrument, these are the tasks we especially want to research. This information should be of interest to all of us in developing more comprehensive supervision programs and activities for the achievement of instructional goals.

The research will be guided by these two general questions:

A. Is there a significant correlation between the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed between two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and elementary supervisors?

B. Is there a significant correlation between the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among subgroupings of two groups of Virginia public school personnel: elementary teachers and elementary supervisors?

I have received encouragement from Dr. Charles W. Beegle of the University of Virginia, under whom I completed the Master's degree in supervision and curriculum.
You will be mailed a detailed copy of the research abstract after the investigation is completed. All information received from the cover sheet will be treated with strict confidence.

I would sincerely appreciate your support of this study. If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Evans, Jr.
Graduate Teaching Associate
Mr. Bernard R. Taylor, Director  
Division of Elementary Education  
Virginia State Board of Education  
State Department of Education  
Richmond, VA  23216  

Dear Mr. Taylor:

I would like to solicit your cooperation in my search for some statistics concerning public elementary teachers in Virginia. Specifically, I would like to obtain data concerning selected demographic factors characteristic of the public elementary school teaching population. Of those teachers charged with instructional responsibilities for K-6 students (i.e., open space teachers, self-contained classroom teachers, etc.) can your office provide me with the following information:

1. Average number of years of classroom teaching experience of all elementary teachers in Virginia public schools (current figures).

2. Average age of classroom teachers (male and female) of all public elementary school teachers in Virginia.

3. The average level of academic preparation (B.A., Master's degree, etc.) of all elementary level teachers in Virginia public schools.

4. Statistical data (if available) concerning the racial composition of the elementary level teaching force in Virginia.

This information should greatly help me in completing the data-gathering process for the doctoral dissertation. I shall use this data I am requesting from you to substantiate whether or not the teacher sample selected for my research is representative of the total universe of Virginia teachers.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Evans, Jr.
Graduate Teaching Associate

RLE:j1
Dear ________:

I would like to take this opportunity to solicit your assistance and support in a research study concerning instructional supervision in Virginia. At the suggestion of Dr. Charles W. Beegle of the University of Virginia, I am addressing this request to you. It is hoped for that the instructional faculty of your school would agree to complete one short questionnaire (each) expressing their expectations concerning supervisory tasks.

"Task Expectations for the Elementary Supervisor Role as Expressed by Selected Elementary Teachers and Supervisors? is an exploratory attempt to analyze the relationship between these expectations of selected supervisors and teachers in the Commonwealth. The instrument is based upon the earlier study by Dr. Jose Cardenas in which the eight vignettes were created based upon the Ben Harris conceptual framework of supervisory tasks: curriculum development, organizing for instruction, providing staff, providing materials for instruction, inservice education, public relations, orienting new staff members, and evaluation of instruction. A copy of the instrument is enclosed.

The research activity will be guided by the following two questions:

A. Is there a significant correlation between the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role, as expressed by two groups of Virginia public school personnel: teachers and supervisors?

B. Is there a significant correlation between the task expectations for the elementary supervisor role as expressed among sub-groupings of teachers and supervisors (elementary) associated with Virginia public schools?

If you should favor this research request, I shall provide sufficient instruments for the total number of teachers within your building who wish to participate. In order not to disrupt the routine schedule of the school, all of the completed instruments could be mailed back to Ohio State in a (provided) stamped envelope. This would ensure that no hardship
was placed upon any participant, all of whom may complete the test in ten minutes, individually.

All information requested will be treated with strict confidence (i.e., number of years of teaching experience, age, subjects taught, etc.). This information will enhance the analyses of the data. A detailed research report will be mailed to your school at the conclusion of the study.

Your decision to help us in this research study would be sincerely appreciated. Since the investigation plans to only involve ten selected Virginia public elementary schools, your decision to support this effort would be invaluable.

I have received encouragement from Dr. Beegle in this activity, under whom I completed the Master of Education degree in curriculum and supervision. At his request, please feel free to contact him at the University of Virginia if you should desire (804-924-0311). If I may provide further information do not hesitate to contact me at Ohio State.

Your time and interest in this dissertation research is valued. I trust that I shall receive your decision soon.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Evans, Jr.
Graduate Teaching Associate

Enclosures
April 14, 1975

Mr. Robert Lee Evans, Jr.
42 East 13th Avenue, Apt. L
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Evans:

I have received the completed research request and research agreement signed by you and your advisor, as well as a copy of the instrument which you will use in your study.

If you have gained the approval and cooperation of the principals and teachers whom you wish to include in your sample, I suggest that you go ahead with the implementation of your study immediately.

Sincerely,

Edward F. DeFord
Assistant Director of Research

EFD/pcs
Mr. Robert L. Evans, Jr.
Graduate Teaching Associate
The Ohio State University
College of Education
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Evans:

I have your letter of April 16 requesting information on elementary teachers in Virginia public schools.

By copy of this letter I am forwarding your letter to Mr. Wayland Jones, Director of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification, who is in a position to answer the several questions raised by you. The statistical data requested in your letter is not gathered in the Division of Elementary Education.

I am confident that you will be hearing from Mr. Jones in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard R. Taylor, Director
Division of Elementary Education

BRT/as
CC:
Mr. Wayland Jones, Director
Division of Teacher Education and Certification
State Department of Education
Mr. Robert L. Evans  
Graduate Teaching Associate  
The Ohio State University  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210  

Dear Mr. Evans:

This is to inform you that your study on Supervision of Instruction is approved. Please feel free to contact members of the supervisory staff in the Prince William County Schools concerning collection of data.

It must be understood that the role and function of the traditional Supervisor of Instruction is a changing one. Your research should be of great importance in the re-organization of these assignments.

Sincerely,

Milton L. Snyder  
Division Superintendent

Milton L. Snyder  

cc: Dr. Jack R. Frymier
Dear Mr. Evans:

Your request to have support in soliciting help in the study of instructional supervision in Virginia meets with my approval.

I have not had a chance to talk with all three, but I know that their schedules are quite full. However, if you will contact them directly I am sure you will find that they will be very cooperative.

I wish you well in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Garland R. Lively
Superintendent of Schools

GRL:w
March 26, 1975

Dr. Jack R. Frymier
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Dr. Frymier:

I shall be very happy to encourage Mr. Graham, Mrs. Edwards, and Mrs. Addington to cooperate with Mr. Evans in his study.

Very sincerely yours,

Harley T. Stallard
Division Superintendent
March 20, 1975

Dr. Jack R. Frymier  
Professor of Education  
The Ohio State University  
College of Education  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Professor Frymier:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 17. I shall relay to my associates your request that they cooperate in filling out a questionnaire utilized for a research project by Mr. Robert L. Evans.

Cordially yours,

Albert L. Ayars  
Superintendent of Schools

cc: Dr. Robert M. Forster  
Mrs. Bettie D. Jorden  
Mrs. Elizabeth Crowder  
Mr. E. Ralph Newton  
Mr. Robert L. Evans
March 20, 1975

Dr. Jack R. Frymier
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
College of Education
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Professor Frymier:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 17. I shall relay to my associates your request that they cooperate in filling out a questionnaire utilized for a research project by Mr. Robert L. Evans.

Cordially yours,

Albert L. Ayara
Superintendent of Schools

cc: Dr. Robert M. Forster
    Mrs. Bettie D. Jorden
    Mrs. Elizabeth Crowder
    Mr. E. Ralph Newton
    Mr. Robert L. Evans
March 20, 1975

Robert L. Evans
Ohio State University
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Evans:

I will be glad to ask Edna Louise Flapan to complete your questionnaire. We understand we will have access to the research abstract.

Sincerely,

Donald Lacey
Area Superintendent
March 20, 1975

Mr. Jack R. Frymier  
Professor of Education and  
Past President, Association for  
Supervision and Curriculum  
Development  
The Ohio State University  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Frymier:

I have referred your request for cooperation on the study being conducted by Bob Evans to Barry Morris and Robert Weiser as you requested. They will be most happy to cooperate with Mr. Evans in his survey.

Your letter indicated that a survey instrument is being mailed to these two people although they have not received it as yet. We assume it will be in the mail during the next few days.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

S. John Davis  
Division Superintendent

SJD/clr

CC: Mr. Barry Morris  
   Mr. F. Robert Weiser
Mr. Robert L. Evans  
Graduate Teaching Associate  
The Ohio State University  
College of Education  
29 West Woodruff Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dear Mr. Evans:

In response to your letter of March 18, 1975, I have discussed this with Mrs. Duncan and she will be happy to cooperate with you in your study.

Sincerely,

Arnold D. Oates, Jr.  
Division Superintendent

ADO/bd