

A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF
LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION
IN VIRGINIA

by

Thomas A. Elliott

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

W. M. Worner, Co-Chairman

W. A. Bost, Co-Chairman

T. C. Hunt

R. R. Richards

J. T. Seyfarth

J. S. Tlou

June, 1982

Blacksburg, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation study would not have been completed without the support, encouragement, and assistance of many people. Chief among these persons were the co-chairmen of this study, Dr. Wayne M. Worner, Professor of Education at Virginia Tech and Dr. William A. Bost, Chairman of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction at Virginia Commonwealth University. Special thanks must also be expressed to other members of the dissertation committee: Dr. Thomas C. Hunt, Dr. Robert R. Richards, Dr. John T. Seyfarth, and Dr. Josiah S. Tlou. The assistance and direction of each of these gentlemen proved invaluable during the development and completion of this study.

Appreciation must also be expressed to the population sample of this study - namely, the three hundred and twenty-five social studies teachers, the one hundred and fifty-one building principals, and the twenty social studies supervisors who took time to complete and return the survey instruments used to collect data necessary for responding to the objectives of this dissertation study. Additionally, deepest gratitude must be extended to Mrs. Debora P. Howard for the personal time and commitment given to the typing and retyping of this manuscript.

Finally, special recognition must go to members of the Cycle II group of the VPI and SU/VCU doctoral program. Their constant friendship, encouragement, and willingness to share diverse expertise and experiences provided a unique dimension of professional growth.

DEDICATION

This dissertation study is dedicated to my lovely wife, Vardreane Kellum Elliott, and to our sons, Anthony Jermaine and Todd Andrew. Throughout this professional endeavor, their encouragement and strong support have made the accomplishment of this project a reality. To them go expressions of sincere love and gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
DEDICATION	iif
LIST OF TABLES	vii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Study	6
Justification and Need for the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	11
Definition of Terms	11
Summary and Organization of the Study	13
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE	15
General Perceptions of Supervision and the Supervisory Role	15
Research Studies Relative to Social Studies Supervisors	33
Supervisory Tasks and Activities	36
Summary	42
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY	44
Research Method	44
Population and Samples	46
Instrumentation	48
Data Collection	50

	Page
Research Objectives, Hypotheses, and Analyses of Data	55
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA	60
Supervisory Activities Rated by Local Super- visors of Social Studies Education, Teachers, and Building Principals	60
Perceptions of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education Relative to Actual and Ideal Supervisory Performance	61
Perceptions of Social Studies Education Teachers Relative to Actual and Ideal Super- visory Performance	70
Perceptions of Building Principals Relative to Actual and Ideal Supervisory Performance . . .	78
Perceptions of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education Versus Perceptions of Social Studies Teachers and Building Prin- cipals Regarding Actual Supervisory Per- formance	85
Perceptions of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education Versus Perceptions of Social Studies Teachers and Building Prin- cipals Regarding Ideal Supervisory Per- formance	91
Summary	96
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING STATEMENT	98
Purpose of the Study	98
Summary of Selected Related Literature	102
Summary of Methods and Procedures	104
Summary of Findings	106
Concluding Statement and Recommendations for Further Study	113

	Page
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	120
Appendices	
A. Letter and Supervisor Questionnaire	127
B. Letter and Teacher Questionnaire	133
C. Letter and Principal Questionnaire	139
D. Follow-Up Letter	145
E. Frequencies and Percentages of Actual and Ideal Supervisory Performance as Reported by Supervisors, Teachers, and Principals	147
F. Comparison of Actual and Ideal Frequencies Between Supervisors and Principals and Supervisors and Teachers	154
VITA	159
ABSTRACT	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	List of Supervisory Activities Included in Survey Questionnaires and Their Source(s)	51
2.	A Listing of Supervisory Activities Included on Mail Survey Questionnaire	62
3.	Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Actual and Ideal Performances as Reported by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities	66
4.	Derived t Values Comparing Mean Frequency Ratings by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Reported Actual and Ideal Performance on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities	71
5.	Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Actual and Ideal Performance of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Perceived by Teachers	72
6.	Derived t Values Comparing Mean Frequency Ratings by Social Studies Teachers on Actual and Ideal Performance of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities	77
7.	Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Actual and Ideal Performance of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Perceived by Building Principals	80
8.	Derived t Values Comparing Mean Frequency Ratings by Building Principals on Actual and Ideal Performance of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities	84
9.	Analysis of Mean Differences of Actual Frequencies Between Supervisors and Teachers	86

Table	Page
10. Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Actual Ratings of Performance on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Reported by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education and Social Studies Teachers	88
11. Analysis of Mean Differences of Actual Frequencies Between Supervisors and Principals	89
12. Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Actual Ratings of Performance on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Reported by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education and Building Principals	90
13. Analysis of Mean Differences of Ideal Frequencies Between Supervisors and Teachers	93
14. Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Ideal Ratings of Performance on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Reported by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education and Social Studies Teachers	94
15. Analysis of Mean Differences of Ideal Frequencies Between Supervisors and Principals	95
16. Means, Ranks, and Differences Between Ideal Ratings of Performance on Forty-Two Selected Supervisory Activities as Reported by Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education and Building Principals	97
17. Distribution of Supervisor Activities Across Assisting, Supporting, Administering, and Other Functions	117

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

For many years the supervisor has been a familiar person in public educational institutions, but the role of supervisor has evolved through the years. "Changing educational objectives, socio-economic conditions, educational background of teachers, changing student populations, increasing numbers of supervisors, and other factors have been part of the evolution."¹ This evolution has gone through five major periods between the late 1800's and the present time: periods of "Administrative Inspection," "Supervision by Specialist," "Scientific Supervision," "Supervision as Democratic Human Relations," and "Supervision Through Reason and Practical Intelligence."² Although each period was characterized by somewhat different supervisory roles, all were known for widespread variations and perceived task functions.

Even though these periods were designated for general supervision, they no doubt have application for supervision in the area

¹Gloria Ann Bohler, "A Questionnaire Survey of Social Studies Supervisor's Job Characteristics," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (January, 1974), 4051-52-A.

²William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action (2nd ed.; New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 12.

of social studies education. Social studies supervision was specifically reported as a separate field first in 1929,³ during the period classified as "Scientific Supervision." Since that time and up through the present the role has included many and varied responsibilities.

With the evolution of supervision between the period of the late 1800's and the present has come the development of considerable material relative to the role function of supervisors as a vehicle for improving education. A consensus with respect to the methods to be utilized in achieving such improvements in education has not been evident. Recognized leaders in the field of education have recommended that additional supervisors be employed to assist teachers in improving education for students. Harris stated: "Supervision is one of the essential functions for the operation of good schools" ⁴ Harris further explained as follows: "Supervision is directed toward both maintaining and improving the teaching-learning processes of the school." ⁵ On the other hand, many persons have considered supervisory jobs to be positions of luxury or frills that could be eliminated

³National Education Association, Current Problems of Supervisors: An Analysis of the Status of Supervision in American Public Schools in 1929, Third Yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1930), p. 190.

⁴Ben M. Harris, Supervisory Behavior of Education (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 2.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

without harm to instructional programs. "It is not news in educational circles," wrote Unruh, "that budget-related cutting of professional positions usually affects supervisory positions first."⁶

Crosby cited in the statement that follows, views held largely by the public regarding the lack of necessity for supervision:

During the depression years of the 1930's, many school systems, faced with the need for drastic budget-cutting, seized upon the elimination of supervision as an economy measure. In such times, when retrenchment is the order of the day, those services considered non-essential or⁷ dispensable are naturally the first to be abandoned....

Despite the positive and negative views of supervision during its evolution, it appears that the perceptions held by instructional supervisors, teachers, and administrators regarding the role of the supervisor have been crucial to the success of the instructional supervisor. Although teachers, administrators, and supervisors must work together for the instructional program to be successful, what has been expected of each party has been unclear in many instances.

A lack of congruence between the actual and ideal role of supervisor as perceived by supervisors has been reported as conclusions

⁶Glenys G. Unruh, "Instructional Supervision: Issues and Trends," Educational Leadership, XXIV (May, 1977), p. 563.

⁷Muriel Crosby, Supervision as Cooperative Action (New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1957), p. 7.

in studies by Esposito⁸ and Bohler.⁹ McGowan¹⁰ and Neville¹¹ concluded that supervisors were not performing effectively in certain tasks of supervision expected by teachers. Further, Carlton¹² and Smith¹³ concluded that few similarities existed between what was considered to be the actual role and ideal role of a supervisor.

The literature supports the rationale that instructional supervisors need a clear self-perception of their role. "The role of the supervisor," maintained Goens and Lange, "is contingent upon the establishment of a 'helping relationship,' a necessary ingredient in any growth-oriented interaction between people."¹⁴ Esposito and Burbach stated the following:

⁸James P. Esposito, "Task Preferences of Instructional Supervisors and The Disbelief-Belief System," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (January, 1970), 3031-34-A.

⁹Bohler, op. cit., p. 174.

¹⁰Gerald Robert McGowan, "A Study of Perceptions of Supervisory Tasks and Processes," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (November, 1971), 2305-41-A.

¹¹Richard F. Neville, "The Supervisor We Need," Educational Leadership, XXIII (May, 1966), p. 639.

¹²Cecil G. Carlton, Jr., "Role of Instructional Supervisors As Perceived by Teachers and Principals in Selected Florida Elementary Schools," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1970), p. 43.

¹³Gary Smith, "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision in Virginia," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (December, 1975), 3041-42-A.

¹⁴George Goens and Ronald W. Lange, "Supervision As Instructional Analysis," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LX (September, 1976), p. 19.

New research and long-standing criticism indicate that the practice of educational supervision has been impeded by the lack of a clear-cut role conceptualization. This ambiguity and the resultant dysfunction have fostered negative attitudes among teachers which have crystallized into doubts about the effectiveness and worth of supervision....¹⁵

Additionally, literature in the area of supervision indicates that the instructional supervisor also needs to know whether or not the recipients of the supervisory services - teachers and building principals - perceive supervisors to be performing services considered important in assisting them in fulfilling their responsibilities. Agreement among supervisors, teachers, and building principals about what the role of the supervisor is and what it should be is essential if acceptance of the supervisor as an important and contributing member of the instructional team is to take place.

From the perspective of the supervisory staff of the Social Studies Service, Virginia Department of Education, local supervisors of the social studies perform many vital services.¹⁶ However, there has been no effort made to determine whether or not responsibilities actually performed by local supervisors of social studies have been consistent with the responsibilities that supervisors would have

¹⁵James P. Esposito and Harold J. Burbach, A Role Study: The Supervisor in Virginia (Richmond: Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), p. 41.

¹⁶Based on a Listing of Suggested Services Performed by Local Social Studies Supervisors Contained in the Publication, "A Handbook for Social Studies Supervisory Personnel in Local School Divisions," (Richmond: Virginia Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, February, 1976), p. 12.

preferred to perform. Likewise, there has been no effort made to determine whether or not the social studies education teachers and administrators received services that they perceived to be useful or desirable. This study was designed to determine the extent to which such relationships exist between the actual and ideal role of local supervisors of social studies as perceived by the social studies supervisors, the teachers who are recipients of the services and building principals who, as instructional leaders, are responsible for social studies instruction in a given school.

PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which relationships exist between the perceptions of secondary local supervisors of social studies and the perceptions of social studies teachers and building principals relative to the role of local supervisors of social studies education. Specifically, the research objectives of the study were to determine:

1. the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies reported performing forty-two selected supervisory activities;
2. the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies believed that they should perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;
3. whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities, as perceived by local

supervisors of social studies;

4. the frequency rate at which social studies teachers believed that supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities;

5. the frequency rate at which social studies teachers preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;

6. whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers;

7. the frequency rate at which building principals believed supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities;

8. the frequency rate at which building principals preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;

9. whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals;

10. whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies teachers, and the perceptions of building principals concerning the actual frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities; and

11. whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions

of social studies teachers, and the perceptions of building principals concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

JUSTIFICATION AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

It is clear from the literature that reactions are mixed among educational leaders regarding the impact that supervision has on improving the quality of education in the school. Several studies have been done regarding general supervisors with some focusing on subject areas. However, few such studies have been done in the area of social studies and none relative to social studies supervision in Virginia.

One study has been done regarding the role function of social studies supervisors, but the study focused on national rather than local supervisory personnel. The purpose of the study was to define the characteristics and describe the job of social studies supervisors in selected states; however, many of the participants in the study were without services of a local supervisor of social studies.¹⁷

Supervisors of social studies education on a local level in Virginia were relatively new additions to supervisory education teams. It was not until the 1959-60 school year that the first local supervisor of social studies was employed in the Arlington County school system. In September 1981, twenty-six local secondary full-time supervisors of social studies were employed in seventeen school

¹⁷Bohler, op. cit., p. 8.

systems. The seventeen school systems employed a total of one thousand eight hundred and fifty-three teachers and one hundred and ninety-seven building principals. The review of the literature did not reveal any writing or research relative to supervisory role perceptions in the area of social studies education in Virginia.

The fact that a large percentage of social studies teachers and building principals utilized the services of local supervisors, coupled with the fact that most school systems have assigned the area of social studies to general central office personnel, serves to justify the need for a study of this nature. Further, the need for this type of research has been expressed by nationally recognized authorities. Among the statements supporting this type of research are conclusions suggesting that findings might be helpful in designing more effective preparatory programs, inservice activities, certification standards, increasing supervisory efficiency by more precise role definitions, and relating professional literature to the needs of the supervisor."¹⁸

This study afforded social studies teachers and building principals the opportunity to suggest to social studies supervisors the frequency of performance of those activities they would prefer

¹⁸Harold T. Shaver, "Introduction," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. xiii-xvii and C. Taylor Whittier, "The Setting and New Challenges," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 8-17.

as means of improving classroom instruction. It also provided local social studies supervisors an opportunity to view themselves as they actually perform selected supervisory activities and to determine how frequently they would prefer to perform such tasks. The results of this study may contribute to increased understanding of the role of local supervisor of social studies education and to increased effectiveness of the supervisory process. They should also enhance the limited research that is now available regarding the perceptions held by supervisors, teachers, and building principals relative to the role of local supervisors of social studies education.

In summary, participation in this study by local supervisors of social studies provided them with the opportunity to analyze their effectiveness and to identify incongruencies that might exist between what they do and what is preferred, in an effort to meet the needs of the teachers and building principals they are employed to serve. Further, this study will aid staff members of the Social Studies Service, Virginia Department of Education, in designing statewide inservice activities that will assist local social studies supervisors in fulfilling their responsibilities to improve social studies instruction as well as to foster stronger relationships with those served. The results of the study could be the basis for a new alliance among building principals, teachers, and supervisors. Such an alliance could lead to improved understandings of the role function of the social studies supervisor and could enhance the development of a supervisory team approach for the improvement of social studies instruction.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited in empirical generalization to local supervisors of social studies, teachers, and building principals in seventeen school systems in Virginia which have full-time local supervisors of social studies for grades seven through twelve. As such, the findings could not be used to generalize about supervisors, teachers, or principals who are members of other populations. Attempting to generalize from the one specific population studied to other populations not studied may have given rise to error.

The mail questionnaire technique was utilized in this study. Typical weaknesses of questionnaire surveys, including the problem of misinterpretation by the respondents and the rate in which the survey questionnaires were returned by individuals in the sample, placed additional limitations on the study. Further, the study was limited in that it was subject to sampling error at the selected probability level of .05. Therefore, the probability that the observed relationships were attributable to chance was five in one hundred.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Throughout the study certain terms were used. The terms were used in the context of the following definitions:

Local Supervisor of Social Studies Education

The term "local supervisor of social studies education" refers

to those individuals employed full-time in seventeen local school divisions to supervise social studies education programs in grades seven through twelve.

Social Studies Teachers

The term "social studies teachers" refers to those teachers in public schools, grades seven through twelve, who were teaching social studies courses in one of the seventeen school systems in which a local supervisor of social studies education was employed.

Building Principals

The term "building principals" refers to those building principals in public schools, grades seven through twelve, who served in school systems in which local supervisors of social studies were employed.

Supervisory Activities

The term "supervisory activities" refers to activities selected to inclusion in the list of tasks which local social studies supervisors, teachers, and building principals rated with respect to frequency of performance and preferred frequency of performance.

Actual Task Performance

The term "actual task performance" has the same definition as given by Smith: "...the perceptions of teachers, building principals, and/or supervisors of the frequency of performance of supervisors in ... selected tasks."¹⁹

¹⁹Smith, op. cit., p. 17.

Ideal Task Performance

The term "ideal task performance" has the same definition as given by Smith: "...the preferred frequency of performance in selected supervisory activities as perceived by teachers, building principals and/or supervisors."²⁰

Supervisory Role Function

The term "supervisory role function" refers to the tasks most frequently performed by supervisors from among those activities selected for inclusion in the list of tasks by local social studies supervisors, teachers, and building principals and then rated for frequency of performance and preferred frequency of performance.

SUMMARY AND ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study included a questionnaire survey sample of social studies teachers, building principals, and social studies supervisors in those Virginia school divisions with full-time secondary social studies supervisors during the 1980-81 school year. The questionnaires were designed to furnish the data needed to accomplish the purpose and objectives of the study. The descriptive-survey method was used as a means of collecting data and testing empirically the extent to which relationships existed between the perceptions of the actual and the ideal performance of local secondary supervisors of social studies as perceived by local secondary supervisors of social

²⁰Ibid.

studies, teachers, and building principals.

As no previous study of this type in social studies education in Virginia has been identified, the results of this effort should assist the Social Studies Service, Virginia Department of Education, in designing statewide programs and activities that will aid local social studies supervisors in fulfilling their responsibilities to improve social studies instruction. Also, this study could provide guidance to school personnel in local school systems interested in analyzing and re-evaluating the role of the social studies supervisor so as to assure greater effectiveness.

The study includes five chapters. An introduction, purpose and objectives, justification and need, limitations, definition of terms, and summary and organization of the study were a part of chapter I. Chapter II includes a review of selected related literature. This includes both theoretical literature and selected research studies in social studies education.

Chapter III provides a description of the methods and procedures used in the study. Specific topics include research method, population and samples, instrumentation, data collection, and research objectives, hypotheses, and analyses of data.

Chapter IV includes a reporting and analysis of the data. Summary and conclusions based on the research findings are the major components of chapter V.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to present a review of selected literature related to the study. This literature is presented in four sections: (1) general perceptions of supervision and the supervisory role, (2) studies of social studies supervisors, (3) supervisory tasks and activities, and (4) summary.

GENERAL PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISION AND THE SUPERVISORY ROLE

The literature reviewed that pertained to supervision was utilized in both theoretical and empirical studies. Harris presented thirteen propositions about supervision which could be loosely interpreted as a tentative theory. The propositions are related to: (1) definition of supervision, (2) supervisory tasks, (3) differentiated activities, (4) social change, (5) increasing knowledge, (6) dynamic and tractive supervision, (7) rate and direction of change, (8) quality of change, (9) desirability of change, (10) activities influencing change, (11) supervisory skills and processes, (12) positions, and (13) distinguishing characteristics of supervisors.¹

¹Harris, op. cit., pp. 32-36 passim.

Wiles developed what he referred to as a theory, but warned that any theory must be inferred and that previous research attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of supervisory theories had proved inconclusive. Some similarities to Harris' propositions, as well as some differences, can be noted in selected assumptions and inferred hypotheses included in his theory.

Assumptions

- I. Supervision exists to produce change in the curriculum and instruction of the schools.
- II. The difference between supervisor and teacher is more one of function than education and experience.
- III. Teachers are professionals with a code of ethics, specialized education, and a desire to be self-directing.
- IV. Supervisors are employed to provide leadership and competency in the process of developing an organization and a working environment that facilitates the constant improvement of curriculum and instruction.
- V. The most valuable sources of concepts to be used in the development of an organization and a strategy for change are the behavioral sciences: psychology (with emphasis on leadership, group development, and human relations), sociology (with emphasis on community power structure), and communication.
- VI. Concepts from each field that seem to have relevance to the formation of a strategy of change should be selected and utilized as the basis for the formulation of a theory of supervision.²

²Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. ix.

Inferred Hypotheses

- A. Supervision is the name given to the activities that contribute to the improvement of the instruction and program of a school system.
- B. Supervision is a function of the organization.
- C. Many people contribute to the function of improvement - some have an official responsibility for contribution to improved instruction, and others contribute by their actions.
- D. Supervision operates in an organization structure.
- E. Qualities of the organization that affect the supervisory function are: rigidity, norms, goals, role perceptions, patterns, communication, use of authority, morale, and cohesiveness.
- F. The effectiveness of the supervision is increased when: the organizational structure includes a change-inducing agent and is flexible enough to accommodate experimentation and innovation; the norms permit innovation, experimentation, acceptance of diversity, and change; the role of perceptions enables each to value the other, to expect to obtain help from the others, to see authority used to hold the group together to make decisions, and to implement those decisions made; communication channels are opened horizontally as well as vertically, upward as well as downward, and for formulating and evaluating as well as implementing and rating.
- G. The persons officially responsible for the function of improvement of instruction...have the task of creating within the organizational structure an intellectual and emotional environment which provides: acceptance and support so satisfying that each teacher feels that he belongs and is encouraged to develop his unique potentialities; many stimuli from which each teacher will choose those that have the greatest meaning and motivation for him; opportunity for each teacher to grow at his own rate and stage of readiness; curriculum development programs and inservice education that permit each teacher to work in terms of his state of development; a procedure for

selecting and distributing materials of instruction that enables teachers to devote full energy to improving the instruction process; evaluation conducted in such a manner that evidence is collected concerning the attainment of goals, and each individual involved becomes more self-directing and establishes higher goals for himself; a means of communication where each feels free to reveal his needs, concerns, and value, wants to discover the purpose and perceptions of others, and has access to the data that will enable him to make increasingly intelligent decisions.

- H. Other staff members...affect improvement of instruction by their attitude, method of operation, interaction pattern, and decisions.³

Further, Wiles listed the behavioral science concepts relevant to formulating a supervision theory. These included six from mental health, counseling, and therapy; six from learning; twelve from group development; twelve from leadership; four from human relations; fifteen from communication; and three from community power structure.⁴

McKean and Mills listed nine principles of supervision, less detailed, but similar to those offered by Wiles. The principles were regarded as a guide to action and equally important as an evaluation approach to the supervisory procedures. Emphasis was placed on improved instruction, cooperative participation, utilization of total talents and strengths, flexibility, evaluation, and satisfaction.⁵

³Ibid., pp. xiii-xiv.

⁴Ibid., pp. ix-xiii.

⁵Robert C. McKean and H. H. Mills, The Supervisor (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), pp. 10-11.

Lucio and McNeil have explained some of the difficulties related to formulating a workable theory. Diversities in supervisory duties, titles, certification requirements, job requirements, and attitudes minimized the usefulness of attempted theories. However, they stressed the importance of not allowing past failures to deter future efforts. Their advice was to use efforts to provide a valuable framework for future efforts by delineating weaknesses and areas for specific research.⁶

Many years of work and study have been devoted to the general concern of improving supervision and instructional leadership by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. A symposium in 1976 publicized the efforts of leading professionals in the field. Agreement was reached that the major focus for the future should include: (1) continued study in theory and role definition for supervision, (2) improved ways of recruiting and selecting supervisory personnel, (3) planning more comprehensive and effective preparatory programs, (4) identifying simple, but more effective, certification standards and procedures, and (5) developing concepts for continued professional development.⁷

Whittier maintained that defining and redefining the role of the supervisor is a priority item. Until this has been done the supervisor is placed in the uncomfortable position of not knowing

⁶Lucio and McNeil, op. cit., pp. 3-77 passim.

⁷Harold T. Shafer, "Introduction," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. xiii-xvii.

exactly how to function.⁸ Klopf agreed with the need for role definition, but primarily for the purpose of helping teachers perform their tasks more effectively.⁹ Hastings believed the role must include evaluation of the learning activities which necessitate the need for skilled supervisors in each discipline.¹⁰ The need for competent supervisors in each discipline has been stressed by Denmark with the rationale that more supervision is required for the changing trends within the disciplines and a general supervisor cannot reach the competency level in all disciplines that is needed.¹¹ Both Lucio and Frymier stressed the need for more clearly defined supervisory roles, based on research findings.¹²

⁸C. Taylor Whittier, "The Setting and New Challenges," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 13-14.

⁹Gordon J. Klopf, "Helping Adults Change," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 20-21.

¹⁰J. Thomas Hastings, "Assessment of Learning Outcomes," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 48-50.

¹¹George W. Denmark, "Coordinating the Team," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 65-70.

¹²William H. Lucio, "Implications for Career Development," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 74-82 passim; and Jack R. Frymier, "The Supervisor and His Professional Identity," The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions, ed. William H. Lucio (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 84-102 passim.

Crosby reviewed sixty articles published in Educational Leadership related to supervision. Her analysis revealed that:

1. Supervision received only modest attention from the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development during the period between 1960-68.
2. More than half the literature was contributed by professors. The literature had been related to supervision as others saw it rather than as supervisors perceived or performed the role.
3. There was an alarming scarcity of research related to supervision. Articles related to research had stressed the need for research rather than reporting research. Supervisors have a tendency to avoid being the subjects of research.
4. Supervisors were contributing little to the literature related to supervision.
5. Supervision should be a team process involving teacher, principal, and supervisor.
6. Only a small percent of the theory or philosophy had been illustrated with examples of usage.
7. Little attention had been given to professional knowledge and competencies needed by the supervisor.
8. The greatest emphasis had been placed on the human aspects of supervision and the qualities needed in working with people.
9. There had been little agreement on the role and functions of supervisors.¹³

Two specific needs were determined by the analysis. One was for the development of a theory of supervision and the other was for research. Each was viewed as supportive of the other, and only

¹³Muriel Crosby, "The New Supervisor: Caring, Coping, Becoming," Changing Supervision for Changing Times, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969), pp. 48-61 passim.

in this way could supervision make the greatest contribution to education.¹⁴

Qualities needed by the supervisor have been stated in various ways. Granite listed nine necessary for the supervisor to function as a stimulator, facilitator, leader, and helper. These included the ability to win respect and confidence, empathy and sensitivity, enthusiasm, a feeling of adequacy, originality, sense of humor, sense of relative value, and resourcefulness. Despite the need for these qualities it has been stressed that the supervisor must have clearly defined responsibilities for maximum effectiveness.¹⁵

Although there is not complete agreement about what has been viewed as the role of the instructional supervisor, review of the literature revealed that many changes had occurred in the perceptions that people held regarding what the role should be. Willower and others suggested in the following statement that the role of the supervisor was unclear:

...given the marginality of the supervisory role and the common absence of specific and detailed prescriptions for the role, we contend that its performance regularly fulfills the latent function of translating communications across the boundary of organizational subsystems, specifically the boundary between the technical (teaching) and managerial (administrative) subsystems.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 61.

¹⁵Harvey Granite, "Supervising Supervisors in An Urban School District," Educational Leadership, XXVI No. 4 (January, 1969), pp. 382-388.

In the downward flow of influence, for instance, the supervisory role often fulfills the latent functions of legitimatizing certain administrative decisions, especially in connection with issues like faculty retention. Compliance with administrative decisions on such matters is furthered by teachers acceptance of the legitimate authority and technical competence of the supervisor to critically review and evaluate teacher performance and to recommend administrative action....¹⁶

Lonsdale indicated what the role of supervision had been in the past and also gave indications of what the role would be in the future when he stated the following:

Supervision will never go back to inspection and demonstration. Through the thinking, action, and language, both spoken and silent, of dedicated educators its new role has emerged. Supervision will continue to improve instruction. The future greatness of our country will be built through the quality of education made available to every individual who is a part of this nation.¹⁷

Ogletree expressed his view of the role of supervision as follows:

To be sure, supervision is not what it used to be. What it will become in the future is anyone's guess. Yet one thing is certain, it will become that which supervisors do in terms of the roles they seek and the services they deliver in their school organizations as they respond to present demands.

Supervisors and supervision will change during this era of change,....¹⁸

¹⁶Donald Willower, Peter Cistone, and John Packard, "Some Functions of the Supervisory Role in Educational Organization," Education, XCII (February-March, 1972), p. 67.

¹⁷Bernard H. Lonsdale, "The 'Guese' of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXI (November, 1963), p. 74.

¹⁸James R. Ogletree, "Changing Supervision In A Changing Era," Educational Leadership, XXIX (March, 1972), p. 510.

Eash's view of the role of supervision was expressed in the following statement:

The supervisor's role, which has always been afflicted by vicissitudes in its halting progress toward professionalization, now conceivably faces extinction.

Supervision, as we have known it, may be a dying role....
...the realignment of traditional relationships of classroom teacher and supervisor is extensive and indicates that the hallowed practice of direct face-to-face operation with classroom teachers is on the wane.

The traditional techniques of supervision which involved a defined relationship of superior and subordinate, the required classroom visits and conferences, the detailed supervisory reports, and the requirements of attendance at supervisor organized meetings, are constrained and circumscribed through contracts drawn up between school boards and classroom teachers.¹⁹

"While no accurate crystal ball is at hand to predict what the supervisory function may be," stated Greene, "there is some basis for speculation that in a climate of change the function will be different."²⁰ From the literature, indications were that supervisors today are more attuned to the needs of teachers than were their predecessors. This contention was supported by Crossley in the following statement:

With an emphasis on opportunity, integrity, and performance, the modern supervisor utilizes democratic supervisory practices. Such practices are perceived as offering more freedom for teachers and supervisory freedom that symbolized greater personal responsibility

¹⁹Maurice J. Eash, "Supervisors: A Vanishing Breed?" Educational Leadership, XXVI (October, 1968), p. 73-75.

²⁰John D. Greene, "Implications for Educational Practice," Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1967), p. 50.

for taking advantages of opportunities, for exemplifying integrity, and for performing the job.²¹

Hartman indicated that individuals possessing democratic leadership skills were needed. She further believed that training programs designed to produce individuals with democratic leadership abilities would yield positive results for educational leaders and teachers.²²

Bishop and Firth expressed the view that the future held exciting opportunities for persons in supervisory positions. They presented this viewpoint in the following statement:

If instructional supervision is to flourish rather than merely exist, it must be associated with development of programs soon to be phased in. Often subsumed under different guises, roles, and titles, supervisory missions are in fact increasing. The future will require expanded services from individuals with new skills, tasks, and technologies. Those who can anticipate the emerging opportunities hold the key to success for supervision as a professional endeavor. They can change the tone from pessimism to optimism by their enlarged perception of the field.²³

Harris also expressed optimism regarding supervision when he stated: "All across the country, I sense a growing conviction that supervisors of instruction are essential in leading the nation's schools

²¹Mattie R. Crossley, "New Conceptions of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), p. 576.

²²Catherine L. Hartman, "Democratic Leadership Doesn't Just Happen," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LXI (December, 1977), p. 41.

²³Leslee J. Bishop and Gerald Firth, "New Conceptions of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXIV (May, 1977), p. 572.

toward better education."²⁴

The shift of emphasis in education from the classroom process to the struggle for power evolves some interesting and noteworthy side issues. A succession of errors in fact or in logic from a central issue to a peripheral matter may grant support to an argument far out of proportion. Among these topics is the demand that supervision of teachers is an irrelevant and obstructive process that should be discarded immediately. It is an argument that appeals to many teachers who fear the consequences of an administrator's yearly visit to a classroom and the evaluation that must follow. And it is a welcome argument to those administrators who do not feel comfortable or competent in their supervisory roles.²⁵

Markowitz explained the frustrations experienced by supervisors as follows:

The supervisor in the educational system is plagued by ambiguities. His or her position in the authority structure is ill-defined and quite often vulnerable. There is a lack of clarity in the definition of his or her role and a lack of agreement on the functions associated with supervision.²⁶

Koehn and Goens, in support of the contention expressed by Markowitz, stated: "Supervisors' perceptions of people, organization, and their own roles vary considerably."²⁷

²⁴Ben M. Harris, "Supervisor Competence and Strategies for Improving Instruction," Educational Leadership, XXX (February, 1976), p. 332.

²⁵John F. Ohles, "Supervision: Essential and Beneficial," The Clearing House, XLIV (November, 1969), p. 134.

²⁶Shirley Markowitz, "The Dilemma of Authority in Supervisory Behavior," Educational Leadership, XXXIII (February, 1976), p. 367.

²⁷John Koehn and George Goens, "The Talent We Nourish: A Word for Supervisors," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), p. 585.

Newton expressed the belief that there are three dilemmas which prevented supervision from being effective in the improvement of instruction. The listing of the dilemmas was as follows:

1. confusion between supervisory judgments based on process rather than outcomes,
2. the tension between supervision as evaluation, and
3. conflict between supervisor and teacher assumptions on ideal teacher behavior.²⁸

Esposito and others concluded that confusion existed among supervisors and teachers because of incongruence between perceptions of the role and activities performed by supervisors. As a result of the incongruence and ambiguity of the role, negative attitudes have been created among the entire educational team regarding the effectiveness and worth of supervision.²⁹ Blumberg concurred with views held that incongruence and ambiguity of the supervisory role existed, as stated in the following:

...supervision tends, in the eyes of teachers, to be associated with evaluation even when the supervisor's role or position is defined otherwise - a helping teacher, for example. Thus, what appears to take place, regardless of the good intentions of the supervisor, is that teachers try to put distance between that person and themselves....³⁰

²⁸Robert R. Newton, "Three Dilemmas of Supervision," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), p. 53.

²⁹James P. Esposito, Gary E. Smith, and Harold J. Burbach, "A Delineation of the Supervisory Role," Education, XCVI (Fall, 1975), p. 63.

³⁰Arthur Blumberg, "Supervision: What Is and What Might Be," Theory Into Practice, XV (October, 1976), p. 284.

Alphonso and others summarized in the following statement the predicament with which supervisors were faced:

In all too many cases, supervisors have spoken with little authority. Unsure of their own esteem and organizational status, they have too often spoken timidly and behaved conservatively.... The structure has often placed them in a 'power limbo' - neither line nor staff, neither administration nor faculty, but somewhere in between, with uncertain and greatly varying degrees of power and authority.³¹

Guss clarified the importance of the perceptions that one has of a role when she stated the following:

Psychological research and theory have indicated that an individual's behavior is determined largely by the individual's perception of himself and his role and that the expectations of others create, in part, this self-image which directs behavior....³²

Although the perceptions that supervisors hold regarding the role of supervisors are important, according to the literature, the perceptions of the recipients of supervisory endeavors also need to be considered. "The absence of the teacher in educational decision-making has long been recognized," stated Drake, "but the teacher is no longer content to be absent from such deliberations."³³ The involvement of teachers in the planning of programs that affect them has proved to be valuable to supervisors and teachers. Bright stated

³¹Robert J. Alphonso, Gerald R. Firth, and Richard F. Neville, Instructional Supervision (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), p. 342.

³²Carolyn Guss, "How is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, XIX (November, 1961), p. 99.

³³Ruth Drake, "Leadership: The Teacher's Option," The Clearing House, L (March, 1977), p. 292.

the following relative to this issue:

....Being involved in planning will help teachers understand why certain decisions are made. And without a doubt, people work harder and more sincerely to reach their own goals or those for which they have shared in the development.³⁴

Neville expressed in the following statement the importance of the other half of the supervisory team, the teachers:

Where the intent of my actions are clear to me but held suspect by others the results of our professional relationship will be limited. If I am aware of the disparity between my intentions and the 'reality' with which they are perceived, it may be possible to take steps to mediate the difference and slowly build the trust and mutual respect so necessary for instructional improvement....³⁵

Neville also cited the importance of knowing how teachers perceived supervision: "...since teachers are either the recipients of or partners in the supervisory process, what they perceive supervision to be is important data in building a sound program."³⁶ Combs and others provided additional support in the following statements for the contention that teachers should be consulted regarding their perceptions of supervision:

A supervisor must recognize that his effectiveness as judged by teachers will be based on the extent to which they perceive him as performing activities they feel to be essential. If a supervisor is concerned that teachers see his efforts as being ineffective, it is important that he direct his energies toward solving problems and

³⁴ Charles Bright, "Effective Supervision Leads to Teacher Growth," Business Education Forum, XXVII (May, 1973), p. 33.

³⁵ Richard F. Neville, "The Supervisor We Need," Educational Leadership, XXIII (May, 1966), p. 636.

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 636-637.

performing tasks that teachers see as vital for their own survival and well-being. Occasionally, in order to develop 'social capital,' a supervisor may need to give special attention to the functions teachers perceive as essential, rather than working exclusively on concerns of less consequence to teachers though of major importance to him.³⁷

In conjunction with this contention, Miles stated, "Whether or not supervision was effective or helpful was not as important as whether the teacher perceived supervision to be effective and helpful."³⁸

During 1975, Young and Heichberger conducted a study in rural and suburban New York in which eighty-two percent of the teachers surveyed believed there was a definite need for supervision and evaluation in the schools. Seventy-five percent of the teachers stated that the supervisor was often perceived as dangerous.³⁹ A supervisor is perceived by teachers to be most effective, according to Harty and Ritz, when the supervisor performs as a subtle force moving people toward positive behavior modification rather than the remediation of deficiencies.⁴⁰

³⁷ Arthur Combs, D. Avila, and W. Purkey, Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 69-70.

³⁸ Foster B. Miles, Jr., "An Analysis of the Perceptions of the Role of the Local Supervisor of Business Education," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1978), p. 40.

³⁹ James M. Young and Robert L. Heichberger, "Teachers' Perceptions of an Effective School Supervision and Evaluation Program," Education, CXVI (Fall, 1975), p. 10.

⁴⁰ Harold Harty and William C. Ritz, "A Non-Evaluative Helping Relationship: An Approach to Classroom-Oriented Supervision," Educational Perspectives, (May, 1976), pp. 15-21.

A lack of congruence between ideal and actual roles of supervisors as perceived by supervisors was indicated by the results of several studies.⁴¹ Krajewski concluded that actual roles of principals in secondary schools in Texas were not congruent with ideal roles.⁴²

Incongruence also existed between behavior exhibited by supervisors and the perceptions held by recipients of supervisory services. Blumberg stated that the possibility was great that discrepancies existed between behavior that was displayed and how the behavior was perceived.⁴³ Blumberg further commented that in many respects behavior that was exhibited by supervisors may not have been as important as the way in which the behavior was perceived.⁴⁴ Moreover he concludes, "A person's perceptions of another's behavior play a large part in his reaction to and feelings about that person."⁴⁵

Bohler conducted a study in which the job of local social studies supervisors was described. Responses were received from 34 states. Her findings included the following:

⁴¹James P. Esposito, "Task Preferences of Instructional Supervisors and the Disbelief-Belief System," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1971), p. 25.

⁴²Robert J. Krajewski, "Texas Principals - Implications for Perceived Roles," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLI (December, 1977), p. 19.

⁴³Arthur Blumberg, Supervisors and Teachers (California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974), p. 42.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 43.

⁴⁵Ibid.

1. There was a significant difference between the "actual" and "desirable" role for sixty-three of sixty-five activities; and
2. The two activities in which there were no significant differences between "actual" and "desirable" were answering telephones and calling meetings.⁴⁶

Gogan conducted a study of supervisory services and activities of selected secondary schools in six states. All schools surveyed were in towns with populations of ten to twenty thousand. The purposes of Gogan's study were to survey the status of supervisory services and activities and to determine what was being offered, the effectiveness of the offerings, and the services and activities considered desirable by teachers and supervisors. Gogan's conclusions included the following:

1. Teachers and supervisors were generally in favor of some type of supervisory program;
2. Classroom visitations, consultant services, demonstration teaching and inter-school visitations were ranked lowest by teachers when ranking activities being used in their systems;
3. A rating of "average" for supervisory programs was generally agreed upon by teachers and supervisors;
4. Classroom visitations and teacher conferences were rated by supervisors as the most desirable supervisory activities; and
5. Supervision⁴⁷ of the "right" kind was desired by teachers.

⁴⁶Bohler, op. cit., p. 163.

⁴⁷William L. Gogan, "A Study of Supervisory Services and Activities for the Improvement of Instruction," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964), pp. 161-164.

In summary, no common definition of supervision exists. The general concept of the need for supervision involved the idea of a "helping" relationship to improve instruction. Although there were some in the literature who maintained that the practice of supervision was unsuccessful and doomed, proponents indicated a belief that supervision was beneficial.

RESEARCH STUDIES RELATIVE TO SOCIAL STUDIES SUPERVISORS

Bohler has reported that despite the fact that few studies surveying local social studies supervisors had been identified, three could be of value to persons interested in social studies supervision.⁴⁸ These studies were conducted by Atkins,⁴⁹ Saunders,⁵⁰ and Psencik.⁵¹

Atkins designed his study to identify and evaluate selected aspects of inservice educational programs for secondary social studies teachers in twenty-three school systems throughout Tennessee. Basic

⁴⁸Gloria Ann Bohler, "A Questionnaire Survey of Social Studies Supervisor's Job Characteristics," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1970), p. 47.

⁴⁹John P. Atkins, "Inservice Experiences for Secondary Social Studies Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Tennessee," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1969), p. 53.

⁵⁰Margaret Catherine Saunders, "Contemporary Practices in Elementary School Social Studies Programs in Nebraska Schools Employing Curriculum Directors or Supervisors," (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1969), pp. 42-43.

⁵¹Leroy F. Psencik, "The Role of the State Social Studies Specialist," Social Education, XXXIV No. 8 (December, 1970), pp. 909-914.

principles of inservice education were ascertained by reviewing the related literature. Thirty-two criteria were developed to guide the analysis of inservice education programs. Program planning and content criteria were related to the operational and substantive aspects of the inservice program. A questionnaire was used to gather information. Larger school systems were found to observe more of the criteria than smaller school systems.

The ten content criteria showed that some inservice efforts were focused on improving instruction in economics, American history, and the treatment of basic issues. Specific recommendations for improving inservice programs stressed better communication, clarification of purpose, and social studies methods and content.⁵²

Saunders' study investigated the contemporary practices in Nebraska's elementary school social studies program in districts employing a full-time curriculum director or supervisor and attempted to ascertain the extent to which the practices paralleled the recommendations of recognized authorities of elementary social studies. Questionnaires were distributed to 216 teachers, grades one through six. Curriculum directors or supervisors in ten of the school districts were interviewed to validate the questionnaire responses.

Recommendations indicated that educational leaders should concentrate on providing workshops, institutes, and/or inservice programs which emphasize the neglected areas in social studies programs and that increased attention should be given to specific areas in the

⁵²Atkins, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

preservice courses offered by Nebraska colleges and universities.⁵³

Psencik's study focused on social studies supervision at the state department of education level. A five-page questionnaire was distributed during a meeting of the Council of State Social Studies Specialists and copies mailed to members not attending the meeting. Of special interest were the data concerning those local school districts employing social studies supervisory personnel. Only forty states were represented in the responses, of which thirty-three reported having local supervisors and seven reporting none. More than twenty of the thirty-three states reported having local supervisors in five percent or less of the school districts within their state. Only four states reported supervisors in more than twenty-five percent of the districts.⁵⁴

In summary, most of the supervisors responding to studies in social studies education indicated that they had served in a supervisory position for ten years or less, with the greatest increase of services as integral parts of the school system, but were frequently the first to suffer budget reductions. There were few studies related to local social studies supervision. Both the lack of studies and the plea for such studies found in the literature further supported the need for this study, as described in the justification and need section of this study.

⁵³Saunders, op. cit., p. 44.

⁵⁴Psencik, op. cit., p. 914.

SUPERVISORY TASKS AND ACTIVITIES

A review of the literature on the duties performed by local supervisors was necessary to develop data for questionnaires used to pursue the purpose of this study. In compiling lists of tasks and/or activities performed by local supervisors, determinations were made as to whether or not certain activities were considered to be important to the improvement of instruction. Selected activities engaged in by supervisors that they believed to be important may not have been perceived to be important to the teacher. Likewise, activities that teachers perceived to be important may not have been performed as frequently by supervisors as teachers would have preferred.

The "Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia," mandated the following regarding supervision:

The superintendent and his staff shall provide an effective program of instructional supervision and assistance to principals and teachers that is congruent with the objectives of the school system.⁵⁵

The Virginia Department of Education defined the mandate as follows:

The division superintendent and his staff are responsible for providing an effective program of instructional supervision. They also are charged with providing assistance to principals and teachers that will help them achieve the objectives of the school division. No rigid formulas are given for achieving an effective program of instructional

⁵⁵"Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for the Public Schools in Virginia, 1972-74," (Richmond, Virginia: State Department of Education, 1972), p. 70.

supervision and assistance; however, at least two responsibilities are implied:

The superintendent and his staff must focus upon maintaining within a school division the level of instructional effectiveness already achieved; and each year, they must foster some activities which are focused on upgrading the level of instructional efficiency.

These responsibilities require two types of supervisory personnel: special or subject-matter supervisors who concentrate on a thrust for change, and general supervisors who concentrate on instructional-program maintenance. It is expected that someone at the central office level will be responsible for planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating the program.⁵⁶

The Virginia Department of Education recommended that, at a minimum, the following activities should be pursued in a program of supervision:

1. Recommending textbooks and other instructional materials and media for adoption and use in the school division.
2. Providing appropriate inservice educational programs for school division personnel including college-sponsored classes and local activities.
3. Providing opportunities for involving teachers and principals in determining the objectives of the school division.
4. Providing opportunities for involving principals and teachers in determining the most appropriate activities and courses of study that will help in achieving the objectives of the school division.
5. Providing opportunities for principals and teachers to determine the most appropriate organization of the school day in each school.

⁵⁶Virginia Department of Education, op. cit., pp. 70-71.

6. Providing teachers and principals with expert technical assistance concerning teaching methodology and subject matter content.
7. Providing techniques and assistance for diagnosing the instructional needs of individual pupils and groups of pupils and prescribing ways to meet these needs.
8. Providing opportunities for assisting teachers and principals in determining instructional strengths and weaknesses and recommending procedures for improvement.
9. Fostering activities with wide involvement throughout the school division that would strengthen consensus with respect to resolving instructional issues in the school system.
10. Fostering innovative educational programs on an experimental basis that may lead to improved teaching practices.⁵⁷

Inasmuch as supervision in educational organizations in Virginia was considered by advocates to be an optimal vehicle for the institution of an effective program, the further enumeration of operational tasks was appropriate at this point in the study to provide a basis for the selection of tasks to be used in the survey.

One of the most respected authors in the field of supervision, Ben M. Harris, delineated ten distinct tasks for instructional supervision which have received widespread support. They include, developing curriculum, organizing for instruction, staffing, providing facilities, providing materials, arranging for inservice education, orienting new staff members, relating special services, developing public relations, and evaluating.⁵⁸ Other specific

⁵⁷Virginia Department of Education, op. cit., p. 72.

⁵⁸Harris, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

activities could be subsumed under one of the tasks, according to Harris.

Franseth divided the supervisory functions into five areas. Tasks were related to: (1) supervisory activities in the classroom; (2) individual conferences; (3) participation in group work; (4) helping schools appraise progress; and (5) working with lay citizens.⁵⁹

In the publication, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner, Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops listed the tasks of educational supervision as follows:

1. Help the professional staff see more clearly the goals of education, and for those working in supervision at each of the three levels of education (elementary, secondary, and higher), to see the special role of the level in which the supervisor may find himself working in achieving these goals.
2. Help teachers see more clearly the problems and needs of children and youth.
3. Provide effective democratic leadership in promoting the professional improvement of the school and its activities in fostering harmonious and cooperative staff relations, in stimulating professional inservice education of teachers, and in enhancing school-community relations.
4. Construct strong group morale, and unify teachers into an effective team working to achieve the same general goals.
5. Determine the work for which each teacher is best suited, assign him to such work, and encourage him to develop his capabilities.

⁵⁹Jane Franseth, Supervision as Leadership (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961), pp. 96-97.

6. Assist the professional staff in the development of greater competence in teaching.
7. Assist teachers new to the school system.
8. Evaluate the results of each teacher's efforts in terms of student growth toward predetermined goals.
9. Aid teachers in the diagnosis and remediation of learning difficulties.
10. Interpret the instructional program to the community.
11. Protect the professional staff from unreasonable demands and from unwarranted, negative criticism.⁶⁰

In a statewide study of supervision conducted in 1968, the Regional Curriculum Project of Atlanta, Georgia, which was funded under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, synthesized twenty-three tasks of supervision from the literature. The twenty-three tasks selected for the survey, on which A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida was based, were considered to be those which were performed by most supervisors. They were fairly inclusive, and most activities of supervisors were either characterized by one of the listed titles or could have been subsumed under it. As a result of their comprehensiveness, the list of twenty-three tasks developed from the study was used a model for several

⁶⁰James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 93.

similar studies in other states.⁶¹ Also many of the activities selected for inclusion in the survey instruments used in this study came from that list of supervisory activities. The list of supervisory activities developed was as follows:

1. Perform routine administrative duties
2. Participate in inservice education workshops and programs
3. Plan and arrange inservice education programs and workshops
4. Collect and disseminate current curriculum materials
5. Engage in public relations
6. Assist teachers in the location, selection, and interpretation of materials
7. Assist in the orientation of new and beginning teachers
8. Coordinate instructional programs
9. Participate in the formulation of policy
10. Assist in the evaluation and appraisal of school programs
11. Develop curricular designs, coordinate curriculum improvement efforts
12. Assist in the development of programs for federal funding
13. Hold individual conferences with teachers

⁶¹See James P. Esposito and Harold J. Burbach, A Role Study: The Supervisor in Virginia (Richmond: Virginia Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), pp. 13-25; and Harold E. Turner, Supervision in Missouri - 1970 (St. Louis: Missouri Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970), pp. 9-11.

14. Assist in the development of curriculum guides and other publications
15. Visit and observe in the classroom
16. Conduct research and evaluation studies related to your area of responsibility
17. Participate in non-supervisory functions as requested
18. Assist textbook selection committees
19. Work with citizen or lay groups
20. Develop and prepare new instructional media
21. Arrange inter-system visitations to observe promising practices
22. Arrange intra-system visitations to observe promising practices
23. Teach demonstration lessons⁶²

SUMMARY

It was apparent in the review of selected literature relative to this study that the supervisory role was perceived differently by supervisors and teachers. Research indicated that discrepancies existed between supervisors' perceptions of actual and ideal performance of supervisors.

It was suggested in the literature that there was a need to structure the role of the instructional supervisor in such a way that less discrepancy exists between the actual and the ideal frequency of

⁶²Edward T. Brown, A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida (Atlanta, Georgia: Regional Curriculum Project, 1968) p. 15.

performance of supervisory activities. Such an accomplishment could further serve the purpose of supervision, the improvement of instruction. To arrive at the point at which steps could be taken to structure the role of the instructional supervisor and decrease discrepancies, the specific tasks performed by local supervisors of social studies education had to be determined. The third section of the literature review was focused upon identifying those specific tasks. There were many lists and much writing about duties or tasks of the supervisor. Further, many lists of duties had been compiled. These duties performed by supervisors were many and varied. Although the lists of duties or tasks were not identical, there were strong similarities among the duties delineated.

Chapter III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter was to describe the methods and procedures used in the study. The chapter is divided into five sections: (1) the research method used in the study; (2) description of the population and the samples used in the study; (3) the questionnaires; (4) description of procedures used in collecting the data; and (5) a statement of the research objectives and hypotheses.

RESEARCH METHOD

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which relationships exist between the perceptions of secondary local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies classroom teachers and building principals concerning the role of local supervisors of social studies education. The descriptive-survey method was used to accomplish the purpose of this study. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich stated the following with respect to descriptive research:

Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain information concerning the current status of phenomena. They are directed toward determining the nature of the situation as it exists at the time of the study.... Their aim is to describe 'what exists' with respect to

variables or conditions in a situation.¹

Kerlinger maintained that survey research, unlike status surveys, was considered to be a branch of social scientific research that could be used to reveal relationships.² Kerlinger further stated that psychological variables "included opinions and attitudes, on the one hand, and behavior, on the other."³

The use of the descriptive-survey method permitted the data to be collected and tested empirically to determine the extent to which relationships exist between perceptions of the actual and ideal performance of local supervisors of social studies education as perceived by local supervisors of social studies, social studies classroom teachers, and building principals. The mail questionnaire technique was utilized to obtain the following information:

1. frequency ratings of the actual performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education;
2. frequency ratings of the ideal preferences of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education;
3. frequency ratings of social studies teachers' perceptions

¹Donald Ary, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972), p. 286.

²Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 410.

³Ibid., p. 411.

of the actual performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education;

4. frequency ratings of social studies teachers' perceptions of the ideal performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education;

5. frequency ratings of building principals' perceptions of the actual performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education; and

6. frequency ratings of building principals' perceptions of the ideal performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities by local supervisors of social studies education.

POPULATION AND SAMPLES

The Directory of Personnel - Social Studies Educators in Virginia revealed that during the 1980-81 school year, twenty full-time social studies supervisors were employed as instructional supervisors of social studies for grades seven through twelve in seventeen school divisions.⁴ One thousand eight hundred and fifty-three social studies teachers and one hundred and ninety-seven principals were employed in those seventeen public school divisions at the same grade levels. The subjects of this study were the twenty full-time social studies supervisors, the one hundred and ninety-seven secondary school

⁴Directory of Personnel - Social Studies Educators in Virginia (Richmond: Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980-81), pp. 1-3.

principals and a systematic random sample of secondary social studies teachers employed in the seventeen school divisions with full-time social studies supervisors. Twenty-five percent of the social studies teachers in each of the seventeen school divisions were utilized in the study. The use of this procedure assured the probability of equal percentage representation of social studies teachers in all local school divisions in which a local supervisor of social studies was employed.

A Listing of Classroom Teachers - History and the Social Sciences⁵ was utilized to obtain a list of all social studies education teachers in the state. All social studies teachers were listed in the publication in alphabetical order under the name of the schools in which the teachers were employed. From the publication the names of the seventeen school divisions and the listings of social studies teachers were taken out for randomized selection. Because a twenty-five percent sample was desired, every fourth teacher in each of the seventeen school systems was included in the sample. To determine the first teacher to be selected, the fishbowl method was utilized.⁶ Using this procedure, every fourth teacher was chosen to be a participant in the study. Four hundred and sixty of the eighteen hundred and fifty-three social studies education teachers were selected.

⁵A Listing of Classroom Teachers - History and the Social Sciences (Richmond: Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980-81).

⁶Donald Ary, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich, Introduction to Research in Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972), p. 133.

Building principals' names were derived from the Virginia Educational Directory - School Year 1980-81.⁷ To update and be certain of changes in administration since the release of the Educational Directory, a comparison was made between those principals listed in the directory and a print-out of middle/junior and secondary principals submitted by division superintendents in their preliminary annual reports for 1980-81.

INSTRUMENTATION

Three questionnaires were constructed to collect the data needed to accomplish the purpose and objectives of this study. The initial questionnaires consisted of a list of fifty-seven selected supervisory activities performed by local supervisors. The list was developed following a review of the literature to determine activities performed by local supervisors. In compiling the list, extensive utilization was made of the twenty-three tasks of supervision as delineated in the 1968 Regional Curriculum Project of Atlanta, Georgia, which was funded under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.⁸ Extensive use also was made of the listing of minimum supervisory activities recommended by the Virginia Department of Education for implementing the Standards of Quality and

⁷Virginia Educational Directory - School Year 1980-81 (Richmond: Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980-81).

⁸Brown, op. cit., p. 16.

Objectives for Virginia's Public Schools⁹ and Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops listing of supervisory activities of educational supervision.¹⁰

Prior to completing the questionnaires which were mailed to the local supervisor of social studies, teachers, and building principals who were participants in the study, a copy was mailed to fifteen social studies teachers, eleven building principals and ten supervisors of social studies. These individuals who piloted the instrument, but were not a part of the study population, were asked to complete the questionnaire based on the directions given; to indicate, after completing the instrument, any ambiguous items in vocabulary, directions, and format; and to indicate the approximate length of time required to complete the questionnaires. Based upon criticisms from the piloting teachers, principals, and supervisors, the preliminary questionnaires were edited, and revisions made in accordance with suggestions. Based upon suggestions from the supervisors, the fifty-seven supervisory activities listed in the questionnaires were reduced to a forty-two item instrument. The pilot testing results from teachers did not result in any additional changes in the questionnaire. They indicated that the approximate time required to complete the instrument was fifteen minutes. Principals participating in the pilot testing indicated that the instrument was clear and presented no problems in the areas suggested for review.

⁹Virginia Department of Education, op. cit., pp. 70-71.

¹⁰Marks, op. cit., p. 93.

Table 1 shows the listing of supervisory activities used in the survey questionnaires for the study and their major source(s).

On the questionnaire sent to supervisors of social studies, each was asked to indicate how frequently they engaged in each of the forty-two activities and how frequently they would prefer to engage in the same activities. The questionnaire sent to social studies teachers and building principals requested that they indicate how frequently they believed local supervisors engaged in each of the forty-two activities and how frequently the teachers and principals preferred that the supervisors perform the forty-two activities.¹¹

A Likert-type measurement scale with responses from 1-5 was provided. Participants were asked to write a numeral from 1-5 in the blank space at the left and right of each of the forty-two activities to indicate their perceptions of the actual (left) and ideal (right) performance of the local supervisors of social studies education. The forced choice ratings were: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; and 5 = frequently.

DATA COLLECTION

A questionnaire printed on green paper with a cover letter

¹¹The directions in the questionnaires were similar to those used by Smith. See Gary Smith, "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision in Virginia." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1975).

TABLE 1
 LIST OF SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES
 AND THEIR SOURCE(S)

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
1.	Recommend and participate in the fomulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program	1
2.	Interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons or teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies	1
3.	Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition	2
4.	Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories of equipment	2
5.	Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division	1, 2
6.	Assist social studies teachers and principals in developing and implementing programs to meet the needs of various target groups including regular, disadvantaged, handicapped, gifted and talented, and students who have limited English-speaking ability	1, 2, 3
7.	Interpret and implement state or federal legislation that affect social studies education programs	1
8.	Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local programs in social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators	1
9.	Assist personnel director(s) and principal(s) in the appointment and placement of social studies education teachers	2
10.	Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments	2
11.	Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers	2
12.	Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers	1
13.	Confer with guidance counselors and school principals to interpret the social studies education program	1
14.	Provide for appropriate equipment, instructional materials, and supplies	1, 2, 3
15.	Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning	1, 2, 3
16.	Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities	2
17.	Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas	1
18.	Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries	1
19.	Encourage integration of various history and social science club activities and projects as a co-curricular activity	1
20.	Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff	1

TABLE 1 (continued)

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
21.	Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies	1, 2, 3
22.	Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs	1, 2
23.	Conduct or arrange for demonstration teaching	1
24.	Visit social studies classrooms to observe teacher performance and classroom management skills	1, 2
25.	Follow-up classroom visitations with teacher conferences, offering suggestions, if needed	1, 2
26.	Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques	1
27.	Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques	1
28.	Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials	1, 3
29.	Maintain good morale among the social studies education teaching staff	4
30.	Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences	1
31.	Encourage and make provisions for teachers to share successful projects or practices with other teachers	1, 2
32.	Encourage teachers to join and participate in professional organizations in the area of social studies education	1
33.	Arrange for extension classes from teacher-education institutions when a need is indicated	4
34.	Encourage teacher participation in teacher-education programs and work toward higher degrees	1
35.	Provide for and arrange in-service education programs and workshops in social studies education	1, 2, 3
36.	Hold individual conferences with teachers who need or request assistance	1
37.	Plan and conduct orientation programs for teachers new to the system	1
38.	Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences	1
39.	Encourage professional reading and provide up-to-date literature to be made available to teachers upon request	2
40.	Prepare bulletins and other communications designed to keep teachers informed	4
41.	Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education	4

TABLE 1 (continued)

Activity Number	Activity	*Source(s)
42.	Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs	4

*Source(s)

1. Brown, Edward T., A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida, (Regional Curriculum Project, Atlanta, Georgia), 1968.
2. Marks, James R., Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.), 1971.
3. Virginia Department of Education, "Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia" (State Department of Education), 1980.
4. Others - includes those activities listed in the survey questionnaire as a result of the writer's experience as a state program supervisor.

and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to local supervisors of social studies education on January 6, 1982.¹² A questionnaire printed on blue paper with a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to twenty-five percent of the social studies teachers employed in school divisions with full-time social studies supervisors.¹³ A third questionnaire printed on yellow paper with a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to building principals in school divisions where social studies supervisors were employed.¹⁴ Three different colors were used to permit easy differentiation of the respondents. Also, for follow-up purposes, each survey participant was assigned a control number.

As of January 20, 1982, one hundred and sixty-eight teachers (thirty-six percent), one hundred and eleven building principals (fifty-six percent), and sixteen social studies supervisors (eighty percent) had returned the questionnaires. A follow-up letter was mailed on January 22, 1982 to all survey participants who had not responded.¹⁵ Responses were subsequently received from one hundred and fifty-seven additional teachers. This increased the response rate to approximately seventy-one percent. Forty additional responses were received from principals, thus increasing the response

¹² See Appendix A, pp. 127-132.

¹³ See Appendix B, pp. 133-138.

¹⁴ See Appendix C, pp. 139-144.

¹⁵ See Appendix D, pp. 145-146.

rate to seventy-seven percent. Once the questionnaires from the four remaining social studies supervisors were received, the response rate from supervisors was one hundred percent.

In order to test for any nonresponse bias, telephone interviews were conducted during the week of March 1-5, 1982, with a random sample of nonrespondents from the teacher and principal populations. The purpose of this follow-up procedure was to determine whether any systematic differences existed between the group that responded to the questionnaire and the group that did not.

Utilizing ten percent of the nonrespondent group from the teacher and principal populations, fourteen teachers and five principals were randomly selected and interviewed by telephone. This sample of nonrespondents was interviewed during the regular school day at a time previously suggested as convenient for responding to the same survey questionnaire that had been completed and returned by the mail questionnaire respondents. Responses from both groups were analyzed and compared. No systematic differences in responses were found between survey respondents and telephone respondents selected from the nonrespondent group.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES, HYPOTHESES, AND ANALYSES OF DATA

The research objectives and major hypotheses appropriate to address the objectives of the study are listed below. Those objectives which do not require statistical treatment, but rather descriptive reporting, do not have null hypotheses. The alpha level selected

for determination of a statistical significance and rejection for all null hypotheses was $p < .05$.

Research Objective 1: to determine the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies reported performing forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 2: to determine the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies believed that they should perform forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 3: to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies;

HO_1 : There are no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies education.

Research Objective 4: to determine the frequency rate at which social studies teachers believed that supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 5: to determine the frequency with which social studies teachers preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 6: to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers;

HO₂: there are no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers.

Research Objective 7: to determine the frequency rate at which building principals believed supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 8: to determine the frequency rate at which building principals preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 9: to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals;

HO₃: there were no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals.

Research Objective 10: to determine whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies teachers, and the perceptions of building principals concerning the actual frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities;

HO₄: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies education teachers concerning the actual

frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

HO₅: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of building principals concerning the actual frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Research Objective 11: to determine whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies teachers and the perceptions of building principals concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities;

HO₆: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies teachers concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

HO₇: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of building principals concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Descriptive statistics, correlated t tests, uncorrelated t tests, and the Spearman rho (ρ) were used in analyzing the data. Research objectives 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Data were reported by means, frequencies, ranks, standard deviations, and percentages. To analyze the data within groups relative to research objectives 3, 6, and 9, the correlated t test was used. The uncorrelated t test was used to analyze the data between groups which dealt with research objectives 10 and 11. To determine

the relationship between the rank differences reported by the sample groups, the Spearman rho (ρ) correlation was computed. The formula for ρ was:

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

Chapter IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA

The results of the analyses of the data collected through the mail survey questionnaire are presented and discussed in this chapter. The chapter is organized so that each research objective and stated hypothesis is presented and discussed. Hypotheses which were tested statistically were rejected or accepted for each of the forty-two supervisory activities rated by local supervisors of social studies, teachers, and building principals. The alpha level selected for determination of statistical significance and rejection of null hypotheses for the study was $p < .05$.

SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES RATED BY LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION, TEACHERS, AND BUILDING PRINCIPALS

A list of forty-two activities which supervisors of social studies education performed with varying frequencies was included on the mail survey questionnaire forwarded to local supervisors of social studies education, teachers, and building principals. The local supervisors were to rate their actual and ideal frequencies of performance on each of the forty-two activities. Social studies teachers and building principals were to rate the frequencies with which they perceived local supervisors performed the activities and the frequencies with which they would prefer supervisors to perform

the activities.

A delineation of the activities as they appeared on the mail survey questionnaire is presented in Table 2. Thereafter the activities are not presented in tabular form, but instead are referred to by numbers assigned each survey item in the mail questionnaire. Absolute frequencies and percentages of actual and ideal supervisory performance as reported by local supervisors, teachers, and principals on the mail questionnaires are reported in Appendix E on pages 147-153 of this study.

PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION RELATIVE TO ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE

In this section a presentation and analyses of data relative to Research Objectives 1, 2, and 3 are presented. Local supervisors of social studies education were to indicate actual frequencies of performance of each of the forty-two selected activities. Also they were to indicate the ideal frequencies they preferred to perform the same activities. Activities were to be rated as: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; and 5 = frequently. A mean score within the range of 1.00-1.49 was assigned to never; 1.50-2.49 to rarely; 2.50-3.49 to sometimes; 3.50-4.49 to often; and 4.50-5.00 to frequently.

Ratings of Actual Performance

The purpose of Research Objective 1 was to determine the frequency local supervisors of social studies education reported performing forty-two selected supervisory activities. Hypothesis testing

TABLE 2
 A LISTING OF SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES
 INCLUDED ON MAIL SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Activity Number	Activity
1.	Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program
2.	Interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons or teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies
3.	Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition
4.	Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories in your division
5.	Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division
6.	Assist social studies teachers and principals in developing and implementing programs to meet the needs of various target groups including regular, disadvantaged, handicapped, gifted and talented, and students who have limited English-speaking ability
7.	Interpret and implement state or federal legislation that affect social studies education programs
8.	Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators
9.	Assist personnel director(s) and principal(s) in the appointment and placement of social studies education teachers
10.	Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments
11.	Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers
12.	Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers
13.	Confer with guidance counselors and school principals to interpret the social studies education program
14.	Provide for appropriate equipment, instructional materials and supplies
15.	Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning
16.	Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities
17.	Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas

TABLE 2 (continued)

Activity Number	Activity
18.	Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries
19.	Encourage integration of various history and social science activities and projects as a co-curricular activity
20.	Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff
21.	Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies
22.	Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs
23.	Conduct or arrange for demonstration teaching
24.	Visit social studies classrooms to observe teacher performance and classroom management skills
25.	Follow-up classroom visitations with teacher conferences, offering suggestions, if needed
26.	Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques
27.	Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques
28.	Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials
29.	Maintain good morale among the social studies education teaching staff
30.	Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences
31.	Encourage and make provisions for teachers to share successful projects or practices with other teachers
32.	Encourage teachers to join and participate in professional organizations in the area of social studies education
33.	Arrange for extension classes from teacher-education institutions when a need is indicated
34.	Encourage teacher participation in teacher-education programs and work toward higher degrees
35.	Provide for and arrange in-service education programs and workshops in social studies education
36.	Hold individual conferences with teachers who need or request assistance
37.	Plan and conduct orientation programs for teachers new to the system

TABLE 2 (continued)

Activity Number	Activity
38.	Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences
39.	Encourage professional reading and provide up-to-date professional literature to be made available to teachers upon request
40.	Prepare bulletins and other communications designed to keep teachers informed
41.	Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education
42.	Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs

was not required for the objective. The mean frequencies for each of the forty-two activities generated by the twenty local supervisors of social studies education are reported in Table 3. Under the actual columns, the mean and rank orders of the forty-two tasks are presented only.

Of the forty-two activities listed, supervisors identified only one in the mean range of 4.50-5.00 which they were performing frequently. Twenty-one activities with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were reported to be performed often. Twelve activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were reported as being performed sometimes. Only eight activities with means in the range of 1.50-2.49 were reported as being performed rarely. According to the rankings of the top five activities supervisors perceived themselves to be performing most frequently, they tended to be related to coordinating functions and routine administrative duties. Activities relating directly to functions of interaction of supervisors and teachers which foster a helping relationship were not rated highly.

The top six ranked activities by supervisors were:

1. Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries - survey item number eighteen ($\bar{X} = 4.85$);

2. Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials - survey item number twenty-eight ($\bar{X} = 4.35$);

3. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning -

TABLE 3
 MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND IDEAL
 PERFORMANCES AS REPORTED BY LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES
 EDUCATION ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

<u>Activity Number</u>	\bar{X}	<u>Actual</u>	\bar{X}	<u>Ideal</u>	<u>Difference</u>	
		Rank		Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	4.00	12.5	4.70	4.5	.70	-8
2	4.05	8.5	4.50	15.5	.45	7
3	2.05	41	2.15	42	.10	1
4	2.35	36	2.55	41	.20	5
5	4.10	5.5	4.53	14	.43	8.5
6	3.75	18	4.65	8.5	.90	-9.5
7	3.90	15.5	4.60	10.5	.70	-5
8	4.00	12.5	4.35	22.5	.35	10
9	3.25	26.5	4.50	15.5	1.25	-11
10	3.10	31	4.55	12.5	1.45	-18.5
11	3.15	29.5	3.50	37.5	.35	8
12	2.35	36	3.90	33.5	1.55	-2.5
13	3.40	22.5	4.45	18.5	1.05	-4
14	3.70	19.5	4.25	27	.55	7.5
15	4.30	3	4.70	4.5	.40	1.5
16	2.20	38	3.90	33.5	1.70	-4.5
17	2.10	39.5	3.90	33.5	1.80	-6
18	4.85	1	4.30	25	-.55	24
19	2.40	36	3.30	39	.90	3
20	2.65	34	3.50	37.5	.85	3.5
21	4.00	12.5	4.70	4.5	.70	-8
22	3.50	22	4.40	21	.90	-1
23	2.80	33	4.00	29.5	1.20	-3.5
24	4.05	8.5	4.70	4.5	.65	-4
25	4.05	8.5	4.80	1	.75	-7.5
26	2.10	39.5	3.90	33.5	1.80	-6
27	2.00	42	3.75	36	1.75	-6
28	4.35	2	4.65	8.5	.30	6.5
29	3.90	15.5	4.45	18.5	.55	3
30	3.60	21	4.70	4.5	1.10	-16.5
31	3.25	26.5	4.45	18.5	1.20	-8
32	3.80	17	4.30	25	.50	8
33	3.15	29.5	4.00	29.5	.85	0
34	3.25	26.5	3.95	31	.70	4.5
35	4.10	5.5	4.70	4.5	.60	-1
36	4.00	12.5	4.55	12.5	.55	0
37	2.90	32	4.10	28	1.20	-4
38	3.70	19.5	4.60	10.5	.90	-9
39	3.25	26.5	4.35	22.5	1.10	-4
40	3.40	22.5	4.30	25	.90	2.5
41	4.05	8.5	4.45	18.5	.40	10
42	4.15	4	2.90	40	-1.25	36

$\rho = .68$

survey item number fifteen ($\bar{X} = 4.30$);

4. Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs - survey item number forty-two ($\bar{X} = 4.15$);

5. Provide for and arrange inservice education programs and workshops in social studies education - survey item number thirty-five ($\bar{X} = 4.10$); and

6. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division - survey item number five ($\bar{X} = 4.10$).

The five activities ranked as being performed least frequently, three of which appear to involve direct supervisor-teacher interaction, were as follows:

1. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-seven ($\bar{X} = 2.00$);

2. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition - survey item number three ($\bar{X} = 2.05$);

3. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-six ($\bar{X} = 2.10$);

4. Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas - survey item number seventeen ($\bar{X} = 2.10$); and

5. Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities - survey item number

sixteen ($\bar{X} = 2.20$).

Ratings of Ideal Performance

Research Objective 2 was intended to determine the frequency with which local supervisors of social studies education believed that they should perform forty-two selected supervisory activities. Data for the objective are presented in Table 3. Under the Ideal column in Table 3, the means and rank order of the forty-two activities are presented.

Of the forty-two activities preferred to be performed by local supervisors, sixteen with means in the range of 4.50-5.00 were preferred to be performed frequently. Twenty-two activities with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were preferred to be performed often. Only four activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were preferred to be performed sometimes. According to the rankings, none of the five activities rated as least frequently performed was included in the top five that the supervisors preferred to perform.

Differences in Actual and Ideal Ratings

The purpose of Research Objective 3 was to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies education. Statistical testing was required for this objective. Utilizing the correlated t test, significant mean differences between the actual and ideal frequencies of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies education were determined.

There were significant mean differences between actual and ideal ratings for thirty-nine of the forty-two activities. Supervisors would prefer to spend significantly more time in thirty-seven of those activities and significantly less time in only two. The two items that supervisors would prefer to spend significantly less time (items eighteen and forty-two) both dealt with routine administrative duties and functions. The null hypotheses for those thirty-nine activities therefore, were rejected.

Knowing that supervisors would prefer to spend significantly more time in thirty-seven of forty-two activities may be interesting but not necessarily useful. If one could assume that most supervisors are already fully occupied, the desire to increase the amount of time spent on many activities without decreasing the amount of time spent on a similar number of tasks is clearly not practical. Therefore, it became necessary to consider other ways of assessing the relative importance of the activities listed. By using the mean scores for each activity, it was possible to rank the activities based upon current (actual) and desired (ideal) priorities. After ordering the rankings for actual and ideal, rank differences were computed and the Spearman rho formula applied to assess the extent to which supervisors would spend their time in an ideal setting compared with their reported current utilization of time.

This analysis yielded a ρ of .68, which suggests that although supervisors are not totally pleased with the way they currently spend their time, they likely would not make dramatic changes in their priorities, given that opportunity. Data to support objective 3 and

related null hypothesis 1 are found in Table 4.

PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION TEACHERS
RELATIVE TO ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE

Data are presented in this section relative to Research Objectives 4, 5, and 6. Social studies education teachers were to rate the frequencies of performance of local supervisors of social studies in each of the forty-two selected supervisory activities. The ratings were to be done on the bases of how frequently they believed the local supervisor performed the task (actual) and how frequently they preferred supervisors to perform the task (ideal). The ratings were: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; and 5 = frequently. A mean score of 1.00-1.49 was assigned to the rating of never; 1.50-2.49 to rarely; 2.50-3.49 to sometimes; 3.50-4.49 to often; and 4.50-5.00 to frequently.

Ratings of Actual Performance

The purpose of Research Objective 4 was to determine the frequency rate at which social studies education teachers believed local supervisors of social studies actually performed forty-two selected supervisory activities. The mean frequencies for each of the forty-two activities as indicated by the teacher population are reported in Table 5.

Under the actual column of Table 5, the means and rank order of the forty-two activities are presented. Of the forty-two activities social studies teachers perceived to be actually performed by

TABLE 4

DERIVED t VALUES COMPARING MEAN FREQUENCY RATINGS BY
LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION ON REPORTED ACTUAL
AND IDEAL PERFORMANCE ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

<u>Activity Number</u>	\bar{x}	<u>Actual</u> SD	\bar{x}	<u>Ideal</u> SD	t Value	Significance
1	4.00	.92	4.70	.47	4.27	.0004
2	4.05	.89	4.50	.69	2.93	.0086
3	2.05	1.00	2.15	.93	.62	.5409*
4	2.35	1.35	2.55	1.50	1.16	.2585*
5	4.10	.91	4.53	.61	2.67	.0155
6	3.75	1.02	4.65	.59	4.72	.0001
7	3.90	1.33	4.60	.60	3.20	.0047
8	4.00	1.08	4.35	.87	2.67	.0153
9	3.25	1.25	4.50	.76	5.48	.0001
10	3.10	1.25	4.55	.51	5.44	.0001
11	3.15	1.35	3.50	1.47	.92	.3672*
12	2.35	1.09	3.90	1.02	7.81	.0001
13	3.40	.99	4.45	.69	4.97	.0001
14	3.70	1.26	4.25	1.07	2.98	.0077
15	4.30	.73	4.70	.66	2.99	.0075
16	2.20	1.11	3.90	.85	8.23	.0001
17	2.10	.85	3.90	.97	8.01	.0001
18	4.85	.37	4.30	.86	-2.77	.0121
19	2.40	1.19	3.30	1.13	4.72	.0001
20	2.65	.81	3.50	.83	4.68	.0002
21	4.00	.72	4.70	.47	3.91	.0009
22	3.50	.88	4.40	.75	5.11	.0001
23	2.80	.77	4.00	1.02	5.64	.0001
24	4.05	.94	4.70	.66	2.80	.0115
25	4.05	.94	4.80	.52	3.68	.0016
26	2.10	.97	3.90	1.07	6.73	.0001
27	2.00	.86	3.75	1.07	7.00	.0001
28	4.35	.74	4.65	.59	2.35	.0298
29	3.90	.97	4.45	.89	3.58	.0020
30	3.60	1.09	4.70	.57	4.82	.0001
31	3.25	.72	4.45	.60	8.72	.0001
32	3.80	1.06	4.30	.86	2.52	.0210
33	3.15	1.04	4.00	.91	4.34	.0003
34	3.25	1.21	3.95	1.00	4.77	.0001
35	4.10	.91	4.70	.66	3.04	.0067
36	4.00	.72	4.55	.69	3.24	.0043
37	2.90	1.37	4.10	1.12	4.19	.0005
38	3.70	.80	4.60	.50	4.41	.0003
39	3.25	.85	4.35	.67	5.77	.0001
40	3.40	1.05	4.30	.80	6.28	.0001
41	4.05	1.00	4.45	.82	2.37	.0284
42	4.15	.88	2.90	1.07	-5.78	.0001

*Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 5

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND IDEAL PERFORMANCE
OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED
SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Activity Number	<u>Actual</u>		\bar{X}	<u>Ideal</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
	\bar{X}	Rank		\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	3.49	8	4.23	4	.74	-4	
2	3.43	10	4.21	6	.78	-4	
3	2.13	39	3.10	41	.97	2	
4	2.32	37.5	3.13	40	.80	2.5	
5	3.58	4	4.31	2	.73	-2	
6	2.86	23	4.09	10.5	1.23	-12.5	
7	3.09	16	3.99	16	.90	0	
8	3.51	5.5	4.05	12	.54	6.5	
9	2.64	29	3.58	32	.94	3	
10	2.39	35	3.38	38	.99	3	
11	2.62	31	4.47	1	1.85	-30	
12	2.11	40	3.52	36	1.41	-4	
13	2.41	34	3.68	28	1.27	-6	
14	3.16	11	4.14	8	.98	-3	
15	3.51	5.5	4.22	5	.71	-.5	
16	2.54	33	3.70	27	1.16	-6	
17	2.59	32	3.77	24.5	1.18	-7.5	
18	3.48	9	3.74	26	.26	17	
19	2.32	37.5	3.34	39	1.02	1.5	
20	2.69	28	3.50	37	.81	9	
21	2.89	21.5	3.94	21	1.05	-.5	
22	3.15	12.5	3.92	22	.77	9.5	
23	2.36	36	3.57	34	1.21	-2	
24	2.77	26	3.55	35	.78	9	
25	2.63	30	3.77	24.5	1.14	-5.5	
26	2.06	41	3.58	32	1.52	-9	
27	2.03	42	3.60	30	1.57	-12	
28	3.50	7	4.13	9	.63	2	
29	3.05	17	4.18	7	1.13	-10	
30	3.15	12.5	4.00	15	.85	2.5	
31	2.96	19	3.97	18	1.01	-1	
32	2.82	25	3.58	32	.76	7	
33	2.91	20	3.84	23	.93	3	
34	2.71	27	3.63	29	.92	2	
35	3.61	3	3.97	18	.36	15	
36	3.10	14.5	4.09	10.5	.99	-4	
37	2.89	21.5	3.97	18	1.08	-3.5	
38	3.62	2	4.01	13.5	.39	11.5	
39	2.99	18	3.95	20	.96	2	
40	2.84	24	4.01	13.5	1.17	-10.5	
41	3.73	1	4.25	3	.52	2	
42	3.10	14.5	3.07	42	-.03	27.5	

$\rho = .71$

supervisors, seven with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were perceived to be performed often. Twenty-six activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were perceived to be performed sometimes. Nine activities with means in the range of 1.50-2.49 were perceived to be performed rarely.

There was considerable disparity in means between the highest ranked activity that teachers perceived supervisors to be performing (activity number forty-one - $\bar{X} = 3.73$) and the lowest (activity number twenty-seven = $\bar{X} = 2.03$). According to the ratings, the five activities teachers perceived supervisors to be performing most frequently were as follows:

1. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education - survey item number forty-one ($\bar{X} = 3.73$);
2. Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences - survey item number thirty-eight ($\bar{X} = 3.62$);
3. Provide for and arrange inservice education programs and workshops in social studies education - survey item number thirty-five ($\bar{X} = 3.61$);
4. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division - survey item number five ($\bar{X} = 3.58$); and
5. Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local programs in social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators - survey item number eight ($\bar{X} = 3.51$).

Of the top five activities that teachers perceived supervisors to be performing most frequently, none appear to relate to interaction between the supervisor and the teacher. Only one of the activities (item thirty-five) was ranked in the top five by local supervisors as an activity that they actually performed.

Of the five activities that teachers indicated that they believed supervisors performed least frequently, three tended to relate to classroom observations or activities involving direct supervisor-teacher interaction. The six least frequently performed activities according to teachers were:

1. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-seven ($\bar{X} = 2.03$);

2. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-six ($\bar{X} = 2.06$);

3. Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers - survey item number twelve ($\bar{X} = 2.11$);

4. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition - survey item number three ($\bar{X} = 2.13$);

5. Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories in your division - survey item number four ($\bar{X} = 2.32$); and

6. Encourage integration of various history and social science activities and projects as a co-curricular activity - survey item number nineteen ($\bar{X} = 2.32$).

Ratings of Ideal Performance

The purpose of Research Objective 5 was to determine the frequency rate at which social studies education teachers preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities. Data for objective 5 are presented in Table 5. Under the ideal column, the means and rank order of the forty-two activities are presented.

Of the forty-two activities surveyed, thirty-seven with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were preferred by social studies teachers to be performed by supervisors often. Five activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were preferred to be performed sometimes. According to the rankings of the top five activities that teachers preferred supervisors to perform most frequently, none was related directly to the interaction of supervisors and teachers that foster a helping relationship deemed necessary for improvement in the instructional program as noted in the literature. The activities tended to be more related to coordinating functions and administrative duties. The top five ranked activities preferred to be performed according to teachers were:

1. Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers - survey item number eleven ($\bar{X} = 4.47$);
2. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division - survey item number five ($\bar{X} = 4.31$);
3. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education - survey item number forty-one ($\bar{X} = 4.25$);

4. Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program - survey item number one ($\bar{X} = 4.23$); and

5. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning - survey item number fifteen ($\bar{X} = 4.22$).

Differences in Actual and Ideal Ratings

The purpose of Research Objective 6 was to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies education teachers. Through the use of a correlated t test, it was determined whether or not there were significant mean differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance as perceived by social studies education teachers.

Data relative to objective 6 and related null hypothesis 2 are presented in Table 6. There were significant mean differences between the actual and ideal mean ratings for all of the activities except for item forty-two. In all forty-one activities, teachers preferred that supervisors spend significantly more time than they are perceived to be spending currently. Although not significant, activity forty-two which dealt with performing routine administrative or supervisory duties unrelated to social studies education was the only activity that was performed more frequently than teachers preferred it to be performed. The null hypotheses, except for item forty-two, were rejected for the entire series of activities.

As in the case of supervisors, teachers supported the

TABLE 6

DERIVED t VALUES COMPARING MEAN FREQUENCY RATINGS BY SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS
ON ACTUAL AND IDEAL PERFORMANCE OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES
EDUCATION ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

Activity Number	\bar{X}	<u>Actual</u> SD	\bar{X}	<u>Ideal</u> SD	t Value	Significance
1	3.49	1.02	4.23	.82	14.47	.0001
2	3.43	1.11	4.21	.83	14.46	.0001
3	2.13	1.12	3.10	1.29	14.89	.0001
4	2.32	1.28	3.13	1.37	12.20	.0001
5	3.58	1.08	4.31	.73	14.58	.0001
6	2.86	1.13	4.09	.82	18.93	.0001
7	3.09	1.18	3.99	.91	14.64	.0001
8	3.51	1.65	4.05	.88	9.97	.0001
9	2.64	1.16	3.58	1.21	14.08	.0001
10	2.39	1.23	3.38	1.36	14.14	.0001
11	2.62	1.29	4.47	1.28	12.28	.0001
12	2.11	1.06	3.52	1.10	20.51	.0001
13	2.41	1.04	3.68	.95	19.88	.0001
14	3.16	1.21	4.14	.96	15.44	.0001
15	3.51	1.18	4.22	.83	11.71	.0001
16	2.54	1.23	3.70	1.03	18.17	.0001
17	2.59	1.09	3.77	.87	18.01	.0001
18	3.48	1.15	3.74	1.06	4.77	.0001
19	2.32	1.18	3.34	1.02	17.03	.0001
20	2.69	1.10	3.50	1.00	14.50	.0001
21	2.89	1.17	3.94	.91	17.55	.0001
22	3.15	1.21	3.92	.99	13.17	.0001
23	2.36	1.10	3.57	.90	18.29	.0001
24	2.77	1.18	3.55	.96	13.20	.0001
25	2.63	1.27	3.77	.99	16.25	.0001
26	2.06	1.03	3.58	.99	21.68	.0001
27	2.03	1.21	3.60	1.01	22.11	.0001
28	3.50	1.08	4.13	.82	12.37	.0001
29	3.05	1.26	4.18	.87	16.16	.0001
30	3.15	1.19	4.00	.81	13.42	.0001
31	2.96	1.18	3.97	.79	15.92	.0001
32	2.82	1.31	3.58	1.04	12.05	.0001
33	2.91	1.34	3.84	.91	14.07	.0001
34	2.71	1.25	3.63	1.01	15.05	.0001
35	3.61	1.12	3.97	.86	5.85	.0001
36	3.10	1.25	4.09	.88	14.75	.0001
37	2.89	1.36	3.97	.97	14.58	.0001
38	3.62	1.12	4.01	.91	6.87	.0001
39	2.99	1.17	3.95	.86	15.26	.0001
40	2.84	1.30	4.01	.85	17.14	.0001
41	3.73	1.00	4.25	.78	10.20	.0001
42	3.10	1.23	3.07	1.32	-0.48	.6328*

*Not significant at .05 level.

allocation of additional time by the supervisor to nearly every activity listed. In order to determine the extent to which teachers believed supervisors were allocating their time appropriately (actual versus ideal), the rank differences were computed and analyzed using the Spearman rho formula. A ρ of .71 suggests that teachers believe supervisors are actually spending (allocating) their time consistent with the priorities of teachers. They simply do not feel that there is sufficient time available to provide services at the level they would prefer.

PERCEPTIONS OF BUILDING PRINCIPALS RELATIVE TO ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE

Data are presented in this section relative to Research Objectives 7, 8, and 9. Building principals were to rate the frequencies of performance of local supervisors of social studies education on each of the forty-two selected supervisory activities. The ratings were to be done on the bases of how frequently they believed the local supervisor performed the task (actual) and how frequently they preferred supervisors to perform the task (ideal). The ratings were: 1 = never; 2 = rarely; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; and 5 = frequently. A mean score falling in the range of 1.00-1.49 for never; 1.50-2.49 for rarely; 2.50-3.49 for sometimes; 3.50-4.49 for often; and 4.50-5.00 for frequently.

Ratings of Actual Performance

The purpose of Research Objective 7 was to determine the

frequency rate at which building principals believed local supervisors of social studies education actually performed forty-two selected supervisory activities. The mean frequencies for each of the forty-two activities as indicated by the building principals are reported in Table 7.

Under the actual column of Table 7, the means and rank order of the forty-two activities are presented. Of the forty-two activities building principals perceived to be actually performed by supervisors, ten with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were perceived to be performed often. Twenty-six activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were perceived to be performed sometimes. Six activities with means in the range of 1.50-2.49 were perceived to be performed rarely.

According to the ratings of building principals, the five top activities frequently performed by supervisors were as follows:

1. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning - survey item number fifteen ($\bar{X} = 3.97$);

2. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division - survey item number five ($\bar{X} = 3.68$);

3. Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials - survey item number twenty-eight ($\bar{X} = 3.64$);

4. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department

TABLE 7

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND IDEAL PERFORMANCE
OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED
SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS PERCEIVED BY BUILDING PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	<u>Actual</u>		<u>Ideal</u>		<u>Difference</u>	
	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	3.56	8.5	4.18	14	.62	5.5
2	3.53	10	4.15	16	.62	6
3	2.22	41	2.84	41	.62	0
4	2.17	42	2.83	42	.66	0
5	3.68	2	4.45	3	.77	1
6	3.14	21	4.27	8.5	1.13	-12.5
7	3.19	19	3.98	23	.79	4
8	3.57	7	4.09	19	.52	12
9	3.02	25.5	3.64	31	.62	5.5
10	2.76	30	3.28	39	.52	9
11	2.75	31.5	3.71	30	.96	-1.5
12	2.36	38.5	3.63	32.5	1.27	-6
13	2.75	31.5	3.84	27	1.09	-4.5
14	3.33	13	4.03	21.5	.70	8.5
15	3.97	1	4.54	1	.57	0
16	2.69	34	3.52	36	.83	2
17	2.67	35	3.63	32.5	.96	-2.5
18	3.59	5	3.72	29	.13	24
19	2.37	37	3.44	37	1.07	0
20	2.72	33	3.41	38	.69	5
21	3.27	14	4.32	5.5	1.05	-8.5
22	3.37	12	4.39	4	1.02	-8
23	2.58	36	3.89	25	1.31	-11
24	2.99	27	4.14	17.5	1.15	-9.5
25	3.24	16	4.29	7	1.05	-9
26	2.36	38.5	3.62	34	1.26	-4.5
27	2.34	40	3.60	35	1.26	-5
28	3.64	3	4.27	8.5	.63	5.5
29	3.23	17	4.32	5.5	1.09	-11.5
30	3.21	18	4.47	2	1.26	-16
31	3.15	20	4.20	12	1.05	-8
32	3.11	22	3.95	24	.84	2
33	2.97	28	3.80	28	.83	0
34	2.86	29	3.86	26	1.00	-3
35	3.56	8.5	4.23	11	.67	2.5
36	3.41	11	4.27	10	.86	-1
37	3.05	24	4.14	17.5	1.09	-6.5
38	3.58	6	4.03	21.5	.45	15.5
39	3.25	15	4.17	15	.92	0
40	3.06	23	4.05	20	.99	-3
41	3.63	4	4.19	13	.56	9
42	3.02	25.5	3.05	40	.03	14.5

$\rho = .77$

of Education - survey item number forty-one ($\bar{X} = 3.63$); and

5. Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries - survey item number eighteen ($\bar{X} = 3.59$).

Of the five activities that building principals indicated that they believed supervisors performed least frequently, three were related to classroom observations or activities involving direct supervisor-teacher interaction. Further, these were the same activities identified by teachers as performed least frequently by supervisors. They were as follows:

1. Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories of equipment - survey item number four ($\bar{X} = 2.17$);

2. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition - survey item number three ($\bar{X} = 2.22$);

3. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-seven ($\bar{X} = 2.34$);

4. Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers - survey item number twelve ($\bar{X} = 2.36$); and

5. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques - survey item number twenty-six ($\bar{X} = 2.36$).

Ratings of Ideal Performance

The purpose of Research Objective 8 was to determine the frequency rate at which building principals preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities. Data for objective

8 are presented in Table 7. Under the ideal column, the means and rank order of the forty-two activities are presented.

Regarding the forty-two activities with means in the range of 4.50-5.00, building principals preferred that supervisors perform one activity frequently. Thirty-five activities with means in the range of 3.50-4.49 were preferred to be performed often. Six activities with means in the range of 2.50-3.49 were preferred to be performed sometimes. Four of the five top activities ranked by building principals tended to be more related to coordinating functions and administrative duties. The one exception dealt with the perception by the building principals of the supervisor maintaining good morale among the social studies education teaching staff. The other four top ranked activities preferred to be performed according to principals were:

1. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning - survey item number fifteen ($\bar{X} = 4.54$);

2. Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences - survey item number thirty ($\bar{X} = 4.47$);

3. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division - survey item number five ($\bar{X} = 4.45$); and

4. Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs - survey item number twenty-two ($\bar{X} = 4.39$).

Differences in Actual and Ideal Ratings

The purpose of Research Objective 9 was to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals. Through the use of a correlated t test, it was determined whether or not there were significant mean differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance as perceived by building principals.

Data regarding objective 9 and related null hypothesis 3 are presented in Table 8. There were significant mean differences between actual and ideal mean ratings for forty-one of the forty-two activities. The t value for activity forty-two was not significant and the null hypothesis was not rejected for that activity. In every other case, the mean for activities ranked for ideal performance differed significantly higher than those ranked for actual performance.

Since principals indicated that supervisors should spend significantly more time in nearly every activity listed (as did supervisors and teachers), a rank order correlation was computed to determine whether principals perceived actual time commitment of supervisors to be consistent with ideal time commitment. The Spearman rho formula for the actual and ideal rank differences yielded a ρ of .77, a high positive correlation (see Table 7). It appeared as though principals like the other groups, desired additional services, but expressed little unhappiness with supervisors in their choice of priorities.

TABLE 8
 DERIVED t VALUES COMPARING MEAN FREQUENCY RATINGS BY
 BUILDING PRINCIPALS ON ACTUAL AND IDEAL PERFORMANCE OF LOCAL
 SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED
 SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES

Activity Number	\bar{X}	Actual SD	\bar{X}	Ideal SD	t Value	Significance
1	3.56	1.00	4.18	.78	9.21	.0001
2	3.53	1.14	4.15	.96	7.57	.0001
3	2.22	.98	2.84	1.18	8.16	.0001
4	2.17	1.14	2.83	1.37	7.02	.0001
5	3.68	.99	4.45	.67	10.00	.0001
6	3.14	1.02	4.27	.79	11.69	.0001
7	3.19	1.12	3.98	.91	9.19	.0001
8	3.57	.98	4.09	.83	6.83	.0001
9	3.02	1.24	3.64	1.12	7.28	.0001
10	2.76	1.26	3.28	1.25	6.81	.0001
11	2.75	1.21	3.71	1.12	9.44	.0001
12	2.36	1.01	3.63	.99	12.66	.0001
13	2.75	1.02	3.84	.86	12.74	.0001
14	3.33	.98	4.03	.87	8.78	.0001
15	3.97	.92	4.54	.64	8.90	.0001
16	2.69	1.12	3.52	1.00	10.45	.0001
17	2.67	.92	3.63	.90	11.56	.0001
18	3.59	1.06	3.72	.99	2.07	.0400
19	2.37	1.05	3.44	.92	12.43	.0001
20	2.72	.88	3.41	.84	8.51	.0001
21	3.27	1.05	4.32	.68	12.27	.0001
22	3.37	1.07	4.39	.74	12.17	.0001
23	2.58	1.01	3.89	.87	14.57	.0001
24	2.99	1.02	4.14	.87	13.49	.0001
25	3.24	1.24	4.29	.82	11.52	.0001
26	2.36	.96	3.62	.87	13.44	.0001
27	2.34	.95	3.60	.92	13.18	.0001
28	3.64	.99	4.27	.78	8.96	.0001
29	3.23	1.07	4.32	.81	12.17	.0001
30	3.21	.96	4.47	.76	10.72	.0001
31	3.15	1.03	4.20	.78	12.58	.0001
32	3.11	1.02	3.95	.94	9.83	.0001
33	2.97	1.04	3.80	.88	9.96	.0001
34	2.86	.99	3.86	.89	11.41	.0001
35	3.56	1.04	4.23	.77	8.68	.0001
36	3.41	1.10	4.27	.81	10.52	.0001
37	3.05	1.16	4.14	.82	11.56	.0001
38	3.58	.94	4.03	.83	6.20	.0001
39	3.25	.99	4.17	.77	11.50	.0001
40	3.06	1.05	4.05	.79	12.34	.0001
41	3.63	.97	4.19	.73	7.36	.0001
42	3.02	1.12	3.05	1.06	.16	.8758*

*Not significant at .05 level.

PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES
EDUCATION VERSUS PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS AND
BUILDING PRINCIPALS REGARDING ACTUAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE

The purpose of Research Objective 10 was to determine whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies teachers, and the perceptions of building principals regarding the frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities. The uncorrelated t test was used to determine whether or not significant differences existed between the groups.

Ratings of Actual Performance (Supervisors Vs. Teachers)

Data pertaining to Research Objective 10 and related null hypothesis 4 are presented in Appendix F on page 155. Significant differences were determined to exist between perceptions of local supervisors and teachers regarding activities actually performed by local supervisors on eighteen of the forty-two supervisory activities. The null hypotheses were rejected for those eighteen activities and not rejected for the remaining twenty-four. The eighteen activities in which there were significant differences are presented in Table 9. This table also illustrates the relationship between the means for supervisors and teachers relative to the actual frequency of performance of those eighteen activities. In each case, supervisors indicated they spent more time on the eighteen activities than did the teachers. Teachers believed that supervisors spent less time on five items than did the supervisors although the differences noted were not significant (see Appendix F).

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES OF ACTUAL FREQUENCIES
BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND TEACHERS^a

Activity Number	<u>Supervisors</u>		<u>Teachers</u>		<u>t</u> Value	Significance
	<u>X̄</u>	SD	<u>X̄</u>	SD		
1	4.00	0.92	3.49	1.02	2.1742	0.0304
2	4.05	0.89	3.43	1.10	2.4466	0.0149
5	4.10	0.91	3.58	1.08	2.1002	0.0365
6	3.75	1.01	2.85	1.12	3.4555	0.0006
7	3.90	1.33	3.09	1.18	2.9404	0.0035
9	3.25	1.25	2.64	1.15	2.2661	0.0241
10	3.10	1.25	2.39	1.23	2.4978	0.0130
13	3.40	0.99	2.41	1.04	4.1249	0.0001
15	4.30	0.73	3.51	1.18	2.9446	0.0035
18	4.85	0.36	3.48	1.14	5.2957	0.0001
21	4.00	0.72	2.89	1.17	4.1565	0.0001
24	4.05	0.94	2.77	1.11	5.0153	0.0001
25	4.05	0.94	2.62	1.27	4.9054	0.0001
28	4.36	0.74	3.50	1.08	3.4582	0.0006
29	3.90	0.97	3.05	1.26	2.9481	0.0034
32	3.80	1.05	2.82	1.31	3.2610	0.0012
36	4.00	0.72	3.10	1.25	3.1726	0.0017
42	4.15	0.87	3.10	1.22	3.7618	0.0002

^aOnly activities with significant differences at .05 level were included.

There was high agreement between teachers and supervisors as to the order of priority placed on activities by the supervisors. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences of actual time spent as perceived by supervisors and the teacher's perception of actual time spent was $\rho = .80$ (see Table 10).

Ratings of Actual Performance (Supervisors Vs. Principals)

Data pertaining to null hypothesis 5 are presented in Appendix F on page 156. Significant differences were determined to exist between perceptions of local supervisors and principals regarding actual performances on fourteen of the forty-two activities. The null hypotheses were not rejected for the remaining twenty-eight activities. The fourteen activities in which there were significant differences are presented in Table 11.

Of the fourteen significantly different mean scores, supervisors indicated they spent more time at thirteen activities than did the principals. Only in the case of activity seventeen - "visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas," did principals indicate they believed the supervisors spent more time than did the supervisors. In eight other activities principals believed supervisors spent more time than did the supervisors but only in the case indicated above was the difference significant.

Principals and supervisors were in close agreement however, as to the priority (ranking) of supervisor's actual use of time. A ρ of .85 was computed based upon rankings of the two groups relative to actual use of supervisors time (see Table 12).

TABLE 10

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL RATINGS OF PERFORMANCE
ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY LOCAL
SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION AND SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

Activity Number	Supervisor's Actual		Teacher's Actual		Difference	
	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	4.00	12.5	3.49	8	.51	4.5
2	4.05	8.5	3.43	10	.62	1.5
3	2.05	41	2.13	39	.08	2.0
4	2.35	36	2.32	37.5	.03	1.5
5	4.10	5.5	3.58	4	.52	1.5
6	3.75	18	2.86	23	.89	5.0
7	3.90	15.5	3.09	16	.81	0.5
8	4.00	12.5	3.51	5.5	.49	7.0
9	3.25	26.5	2.64	29	.61	2.5
10	3.10	31	2.39	35	.71	4.0
11	3.15	29.5	2.62	31	.53	1.5
12	2.35	36	2.11	40	.24	4.0
13	3.40	22.5	2.41	34	.99	11.5
14	3.70	19.5	3.16	11	.54	8.5
15	4.30	3	3.51	5.5	.79	2.5
16	2.20	38	2.54	33	.34	5.0
17	2.10	39.5	2.59	32	.49	7.5
18	4.85	1	3.48	9	1.37	8.0
19	2.40	36	2.32	37.5	.08	1.5
20	2.65	34	2.69	28	.04	6.0
21	4.00	12.5	2.89	21.5	1.11	9.0
22	3.50	22	3.15	12.5	.35	9.5
23	2.80	33	2.36	36	.44	3.0
24	4.05	8.5	2.77	26	1.28	17.5
25	4.05	8.5	2.63	30	1.42	21.5
26	2.10	39.5	2.06	41	.04	1.5
27	2.00	42	2.03	42	.03	0
28	4.35	2	3.50	7	.85	5.0
29	3.90	15.5	3.05	17	.85	1.5
30	3.60	21	3.15	12.5	.45	8.5
31	3.25	26.5	2.96	19	.29	7.5
32	3.80	17	2.82	25	.98	8.0
33	3.15	29.5	2.91	20	.24	9.5
34	3.25	26.5	3.71	27	.54	0.5
35	4.10	5.5	3.61	3	.49	2.5
36	4.00	12.5	3.10	14.5	.90	2.0
37	2.90	32	2.89	21.5	.01	10.5
38	3.70	19.5	3.62	2	.08	17.5
39	3.25	26.5	2.99	18	.26	8.5
40	3.40	22.5	2.84	24	.56	1.5
41	4.05	8.5	3.73	1	.32	7.5
42	4.15	4	3.10	14.5	1.05	10.5

$\rho = .80$

TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES OF ACTUAL FREQUENCIES
BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS^a

Activity Number	Supervisors		Principals		t Value	Significance
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD		
6	3.75	1.01	3.14	1.02	2.5049	0.0132
7	3.90	1.33	2.18	1.11	2.6139	0.0098
13	3.40	0.99	2.75	1.01	2.6778	0.0082
17	2.10	0.85	2.67	0.92	-2.6298	0.0094
18	4.85	0.36	3.59	1.05	5.2636	0.0001
21	4.00	0.72	3.27	1.05	2.9843	0.0033
24	4.05	0.94	2.99	1.02	4.3731	0.0001
25	4.05	0.94	3.24	1.23	2.8035	0.0057
28	4.35	0.74	3.64	0.98	3.0790	0.0024
29	3.90	0.97	3.22	1.06	2.6580	0.0086
32	3.80	1.05	3.10	1.02	2.8248	0.0053
35	4.10	0.91	3.55	1.04	2.2173	0.0279
36	4.00	0.72	3.40	1.10	2.3128	0.0220
42	4.15	0.87	3.02	1.12	4.3232	0.0001

^aOnly activities with significant differences at .05 level were included.

TABLE 12

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ACTUAL RATINGS OF PERFORMANCE
ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY LOCAL
SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION AND BUILDING PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	Supervisor's		Principal's		Difference	
	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	4.00	12.5	3.56	8.5	.44	4.0
2	4.05	8.5	3.53	10	.52	1.5
3	2.05	41	2.22	41	.17	0
4	2.35	36	2.17	42	.18	6.0
5	4.00	5.5	3.68	2	.42	3.5
6	3.75	18	3.14	21	.61	3.0
7	3.90	15.5	3.19	19	.71	3.5
8	4.00	12.5	3.57	7	.43	5.5
9	3.25	26.5	3.02	25.5	.23	1.0
10	3.10	31	2.76	30	.34	1.0
11	3.15	29.5	2.75	31.5	.40	2.0
12	2.35	36	2.36	38.5	.01	2.5
13	3.40	22.5	2.75	31.5	.65	9.0
14	3.70	19.5	3.33	13	.37	6.5
15	4.30	3	3.97	1	.33	2.0
16	2.20	38	2.69	34	.49	4.0
17	2.10	39.5	2.67	35	.57	4.5
18	4.85	1	3.59	5	1.26	4.0
19	2.40	36	2.37	37	.03	1.0
20	2.65	34	2.72	33	.07	1.0
21	4.00	12.5	3.27	14	.73	1.5
22	3.50	22	3.37	12	.13	10.0
23	2.80	33	2.58	36	.22	3.0
24	4.05	8.5	2.99	27	1.06	18.5
25	4.05	8.5	3.24	16	.81	7.5
26	2.10	39.5	2.36	38.5	.26	1.0
27	2.00	42	2.34	40	.34	2.0
28	4.35	2	3.64	3	.71	1.0
29	3.90	15.5	3.23	17	.67	1.5
30	3.60	21	3.20	18	.39	3.0
31	3.25	26.5	3.15	20	.10	6.5
32	3.80	17	3.11	22	.69	5.0
33	3.15	29.5	2.97	28	.18	1.5
34	3.25	26.5	2.86	29	.39	2.5
35	4.10	5.5	3.56	8.5	.54	3.0
36	4.00	12.5	3.41	11	.59	1.5
37	2.90	32	3.05	24	.15	8.0
38	3.70	19.5	3.58	6	.12	13.5
39	3.25	26.5	3.25	15	0	11.5
40	3.40	22.5	3.06	23	.34	0.5
41	4.05	8.5	3.63	4	.42	4.5
42	4.15	4	3.02	25.5	1.13	21.5

$\rho = .85$

PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES
EDUCATION VERSUS PERCEPTIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS
AND BUILDING PRINCIPALS REGARDING IDEAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE

The purpose of Research Objective 11 was to determine whether or not there were differences among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies teachers, and the perceptions of building principals regarding the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities. The uncorrelated t test was used to determine whether or not significant differences existed between the groups.

Ratings of Ideal Performance (Supervisors Vs. Teachers)

Data pertaining to Research Objective 11 and related null hypothesis 6 are presented in Appendix F on page 157. Significant differences were determined to exist between perceptions of local supervisors and teachers regarding ideal frequency of performance on twenty-two of the forty-two supervisory activities. The null hypotheses were rejected for those twenty-two activities and not rejected for the remaining twenty.

Of the twenty-two significantly different mean scores, supervisors indicated that they spent more time at twenty-one activities than did the teachers. Only in the case of activity three - "assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition," did teachers indicate that the supervisors should spend more time than did the supervisors themselves. In four activities teachers believed supervisors should spend more time than did the supervisors, but only in the case cited above was the difference

statistically significant.

Teachers and supervisors were in moderate agreement relative to the setting of priorities for time utilization by supervisors across the forty-two activities. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences (ideal) shown in Table 14 was $\rho = .51$. The twenty-two activities in which there were significant differences are presented in Table 13. Also, illustrated in this table is the relationship between the means for supervisors and teachers regarding the ideal frequency of performance by supervisors on those activities.

Ratings of Ideal Performance (Supervisors Vs. Principals)

Data pertaining to null hypothesis 7 are presented in Appendix F on page 158. Significant differences were determined to exist between perceptions of local supervisors and principals regarding ideal frequency of performance on fifteen of the forty-two supervisory activities. The null hypotheses were rejected for those fifteen activities and not rejected for the remaining twenty-seven activities. The fifteen activities for which there were significant differences are presented in Table 15.

Of the fifteen significantly different mean scores, supervisors indicated that they should spend more time at fourteen activities than did the principals. Only in the instance of activity two - "interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons and teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies," did principals indicate that supervisors should spend more time than did the supervisors themselves. In six activities principals believed supervisors should spend more time than did the

TABLE 13

ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES OF IDEAL FREQUENCIES
BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND TEACHERS^a

Activity Number	Supervisors		Teachers		<u>t</u> Value	Significance
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD		
1	4.70	0.47	4.22	0.82	2.5322	0.0118
3	2.15	0.93	3.10	1.28	-3.2527	0.0013
6	4.64	0.58	4.08	0.82	2.9628	0.0033
7	4.60	0.59	3.99	0.91	2.9257	0.0037
9	4.50	0.76	3.57	1.20	3.3633	0.0009
10	4.55	0.51	3.38	1.36	3.8002	0.0002
13	4.45	0.68	3.67	0.95	3.5575	0.0004
15	4.70	0.65	4.22	0.83	2.5040	0.0128
18	4.30	0.86	3.73	1.05	2.3230	0.0208
21	4.70	0.47	3.94	0.91	3.6551	0.0003
22	4.40	0.75	3.92	0.99	2.1141	0.0353
23	4.00	1.02	3.56	0.89	2.0608	0.0401
24	4.70	0.65	3.55	0.95	5.2544	0.0001
25	4.80	0.52	3.77	0.99	4.5710	0.0001
28	4.65	0.58	4.13	0.81	2.7688	0.0059
30	4.70	0.57	4.00	0.81	3.7553	0.0002
31	4.45	0.60	3.97	0.80	2.6576	0.0083
32	4.30	0.86	3.57	1.03	3.0392	0.0026
35	4.70	0.65	3.97	0.86	3.6980	0.0003
36	4.55	0.68	4.08	0.87	2.3196	0.0210
38	4.50	0.50	4.00	0.90	2.8781	0.0043
39	4.35	0.67	3.95	0.85	2.0127	0.0450

^aOnly activities with significant differences at .05 level were included.

TABLE 14

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IDEAL RATINGS OF PERFORMANCE
ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY LOCAL
SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION AND SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

Activity Number	Supervisor's Ideal		Teacher's Ideal		Difference	
	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	4.70	4.5	4.23	4	.47	0.5
2	4.50	15.5	4.21	6	.29	9.5
3	2.15	42	3.10	41	.95	1.0
4	2.55	41	3.13	40	.58	1.0
5	4.53	14	4.31	2	.22	12.0
6	4.65	8.5	4.09	10.5	.56	2.0
7	4.60	10.5	3.99	16	.61	5.5
8	4.35	22.5	4.05	12	.30	10.5
9	4.50	15.5	3.58	32	.92	16.5
10	4.55	12.5	3.38	38	1.17	25.5
11	3.50	37.5	4.47	1	.97	36.5
12	3.90	33.5	3.52	36	.38	2.5
13	4.45	18.5	3.68	28	.77	9.5
14	4.25	27	4.14	8	.11	19.0
15	4.70	4.5	4.22	5	.48	0.5
16	3.90	33.5	3.70	27	.20	6.5
17	3.90	33.5	3.77	24.5	.13	9.0
18	4.30	25	3.74	26	.56	1.0
19	3.30	39	3.34	39	.04	0
20	3.50	37.5	3.50	37	0	0.5
21	4.70	4.5	3.94	21	.76	16.5
22	4.40	21	3.92	22	.48	1.0
23	4.00	29.5	3.57	34	.43	4.5
24	4.70	4.5	3.55	35	1.15	30.5
25	4.80	1	3.77	24.5	1.03	23.5
26	3.90	33.5	3.58	32	.32	1.5
27	3.75	36	3.60	30	.15	6.0
28	4.65	8.5	4.13	9	.52	0.5
29	4.45	18.5	4.18	7	.27	11.5
30	4.70	4.5	4.00	15	.70	10.5
31	4.45	18.5	3.97	18	.48	0.5
32	4.30	25	3.58	32	.72	7.0
33	4.00	29.5	3.84	23	.16	6.5
34	3.95	31	3.63	29	.32	2.0
35	4.70	4.5	3.97	18	.73	13.5
36	4.55	12.5	4.09	10.5	.46	2.0
37	4.10	28	3.97	18	.13	10.0
38	4.60	10.5	4.01	13.5	.59	3.0
39	4.35	22.5	3.95	20	.40	2.5
40	4.30	25	4.01	13.5	.29	11.5
41	4.45	18.5	4.25	3	.20	15.5
42	2.90	40	3.07	42	.17	2.0

$\rho = .51$

TABLE 15
 ANALYSIS OF MEAN DIFFERENCES OF IDEAL FREQUENCIES
 BETWEEN SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS^a

Activity Number	Supervisors		Principals		t Value	Significance
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD		
1	4.70	0.47	4.18	0.77	-2.8975	0.0043
2	2.15	0.93	2.83	1.18	2.4941	0.0136
6	4.65	0.58	4.27	0.78	-2.0772	0.0393
7	4.60	0.59	3.98	0.90	-2.9638	0.0035
9	4.50	0.76	3.63	1.11	-3.3477	0.0010
10	4.55	0.51	3.28	1.25	-4.4667	0.0001
13	4.45	0.68	3.84	0.85	-3.0140	0.0030
18	4.30	0.86	3.72	0.98	-2.4839	0.0140
21	4.70	0.47	4.32	0.68	-2.4042	0.0173
24	4.70	0.65	4.14	0.87	-2.7254	0.0071
25	4.80	0.52	4.29	0.81	-2.6829	0.0080
28	4.65	0.58	4.26	0.77	-2.1152	0.0359
30	4.70	0.57	4.04	0.75	-3.7174	0.0003
35	4.70	0.65	4.23	0.77	-2.5629	0.0113
38	4.60	0.50	4.02	0.83	-3.0111	0.0030

^aOnly activities with significant differences at .05 level were included.

supervisors but only in the case above was the difference significant.

Principals and supervisors were in high agreement relative to the priorities (based on ideal rankings) for supervisors. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences illustrated in Table 16 was $\rho = .78$.

SUMMARY

There was a high positive correlation between teachers, principals, and supervisors relative to how supervisors spent their time. Lower, but still moderate to high, positive correlations did exist with regard to how supervisors should spend their time. However, supervisor-teacher correlations were lower than supervisor-principal correlations. In summary, the findings are as follows:

1. Supervisors, teachers, and principals agreed that supervisors should spend more time on nearly all of the identified activities than they currently do.
2. Each group surveyed agreed that the ideal performance of supervisors should be closely related to that group's perceptions of what supervisors currently do.
3. There was a high positive correlation between the supervisors, teachers, and principals as to the allocation of priorities by supervisors.
4. There was a moderate to high positive correlation across groups as to how supervisors should allocate their time.

TABLE 16

MEANS, RANKS, AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IDEAL RATINGS OF PERFORMANCE
ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY LOCAL
SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION AND BUILDING PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	Supervisor's Ideal		Principal's Ideal		Difference	
	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank	\bar{X}	Rank
1	4.70	4.5	4.18	14	.52	9.5
2	4.50	15.5	4.15	16	.35	0.5
3	2.15	42	2.84	41	.69	1.0
4	2.55	41	2.83	42	.28	1.0
5	4.53	14	4.45	3	.08	11.0
6	4.65	8.5	4.27	8.5	.38	0
7	4.60	10.5	3.98	23	.62	12.5
8	4.35	22.5	4.09	19	.26	3.5
9	4.50	15.5	3.64	31	.86	15.5
10	4.55	12.5	3.28	39	1.27	26.5
11	3.50	37.5	3.71	30	.21	7.5
12	3.90	33.5	3.53	32.5	.27	1.0
13	4.45	18.5	3.84	27	.61	8.5
14	4.25	27	4.03	21.5	.22	5.5
15	4.70	4.5	4.54	1	.16	3.5
16	3.90	33.5	3.52	36	.38	2.5
17	3.90	33.5	3.63	32.5	.27	1.0
18	4.30	25	3.72	29	.58	4.0
19	3.30	39	3.44	37	.14	2.0
20	3.50	37.5	3.41	38	.09	0.5
21	4.70	4.5	4.32	5.5	.38	1.0
22	4.40	21	4.39	4	.01	17.0
23	4.00	29.5	3.89	25	-.11	4.5
24	4.70	4.5	4.14	17.5	.56	13.0
25	4.80	1	4.29	7	.51	6.0
26	3.90	33.5	3.62	34	.28	0.5
27	3.75	36	3.60	35	.15	1.0
28	4.65	8.5	4.27	8.5	.38	0
29	4.45	18.5	4.32	5.5	.13	13.0
30	4.70	4.5	4.47	2	.23	2.5
31	4.45	18.5	4.20	12	.25	6.5
32	4.30	25	3.95	24	.35	1.0
33	4.00	29.5	3.80	28	.20	1.5
34	3.95	31	3.86	26	.09	5.0
35	4.70	4.5	4.23	11	.47	6.5
36	4.55	12.5	4.27	10	.28	2.5
37	4.10	28	4.14	17.5	.04	10.5
38	4.60	10.5	4.03	21.5	.57	11.0
39	4.35	22.5	4.17	15	.18	7.5
40	4.30	25	4.05	20	.25	5.0
41	4.45	18.5	4.19	13	.26	5.5
42	2.90	40	3.05	40	.15	0

$\rho = .78$

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The final chapter of this study is organized into four sections. A review of the purpose, objectives, and justifications for the study is the focus of the first section. This is followed with a summary of related literature, a review of methods and procedures, and a summary of findings and concluding statement and recommendations for further study.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which relationships exist among the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education, the perceptions of social studies classroom teachers, and the perceptions of building principals regarding the role of local supervisors of social studies education. Specifically, the research objectives of the study were to determine:

1. the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies reported performing forty-two selected supervisory activities;
2. the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies believed that they should perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;
3. whether or not there were differences between the actual

frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies;

4. the frequency rate at which social studies teachers believed that supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities;

5. the frequency rate at which social studies teachers preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;

6. whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers;

7. the frequency rate at which building principals believed supervisors performed forty-two selected supervisory activities;

8. the frequency rate at which building principals preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities;

9. whether or not there were differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals;

10. whether or not there were differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies teachers and building principals concerning the actual frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities; and

11. whether or not there were differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies teachers and building principals concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

Major null hypotheses for the study were as follows:

HO_1 : there are no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies education.

HO_2 : there are no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers.

HO_3 : there are no significant mean differences between the actual frequency of performance and the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by building principals.

HO_4 : there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies education teachers concerning the actual frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

HO_5 : there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of building principals concerning the actual frequency

of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

HO₆: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies teachers concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

HO₇: there are no significant mean differences between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of building principals concerning the ideal frequency of performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities.

In Virginia, there had been no effort made to determine the extent to which relationships existed between responsibilities actually performed and those ideally preferred to be performed by local supervisors of social studies. Likewise, there had been no effort made to determine whether or not the social studies teachers and building principals received services that they perceived to be desirable. This study was designed to determine whether or not there was congruence between the actual and ideal role of local supervisors of social studies as perceived by social studies supervisors, teachers, and building principals. A clear perspective of this role is essential if acceptance of the supervisor as an important and contributing member of the instructional team is to take place. Through this study, incongruencies between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and the perceptions of social studies teachers and principals relative to the actual and ideal performance of local supervisors were identified.

The fact that a large percentage of social studies teachers

and building principals utilize services of local supervisors coupled with the fact that many other school systems have assigned the area of social studies to general central office personnel, seems to give further justification to a study of this nature. Also, the need for this type of research has been expressed by nationally recognized authorities. Among the reasons given are statements of how the research findings can be helpful in designing more effective preparatory programs, inservice activities, and certification standards; increasing supervisory efficiency by more precise role definitions; and relating professional literature to the needs of the supervisor. It was hoped that this study might help resolve these issues especially as they relate to social studies education.

SUMMARY OF SELECTED RELATED LITERATURE

General perceptions of supervision and the supervisory role constituted the initial phase of the literature review section of this study. Early in this review it became clear that no common definition of supervision was available. Both theoretical and empirical studies delineated characteristics or propositions relative to supervision, but stopped short of defining this position. However, it was generally agreed that the supervisory role should place emphasis on improved instruction, cooperative participation, utilization of total talents and strengths, flexibility, evaluation, and satisfaction. Although there were some who maintained that the practice of supervision was unsuccessful and doomed, others indicated

that supervision was beneficial and would remain an integral part of the educational process, both in maintaining and improving instructional programs.

Research studies specific to social studies supervision were few. In reviewing the three social studies-related studies cited in the literature section of the study, it was apparent that supervision in this discipline needed additional research to yield findings that would be helpful in designing more effective preparatory programs, inservice activities, certification standards, increased supervisory efficiency by more precise role definitions; and in relating professional literature to the needs of the supervisor.

Literature regarding duties or tasks of the local supervisor was reviewed. Specific activities performed by local supervisors of social studies were identified. Numerous lists and writings pertaining to duties of local supervisors were available. These task listings determined by authorities in the field of supervision were used to construct the questionnaires used in this study.

Apparent throughout the literature review section of this study was the idea that the supervisory role was perceived differently by supervisors, teachers, and principals. Researchers determined that there were discrepancies between supervisors' perceptions of activities they actually performed and perceptions of activities they preferred to perform. Discrepancies also were determined to exist between the perceptions teachers and principals held of the actual and ideal performance of supervisors.

SUMMARY OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The descriptive-survey method was used to accomplish the purpose of this study. This method was used as a means of collecting the data and testing empirically the extent to which relationships existed between perceptions of the actual and ideal performance of local supervisors of social studies education as perceived by supervisors, teachers, and principals. The mail questionnaire technique was utilized to gather the data.

The subjects of this study were the twenty full-time social studies supervisors employed in seventeen local school divisions in Virginia during the 1980-81 school year. Also included in the population sample of the study were the one hundred and ninety-seven principals employed in those seventeen school divisions and a twenty-five percent systematic random sample of social studies teachers. The total population and sample, therefore, consisted of twenty local supervisors of social studies education, one hundred and ninety-seven principals, and four hundred and sixty teachers.

The Directory of Personnel-Social Studies Educators in Virginia, A Listing of Classroom Teachers-History and the Social Sciences, and the Virginia Educational Directory-School Year 1980-81 were used to obtain the names of participants for the study. Through the use of the mail survey questionnaire, data was collected from survey participants.

Pilot questionnaires were mailed to selected social studies supervisors, teachers, and principals prior to the printing of the

instruments. These individuals who piloted the instruments, but were not a part of the study population, were asked to complete the questionnaire based on the directions given; to indicate, after completing the instruments, any ambiguous items in vocabulary, directions, and format; and to indicate the approximate length of time required to complete the questionnaire. Comments from the piloting population provided suggestions used in editing and revising the survey instruments used in the study.

The questionnaire forwarded to social studies supervisors, asked them to indicate how frequently they engaged in each of the forty-two supervisory activities and how frequently they would prefer to engage in the same activity. The questionnaires forwarded to social studies teachers and principals requested that they indicate how frequently they believed local supervisors of social studies engaged in each of the forty-two activities and how frequently they preferred that the supervisors perform the forty-two activities. A Likert-type measurement scale with responses from 1-5 was provided. Participants were asked to write a numeral from 1-5 in the blank space at the left and right of each of the forty-two activities. The numbers on the left indicated actual performance while those on the right suggested ideal performance as perceived by the population sample.

The response rate for supervisors involved in the study was one hundred percent. Teacher response rate was seventy-seven percent and principal response rate was seventy-one percent. A telephone nonresponse survey with ten percent of the nonrespondents was also

conducted. Following a comparative analysis of the data gathered in the nonresponse survey with the information received through the mail survey questionnaire, it was concluded that there were no significant differences between the two groups.

Responses to the forty-two survey items on the questionnaires from supervisors, teachers, and principals were analyzed through the Statistical Analyze System (SAS). Descriptive statistics, correlated t tests, and uncorrelated t tests were used in analyzing the data. Research objectives 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Data were reported by means, frequencies, ranks, standard deviations, and percentages. To analyze the data within the groups relative to research objectives 3, 6, and 9, the correlated t test was used. The uncorrelated t test was used to analyze the data between groups which dealt with research objectives 10 and 11. To determine the relationship between the rank differences reported by the sample groups, the Spearman rho (ρ) correlation was computed using formula $\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$. The alpha level of significance used in the study was $p < .05$.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which relationships exist among the perceptions of supervisors, teachers, and principals regarding the role of local supervisors of social studies. To accomplish this purpose eleven research objectives were

delineated. The summary of findings were organized to coincide with the research objectives and the null hypotheses used in the study.

Research Objective 1 was to determine the frequency rate at which local supervisors of social studies education reported performing forty-two selected supervisory activities. Of the forty-two activities supervisors perceived themselves to be performing, one was reported to be performed frequently, twenty-one activities were reported to be performed often, and twelve activities were reported as being performed sometimes. Only eight activities were reported as being performed rarely. Based upon a review of the type of things supervisors listed as consuming more of their time, it seemed as though supervisors performed activities of a routine or administrative nature more frequently than they performed activities involving direct interaction between teacher and supervisor. It appears that the local supervisors of social studies education in Virginia engage more frequently in coordinating administrative duties and functions, rather than providing direct assistance to the teachers they serve.

Research Objective 2 was intended to determine the frequency rate at which local supervisors believed that they should perform forty-two selected supervisory activities. Local supervisors preferred to perform sixteen of the supervisory activities at the frequent level. This represented fifteen more activities at the frequent level than they actually reported performing. They reported that they preferred to perform twenty-two activities often and four sometimes. Within the activities reported as frequently and often preferred to be performed by supervisors, it was apparent that a

greater number of these activities dealt with a direct interaction relationship between supervisors, teachers, and principals.

Research Objective 3 was designed to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of the forty-two selected supervisory activities as perceived by local supervisors of social studies education. There were significant mean differences between actual and ideal ratings for thirty-nine of the forty-two activities. In most cases (thirty-seven of thirty-nine) in which there was a significant difference, the mean was higher for ideal than for actual. This was an indication that local supervisors preferred to perform those activities more frequently than they actually performed them. There was however a high correlation between actual ranking of activities and ideal ranking of activities indicating supervisors are not totally unhappy with the way they currently allocate their time. They may, however, be concerned that they have insufficient time to allocate.

Research Objective 4 was to determine the frequency rate at which social studies teachers believed local supervisors actually performed forty-two selected supervisory activities. Of the forty-two activities, teachers perceived supervisors to be actually performing seven often, twenty-six sometimes, and nine rarely. Teachers believed that supervisors performed more frequently activities that appeared to be of a coordinating nature, rather than those involving direct interaction between supervisors and teachers. These findings were consistent with the way supervisors believed they actually performed.

Research Objective 5 was designed to determine the frequency

rate at which social studies teachers preferred that supervisors perform forty-two selected supervisory activities. Of the forty-two activities surveyed, teachers preferred that supervisors perform thirty-seven often and five sometimes. Among the major activities ranked consistently by teachers as preferred was one dealing with the provision for appropriate equipment, instructional materials, and teaching aids. It was apparent that teachers considered the provision of such materials as an important activity to be performed by supervisors. For whatever reasons, teachers appeared to rank direct instructional assistance activities lower than did supervisors.

The purpose of Research Objective 6 was to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two supervisory activities as perceived by social studies teachers. There were significant mean differences between actual and ideal mean ratings for forty-one of the forty-two activities. Although it was evident that teachers preferred that supervisors perform activities more frequently than they believed the activities were performed. Teachers generally believe that supervisors should do more of essentially the same activities they currently engage in.

Research Objective 7 was to determine the frequency rate at which building principals believed local supervisors of social studies education actually performed forty-two supervisory activities. Of the forty-two activities principals perceived that ten were performed often, twenty-six sometimes, and six rarely by supervisors. The five top ranked activities by principals included tasks relating to review,

evaluation, and recommendation of teaching materials; updating annual plans for social studies; developing courses of study; working with the Department of Education; and performing routine administrative duties. Least frequently performed activities according to principals related to classroom observations or activities involving direct supervisor-teacher interaction.

Research Objective 8 was to determine the frequency rate at which building principals preferred that supervisors perform forty-two supervisory activities. Regarding the forty-two activities, principals preferred that supervisors perform one activity frequently, thirty-five often, and six sometimes. The activities preferred by principals appeared to be fairly evenly distributed between direct support of instructional activities and administration/coordination program support functions.

Research Objective 9 was to determine whether or not there were differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance of forty-two supervisory activities as perceived by principals. It was determined that there were significant mean differences between the actual and ideal frequency of performance as perceived by principals. There were significant mean differences between actual and ideal mean ratings for forty-one of the forty-two activities.

Research Objectives 10 and 11 dealt with perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education versus perceptions of social studies teachers and principals regarding actual and ideal performance of supervisory activities. In a comparison of perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education versus perceptions of teachers

regarding actual performance of forty-two selected supervisory activities, it was determined that significant differences existed with eighteen of the activities. In each case, supervisors indicated they spent more time on the eighteen activities than did the teachers. Teachers believed that supervisors spent less time on five items than did the supervisors although the differences noted were not significant. There was a high agreement between teachers and supervisors as to the order of priority placed on activities by supervisors. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences of actual time spent as perceived by supervisors and the teacher's perception of actual time spent yielded a high positive correlation. Regarding principals, significant differences were determined to exist relative to actual performance on fourteen of the forty-two supervisory activities. Of the fourteen significantly different mean scores, supervisors indicated they spent more time at thirteen activities than did the principals. Principals and supervisors were in close agreement, however, as to the priority of supervisor's actual use of time. A high positive correlation was found to exist based upon rankings of the two groups relative to actual use of supervisors' time.

Significant differences were noted between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education and those of social studies teachers and building principals relative to ideal supervisory performance. Significant differences between perceptions of local supervisors and those of teachers regarding ideal frequency of performance on twenty-two of the forty-two supervisory activities were also determined. Of the twenty-one significantly different

mean scores, supervisors indicated that they spent more time at twenty-one activities than did the teachers.

Teachers and supervisors were in moderate agreement relative to the setting of priorities for time utilization by supervisors across the forty-two activities. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences yielded a moderate positive correlation.

Significant differences were determined to exist between perceptions of local supervisors and principals regarding ideal frequency of performance on fifteen of the forty-two supervisory activities. Of the fifteen significantly different mean scores, supervisors indicated that they should spend more time at fourteen activities than did the principals. Principals and supervisors were in high agreement relative to the priorities based on ideal rankings for supervisors. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences yielded a high positive correlation.

Major findings of this research could be summarized as follows:

1. Supervisors, teachers, and principals agreed that supervisors should spend more time on nearly all of the identified activities than they currently do.

2. Each group surveyed agreed that the ideal performance of supervisors should be closely related to that group's perceptions of what supervisors currently do.

3. There was a high positive correlation between the supervisors, teachers, and principals as to the allocation of priorities by supervisors.

4. There was a moderate to high positive correlation across groups as to how supervisors should allocate their time.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Apparent in the findings of this study was the notion that supervisors, teachers, and principals wanted supervisors to perform more activities than they currently perceived that they were performing. It was reported in the study that supervisors would prefer to spend significantly more time on thirty-seven of the forty-two surveyed activities. As in the case of supervisors, principals and teachers supported the allocation of additional time by the supervisor to nearly every activity listed. Accepting this data, several options could be considered to solve the dilemma of allocation of time sufficient to meet the expectations of supervisors, teachers, and principals.

First is the option of having supervisors do more than they are currently doing. The problem with this option is that according to the data from principals and teachers, supervisors are already engaged in many varied activities. Perhaps an analysis of time management on the part of supervisors or the shifting of some responsibilities to other personnel may assist in the problem, but not necessarily solve it. The second option is to add additional supervisors to assume some of the responsibility so that the allocation of time to the varied activities of the supervisor can be more evenly distributed. However, with the economic climate as it is today,

public school supervisory staff is being decreased instead of increased. So, clearly the only reasonable approach is to look at what currently exists and make some decision about those activities that are essential to the improvement of instruction in social studies education. Once that decision is made, it then becomes the responsibility of the supervisor to work toward the accomplishment of those activities.

If one wished to take direction from this study with regard to what supervisory activities teachers and principals wanted more or less of, it would appear that those activities which received almost or unanimous agreement in the ideally preferred and least frequently preferred categories among the sample populations should suggest areas of increased or decreased emphases. Therefore, it may be beneficial to examine the top five supervisory activities ideally preferred by teachers, principals, and supervisors and to suggest those tasks that the groups would like to see performed more frequently. Likewise, an analysis of the five least frequently preferred activities may suggest those tasks that may be considered for deletion from the supervisors role so as to provide more time for preferred activities.

Among the groups surveyed, unanimous agreement was determined to exist with respect to survey item fifteen. Supervisors, teachers, and principals ideally ranked the "review, evaluation, and recommendation of textbooks, supplementary books, films, and filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning" among the social studies supervisors top five supervisory responsibilities. Other activities

ranked in the top five by at least two of the three groups surveyed included:

1. Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program (Supervisors and Teachers).

2. Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies (Supervisors and Principals).

3. Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences (Supervisors and Principals).

4. Prepare and update local annual and long-range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program (Teachers and Principals).

Among the five least preferred supervisory activities, unanimous agreement was determined to exist with respect to two of the surveyed items. They were survey items three and four which dealt with "assuming the responsibility for seeing to it that equipment is kept in operable condition and keeping up-to-date inventories in school divisions."

Other activities ranked in the bottom five by at least two of the three groups surveyed included:

1. Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff (Supervisors and Principals).

2. Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments (Teachers and Principals).

3. Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs (Teachers and Principals).

The examination of the top and bottom five supervisory activities ideally preferred by teachers, principals, and supervisors would serve as a means of paralleling the supervisor's role expectations with that of the recipients of the service. Time would be allocated more directly toward those activities perceived as essential across groups. Also, activities considered non-essential could be deleted from the supervisor's functions.

Another approach to gaining insight from this study that may provide direction for examining the role of the supervisors, is to examine the distribution of the surveyed activities along the continuum of supervisor as "helper" or administrator. If one were to place the activities surveyed on a continuum of supervisor as a "helper," as postulated by the literature, to supervisor as an administrator, the items might be distributed as illustrated in Table 17. Of the twenty-one activities listed in Table 17, supervisors and principals ideally preferred five each, while teachers only ideally preferred that supervisors engage frequently in the performance of one of the activities. Ideally teachers preferred seven of the supporting activities, supervisors preferred five and principals preferred four. In the area of administration, teachers ideally preferred three activities while principals preferred one and supervisors none. Other activities included professional development activities; both were ideally preferred by supervisors.

Even though the literature in supervision strongly suggested

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERVISOR ACTIVITIES ACROSS
ASSISTING, SUPPORTING, ADMINISTERING, AND OTHER FUNCTIONS^a

N = 42

Assisting Activities	Supporting Activities	Administering Activities	Other
21	1	2	17
22	5	3	38
23	6	4	
24	7	16	
25	8	18	
26	9	29	
27	10	41	
30	11	42	
31	12		
35	13		
36	14		
	15		
	19		
	20		
	28		
	32		
	33		
	34		
	37		
	39		
	40		

^aA distribution of the forty-two supervisory activity item numbers used to survey the sample groups in this study.

the idea that the most effective role of the supervisor is to offer direct assistance to the teacher, an analysis across groups in this study, clearly placed the most frequent ideally preferred activities by teachers in the area of supporting rather than assisting functions. These functions dealt with activities such as program and policy formulation and interpretation instead of direct teacher-supervisor interaction functions. On the other hand, supervisors and principals, to a lesser degree, preferred ideally throughout the distribution of activities those that dealt with direct assistance to the teacher. This poses the eternal problem of role ambiguity in supervision. Such ambiguity, no doubt, was responsible for the differing expectations expressed by the groups in this study. By way of recommendation, it clearly supports the need for local school division superintendents to decide what is expected of the social studies supervisor and to make it explicit to all populations. This will require the need to engage, at the local level, in dialogue to the degree that all groups know what their expectations and priorities are. Such dialogue will strengthen the supervisor's role by:

1. clarifying and making explicit to all groups the role of the local supervisor of social studies education;
2. establishing greater congruency between activities performed by local social studies supervisors and activities they would prefer to perform; and
3. establishing greater congruency between activities performed by social studies supervisors and activities preferred by the recipients of supervisory services.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Recommendations for further research include suggested studies which focus on the following:

1. Factors that contribute to discrepancies between the actual and ideal performance of social studies supervisors in school divisions with full-time supervisors;
2. Factors responsible for bridging the gap between the actual and ideal discrepancies that exist among social studies supervisors, teachers, and principals;
3. Restraints prohibiting supervisors of social studies from performing more frequently activities that involve direct interaction between themselves, teachers, and principals;
4. Reasons why teachers prefer that supervisors of social studies education engage more frequently in activities of a supporting rather than direct assisting role;
5. In light of supervisors precarious political position, skills and abilities necessary to survive the profession;
6. Variables related to educational experience and training that cause discrepancies between the perceptions of teachers, principals, and supervisors regarding the supervisory role; and
7. Analysis of the social studies supervisory role between local school divisions with supervisors whose sole responsibility is in the area of social studies education versus supervisors with multiple supervisory responsibilities.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Alphonso, Robert J., Gerald R. Firth, and Richard F. Neville. Instructional Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Ary, Donald, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, and Asghar Razavich. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Blumberg, Arthur. Supervisors and Teachers. California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Cook, David R. and N. Kenneth LaFleur. A Guide to Educational Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Combs, Arthur, D. Avila, and William Purkey. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Crosby, Muriel. Supervision as Cooperative Action. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Franseth, Jane. Supervision as Leadership. Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1961.
- Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham, and Ronald F. Campbell. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.
- Harris, Ben M. Supervisory Behavior in Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Hinkle, Dennis E., William Wiersma, and Stephen G. Jurs. Applied Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1979.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Leeper, Robert R. (ed.). Changing Supervision for Changing Times. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.

- _____. (ed.). Supervision: Emerging Profession. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Lucio, William H. (ed.). The Supervisor: New Demands New Dimensions. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1969.
- Lucio, William H. and John D. McNeil. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- McKean, Robert C. and H. H. Mills. The Supervisor. Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964.
- Neagley, Ross L. and N. Dean Evans. Handbook of Effective Supervision of Instruction. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Robert J. Starratt. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

B. PERIODICALS

- Blumberg, Arthur. "Supervision: What Is and What Might Be," Theory Into Practice, XV (October, 1976), pp. 284-290.
- Bishop, Leslee and Gerald Firth. "New Conceptions of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), pp. 572-577.
- Bright, Charles. "Effective Supervision Leads to Teacher Growth," Business Education Forum, XXVII (May, 1973), pp. 33-35.
- Crossley, Mattie R. "New Conceptions of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), pp. 575-577.
- Drake, Ruth. "Leadership: The Teacher's Option," The Clearing House, L (March, 1977), pp. 291-293.
- Eash, Maurice J. "Supervisors: A Vanishing Breed?" Educational Leadership, XXVI (October, 1968), pp. 63-74.
- Esposito, James P., Gary E. Smith, and Harold J. Burbach. "A Delineation of the Supervisory Role," Education, XCVI (Fall, 1975), pp. 63-67.

- _____ and Harold J. Burbach. "A Role Study: The Supervisor in Virginia," Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, (1974).
- Goens, George and Ronald W. Lange. "Supervision as Instructional Analysis," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LX (September, 1976), pp. 15-20.
- Granite, Harvey. "Supervising Supervisors in An Urban School District," Educational Leadership, XXVI (January, 1969), pp. 382-388.
- Greene, John D. "Implications for Educational Practice," Supervision: Perspectives & Propositions (1967), pp. 42-53.
- Guss, Carolyn. "How Is Supervision Perceived?" Educational Leadership, XIX (November, 1961), pp. 99-102.
- Harris, Ben M. "Supervisor Competence and Strategies for Improving Instruction," Educational Leadership, XXX (February, 1976), pp. 332-335.
- Hartman, Catherine L. "Democratic Leadership Doesn't Just Happen," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LXI (December, 1977), pp. 41-45.
- Harty, Harold and William C. Ritz. "A Non-Evaluative Helping Relationship: An Approach to Classroom-Oriented Supervision," Educational Perspectives (May, 1976), pp. 15-21.
- Koehn, John J. and George A. Goens. "The Talent We Nourish: A Word for Supervisors," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), pp. 585-588.
- Krajewski, Robert J. "Texas Principals - Implications for Perceived Roles," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLI (December, 1977), pp. 16-20.
- Lonsdale, Bernard J. "The 'Guese' of Supervision," Educational Leadership, XXI (November, 1963), pp. 69-74.
- Markowitz, Shirley. "The Dilemma of Authority in Supervisory Behavior," Educational Leadership, XXXIII (February, 1976), pp. 367-372.
- Neville, Richard F. "The Supervisor We Need," Educational Leadership, XXIII (May, 1966), pp. 634-640.
- Newton, Robert R. "Three Dilemmas of Supervision," The National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, LVI (December, 1972), pp. 52-56.

- Nixon, John E. "The Mechanics of Questionnaire Construction," Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (March, 1964), pp. 481-487.
- Ogletree, James R. "Changing Supervision in A Changing Era," Educational Leadership, XXIX (March, 1972), pp. 507-510.
- Ohles, John F. "Supervision: Essential and Beneficial," The Clearing House (November, 1969), pp. 134-136.
- Psencik, Leroy F. "The Role of the State Social Studies Specialist," Social Education, XXXIV (December, 1970), pp. 909-916.
- Unruh, Glenys. "Instructional Supervision: Issues and Trends," Educational Leadership, XXXIV (May, 1977), pp. 563-566.
- Willower, Donald J., Peter Cistone, and John Packard. "Some Functions of the Supervisory Role in Educational Organizations," Education, XCII (February-March, 1972), pp. 66-68.
- Worner, Wayne M. "Survival Kit for Supervisors," Educational Leadership (January, 1982), pp. 258-259.
- Young, James M. and Robert L. Heichberger. "Teachers' Perceptions of An Effective School Supervision and Evaluation Program," Education, CXVI (Fall, 1975), p. 10.

C. DISSERTATIONS AND ABSTRACTS

- Atkins, John P. "Inservice Experiences for Secondary Social Studies Teachers in Selected Public School Systems in Tennessee." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1969.
- Bohler, Gloria Ann. "A Questionnaire Survey of Social Studies Supervisors' Job Characteristics," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXIV (January, 1974), 4051-52-A.
- _____. "A Questionnaire Survey of Social Studies Supervisors' Job Characteristics." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia, 1973.
- Carlton, Cecil G. "Role of Instructional Supervisors as Perceived by Teachers and Principals in Selected Florida Elementary Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXI (March, 1971), 4406-A.

- Carman, Beatrice D. "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings, 1955-1969." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1970.
- Esposito, James P. "Task Preferences of Instructional Supervisors and the Disbelief-Belief System" Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1971.
- Gogan, William L. "A Study of Supervisory Services and Activities for the Improvement of Instruction," Dissertation Abstracts International, XXIV (July, 1964), 229-30-A.
- McGowan, Gerald R. "A Study of Perceptions of Supervisory Tasks and Processes." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1971.
- Miles, Foster B. "An Analysis of the Perceptions of the Role of the Local Supervisor of Business Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Virginia, 1978.
- Neville, Richard F. "The Supervisory Function of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, XXV (March, 1965), 5069-A.
- Saunders, Margaret C. "Contemporary Practices in Elementary School Social Studies Programs in Nebraska Schools Employing Curriculum Directors or Supervisors." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Nebraska, 1969.
- Smith, Gary Edward. "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision in Virginia," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (December, 1975), 3031-32-A.
- _____. "Teachers' Perceptions of Supervision in Virginia." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Virginia, 1975.

D. OTHER SOURCES

- A Listing of Classroom Teachers-History and Social Sciences. Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980-81.
- Brown, Edward T. A Role Study: The County Level Supervisor in Florida. Atlanta, Georgia: Regional Curriculum Project, 1968.
- Directory of Personnel-Social Studies Educators in Virginia. Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980-81.

Gansneder, Bruce M. "Selection of Sample Size." Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, (Mimeographed).

Handbook for Social Studies Supervisory Personnel in Local School Divisions. Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1976.

Manual for Implementing Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, 1980-82. Department of Education, Commonwealth of Virginia, 1980.

Turner, Harold E. Supervision in Missouri - 1970. St. Louis: Missouri Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.

APPENDIX A

LETTER AND SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P.O. Box 6Q
RICHMOND 23216

January 4, 1982

Jamie H. Brown
Coordinator of Social Studies
Albemarle County Schools
310 County Office Building
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Dear Jamie:

Currently, I am pursuing doctoral studies at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia in the area of supervision and administration. A final requirement of my doctoral work is the conception, development, and writing of a dissertation. The topic I have chosen for this endeavor is "An Analysis of Perceptions of the Role of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education in Virginia."

The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there are relationships between perceptions that local supervisors of social studies, junior high/middle/high school teachers of social studies, and building level principals hold concerning the role of local supervisors of social studies education. A study of this nature represents, for the first time in social studies in Virginia, an opportunity for supervisors, teachers, and building principals to provide input that may help to clarify the role function of supervisors toward the end of creating a stronger partnership between this supervisory team.

As a full-time supervisor of social studies your participation is crucial to the successful completion of this study. I would greatly appreciate your taking about fifteen minutes to complete the attached survey.

A 100% return rate is the goal of the supervisory population of this study. Please assist me in achieving this goal by completing and returning the questionnaire in the stamped self-addressed envelope on or before January 15, 1982. Thank you for your assistance with this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Elliott, Associate Director
Social Studies Service

TAE/mw
Enclosure

Control Number _____

Please return to:
Thomas A. Elliott
P. O. Box 60
Richmond, VA. 23216

PART I

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the one answer for each of the following questions that best describes your situation.

1. My sex is
 1. Male
 2. Female
2. My age is
 1. 26 or younger
 2. 27-35
 3. 36-44
 4. 45-54
 5. 55 or older
3. My race is
 1. Caucasian
 2. Black
 3. Indian
 4. Oriental
 5. Other
4. The level of my educational preparation is
 1. Bachelor's Degree
 2. Bachelor's Degree plus add'l courses
 3. Master's Degree
 4. Master's Degree plus add'l courses
 5. Specialist (Sixth Yr. Program or Degree)
 6. Specialist plus add'l courses
 7. Doctorate
 8. Doctorate plus add'l courses
5. The number of years (including this one) that I have served as a classroom teacher or as an administrator is
 1. 0-1
 2. 2-5
 3. 6-10
 4. 11-20
 5. more than 20
6. My teaching level or level of administration is
 1. Middle/Junior H.gh
 2. Secondary
 3. Social Studies Department Chairperson (Please check if you have served or currently serve as a department chairperson.)
7. The number of pupils in my school system is
 1. 0 - 2,499
 2. 2,500 - 4,999
 3. 5,000 - 14,999
 4. 15,000 - 24,999
 5. 25,000 or more
8. The demographic situation of the majority of students in my school system can best be described as
 1. Rural
 2. Small city or town
 3. Suburban
 4. Urban
9. During this past school year (including the summer of 1981), approximately how many direct contacts (interactions) as an individual or member of a group have you had with the supervisor of social studies for the express purpose of the improvement of instruction, learning, explanation of school policy, or teacher competence? Please respond in both categories.
- | Individual Contact(s) | | Group Contact(s) | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | |
10. Were the number of contacts you had with the social studies supervisor adequate?
 1. Yes
 2. No
11. Would you like to meet with the social studies supervisor
 1. More
 2. About the same as now
 3. Less
12. In general, I would rate my social studies supervisor's overall performance as
 1. Highly effective
 2. Effective
 3. Somewhat effective
 4. Somewhat ineffective
 5. Ineffective
 6. Highly ineffective

PART IIACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Directions: Listed below are 42 activities which are generally considered to be performed by local supervisors of social studies education. Not all tasks are performed by all supervisors, nor are they performed in the same frequency. Based upon your experience in working with local supervisors of social studies, please write the numeral in the blank in the LEFT COLUMN (Actual) beside each activity to indicate how frequently you think local supervisors of social studies perform each task according to the scale below. You may not know for sure whether or not local supervisors perform the task at all, or, if so, how often; however, your PERCEPTION of how frequently local supervisors of social studies perform the tasks is what is important - so please rate each task on the basis of your best judgment. Likewise, in the blank in the RIGHT COLUMN (Ideal), please rate each task in terms of the frequency you would prefer the task to be performed.

Scale: 1 = Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
<u>2</u>	Ex. 01. Arrange for teacher exchanges with community agencies	<u>5</u>
<u>4</u>	02. Write news releases for schools and area media	<u>4</u>

___	1. Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program	___
___	2. Interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons or teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies	___
___	3. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition	___
___	4. Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories of equipment	___
___	5. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division	___
___	6. Assist social studies teachers and principals in developing and implementing programs to meet the needs of various target groups including regular, disadvantaged, handicapped, gifted and talented, and students who have limited English-speaking ability.	___
___	7. Interpret and implement state or federal legislation that affect social studies education programs	___
___	8. Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local programs in social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators	___

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
___	9. Assist personnel director(s) and principal(s) in the appointment and placement of social studies education teachers	___
___	10. Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments	___
___	11. Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers	___
___	12. Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers	___
___	13. Confer with guidance counselors and school principals to interpret the social studies education program	___
___	14. Provide for appropriate equipment, instructional materials, and supplies	___
___	15. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning	___
___	16. Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities	___
___	17. Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas	___
___	18. Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries	___
___	19. Encourage integration of various history and social science club activities and projects as a co-curricular activity	___
___	20. Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff	___
___	21. Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies	___
___	22. Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs	___
___	23. Conduct or arrange for demonstration teaching	___
___	24. Visit social studies classrooms to observe teacher performance and classroom management skills	___
___	25. Follow-up classroom visitations with teacher conferences, offering suggestions, if needed	___
___	26. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques	___
___	27. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques	___

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
___	28. Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials	___
___	29. Maintain good morale among the social studies education teaching staff	___
___	30. Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences	___
___	31. Encourage and make provisions for teachers to share successful projects or practices with other teachers	___
___	32. Encourage teachers to join and participate in professional organizations in the area of social studies education	___
___	33. Arrange for extension classes from teacher-education institutions when a need is indicated	___
___	34. Encourage teacher participation in teacher-education programs and work toward higher degrees	___
___	35. Provide for and arrange in-service education programs and workshops in social studies education	___
___	36. Hold individual conferences with teachers who need or request assistance	___
___	37. Plan and conduct orientation programs for teachers new to the system	___
___	38. Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences	___
___	39. Encourage professional reading and provide up-to-date professional literature to be made available to teachers upon request	___
___	40. Prepare bulletins and other communications designed to keep teachers informed	___
___	41. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education	___
___	42. Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs	___

OTHER(S) - Please specify: _____

APPENDIX B

LETTER AND TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P.O. Box 60
RICHMOND 23216

January 6, 1982

Dear Social Studies Educator:

Currently, I am pursuing doctoral studies at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia in the area of supervision and administration. A final requirement of my doctoral work is the conception, development, and writing of a dissertation. The topic I have chosen for this endeavor is "An Analysis of Perceptions of the Role of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education in Virginia."

The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there are relationships between perceptions that local supervisors of social studies, junior high/middle/high school teachers of social studies, and building level principals hold concerning the role of local supervisors of social studies education. A study of this nature represents, for the first time in social studies in Virginia, an opportunity for supervisors, teachers, and building principals to provide input that may help to clarify the role function of supervisors toward the end of creating a stronger partnership between this supervisory team.

Using a systematic random sampling procedure of social studies teachers in local school divisions with full-time social studies supervisors, you were selected to participate in this study. I would greatly appreciate your taking about fifteen minutes to complete the attached survey.

A high return rate is the goal of the teacher population of this study. Please assist me in achieving this goal by completing and returning the questionnaire in the stamped self-addressed envelope on or before January 20, 1982. Thank you for your assistance with this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Elliott, Associate Director
Social Studies Service

TAE/dc
Enclosure

Control Number _____

Please return to:
 Thomas A. Elliott
 P. O. Box 60
 Richmond, VA. 23216

PART IDESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the one answer for each of the following questions that best describes your situation.

1. My sex is
 1. Male
 2. Female
2. My age is
 1. 26 or younger
 2. 27-35
 3. 36-44
 4. 45-54
 5. 55 or older
3. My race is
 1. Caucasian
 2. Black
 3. Indian
 4. Oriental
 5. Other
4. The level of my educational preparation is
 1. Bachelor's Degree
 2. Bachelor's Degree plus add'l courses
 3. Master's Degree
 4. Master's Degree plus add'l courses
 5. Specialist (Sixth Yr. Program or Degree)
 6. Specialist plus add'l courses
 7. Doctorate
 8. Doctorate plus add'l courses
5. The number of years (including this one) that I have served as a classroom teacher or as an administrator is
 1. 0-1
 2. 2-5
 3. 6-10
 4. 11-20
 5. more than 20
6. My teaching level or level of administration is
 1. Middle/Junior High
 2. Secondary
 3. Social Studies Department Chairperson (Please check if you have served or currently serve as a department chairperson.)
7. The number of pupils in my school system is
 1. 0 - 2,499
 2. 2,500 - 4,999
 3. 5,000 - 14,999
 4. 15,000 - 24,999
 5. 25,000 or more
8. The demographic situation of the majority of students in my school system can best be described as
 1. Rural
 2. Small city or town
 3. Suburban
 4. Urban
9. During this past school year (including the summer of 1981), approximately how many direct contacts (interactions) as an individual or member of a group have you had with the supervisor of social studies for the express purpose of the improvement of instruction, learning, explanation of school policy, or teacher competence? Please respond in both categories.
- | Individual Contact(s) | | Group Contact(s) | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | |
10. Were the number of contacts you had with the social studies supervisor adequate?
 1. Yes
 2. No
11. Would you like to meet with the social studies supervisor
 1. More
 2. About the same as now
 3. Less
12. In general, I would rate my social studies supervisor's overall performance as
 1. Highly effective
 2. Effective
 3. Somewhat effective
 4. Somewhat ineffective
 5. Ineffective
 6. Highly ineffective

PART IIACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Directions: Listed below are 42 activities which are generally considered to be performed by local supervisors of social studies education. Not all tasks are performed by all supervisors, nor are they performed in the same frequency. Based upon your experience in working with local supervisors of social studies, please write the numeral in the blank in the LEFT COLUMN (Actual) beside each activity to indicate how frequently you think local supervisors of social studies perform each task according to the scale below. You may not know for sure whether or not local supervisors perform the task at all, or, if so, how often; however, your PERCEPTION of how frequently local supervisors of social studies perform the tasks is what is important - so please rate each task on the basis of your best judgment. Likewise, in the blank in the RIGHT COLUMN (Ideal), please rate each task in terms of the frequency you would prefer the task to be performed.

Scale: 1 = Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
<u>2</u>	Ex. 01. Arrange for teacher exchanges with community agencies	<u>5</u>
<u>4</u>	02. Write news releases for schools and area media	<u>4</u>

___	1. Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program	___
___	2. Interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons or teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies	___
___	3. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition	___
___	4. Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories of equipment	___
___	5. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division	___
___	6. Assist social studies teachers and principals in developing and implementing programs to meet the needs of various target groups including regular, disadvantaged, handicapped, gifted and talented, and students who have limited English-speaking ability.	___
___	7. Interpret and implement state or federal legislation that affect social studies education programs	___
___	8. Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local programs in social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators	___

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)

(Ideal)

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| ___ | 9. Assist personnel director(s) and principal(s) in the appointment and placement of social studies education teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 10. Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments | ___ |
| ___ | 11. Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 12. Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 13. Confer with guidance counselors and school principals to interpret the social studies education program | ___ |
| ___ | 14. Provide for appropriate equipment, instructional materials, and supplies | ___ |
| ___ | 15. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning | ___ |
| ___ | 16. Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities | ___ |
| ___ | 17. Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas | ___ |
| ___ | 18. Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries | ___ |
| ___ | 19. Encourage integration of various history and social science club activities and projects as a co-curricular activity | ___ |
| ___ | 20. Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff | ___ |
| ___ | 21. Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies | ___ |
| ___ | 22. Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs | ___ |
| ___ | 23. Conduct or arrange for demonstration teaching | ___ |
| ___ | 24. Visit social studies classrooms to observe teacher performance and classroom management skills | ___ |
| ___ | 25. Follow-up classroom visitations with teacher conferences, offering suggestions, if needed | ___ |
| ___ | 26. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques | ___ |
| ___ | 27. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques | ___ |

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)

(Ideal)

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| — | 28. Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials | — |
| — | 29. Maintain good morale among the social studies education teaching staff | — |
| — | 30. Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences | — |
| — | 31. Encourage and make provisions for teachers to share successful projects or practices with other teachers | — |
| — | 32. Encourage teachers to join and participate in professional organizations in the area of social studies education | — |
| — | 33. Arrange for extension classes from teacher-education institutions when a need is indicated | — |
| — | 34. Encourage teacher participation in teacher-education programs and work toward higher degrees | — |
| — | 35. Provide for and arrange in-service education programs and workshops in social studies education | — |
| — | 36. Hold individual conferences with teachers who need or request assistance | — |
| — | 37. Plan and conduct orientation programs for teachers new to the system | — |
| — | 38. Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences | — |
| — | 39. Encourage professional reading and provide up-to-date professional literature to be made available to teachers upon request | — |
| — | 40. Prepare bulletins and other communications designed to keep teachers informed | — |
| — | 41. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education | — |
| — | 42. Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs | — |

OTHER(S) - Please specify: _____

APPENDIX C

LETTER AND PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P.O. Box 60
RICHMOND 23216

January 6, 1982

Dear Principal:

Currently, I am pursuing doctoral studies at Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia in the area of supervision and administration. A final requirement of my doctoral work is the conception, development, and writing of a dissertation. The topic I have chosen for this endeavor is "An Analysis of Perceptions of the Role of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education in Virginia."

The primary purpose of this study is to determine whether or not there are relationships between perceptions that local supervisors of social studies, junior high/middle/high school teachers of social studies, and building level principals hold concerning the role of local supervisors of social studies education. A study of this nature represents, for the first time in social studies in Virginia, an opportunity for supervisors, teachers, and building principals to provide input that may help to clarify the role function of supervisors toward the end of creating a stronger partnership between this supervisory team.

Using a systematic random sampling procedure of building principals in local school divisions with full-time social studies supervisors, you were selected to participate in this study. I would greatly appreciate your taking fifteen minutes to complete the attached survey.

A high return rate is the goal of the principal population of this study. Please assist me in achieving this goal by completing and returning the questionnaire in the stamped self-addressed envelope on or before January 20, 1982. Thank you for your assistance with this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Elliott, Associate Director
Social Studies Service

TAE/dc
Enclosure

Control Number _____

Please return to:
 Thomas A. Elliott
 P. O. Box 60
 Richmond, VA. 23216

PART I

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

Directions: Please check the one answer for each of the following questions that best describes your situation.

1. My sex is
 1. Male
 2. Female
2. My age is
 1. 26 or younger
 2. 27-35
 3. 36-44
 4. 45-54
 5. 55 or older
3. My race is
 1. Caucasian
 2. Black
 3. Indian
 4. Oriental
 5. Other
4. The level of my educational preparation is
 1. Bachelor's Degree
 2. Bachelor's Degree plus add'l courses
 3. Master's Degree
 4. Master's Degree plus add'l courses
 5. Specialist (Sixth Yr. Program or Degree)
 6. Specialist plus add'l courses
 7. Doctorate
 8. Doctorate plus add'l courses
5. The number of years (including this one) that I have served as a classroom teacher or as an administrator is
 1. 0-1
 2. 2-5
 3. 6-10
 4. 11-20
 5. more than 20
6. My teaching level or level of administration is
 1. Middle/Junior H.gh
 2. Secondary
 3. Social Studies Department Chairperson (Please check if you have served or currently serve as a department chairperson.)
7. The number of pupils in my school system is
 1. 0 - 2,499
 2. 2,500 - 4,999
 3. 5,000 - 14,999
 4. 15,000 - 24,999
 5. 25,000 or more
8. The demographic situation of the majority of students in my school system can best be described as
 1. Rural
 2. Small city or town
 3. Suburban
 4. Urban
9. During this past school year (including the summer of 1981), approximately how many direct contacts (interactions) as an individual or member of a group have you had with the supervisor of social studies for the express purpose of the improvement of instruction, learning, explanation of school policy, or teacher competence? Please respond in both categories.
- | Individual Contact(s) | | Group Contact(s) | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. 0 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. 7-8 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. 1-2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6. 9-10 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. 3-4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7. 11 or more |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. 5-6 | |
10. Were the number of contacts you had with the social studies supervisor adequate?
 1. Yes
 2. No
11. Would you like to meet with the social studies supervisor
 1. More
 2. About the same as now
 3. Less
12. In general, I would rate my social studies supervisor's overall performance as
 1. Highly effective
 2. Effective
 3. Somewhat effective
 4. Somewhat ineffective
 5. Ineffective
 6. Highly ineffective

ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF
LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Directions: Listed below are 42 activities which are generally considered to be performed by local supervisors of social studies education. Not all tasks are performed by all supervisors, nor are they performed in the same frequency. Based upon your experience in working with local supervisors of social studies, please write the numeral in the blank in the LEFT COLUMN (Actual) beside each activity to indicate how frequently you think local supervisors of social studies perform each task according to the scale below. You may not know for sure whether or not local supervisors perform the task at all, or, if so, how often; however, your PERCEPTION of how frequently local supervisors of social studies perform the tasks is what is important - so please rate each task on the basis of your best judgment. Likewise, in the blank in the RIGHT COLUMN (Ideal), please rate each task in terms of the frequency you would prefer the task to be performed.

Scale: 1 = Never
2 = Rarely
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
<u>2</u>	Ex. 01. Arrange for teacher exchanges with community agencies	<u>5</u>
<u>4</u>	02. Write news releases for schools and area media	<u>4</u>

___	1. Recommend and participate in the formulation of local administrative policies that affect the operation of the social studies education program	___
___	2. Interpret general administrative policies to social studies department chairpersons or teachers to obtain uniform understanding of policies	___
___	3. Assume responsibility for seeing that equipment is kept in operable condition	___
___	4. Assume responsibility for keeping up-to-date inventories of equipment	___
___	5. Prepare and update local annual and long range plans for social studies education as an integral part of the total educational program in your division	___
___	6. Assist social studies teachers and principals in developing and implementing programs to meet the needs of various target groups including regular, disadvantaged, handicapped, gifted and talented, and students who have limited English-speaking ability.	___
___	7. Interpret and implement state or federal legislation that affect social studies education programs	___
___	8. Prepare or assist in preparing reports concerning the status of local programs in social studies education as required by the state or local school administrators	___

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)

(Ideal)

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| ___ | 9. Assist personnel director(s) and principal(s) in the appointment and placement of social studies education teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 10. Assist principals in the selection of department heads for social studies departments | ___ |
| ___ | 11. Assist in the evaluation of social studies education teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 12. Assist supervising teachers in planning for and working with student teachers | ___ |
| ___ | 13. Confer with guidance counselors and school principals to interpret the social studies education program | ___ |
| ___ | 14. Provide for appropriate equipment, instructional materials, and supplies | ___ |
| ___ | 15. Review, evaluate, and recommend textbooks, supplementary books, films, filmstrips, recordings, and other aids to learning | ___ |
| ___ | 16. Assist in the planning of new and renovation of existing social studies education classroom facilities | ___ |
| ___ | 17. Visit social studies education classrooms in other school systems for new and innovative ideas | ___ |
| ___ | 18. Perform routine administrative duties such as answering correspondence and telephone inquiries | ___ |
| ___ | 19. Encourage integration of various history and social science club activities and projects as a co-curricular activity | ___ |
| ___ | 20. Assist in planning and conducting research projects in cooperation with local school personnel and with the state supervisory staff | ___ |
| ___ | 21. Assist teachers in selecting and using effective instructional strategies | ___ |
| ___ | 22. Assist teachers in developing measurable goals and standards for all social studies education programs | ___ |
| ___ | 23. Conduct or arrange for demonstration teaching | ___ |
| ___ | 24. Visit social studies classrooms to observe teacher performance and classroom management skills | ___ |
| ___ | 25. Follow-up classroom visitations with teacher conferences, offering suggestions, if needed | ___ |
| ___ | 26. Arrange inter-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques | ___ |
| ___ | 27. Arrange intra-system visitations by teachers to observe new or promising practices and techniques | ___ |

Scale: 1 = Never
 2 = Rarely
 3 = Sometimes
 4 = Often
 5 = Frequently

(Actual)		(Ideal)
_____	28. Assist in examining, revising, and developing courses of study and other curricular materials	_____
_____	29. Maintain good morale among the social studies education teaching staff	_____
_____	30. Encourage and provide opportunities for teachers to attend local, regional, and state meetings and conferences	_____
_____	31. Encourage and make provisions for teachers to share successful projects or practices with other teachers	_____
_____	32. Encourage teachers to join and participate in professional organizations in the area of social studies education	_____
_____	33. Arrange for extension classes from teacher-education institutions when a need is indicated	_____
_____	34. Encourage teacher participation in teacher-education programs and work toward higher degrees	_____
_____	35. Provide for and arrange in-service education programs and workshops in social studies education	_____
_____	36. Hold individual conferences with teachers who need or request assistance	_____
_____	37. Plan and conduct orientation programs for teachers new to the system	_____
_____	38. Attend local, state, regional, and national professional meetings and conferences	_____
_____	39. Encourage professional reading and provide up-to-date professional literature to be made available to teachers upon request	_____
_____	40. Prepare bulletins and other communications designed to keep teachers informed	_____
_____	41. Work cooperatively with the members of the Social Studies Service, Department of Education, and other personnel of the Department of Education	_____
_____	42. Perform other administrative or supervisory tasks unrelated to social studies education programs	_____
	OTHER(S) - Please specify: _____	

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P.O. Box 60

RICHMOND 23216

January 22, 1982

Dear Survey Participant:

On January 6, 1982, a copy of a survey instrument titled Activities and Responsibilities of Local Supervisors of Social Studies Education was forwarded to you with a return stamped self-addressed envelope. The letter accompanying the survey requested that you complete and return the questionnaire on or before January 20, 1982. As a high return rate is necessary for the successful completion of the study of which your survey data is a major part, it is essential to the study that I receive your completed questionnaire on or before January 29.

For your convenience, another survey instrument and a stamped self-addressed envelope for returning the questionnaire are enclosed. Please take fifteen minutes and complete and return your survey on or before January 29.

The completed survey to be received from you will greatly assist me in completing a final requirement for the Doctor of Education degree at Virginia Tech. Further, the results of the study should assist social studies supervisory personnel in Virginia in clarifying the role function of supervisors toward the end of creating a stronger partnership between teachers, principals, and supervisors.

I look forward to hearing from you on or before January 29.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Elliott, Associate Director
Social Studies Service

TAE/ch
Enclosure

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL
SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE AS REPORTED BY SUPERVISORS,
TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL SUPERVISORY PERFORMANCE
ON FORTY-TWO SELECTED SUPERVISORY ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY
SUPERVISORS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS^a

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
1	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	5(25)	7(35)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	9(3)	46(15)	94(30)	115(36)	52(16)	316
		Principals	4(3)	16(11)	50(33)	51(34)	28(19)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	6(30)	14(70)	20
		Teachers	2(1)	8(3)	42(13)	126(40)	136(43)	314
		Principals	0(0)	6(4)	15(10)	72(49)	54(37)	147
2	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	7(35)	5(25)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	15(5)	49(15)	100(31)	92(29)	62(20)	318
		Principals	6(4)	21(14)	49(32)	37(25)	37(25)	150
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	6(30)	12(60)	20
		Teachers	3(1)	6(2)	46(14)	125(40)	134(43)	314
		Principals	2(1)	10(7)	16(11)	56(37)	65(44)	149
3	Actual	Supervisors	7(35)	7(35)	4(20)	2(10)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	115(37)	98(31)	55(18)	35(11)	10(3)	313
		Principals	37(25)	62(41)	35(23)	13(9)	3(2)	150
	Ideal	Supervisors	6(30)	6(30)	7(35)	1(5)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	52(17)	41(13)	85(27)	87(28)	45(15)	310
		Principals	20(13)	44(30)	39(26)	32(22)	14(9)	149
4	Actual	Supervisors	8(40)	3(15)	4(20)	4(20)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	109(36)	78(25)	44(14)	44(14)	22(7)	307
		Principals	49(33)	55(37)	13(8)	13(8)	8(5)	150
	Ideal	Supervisors	7(35)	4(20)	3(15)	3(15)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	61(20)	36(12)	65(21)	93(30)	53(17)	308
		Principals	33(22)	34(23)	27(18)	35(24)	20(13)	149
5	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	4(20)	7(35)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	11(4)	45(14)	76(24)	116(37)	67(21)	315
		Principals	4(3)	13(9)	42(28)	59(39)	32(21)	150
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	7(37)	11(58)	20
		Teachers	0(0)	3(1)	41(13)	124(40)	144(46)	312
		Principals	0(0)	2(1)	9(6)	58(39)	80(54)	149
6	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	7(35)	5(25)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	41(14)	72(23)	120(38)	51(16)	29(9)	313
		Principals	5(3)	37(25)	57(38)	34(23)	17(11)	150
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	5(25)	14(70)	20
		Teachers	3(1)	4(1)	62(20)	135(43)	109(35)	313
		Principals	1(1)	3(2)	16(11)	63(42)	65(44)	148
7	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	1(5)	3(15)	5(25)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	32(10)	65(21)	99(32)	71(23)	43(14)	310
		Principals	11(7)	28(19)	52(35)	38(26)	20(13)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	6(30)	13(65)	20
		Teachers	4(1)	11(3)	73(24)	117(38)	105(34)	310
		Principals	1(1)	8(5)	33(22)	59(39)	59(39)	150

APPENDIX E (continued)

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
8	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	3(15)	2(10)	7(35)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	18(6)	46(15)	75(24)	99(32)	70(23)	308
		Principals	3(2)	17(11)	47(32)	54(37)	27(18)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	2(10)	6(30)	11(55)	20
		Teachers	1(1)	13(4)	67(22)	116(37)	113(36)	310
		Principals	0(0)	6(4)	27(18)	63(42)	53(36)	149
9	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	3(15)	7(35)	4(20)	4(20)	20
		Teachers	60(19)	86(28)	92(29)	56(18)	19(6)	313
		Principals	16(11)	41(28)	38(26)	30(20)	23(15)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	0(0)	7(35)	12(60)	20
		Teachers	28(9)	23(7)	85(27)	94(30)	83(27)	313
		Principals	5(3)	21(14)	36(24)	48(33)	39(26)	149
10	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	5(25)	5(25)	5(25)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	97(32)	74(24)	71(23)	45(15)	18(6)	305
		Principals	27(18)	38(26)	46(31)	17(11)	20(14)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	9(45)	11(55)	20
		Teachers	52(17)	20(6)	70(23)	93(30)	75(24)	310
		Principals	17(11)	17(11)	53(36)	29(20)	32(22)	148
11	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	5(25)	6(30)	2(10)	5(25)	20
		Teachers	80(26)	71(23)	83(26)	47(15)	32(10)	313
		Principals	27(18)	36(24)	48(32)	23(16)	15(10)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	3(15)	3(15)	1(5)	7(35)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	42(14)	15(5)	85(27)	93(30)	76(24)	311
		Principals	10(7)	6(4)	43(29)	48(32)	42(28)	149
12	Actual	Supervisors	5(25)	6(30)	7(25)	1(5)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	109(36)	89(30)	71(24)	25(8)	7(2)	301
		Principals	32(22)	51(35)	49(33)	11(7)	5(3)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	1(5)	0(0)	5(25)	8(40)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	21(7)	23(8)	95(31)	106(35)	59(19)	304
		Principals	4(3)	13(9)	47(31)	55(37)	30(20)	149
13	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	4(20)	7(35)	6(30)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	67(22)	103(33)	95(31)	34(11)	10(3)	309
		Principals	16(11)	43(29)	61(41)	20(13)	9(6)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	7(35)	11(55)	20
		Teachers	9(3)	17(5)	102(33)	120(39)	63(20)	311
		Principals	1(1)	7(5)	41(27)	65(44)	35(23)	149
14	Actual	Supervisors	1(5)	3(15)	4(20)	5(25)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	35(11)	55(17)	96(31)	79(25)	49(16)	314
		Principals	5(4)	20(13)	64(43)	40(27)	20(13)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	1(5)	0(0)	3(15)	5(25)	11(55)	20
		Teachers	9(3)	8(3)	48(15)	113(36)	135(43)	313
		Principals	1(1)	8(5)	24(16)	68(46)	48(32)	149

APPENDIX E (continued)

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
15	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)	8(40)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	19(6)	47(15)	79(25)	95(30)	76(24)	316
		Principals	1(1)	10(7)	30(20)	60(40)	48(32)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	2(10)	16(80)	20
		Teachers	2(10)	6(2)	52(16)	114(36)	140(45)	314
		Principals	0(0)	1(1)	9(6)	48(32)	91(61)	149
16	Actual	Supervisors	6(30)	8(40)	2(10)	4(20)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	78(25)	77(25)	88(29)	40(13)	26(8)	309
		Principals	23(16)	42(29)	48(33)	23(16)	10(6)	146
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	8(40)	6(30)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	13(40)	14(5)	105(34)	100(32)	78(25)	310
		Principals	5(3)	15(10)	50(34)	53(36)	25(17)	148
17	Actual	Supervisors	5(25)	9(45)	5(25)	1(15)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	51(17)	98(32)	99(33)	37(12)	19(6)	304
		Principals	12(8)	51(35)	64(44)	13(9)	7(4)	147
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	7(35)	5(25)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	3(1)	8(3)	119(38)	105(34)	74(24)	309
		Principals	2(1)	6(4)	67(46)	43(29)	30(20)	148
18	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)	17(85)	20
		Teachers	20(6)	36(12)	93(30)	91(30)	67(22)	307
		Principals	6(4)	13(9)	51(34)	45(30)	34(23)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	2(10)	7(35)	10(50)	20
		Teachers	8(3)	29(9)	86(28)	95(31)	88(29)	306
		Principals	4(3)	8(5)	50(34)	49(33)	37(25)	148
19	Actual	Supervisors	4(20)	10(50)	1(5)	4(20)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	90(29)	98(32)	67(22)	33(11)	19(6)	307
		Principals	32(22)	54(36)	44(30)	11(7)	7(5)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	2(10)	2(10)	6(30)	8(40)	2(10)	20
		Teachers	18(6)	30(10)	128(42)	88(29)	41(13)	305
		Principals	2(1)	19(13)	60(40)	48(32)	20(14)	149
20	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	5(25)	11(55)	2(10)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	43(14)	95(31)	97(32)	48(16)	20(7)	303
		Principals	10(7)	48(33)	62(43)	22(15)	3(2)	145
	Ideal	Supervisors	1(5)	0(0)	8(40)	10(50)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	14(5)	20(6)	122(40)	98(32)	51(17)	305
		Principals	2(1)	11(7)	76(52)	41(28)	17(12)	147
21	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	5(25)	10(50)	5(25)	20
		Teachers	40(13)	80(25)	104(33)	57(18)	35(11)	316
		Principals	6(4)	27(18)	58(39)	36(24)	22(15)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	6(30)	14(70)	20
		Teachers	8(3)	3(1)	82(26)	124(40)	95(30)	312
		Principals	0(0)	1(1)	15(10)	68(46)	65(43)	149

APPENDIX E (continued)

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
22	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	3(15)	6(30)	9(45)	2(10)	20
		Teachers	33(11)	57(18)	107(34)	64(20)	54(17)	315
		Principals	7(5)	21(14)	55(37)	41(27)	25(17)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)	6(30)	11(55)	20
		Teachers	10(3)	8(3)	81(26)	109(35)	103(33)	311
		Principals	1(1)	1(1)	14(9)	55(37)	78(52)	149
23	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	7(35)	11(55)	1(5)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	82(27)	92(29)	95(30)	29(9)	14(5)	313
		Principals	21(14)	50(33)	55(37)	16(11)	7(5)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	4(20)	6(30)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	7(3)	15(5)	134(43)	104(33)	51(16)	311
		Principals	2(1)	5(3)	38(26)	66(44)	38(26)	149
24	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	8(40)	3(15)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	39(12)	94(30)	113(36)	39(12)	30(10)	315
		Principals	8(5)	38(26)	66(44)	21(14)	16(11)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	2(10)	16(80)	20
		Teachers	10(3)	17(5)	131(42)	98(31)	57(18)	313
		Principals	1(1)	4(3)	29(19)	53(35)	62(42)	151
25	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	8(40)	3(15)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	70(22)	88(28)	80(26)	39(12)	30(10)	315
		Principals	10(7)	35(24)	46(31)	23(15)	34(23)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	2(10)	17(85)	20
		Teachers	9(3)	14(5)	100(32)	104(33)	85(27)	312
		Principals	1(1)	3(2)	19(13)	54(36)	72(48)	149
26	Actual	Supervisors	6(30)	8(40)	4(20)	2(10)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	116(37)	93(30)	75(24)	20(7)	7(2)	311
		Principals	24(16)	66(45)	43(29)	8(6)	6(4)	147
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	6(30)	4(20)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	9(3)	19(6)	134(43)	82(26)	69(22)	313
		Principals	2(1)	9(6)	57(38)	57(38)	24(17)	149
27	Actual	Supervisors	6(30)	9(45)	4(20)	1(5)	0(0)	20
		Teachers	127(41)	91(30)	56(18)	19(6)	14(5)	307
		Principals	25(17)	66(45)	44(30)	7(4)	6(4)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	8(40)	3(15)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	12(4)	17(6)	121(39)	90(29)	68(22)	308
		Principals	3(2)	9(6)	60(40)	50(34)	27(18)	149
28	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	3(15)	7(35)	10(50)	20
		Teachers	14(4)	43(14)	90(28)	109(35)	60(19)	316
		Principals	3(2)	16(11)	42(28)	58(39)	30(20)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	5(25)	14(70)	20
		Teachers	2(1)	3(1)	65(21)	123(39)	119(38)	312
		Principals	0(0)	4(3)	18(12)	61(41)	66(44)	149

APPENDIX E (continued)

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
29	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	4(20)	8(40)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	41(13)	64(20)	99(32)	57(18)	53(17)	314
		Principals	7(4)	26(18)	65(44)	26(18)	24(16)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	2(10)	4(20)	13(65)	20
		Teachers	3(1)	8(3)	54(17)	114(36)	135(43)	314
		Principals	0(0)	4(3)	21(14)	47(31)	77(52)	149
30	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	3(15)	8(40)	3(15)	6(30)	20
		Teachers	28(9)	70(22)	90(29)	80(25)	47(15)	315
		Principals	5(3)	26(17)	65(44)	38(26)	15(10)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	4(20)	15(75)	20
		Teachers	1(10)	6(2)	77(25)	132(43)	94(30)	310
		Principals	0(0)	4(3)	27(18)	76(51)	42(28)	149
31	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	12(60)	5(25)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	38(12)	71(23)	113(36)	52(16)	41(13)	315
		Principals	5(3)	32(22)	64(46)	21(14)	22(15)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	1(5)	9(45)	10(50)	20
		Teachers	0(0)	6(2)	86(28)	133(42)	88(28)	313
		Principals	0(0)	2(1)	27(18)	59(40)	61(41)	149
32	Actual	Supervisors	1(5)	2(10)	1(5)	12(60)	4(20)	20
		Teachers	63(20)	77(24)	69(22)	69(22)	39(12)	317
		Principals	6(4)	39(26)	49(33)	41(28)	13(9)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	2(10)	7(35)	10(50)	20
		Teachers	15(5)	22(7)	106(34)	108(34)	63(20)	314
		Principals	3(2)	7(5)	30(20)	63(42)	46(31)	149
33	Actual	Supervisors	1(5)	4(20)	8(40)	5(25)	2(10)	20
		Teachers	60(19)	64(21)	78(25)	59(19)	48(16)	309
		Principals	10(7)	38(25)	64(42)	24(16)	15(10)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	5(25)	7(35)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	4(1)	12(4)	99(32)	111(36)	85(27)	311
		Principals	0(0)	7(5)	54(36)	50(34)	38(26)	151
34	Actual	Supervisors	2(10)	2(10)	9(45)	3(15)	4(20)	20
		Teachers	69(22)	69(22)	94(30)	53(17)	31(9)	316
		Principals	9(6)	45(30)	64(43)	19(13)	12(8)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	4(20)	7(35)	7(35)	20
		Teachers	13(4)	16(5)	111(36)	104(30)	68(22)	312
		Principals	1(1)	7(5)	44(29)	57(38)	40(27)	149
35	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	4(20)	7(35)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	15(5)	35(11)	87(27)	100(32)	80(25)	317
		Principals	6(4)	14(9)	50(34)	49(33)	30(20)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	2(10)	16(80)	20
		Teachers	1(1)	11(4)	82(26)	120(38)	98(31)	312
		Principals	0(0)	0(0)	31(21)	52(35)	66(44)	149

APPENDIX E (continued)

Activity Number	Performance	Ranked by	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Frequently	No. of Cases
36	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	5(25)	10(50)	5(25)	20
		Teachers	35(11)	74(24)	76(25)	75(24)	50(16)	310
		Principals	7(5)	23(15)	50(34)	40(27)	29(19)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	5(25)	13(65)	20
		Teachers	2(1)	7(2)	74(24)	108(34)	121(39)	312
		Principals	1(1)	2(1)	22(15)	54(36)	70(47)	149
37	Actual	Supervisors	4(20)	4(20)	5(25)	4(20)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	63(20)	67(22)	67(22)	62(20)	49(16)	308
		Principals	16(11)	29(20)	54(36)	30(20)	19(13)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	1(5)	1(5)	2(10)	7(35)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	7(2)	13(4)	68(22)	114(37)	108(35)	310
		Principals	1(1)	2(1)	29(20)	60(40)	57(38)	149
38	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	7(35)	9(45)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	14(5)	30(10)	94(31)	81(27)	82(27)	301
		Principals	2(2)	13(9)	58(39)	47(32)	28(19)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	8(40)	12(60)	20
		Teachers	7(3)	7(2)	79(26)	108(35)	108(35)	309
		Principals	1(1)	3(2)	34(23)	64(43)	47(30)	149
39	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	4(20)	8(40)	7(35)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	41(13)	62(20)	104(33)	76(24)	33(10)	316
		Principals	6(4)	24(16)	62(42)	40(27)	17(11)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	2(10)	9(45)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	3(1)	7(2)	84(27)	127(40)	93(30)	314
		Principals	0(0)	3(2)	24(16)	66(44)	56(38)	149
40	Actual	Supervisors	1(5)	2(10)	8(40)	6(30)	3(15)	20
		Teachers	62(20)	64(20)	95(30)	51(16)	44(14)	316
		Principals	10(7)	32(21)	62(42)	29(19)	16(11)	149
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	1(5)	9(45)	9(45)	20
		Teachers	2(1)	8(3)	77(24)	125(40)	102(32)	314
		Principals	1(1)	2(1)	31(21)	69(46)	46(31)	149
41	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	2(10)	3(15)	7(35)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	13(4)	14(5)	84(28)	122(40)	69(23)	302
		Principals	4(3)	11(7)	49(33)	55(37)	29(20)	148
	Ideal	Supervisors	0(0)	0(0)	4(20)	3(15)	13(65)	20
		Teachers	2(1)	2(1)	47(15)	124(40)	134(43)	309
		Principals	0(0)	1(1)	25(17)	67(45)	56(37)	149
42	Actual	Supervisors	0(0)	1(5)	3(15)	8(40)	8(40)	20
		Teachers	40(14)	45(15)	94(32)	72(25)	41(14)	292
		Principals	12(8)	33(23)	60(41)	20(14)	20(14)	145
	Ideal	Supervisors	2(10)	5(25)	7(35)	5(25)	1(5)	20
		Teachers	45(15)	57(19)	86(29)	51(17)	58(20)	297
		Principals	7(5)	37(26)	60(42)	20(14)	19(13)	143

^aNumbers in parentheses are percentages and are rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX F

COMPARISON OF ACTUAL AND IDEAL FREQUENCIES BETWEEN
SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORS AND TEACHERS

APPENDIX F
COMPARISON OF ACTUAL FREQUENCIES BETWEEN
SUPERVISORS AND TEACHERS

Activity Number	t Value	df	Significance
1	2.1742	334.0	0.0304*
2	2.4466	336.0	0.0149*
3	-0.3017	331.0	0.7631
4	0.0926	325.0	0.9263
5	2.1002	333.0	0.0365*
6	3.4555	331.0	0.0006*
7	2.9404	328.0	0.0035*
8	1.8309	326.0	0.0680
9	2.2661	331.0	0.0241*
10	2.4978	323.0	0.0130*
11	1.7867	331.0	0.0749
12	0.9772	319.0	0.3292
13	4.1249	327.0	0.0001*
14	1.9043	332.0	0.0577
15	2.9446	334.0	0.0035*
16	-1.2145	327.0	0.2254
17	-1.9559	322.0	0.0513
18	5.2957	325.0	0.0001*
19	0.2722	325.0	0.7856
20	-0.1717	321.0	0.8638
21	4.1565	334.0	0.0001*
22	1.2489	333.0	0.2126
23	1.7637	331.0	0.0787
24	5.1053	333.0	0.0001*
25	4.9054	331.0	0.0001*
26	0.1499	329.0	0.8809
27	-0.1147	325.0	0.9088
28	3.4582	334.0	0.0006*
29	2.9481	332.0	0.0034*
30	1.6418	333.0	0.1016
31	1.0887	333.0	0.2771
32	3.2610	335.0	0.0012*
33	0.7985	327.0	0.4252
34	1.8756	334.0	0.0616
35	1.8990	335.0	0.0584
36	3.1726	328.0	0.0017*
37	0.0226	326.0	0.9819
38	0.3080	319.0	0.7583
39	0.9602	334.0	0.3377
40	1.8722	334.0	0.0621
41	1.3867	320.0	0.1665
42	3.7618	310.0	0.0002*

*Significant at .05 level.

APPENDIX F (continued)
 COMPARISON OF ACTUAL FREQUENCIES BETWEEN
 SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	<u>t</u> Value	df	Significance
1	-1.8726	167.0	0.0629
2	-1.9741	168.0	0.0500
3	0.7257	168.0	0.4690
4	-0.6370	168.0	0.5250
5	-1.7943	168.0	0.0746
6	-2.5049	168.0	0.0132*
7	-2.6139	167.0	0.0098*
8	-1.7966	166.0	0.0742
9	-0.7755	166.0	0.4392
10	-1.1189	166.0	0.2648
11	-1.3606	167.0	0.1755
12	0.0611	166.0	0.9513
13	-2.6778	167.0	0.0082*
14	-1.5017	167.0	0.1351
15	-1.5463	167.0	0.1239
16	1.8389	164.0	0.0677
17	2.6298	165.0	0.0094*
18	-5.2636	167.0	0.0001*
19	-0.1115	166.0	0.9113
20	0.3571	163.0	0.7215
21	-2.9843	167.0	0.0033*
22	-0.4968	167.0	0.6200
23	-0.9174	167.0	0.3602
24	-4.3731	167.0	0.0001*
25	-2.8035	166.0	0.0057*
26	1.1401	165.0	0.2559
27	1.5349	166.0	0.1267
28	-3.0790	167.0	0.0024*
29	-2.6580	166.0	0.0086*
30	-1.6531	167.0	0.1002
31	-0.4014	167.0	0.6887
32	-2.8248	166.0	0.0053*
33	-0.7105	167.0	0.4784
34	-1.5849	167.0	0.1149
35	-2.2173	167.0	0.0279*
36	-2.3128	167.0	0.0220*
37	0.5202	166.0	0.6036
38	-0.5393	166.0	0.5904
39	0.0216	167.0	0.9828
40	-1.3539	167.0	0.1776
41	-1.7892	166.0	0.0754
42	-4.3232	163.0	0.0001*

*Significant at .05 level.

APPENDIX F (continued)
 COMPARISON OF IDEAL FREQUENCIES BETWEEN
 SUPERVISORS AND TEACHERS

Activity Number	t Value	df	Significance
1	2.5322	332.0	0.0118*
2	1.5074	332.0	0.1327
3	-3.2527	328.0	0.0013*
4	-1.8287	326.0	0.0684
5	1.2551	329.0	0.2103
6	2.9628	331.0	0.0033*
7	2.9257	328.0	0.0037*
8	1.4521	328.0	0.1474
9	3.3633	331.0	0.0009*
10	3.8002	328.0	0.0002*
11	0.1022	329.0	0.9187
12	1.4922	322.0	0.1366
13	3.5575	329.0	0.0004*
14	0.4890	331.0	0.6252
15	2.5040	332.0	0.0128*
16	0.8636	328.0	0.3885
17	0.6223	327.0	0.5342
18	2.3230	324.0	0.0208*
19	-0.1724	323.0	0.8633
20	0.0072	323.0	0.9943
21	3.6551	330.0	0.0003*
22	2.1141	329.0	0.0353*
23	2.0608	329.0	0.0401*
24	5.2544	331.0	0.0001*
25	4.5710	330.0	0.0001*
26	1.3739	331.0	0.1704
27	0.6360	326.0	0.5252
28	2.7688	330.0	0.0059*
29	1.3495	332.0	0.1781
30	3.7553	328.0	0.0002*
31	2.6576	331.0	0.0083*
32	3.0392	332.0	0.0026*
33	0.7610	329.0	0.4472
34	1.3524	330.0	0.1772
35	3.6980	330.0	0.0003*
36	2.3196	330.0	0.0210*
37	0.5425	328.0	0.5879
38	2.8781	324.0	0.0043*
39	2.0127	332.0	0.0450*
40	1.4777	332.0	0.1404
41	1.1107	327.0	0.2675
42	-0.5530	315.0	0.5806

*Significant at .05 level.

APPENDIX F (continued)
 COMPARISON OF IDEAL FREQUENCIES BETWEEN
 SUPERVISORS AND PRINCIPALS

Activity Number	t Value	df	Significance
1	-2.8975	165.0	0.0043*
2	-1.5606	167.0	0.1205
3	2.4941	167.0	0.0136*
4	0.8564	167.0	0.3930
5	-0.4725	166.0	0.6372
6	-2.0772	166.0	0.0393*
7	-2.9638	168.0	0.0035*
8	-1.2832	167.0	0.2012
9	-3.3477	167.0	0.0010*
10	-4.4667	166.0	0.0001*
11	0.7604	167.0	0.4481
12	-1.1387	167.0	0.2565
13	-3.0140	167.0	0.0030*
14	-1.0124	167.0	0.3128
15	-1.0635	167.0	0.2891
16	-1.5912	166.0	0.1135
17	-1.2580	166.0	0.2102
18	-2.4839	166.0	0.0140*
19	0.6020	167.0	0.5480
20	-0.4586	165.0	0.6472
21	-2.4042	167.0	0.0173*
22	-0.0227	167.0	0.9819
23	-0.5066	167.0	0.6131
24	-2.7254	167.0	0.0071*
25	-2.6829	167.0	0.0080*
26	-1.3197	167.0	0.1888
27	-0.6820	167.0	0.4962
28	-2.1152	167.0	0.0359*
29	-0.6513	167.0	0.5158
30	-3.7174	167.0	0.0003*
31	-1.3707	167.0	0.1723
32	-1.5644	167.0	0.1196
33	-0.9584	167.0	0.3392
34	-0.4216	167.0	0.6738
35	-2.5629	167.0	0.0113*
36	-1.4440	167.0	0.1506
37	0.1996	167.0	0.8420
38	-3.0111	167.0	0.0030*
39	-0.9719	167.0	0.3325
40	-1.2996	167.0	0.1955
41	-1.4424	167.0	0.1511
42	0.5861	161.0	0.5586

*Significant at .05 level.

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 2**

**The two page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 2**

A SURVEY STUDY OF AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE
ROLE OF LOCAL SUPERVISORS OF SOCIAL STUDIES
EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA

by

Thomas A. Elliott

(Abstract)

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which relationships exist between the perceptions of local supervisors of social studies, social studies teachers, and building principals relative to the role of the local supervisor of social studies education. Data were gathered to determine the perceptions of supervisors, teachers, and principals regarding actual and ideal performance on forty-two selected supervisory activities.

The descriptive-survey method was utilized in the study. Population sample included twenty local social studies supervisors, one hundred and ninety-seven building principals, and four hundred and sixty social studies teachers. The four hundred and sixty social studies teachers (twenty-five percent) and one hundred and ninety-seven building principals represented employees in each school division in Virginia during the 1980-81 school year where local supervisors of social studies education were employed full-time.

Mail questionnaires were developed, piloted, and forwarded to the selected sample population. Usable responses were received from

three hundred and twenty-five teachers (seventy-one percent), one hundred and fifty-one building principals (seventy-seven percent), and twenty local supervisors of social studies (one hundred percent).

The alpha level selected for determination of statistical significance and rejection of the seven null hypotheses was $p < .05$. Descriptive statistics, correlated t tests, uncorrelated t tests, and the Spearman rho (ρ) were used in analyzing the data. Data were reported by means, frequencies, ranks, standard deviations, and percentages. To analyze data within groups the correlated t test was used. The uncorrelated t test was used to analyze the data between groups. To determine the relationship between the rank differences reported by the sample groups, Spearman rho (ρ) correlations were computed using the formula $\rho = 1 - \frac{6 \sum d^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$.

In a comparison of perceptions of local supervisors of social studies education versus perceptions of teachers regarding actual performance on forty-two selected supervisory activities, it was determined that there was a high agreement between teachers and supervisors as to the order of priority placed on activities by supervisors. The Spearman rho computation based on rank differences of actual time spent as perceived by supervisors and the teacher's perceptions of actual time spent yielded a high positive correlation. Also, principals and supervisors were in close agreement as to the priority of supervisors' actual use of time. A high positive correlation was found to exist based upon rankings of the two groups relative to actual use of supervisors' time.

Significant differences were noted between the perceptions

of local supervisors of social studies education and those of social studies teachers and building principals relative to ideal supervisory performance. Teachers and supervisors were in moderate agreement relative to the setting of priorities for time utilization by supervisors across the forty-two activities. Principals and supervisors were in high agreement relative to the priorities based on ideal rankings for supervisors.

Major findings of the study were as follows:

1. Supervisors, teachers, and principals agreed that supervisors should spend more time on nearly all of the identified activities than they currently do.

2. Each group surveyed agreed that the ideal performance of supervisors should be closely related to that group's perceptions of what supervisors currently do.

3. There was a high positive correlation between the supervisors, teachers, and principals as to the allocation of priorities by supervisors.

4. There was a moderate to high positive correlation across groups as to how supervisors should allocate their time.