

The Historical Context of Modern Concept of Supervision

Shilpa Thakral

Delhi University

Abstract

Lately, there has been an impetus on supervision of schools towards improving quality of education. The potential of supervision in bringing improvement in classroom practices and student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers has been well documented and widely recognized. In India, the concept of supervision and the purpose it has acquired at the practice level undermines the significance of supervision in education as established by literature. Supervision in Indian schools is considered inadequate and weak due to persisting traditional inspectorial model of supervision. The current literature on supervision advocates modern concept of supervision which evolved, developed and is being practiced to a large extent in America. In order to fill in the gap between theory and practice of supervision, it becomes imperative to understand the context in which the traditional context of inspection and modern concept of supervision acquired specific nature and characteristics. The need to study the historical context is a precursor to understand and evolve the present supervisory practices to cater to the present scenario. The paper, thus, seeks to explore the history of modern concept of supervision in American context. The study also provides insights on significance of the history of supervision and the status of historical research on supervision. The findings suggest that the concept of supervision in America has been changing, shaped and influenced by a variety of historical forces and supervisory practices being followed in other realms such as the political arena, business and industry. The findings reveal the absence of a single, coherent and definitive history of supervision. The outcome of this work can serve to determine the possibility of the application of modern concept of supervision in the Indian context and in providing a suggestive frame work of supervision for the Indian education system.

Keywords: modern concept of supervision, ahistoricism, social efficiency, democratic, scientific, clinical, changing concepts

INTRODUCTION

Education is aimed at imparting knowledge and skill, and inculcating human values which help in personal and professional growth. It is the 'education' which constitutes an essential pre-requisite for achieving national goal of inclusive development and equitable justice to the society at large. Giving quality education is the priority of each and every nation in the world because the quality of education forms the basis of socio economic and personal growth, an indicator of national progress. Of late, there have been high expectations from schools in terms of transparency and accountability to improve the quality of education. This demand has augmented the need for better supervision of in house activities of schools. Emphasizing the role of supervision for teachers, Lockheed and Verspoor (1991) observed that the quality education partly depends on how well teachers are trained and supervised since they are one of the key inputs to educational delivery.

The word supervision is a coinage from two Latin words: 'super' and 'video'. Super means 'over' or 'above', while video means 'to see'. Therefore, taken together, super-video simply means 'to see from above' or 'to oversee' (Marecho, 2012).

Generally speaking, Supervision may be defined as "to oversee, to superintend or to guide and to

stimulate the activities of others, with a view of their improvement" (Douglass & Bent, 1953).

According to Mohanty (2008), in education supervision carries the same general concept and is applied to both academic and administrative tasks. Administrative functions of supervision included providing physical facilities to the teachers, checking the safety and security of the school plant, maintaining proper service conditions and redressing grievances of teachers in time, checking the accounts and records of the school and maintaining proper distribution of work load. The academic tasks included monitoring of instruction, providing guidance to teachers for improving teaching evaluation and assessment of pupil's achievement etc. But primarily in literature, supervision is usually applied to the activities of teaching i.e. supervision of instruction (*ibid*, pp.289-290).

Bhatnagar & Aggarwal (2006) explained that "in view of the different functions which a supervisor has to perform, the necessity of supervision hardly needs any emphasis in the present scenario". Few significant functions of supervision include providing expert technical assistance, helping teachers prepare for teaching, keeping them up to date, and providing professional democratic leadership (*ibid*, pp.205).

During the last two decades there has been a renewed interest in supervision and monitoring of the quality of education (International Institute for Educational Planning, 2007, p.2). The reasons provided by International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) for the above development are:

- Policy focus on quality improvement of education through quality control.
- A stronger demand for accountability to derive 'value of money' invested in educational enterprise.
- Various research studies which explain the weakening of quality monitoring devices including the professional supervision and support as one of the factors leading to the deterioration of quality of schools.
- Increasing trend towards school autonomy which demands monitoring procedures to guarantee standards of quality and equity across the system.

Many researchers believe that supervision of instruction has the potential to improve classroom practices and contribute to student success through the professional growth and improvement of teachers (Blasé & Blasé 1998; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002 and Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). According to Douglass and Bent (1953), supervision does improve instruction is the conclusion which may fairly be drawn from the experimental studies available. Such conclusion has been drawn by measuring differences in pupil attainment and by attempts to measure improvement in teaching. Douglass and Bent (1953) found that most of the experimental studies of the value of supervision are at the elementary school level and few have been reported since 1930. Several Studies (Crabb, 1925; Green Field, 1933; Harman, 1947; Jinske, 1936; Kinhart, 1941, Van Antwerp, 1936) found supervision to be of value in improving teaching and learning(*ibid*, pp.17).

Thus, the importance of supervision has been established by research studies far back (Douglass & Bent, 1953) and is being felt worldwide even today (International institute of educational planning, 2007).

Significance of supervision has been highlighted in the Indian policy documents on education. Dash (2004) provided that "The National Policy of Education (1986) lays special emphasis on improving the educational system. The Programme of action (NPE, 1986) spells out the significant role to be played by supervision in this regard" (p.94). The Education Commission (1964–66) also rightly remarked: "Supervision is, in a sense, the back bone of educational improvement" (*ibid*, p.94). The report of the Directorate of Education (2012) suggests that a blend of autonomy and supervision is clearly required keeping in view the past experience and the need for

school expansion to keep pace with the changing demography as well as the current aspirations of parents. However, the concept of supervision and the purpose it has acquired at the practice level undermines the significance of supervision in education as established by literature.

According to Goyal (2001), the National University of Educational Planning and Administration undertook two National Surveys in School educational administration- the first from 1973 to 1981 (NUEPA 1973–81) and the second from 1991 to 2001 (NUEPA 1991–2001). These showed significant country wide trends with respect to Institutional Planning, Financial Administration and other aspects of Educational Administration which included Inspection and Supervision in India. The study findings suggest the following aspects about the concept of inspection and supervision and the supervisory practices being followed in India-

- The terms *used* in the studies are 'Inspection' and 'Inspecting officers' and not supervisors.
- *Inspection* and *supervision* are used interchangeably. No specific definitions have been provided for both inspection and supervision. It is pertinent to mention that the existing form of Inspection report under DSEAR'1973 (Delhi School Education Act and Rules) includes a section titled Supervision/ Inspection of the Academic Work (Actual teaching and its different aspects).

Difference between inspection and supervision has been discussed in literature and research studies. Tyagi (2011) suggests that the difference between inspection and supervision can be understood on the basis of school functions which they cover (administrative, academic etc), purpose they seek to achieve, personnel conducting the evaluation are internal or external to the school. Inspection has been referred to the system-based assessment and evaluation of schools, teachers and students done by the local authority personnel, inspectors, and advisors. Supervision is a school based activity more concerned with the assessment of academic aspects of the institution for continuous school improvement by enhancing teaching-learning practices. Moswela (2010) also differentiated inspection and supervision on the basis of their purpose. Supervision intends to help teachers improve instruction by directly assisting them where as inspection aims to check the completion of the goals of curriculum by the teacher and in case of failure, caution them critically.

Thus, supervision is about assessing and assisting the teachers for bringing improvement in the teaching-learning process and their professional development. Supervisor is formally and officially designated person to assess and assist teachers in teaching-learning process and professional development.

- Inspection and supervision referred to in the studies is completely external *i.e.* the inspectors and supervisors are located outside the school and regular visits to schools are essential part of their mandate. Tyagi (2010) in his paper has also mentioned that supervision in India is seen as an external inspection service and that the supervisory support and academic guidance provided by inspectors to teachers in schools is inadequate. According to Tyagi, supervision practices still do not take in its purview the role of actors at the school site level (principals, teachers, community members etc.). As there is a worldwide trend to reinforce school site supervision (International institute of educational planning, 2007), more research studies can be carried out to find its effectiveness in the Indian context.
- Both administrative and academic functions are performed by the inspecting officers.
- The studies show that there is a weak system of supervision and inspection in India. One of the major reasons provided is that the considerable time of inspecting officers is consumed in administrative and non educational function, and hence academic function suffers.

Other scholars support this view and provided other reasons for weak supervisory system in India. In India the traditional 'inspectional model' used since independence still prevails despite its long standing defects (Tyagi, 2010). The inadequacy of the system was noted by the Mudaliar commission in 1952 and there has been little change in the last five decades (Noord, 2003). Lack of supervisory personnel in relation to demand has led to poor monitoring because inspectorial visits are few (Clarke and Jha, 2006 as cited in Tyagi, 2010). As per Tyagi (2010), the situation in India has been and is exacerbated by the size of the school system, the federal and state presence and the complexities associated with multiple management systems. For the last five decades supervision in India has been moribund (Tyagi, 2010). 'Modern' approaches to fostering school quality such as school self evaluation, are not in accord with school and supervisory practices in India (Grauwe, 2007).

According to Tyagi (2010), the gradual decline in the standards of education despite substantial monetary allocation for education in the different five year plans may be attributed to the ineffective administrative practices particularly to the inadequate and inefficient inspection and supervision system, which through a key aspect of educational administration is unable to provide academic leadership and support.

Thus, an overview of the literature and research studies on supervision in India suggests that the prime cause for the inadequacy of supervision system in India is the continuation of the traditional inspectional model of supervision.

To remove weakness in the practice of supervision, current literature on supervision suggests (Mohanty, 2008; Bhatnagar and Aggarwal, 2006) the use and application of *the Modern concept of supervision* in place of the traditional concept of Inspection. In theory, Modern Supervision has been advocated for schools which is described as objective, systematic, democratic, growth centered & productive, which accentuates the spirit of inquiry by emphasizing experimentation and continuous evaluation as compared to traditional inspectional system which is authoritarian and imposing (Burton & Bruecker, 1955, p.13).

The nature and characteristics of Modern supervision which distinguishes it from the Traditional inspection as provided by Bhatnagar & Aggarwal (2006) may be stated as follows:-

- Modern supervision is positive in its approach, that is, creative and constructive whereas inspection is a process of criticizing and fault finding.
- Modern supervision is democratic in approach whereas traditional inspection is bureaucratic and authoritative.
- Modern supervision focuses on total quality management (*TQM*), on the other hand traditional inspection is primarily concerned with classroom inspection and audit of accounts.
- Supervision is participatory in nature while the traditional inspection tends to a 'one man show'.
- Modern supervision has a continuous role to play: to stimulate, coordinate and evaluate the efforts of teachers and students, to improve the teaching-learning situation. On the contrary, inspection is of short duration.
- Supervision is an informal process, on the contrary inspection is formal and fear provoking.
- Modern supervision is **scientific** in nature. Whimsical approach of the inspector is replaced by judicious approach of the supervisor.

- Modern supervision is **coordinating and integrating** in nature. Traditional inspection on the other hand, lacks in coordination and integration of efforts.
- Modern supervision **employs a variety of devices** like seminars, meetings, conferences, workshops, class visits, school visits, panel inspection and scientific tools of evaluation to assess the progress and quality and to arrive at measures for improvement. Inspection on the other hand, employs school visitation and class inspection by the Inspector only.

As said earlier the concept of Modern supervision in India exists in theory only. In practice educational supervision in India remains today as traditional as it was several decades ago. (Noords, 2003; Bhatnagar & Aggarwal, 2006). The inadequacies of the traditional inspectional system still prevail.

Owing to the fact that modern concept of supervision evolved, developed and is being practiced to a large extent in America (Sullivan & Glanz , 2000) ,it becomes imperative to study and understand the historical context in which the traditional concept of inspection and modern concept of supervision acquired the nature and characteristics as discussed above. The objective of this paper is to trace the historical trends of modern concept of supervision observed in the field of education.

The awareness about the context in which the modern concept of supervision evolved can help us in determining the possibility of its application in the Indian context and in providing a suggestive framework of supervision for the Indian education system. It should be noted that the feasibility of models of supervision can be ascertained by complete understanding of the Indian context; historical evolution of supervision in India and current supervisory practices, but in this paper focus is only on understanding the evolution and development of the concept of supervision in American context.

The forthcoming areas covered by the paper are as follows:

- ❖ Significance of the History of supervision
- ❖ The Status of Historical Research on Supervision.
- ❖ The changing concept of supervision
- ❖ Conclusion

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The study of history is a struggle to understand the "unending dialogue between the present and the past" (E.H. Carr, 1961 as cited in Glanz, 1994). People as well as events cannot be explained in terms of the present, but must be understood by a past and a future. The past, present and future according to Ernet Cassirer, form an "undifferentiated unity and an indiscriminate whole". (1953, p. 219)

Marsar (1970) provides that the experience of reflective consciousness through historical inquiry implies an awareness of the past its interconnectedness to present conditions and future possibilities. History, then, can be understood as an attempt to study the events and ideas of the past that shape human experience over time in order to inform current practice as well as to make more intelligent decisions for the future (Marsar , 1970 as cited in Glanz,1994).

The value of history is its concreteness, its placing of events, people and theories within context (Goodson I.F., 1985). History supplies the context with which to view current proposals. Historical exploration can help us in understanding as to how field has come to take the shape it has and the antecedents of current innovations or theories.

As stated by Glanz (1994), it is not enough for theorists of supervision to develop proposals and formulate new models of supervision by systematically explaining their underlying assumptions. It is also not enough that practitioners carry out supervisory strategies in order to same immediate problems. Instead, those concerned with supervision must continually reflect on their basis for doing what they do. Critical historical analysis will have per se a twofold effect on the field of supervision:

- 1) Leader, developers and researchers will look to the past for precedent.
- 2) Those who write and theorize about supervision will now view their efforts as embedded or situated in a set of historical conditions. (*ibid*,pp.17)

Thus, to look for precedents, to view current proposals and models as connected to prior efforts and dilemmas is to acknowledge historicity of supervisor (Glanz, 1994).

According to Reid, to be historical, means to be concerned with questions such as:-

- 1) How are our prevailing practices and advocated theories connected to the past?
- 2) How have significant ideas, events and people influenced or informed current practice?
- 3) What are the social, economic, philosophical and political forces that have shaped our experiences/theories/field?
- 4) Once we understand our legacies can he formulate models of supervision that address the urgencies of the present by building on lessons of the past?
- 5) What else can we learn from history that might help develop the field of supervision? (Reid as cited in Glanz,1994)

Thus, understanding the intricacies of supervision by digging into its history hardly needs any emphasis.

Status of Historical Research on Supervision

Supervision as a field of study and practice has escaped serious and ongoing investigations by educational historians (Glanz, 1994). The paucity of historical research in supervision can be attributed to the following reasons:-

- According to Glanz, Ahistoricism is responsible for the lack of interest in supervision. The dictionary definition of the term 'Ahistoricism' means not concerned with or related to history, historical development or tradition (Merriam Webster dictionary, 2003). Many educators and supervisors are very much practice oriented and they assert that historical inquiry has little, if any, impact on day to day practice (Anderson, Major & Mitchell, 1992 as cited in Glanz, 1994).
- Not only do practitioners question the usefulness of understanding the past events but they tend to uncritically accept current ideas about supervisory practice that have their origin in the past. Reflective of this notion of "Presentism" (Glanz, 1991), for instance is the persistence of bureaucratic authority in supervision.
- There is a lack of clarity in even defining supervision (Bolin, 1987). Robert Alfonso and Gerald Firth (1990) have noted that the study of supervision lacks focus largely due to the "lack of research and continuing disagreement on the definition and purposes of supervision". Consequently, a lack of clarity as to even the duties and responsibilities has been provident since around 1920 (Glanz, 1994).
- It is not only that supervision history has been marginalized but supervision as a field of study has not received adequate attention. Harris (1964) decried the lack of research in supervision.
- According to Glanz, supervision, historically, has had an identity crisis. The fields of administration and curriculum seem to have subsumed the function of, supervision. Supervision as a field of study in its own right has not been recognized (Glanz, 1991).

The changing concept of supervision

In light of the literature reviewed it has been observed that instructional supervision in the western education systems, particularly, USA has evolved over centuries from an inspection and control model to humanistic and collegial model (Moswela, 2010).

The history of supervision is marked by seven models:

- *inspection*
- *social efficiency*
- *democratic*
- *scientific*
- *leadership*
- *clinical*

- *changing concepts* (Glanz, 1994).

In the following section an attempt has been made to study the evolution of these models, specially focusing on the context in which they developed and their basic characteristics, by reviewing the literature on history of supervision. This history of supervision is referred to as both history of instructional supervision or history of school supervision in books on supervision in education.

Supervision as Inspection

The first supervisory concepts and behaviours were characterized by Inspection (Eye & Netzer, 1965). The phase or time period during which supervision in education began as a process of external Inspection is known as 'The Community Accountability Phase' (Tracy, 1995) or 'The Period of Administrative Inspection' (Burnham, 1976). The literature available revealed that inspection during this phase connoted monitoring, controlling or judging. Burnham (1976) explained that those who were functioning as supervisors invested the school for the purpose of controlling standards i.e., maintaining the requirement of the prescribed curriculum rather than the improvement of instruction. According to Lovell and Wiles (1983) the prime function of supervisor during that phase was to make judgments about the teacher rather than pupil learning or teaching and the chief remedy for a school or classroom which did not meet the standards was that of replacing the teaching personnel. Thus, there was no assumption of a science of teaching that could be taught or learned (Lovell & Wiles, 1983) and the teachers were totally accountable.

The responsibility for supervision rested with the various members of community because of the strong American belief in local, lay control of education (Tracy, 1995). Local and state legislation reinforced this assumption. Tracy found that the well known Massachusetts School law of 1647 required towns to establish schools and instructed community leaders to monitor the student's progress in reading and in understanding religious principles. These community members were required to determine the school schedule guidelines for students discipline and the curriculum of school, and hire the teachers (pp.320).

Thus it was assumed that the teacher was the servant of the community and should be expected to respond to the community needs (Lovell & Wiles, 1983). There was an assumption that no special professional competence was required for supervisors i.e., these local lay trustees were not professionally trained (Button, 1961 as cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). According to Tracy (1995), the supervisory skills required understanding the community values and mores in order to assess that they were being transmitted to the students.

Later on professionalization of supervision (Burnham, 1976) occurred and the responsibility for the overall operations of the school shifted from community leadership to a cadre of professional educators-superintendent, head teacher and principal. This shift in control and creation of hierarchical system for overseeing instruction can be attributed to the formation of common school system in late of 1830's ,increase in population, formation of school districts, growing complicity of school systems addition to the curriculum of new subjects that required special competencies (Ayer & Barr, 1928) but inspection as a method of supervision continued.

Supervision as Social Efficiency

The concept of supervision as social efficiency owes its emergence to the impact of industrial revolution on education, numerous technological advances during 1900's and the dominance of the scientific management theory for organizational improvement (Lovells & Wiles, 1983). Review of the literature (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) revealed that the concept of *Efficiency* as the purpose of supervision finds its origin in the work of F.W. Taylor, 'The Principles of Scientific Management'. The worker according to Taylor was merely a cog in the business machinery and the main purpose of the management was to promote the efficiency of the worker. According to (Lovell & Wiles, 1983) this efficiency was to be achieved by "determining the one best way of achieving a special task. Workers were expected to do it that way and supervisors were there to see that they did" (p.30).

Franklin Bobbitt (as cited in Sullivan & Glanz ,2000) applied these ideas that Taylor espoused to the "Problems of Educational Management and Supervision". Like Taylor, he was also concerned with finding the most efficient and effective educational methodology and utilizing supervisions to see that teachers carried it out so that efficiency in teaching could be achieved. Bobbitt interpreted **efficiency in terms of 'Elimination of Waste'** (Lovell & Wiles, 1983).

Sullivan & Glanz (2000) have documented Bobbitt's belief that to ensure efficiency in their teaching and amongst teachers, impersonal methods of scientific administration and supervision should be adopted. According to Tracy (1995) this was often translated into the development of rating schemes, **supervision become synonymous with teacher rating.**

Emphasizing on the importance of supervision for achieving organizational goals, Bobbitt (as cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) elaborated on the role and functions of supervisor and supervision. Bobbitt maintained that supervision was an essential function to "coordinate school affairs.... Supervisory members must coordinate the labours of all.... find the best

methods of work and enforce the use of these methods on the part of the workers" (*ibid* ,pp.13). Bobbitt methods met criticism on the ground that he compared education in "school" to "product in a factory".

A similarity was discussed, by Lovell & Wiles, between the period of 'administrative inspection' and the above discussed phase of 'scientific management', that in both the phases it was assumed that "the worker was a passive instrument who could be manipulated to achieve the goals of the organization. The only difference was that in phase of scientific management, the methods of science were applied to achieve the greatest possible efficiency" (Lovell & Wiles, 1983, p.30).

It is pertinent to mention that in whole of the literature under review no where it has been made clear as to why the term 'social' has been prefixed to efficiency.

Supervision as Leadership

Supervision as leadership has been presented in pieces in the text available on the history of supervision. No details about the context in which supervision evolved as leadership has been provided. Despite the fact that the work of Robert. R. Leeper (1969) "Supervision: Emerging profession" is considered significant (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) for the understanding of the concept of supervisory leadership, only a passing reference of it has been made. "Supervision: Emerging profession" is a compilation of an official journal 'Educational leadership' of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Leeper and the authors of this anthology explained the significance of supervision as a leadership function. According to them, supervisors through this way can extend "democracy in their relationship with teachers."

Harris (1964) viewed supervisory leadership in term of its function of leading schools towards change. Elaborating on this Harris suggested two kinds of leadership:

"Those in status positions must lead out with new boldness and find better ways of influencing the schools towards rationally planned, timed change.

New leadership position must be created and coordinated to facilitate the enormously complex job of leading instructional change."

According to Sullivan & Glanz (2000), during the period when supervision as leadership emerged, the supervisors provided leadership in five different ways: developing mutually acceptable goals, extending cooperative and democratic methods of

supervision, improving classroom instruction, promoting research into educational problems and promoting leadership (p.18).

The context and the concept of supervision as leadership is wanting in clarity and comprehension and requires in depth study.

Democratic Supervision

According to Lovell and Wiles (1983), a survey of the literature reveals that Democratic supervision meant different things to different people. Giving different interpretations, Lovell and Wiles provided that "to some it meant a type of manipulation in which teachers were to be treated blindly and maneuvered into doing what the supervisor wanted to do all along. To others it meant a hands off approach what teachers could do as they pleased. But to others, it meant involving teachers in cooperative instructional improvement" (p.2). Thus to remove the ambiguity in understanding of Democratic supervision, it is essential to detail the context in which it originated.

This phase in which emergence of the concept took place is referred to as 'The period of emergence of democratic methods in supervision' (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000) or 'The Human Relations Phase' (Tracy, 1995) or 'The Period of cooperative group effort' (Eye & Netzer, 1965).

The emergence of Democratic supervision has been attributed to different strands of thought. As Lovell & Wiles (1983) provided "A combination of factors including the development of theoretical formulations and empirical findings as well as certain social development set in motion a challenge to the theory of scientific management and laid the foundation for a growing concern with the psychological well being of organizational members."

That period in America characterized depression, economic suffering and disenchantment with the business community. People spoke against economic oppression and for human rights & democratic principles (Burnham, 1976).

There was **development of Motivation Theory** which suggested that workers efforts and morale increased when employers paid increased attention to the work environment. This theory was derived from the well known Hawthorne studies in industry that demonstrated increased attention to workers improved production (Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1947 as cited in Burnham, 1976).

Lovell & Wiles (1983) explained that **the study of social groups** coming from the behavioural sciences also has a profound effect on the growing body of literature on instructional supervision as well as the

practice. Lewin (1943, 1944), Homans (1950), Lippitt and White (1947) were amongst the significant contributors. Research findings indicated that group members who participate in making group decisions are more likely to accept and act on these decisions. A person's position in the social group can be an important factor in behavior including work production (*ibid*, p.32).

Tracy (1995) mentioned that the study of leadership behavior also had an important effect on educational supervision. Through these studies the focus was placed on the importance of behavior in organizational leaders. Work considered significant in this context -Lippitt and White (1947), Stogdill (1948), Lewin (1930), Bavelas (1942) etc. Findings indicated that the same groups or similar groups operating under different styles of leadership will develop different group structure and group production (*ibid*, p.323).

Influenced in large measure by Dewey's (1929) theories of democratic and scientific thinking as well by Hosil's (1920) ideas of democratic supervision, supervisors attempted to apply scientific methods and cooperative problem solving approaches to educational problems (Pajak, 1993 as cited in Lovell & Wiles, 1983).

All the above factors become important in contributing towards the emergence of Democratic supervision. Such varied influences might have contributed in interpreting and defining democratic supervision in different ways.

The impact of various strands of thought on the body of professional literature of this period was significant. Lovell & Wiles (1983) mentioned that the titles of important text books of this period were indicative of the trends of the day:

- 1) John Bartky, *Supervision as Human Relations*.
- 2) Charles Boardman, *Democratic Supervision in Secondary Schools*.
- 3) William H. Button and Leo.J Brueckner.

Supervision. A Social Process

Further Lovell & Wiles explained that the movement had great impact on the activities of the Department of supervisors and Director of Instruction, which later became the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Democratic principles were defined and applied to the supervisory role. It was assumed that teachers were capable of participating in decisions on teaching and curriculum. The role of the supervisor was to provide a climate where this participation could happen. Much was written about group process, the importance of morale, cooperative problem solving, worth and dignity of the individual, leadership and positive support. Less was written about supervision as maintenance and improvement of

quality, teaching and learning and the necessity for responsibility and authority (*ibid*, p.33).

This democratic approach of supervision could not work effectively (Lovell & Wiles, 1983) as teachers perceived supervisors as the old traditional inspector and did not trust the new approach that supervisor were using. Further some supervisors failed to live up to expectations of some teachers as they were more interested in being democratic than in helping teachers identify and solve some problems. Despite different influences, Democratic supervision implied that educators including teachers, curriculum specialists and supervisors would cooperate to improve instruction.

Scientific Supervision

The hall mark of scientific phase was the transfers of scientific principles of business management for example control accountability and efficiency into supervision of teaching (Tanner and Tanner, 1987). According to Tracy (1995), "central to scientific supervision was the concept of measuring the methods of teaching to determine the most productive ones in relation to student outcomes."

Barr (1931) elaborated "that a scientific analysis of teaching is a necessary part of the training of a supervisor." Contending for the significance of scientific study of teaching Barr commented that "teaching could be broken down into its component parts and that each part had to be studied scientifically. If good teaching procedures could be isolated, then specific standards could be established to guide the supervisor in judging the quality of instruction."

Further the emphasis on measurement led to the increased attention to direct classroom observation and the use of various data gathering devices like tests rating scales and observational instruments (Suvillan & Glanz, 2000).

Application of the scientific method to the supervisory practice was criticized (Tracy, 1995) on the ground that it is difficult to measure the productivity of education and the issue of control which suggested that teachers were not viewed as professions but rather as workers to be directed and monitored.

Thus the scientific nature of supervision aimed at improving instruction on the basis of research and measurement which could provide supervisors with a firm base on which to guide the equality of instruction.

Clinical Supervision

Morris Cogan is given credit for coining the term 'Clinical Supervision' (Sullivan Glanz, 2000; Tracy, 1995; Krajewski & Anderson,1976).

The pioneers in the field Robert H. Anderson, Robert J. Krajewski themselves discussed the unsuitability of the term 'Clinical' owing to its different interpretations and its origin from the medical field which according to them led to slow acceptance of clinical supervision by the teachers (Krajewski & Anderson,1976). Krajewski & Anderson commented "In effect, people tend to think of the word negatively. It suggests cold, formal, uniform, cut-and-dried procedures that leave out the personal elements of human contact." Clarifying the apprehensions about the term clinical they explained the concept of clinical supervision in education as "a face to face relationship between supervisor and the teacher." (p. 421, para. 7). Further elaborating Krajewski and Anderson clarified that clinical refers to "hands-on [direct] or eyes-on aspect of supervisor who is attempting to intervene in a helpful way." (*ibid*, p. 422, para. 1)

Clinical supervision emerged to fill in the gaps which were not addressed by the earlier phases in which different concepts of supervision developed. As Tracy (1995) stated "Human relations phase had little success because even though it allowed teachers the freedom to determine their own effectiveness, it did not equip them with the tools to do so. Scientific phase developed the tools but lacked the teacher freedom." Thus clinical supervision attempted to combine the tools and techniques of the scientific phase with the supervisor/teacher team approach of the Human Relations (Tracy, 1995). Borrowing from the relational and motivational concerns of the Human Relation phase, clinical supervision placed emphasis on sustained teacher and supervisor interaction in order mutually solve classroom problems by having the supervisor and teacher analyze the teachers' performance together (Lovell & Wiles, 1983).

As far as scientific aspect is concerned, clinical supervisor is supposed to be highly skilled in data collection and analysis (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000).

Different models of clinical supervision have evolved but they are kept out of the discussion in this paper. Clinical supervision although advocated by professors and authors of text books, did not gain wide acceptance in schools (Garman, 1997 as cited in Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The reason provided was that the people were not conversant with this model and doubt its usefulness (Okafor, 1998). According to Krajewski & Anderson (1976) both teachers and supervisors should have total knowledge on the concept of clinical supervision in order to make it work in school system.

"Changing Concepts" Model of Supervision

Review of literature (Suvillan & Glanz, 2000) suggest that this model of supervision was given the name changing concepts as this period was marked by the emergence of different models and conception of supervision in "an attempt to extend democratic methods and to dissociate from bureaucratic and inspection of supervision." As per Suvillan & Glanz (2000), the alternative methods and new concepts of supervision which have their origin during this phase are: clinical, developmental and transformational supervision; concepts of teacher empowerment, teacher as a leader, peer supervision etc.; use of terms instructional leadership and instructional leader instead of supervision and supervisor.

Despite the variety of concepts and models, this model of supervision was overall viewed as a democratic enterprise.

CONCLUSION

In this paper an attempt is made to present the changing concepts of supervision. Thus it is not possible to give a precise definition of supervision as the concepts have been continuously changing under the impact of different factors. This study brought into light few significant findings:

School supervision in America has been shaped and influenced by a variety of historical forces. Despite the fact that certain traditions of supervision have been brought over from Western Europe like 'Inspectorial' supervision but in America supervision has been shaped by factors that were American for e.g., impact of industrial revolution, emergence of scientific management theory etc. School supervision has been influenced by supervision practices in other realms such as the political arena, business and industry.

History of School supervision has been presented as a series of disjointed and unrelated events. As mentioned in literature (Burnham, 1976; Tracy, 1995) each dominant supervisory theory and practice represented a reaction to the previous phase. In literature available on history of supervision this common thread of continuation is missing. Even the time period of the evolution of different models of supervision is not same in different books.

Thus, since there seems to be no single, coherent and definitive history of supervision, historical treatment of supervision must be found in the literature of education or educational administration.

The analysis of the historical trends of concepts of supervision will facilitate in finding solutions to evolving and effective system of supervision in education. Such a detailed study of history of supervision can inform and assist the practitioners in

designing new adaptations of supervision better suited to the contemporary learning environment. Hence, research can be carried out to develop a model of supervision suitable in Indian context.

REFERENCES

Ayer, F.C. & Barr, A.S. (1928). *The Organization of Supervision: An Analysis of the Organization and Administration of Supervision in City School Systems*. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Barr, A.S. (1931). *An Introduction to the Scientific Study of Classroom Supervision*. New York: Appleton.

Bhatnagar, R.P. & Aggarwal, V. (2006). *Educational Administration: Supervision, Planning and Financing*. Meerut, India: Surya Publication.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1998). *Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Burton, W.H. & Brueckner, L.J. (1955). *Supervision: A Social Process*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Cassirer, E. (1953). *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*. New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc.

Dash, M. (2004). *Education in India: Problems and Perspectives*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.

Douglass, H.R. & Bent, R.K. (1953). *Supervision Schools*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Riverside Press.

Eye, G.G. & Netzer, L.A. (1965). *Supervision of Instruction: Phase of Administration*. New York: Harper & Row.

Glanz, J. (1991). *Bureaucracy and Professionalism: The Evolution of Public School Supervision*. New Jersey: Farleigh Dickinson University Press.

Goodson, F. (1985). History, context and qualitative methods in the study of curriculum. In R. G. Burgess (Ed.), *Strategies of educational research: Qualitative methods* (pp.121–152). London: Falmer Press.

Goyal, J.C. (2001). *Inspection and Supervision of Schools*. In *Governance of School Education in India* ed. M. Mukhopadhyay and R.S. Tyagi, 232-49. New Delhi, India: National University of Educational Planning and Administration.

Harris, B.H. (1964). Need for Research on Instructional Supervision. In *Supervision: Emerging Profession*, ed. Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

Lockheed, M.E., & Verspoor, A.M. (1991). *Improving primary education in developing countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lovell, J.T. & Wiles, K. (1983). *Supervision for Better Schools*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mohanty, J. (2008). *Educational Administration Supervision and School Management*, New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.

Noord, S., ed. (2003). *School Education in India*. New Delhi, India: National University of Educational Planning and Administration.

Sergiovanni, T.J., & Starratt, R.J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Sullivan S. & Glanz, J. (2000). *Supervision That Improves Teaching: Strategies and Techniques*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. (1987). *Supervision in Education: Problems and Practices*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Journals

Alfonso, R.J. & Firth, G.R. (1990). Supervision: Needed Research. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 5, 181-188.

Bolin, F.S. (1987). On Defining Supervision. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 2, 368-380.

Burnham, R.M. (1976). Instructional Supervision: Past, Present and Future Perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 15(4), 301-305. Retrieved From <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476050>.

Grauwe, A.D. (2007). Transforming School Supervision into a Tool for Quality Improvement. *International Review of Education*, 53, 709-714. doi: 10.1007/511159-007-9057-9

Moswela, B. (2010). Instructional supervision in Botswana secondary schools. *Educational Management & Leadership*, 38(1), 71-87. doi: 10.1177/1741143209351811

Tracy, S.J. (1995). How Historical Concepts of Supervision Relate to Supervisory Practices Today. *The Clearing House*, 68(5), 320-325. Retrieved From <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30189094>.

Tyagi, R.S. (2010). School-based Instructional Supervision and the Effective Professional Development of Teachers. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 40(10), 111-125. doi: 10.1080/03057920902909485

Reports

Directorate of Education, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi. (2012). Report of the review committee on the Delhi school education act and rules, 1973: Preamble & section wise examination of issues (Vol.1). Retrieved from http://www.righttoeducation.in/sites/default/files/report-of-the-review-committee-on-dse-act-and-rule_vol-1.Pdf

Unpublished Sources

Tyagi, R.S. (2011). Academic supervision in secondary schools: School-based approach for quality management. Unpublished manuscript, NUEPA, New Delhi.

Marecho, E.W. (2012). Factors influencing the role of quality assurance and standards officers in primary school curriculum implementation in Kitui county, Kenya (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Nairobi, Nairobi.

Other sources from Websites / Electronic databases

Glanz, J. (1994, March). History of Educational Supervision: Proposals and Prospects Paper Presented Before the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, Illinois, Chicago. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/>
<http://patrickokafor.com/files/ClinicalSupervision.pdf>
International institute of educational planning (UNESCO). (2007). Reforming school supervision for quality improvement: Module 1: Supervision: a key component of a quality monitoring system. Paris: IIEP/UNESCO. Retrieved from www.iiep.unesco.org/capacity-development/training/training-materials/school-supervision.html
www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198002_krajeswski.pdf