

Perspectives and Imperatives PARADIGMS, TRANSITIONS, AND THE NEW SUPERVISION

STEPHEN P. GORDON, *The Pennsylvania State University*

The terms *paradigm* and *paradigm shift* have been used in recent years to describe new belief systems that have emerged in the natural and social sciences, business and industry, politics, philosophy, and a host of other areas of human endeavor. While these terms often have been misunderstood and misused, they remain powerful concepts that can help describe a number of transitions in thought and action currently under way in the field of educational supervision.¹ Before discussing the paradigm shift in supervision—a shift toward what I call *the new supervision*—we need to develop a better understanding of just what is meant by terms like *paradigm* and *paradigm shift*.

The concept of a paradigm was made popular in America by the scientist Thomas Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.² Kuhn actually defines the term *paradigm* on two levels. On one level, a paradigm is "the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community."³ On a more concrete level, a paradigm is a model that can be used to solve a problem. A *paradigm shift* can be

¹I use two words in this article—*paradigm* and *empowerment*—that have accumulated considerable "baggage" as a result of misuse, trivialization, and in some cases, outright bastardization. There are two possible courses of action a writer who wants to discuss powerful concepts can take when the language symbolizing those concepts has been abused. One is to use different words that mean essentially the same thing as the original terms (for example, using the word *enablement* in place of *empowerment*). The other is to attempt to revive the original terms by reintroducing them along with a discussion of what the writer considers to be their authentic meaning and appropriate use. I have chosen the latter (despite the irony of using "old" words to describe the new supervision) for two reasons. First, by abandoning words like *paradigm* and *empowerment*, we to some extent abandon the rich literature, educative dialogue, and positive action that (along with the excess baggage) are associated with the terms. Second, my guess is that new terms used to describe the same concepts, if they became popular, would be subject to the same misuse as the original terms.

²Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

³Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed., enlarged (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 175.

defined as "a profound change in the thoughts, perceptions, and values that form a particular vision of reality."⁴ Although Kuhn's seminal work was concerned with paradigm shifts within scientific communities, the concept has been extended to a variety of fields. Schwartz and Ogilvy, for instance, have discussed paradigm shifts in such diverse areas as mathematics, philosophy, politics, linguistics, religion, and art.⁵

What causes a paradigm shift? The shift can be described in terms of a number of stages:

1. Before a new paradigm is considered, the currently accepted paradigm fails to solve important problems that it is intended to address. The awareness that the old paradigm is not working may develop quite gradually. Instead of immediately considering a new paradigm, the professional community will simply rely on different variations of the old paradigm in repeated failures to solve critical problems.

2. Normally the old paradigm's failure to solve significant problems leads the community to a state of crisis. The sense of crisis may not originate from within the community itself, it may be forced on the community by outside groups or events.

3. Even after the community has admitted that a crisis exists, it does not immediately turn to a new paradigm. Rather, some community members begin to question the old paradigm. Gradually, a larger and larger segment of the community begins to lose faith in the old paradigm and to search for alternatives. This period is distinguished by intense debates over whether or not the old paradigm has outlived its usefulness.

4. The community does not reject the old paradigm until a new paradigm emerges to take its place. The new paradigm may already be in existence or may develop gradually or rapidly in a direct response to the crisis. The new paradigm does not easily replace the old one. Considerable testing of the new paradigm takes place, and there is intense resistance from those still supporting the old one. The paradigm shift is completed when a preponderance of the community has rejected the old paradigm and embraced the new.⁶

THE NEW SUPERVISION

The concepts of paradigm and paradigm shift can be applied to a growing awareness among those involved with educational supervision that traditional supervision is becoming increasingly less effective at solving the problems in today's schools, and a growing acceptance of a new paradigm for curriculum

⁴Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point* (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1982), p. 30.

⁵Peter Schwartz and James Ogilvy, *The Emergent Paradigm: Changing Patterns of Thought and Belief* (Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1979).

⁶Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

and instructional leadership. For the purpose of discussing the paradigm shift currently taking place, I'll refer to the old paradigm as *the old supervision*, and the emergent paradigm as *the new supervision*. The paradigm shift discussed here actually consists of a whole series of changes in beliefs about leadership, teachers, and change itself. It involves transitions in beliefs concerning six different areas relative to educational supervision. Figure 1 summarizes the six transitions. The first two transitions relate to beliefs about the nature of supervision, including its purpose and functions. The next two transitions are concerned with beliefs about teachers and their needs. The last two transitions focus on beliefs about the improvement process. The following discussion examines each of the six transitions.

Transition 1: From Control to Empowerment

The first transition is the single most important one within the overall paradigm shift. It represents a change in beliefs about the very core of supervision. It is a transition from viewing supervision as a means of controlling teachers' instructional behaviors to viewing supervision as a vehicle for teacher empowerment. The history of supervision in the United States is a history of well-intentioned efforts to control teachers:

- From the 17th to the late 19th century, supervision took the form of committees of laypersons conducting "inspections" of schools, teachers, and student progress.
- During the first part of the 20th century—the age of scientific management—lay committees were replaced by professional supervisors. These supervisors demonstrated how subjects were to be taught and visited class-

Figure 1. The Shifting Paradigm in Supervision

Old Supervision	→	New Supervision
Control	→	Empowerment
Separate Functions	→	Integrated Functions
Sameness	→	Diversity
Occasional Supervisor Assistance	→	Continuous Collegial Support Networks
Applied Science	→	Professional Inquiry
Mechanical Change	→	Organic Change

⁷James M. Cooper, "Supervision of Teachers," in *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 2nd ed, ed Harold E. Mitzel (New York: The Free Press, 1982), pp. 1824–1834.

rooms to recommend ways teachers could improve instruction. Inspection and control by lay committees became inspection and control by bureaucrats.⁸

- From the 1930s through the late 1950s, the theory of "human relations supervision" offered hope of more democratic instructional leadership. Throughout this period, however, the control paradigm remained dominant. Attention to the individual and to participatory supervision actually never went beyond the superficial. Human relations theory was co-opted by the dominant control view. On a practical level, human relations supervision was more artificial and manipulative than empowering.⁹

- In the 1960s, instructional supervision came under the sway of the behavioral science approach. Direct control was replaced by indirect control through "teacher-proof" curricula and materials developed by outside researchers and publishers.¹⁰ Supervisors, consciously or unconsciously, became collaborators in such external control.

- The neo-scientific management of the 1970s and 1980s expanded the pattern of indirect control, while the basis of that control shifted to state legislatures and state departments of education. Narrowly defined student performance objectives, standardized achievement tests, and evaluation systems requiring the display of externally defined teacher competencies resulted not only in "teacher-proof" but also "supervisor-proof" teaching. The task of the supervisor became that of helping teachers to understand and implement "legislated learning."¹¹ In the early 1990s, external control seems to be shifting its basis again, from a state to a national level. A national curriculum, state-by-state comparison of standardized achievement test scores, and nationwide teaching standards loom on the horizon.

To summarize, although we have seen a number of *variations* of control—control by laypersons, scientific management, manipulation through co-opted "human relations" supervision, teacher-proof curricula, and legislated neo-scientific management—the control view has remained dominant throughout. Other views (for example, authentic human relations supervision) have challenged the dominant view, but they have always failed to displace it.

Why should the control view of supervision now finally be endangered? The answer lies in the current education crisis. American public education in general and curriculum and instructional leadership in particular have not successfully adapted to the rapidly changing needs and problems of the nation and its young people. They are being called into question as never before. So

⁸Ibid

⁹John W Smyth, "Towards a 'Critical Consciousness' in the Instructional Supervision of Experienced Teachers" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision, Houston, March 1983)

¹⁰Ibid

¹¹Arthur A. Wise, *Legislated Learning. The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979). Arthur A. Wise, "The Two Conflicting Trends in School Reform: Legislated Learning Revisited," *Phi Delta Kappan* 69 (January 1988): 328-333

far, the reaction to this crisis has been to expand rather than reduce control over teachers and instruction. This increasing control has lowered teacher morale and increased teacher stress and resentment, but has failed to solve any of the major problems facing our schools. Each new failure of the control view has resulted in an even more determined effort to increase control and an even more disappointing failure.¹² For these reasons the control view underlying the old supervision is the subject of increasing criticism, and a shift toward the empowerment view seems to be gradually taking place.

Many educational leaders view the word *empowerment* in less than enthusiastic terms. Even some leaders committed to teacher enablement shy away from the word because it is so "value laden" and generates such strong emotion. But it is exactly the type of intense debate and resistance generated by the concept of teacher empowerment that characterizes initial reaction to an emergent paradigm! The notion of teacher empowerment is radically different from and inconsistent with the control view. Thus, there seems to be little chance of control supervision co-opting the empowerment movement. Educational supervision is nearing an either-or stage regarding the two views; authentic empowerment is currently being tested in a sufficient number of schools across the nation that comparisons with control supervision are inevitable. Given the current crisis in education, if empowerment works where control has failed, the paradigm shift is most likely to accelerate dramatically.

If teacher empowerment is the foundation of the new supervision, exactly what is empowerment? Teacher empowerment can be discussed in terms of three aspects:

1. The pedagogical, personal, and social development of teachers, enabling them to become highly skilled, reflective, self-directing professionals.
2. The involvement of teachers in collaborative curriculum and instructional leadership, including participation in professional dialogue, decision making, and mutual assistance relative to all aspects of curriculum and instruction at the classroom and school level.
3. A shift away from external accountability to internal accountability, including individual accountability for individual performance and collective accountability for school performance.

Teacher empowerment recognizes that if significant changes are to be made in curriculum and instruction, then teachers must assume ownership of change efforts. Further, if such ownership is to take place, teachers must be involved in decision making relative to both the nature of desired changes and the means by which such changes will be achieved.

¹²Carl D. Glickman, "Has Sam and Samantha's Time Come at Last?" *Educational Leadership* 46 (May 1989): 4-9

What is the supervisor's role relative to teacher empowerment? Teacher empowerment does not mean a reduction in the supervisor's leadership function. Rather it can be viewed as expansion of leadership throughout the school's professional community. The supervisor's role is not diminished, but it is changed. The goals of the new supervision, like the old supervision, remain the improvement of curriculum, instruction, and, ultimately, student learning, but for the new supervision the means for improvement becomes facilitation of teacher empowerment rather than control of teachers' behavior. The "new" supervisor becomes a mentor of mentors and leader of leaders—an authentic colleague and role model rather than control agent. In the new supervision, reciprocal, helping relationships develop between supervisors and teachers, and also *among* teachers. Thus, while formally designated supervisors are vital to teacher empowerment, the new supervision is identified more with a leadership process than with any single role—a process in which all teachers are invited to participate.

Of course, the fact that in many states, legislatures and state departments of education currently support the control view presents an obstacle to empowerment. But it is an obstacle that the empowerment movement can overcome. Those in the educational hierarchy have traditionally taken a *reactive* posture toward those at higher levels. Teachers have reacted to actions by supervisors, supervisors to actions by top-level administrators, and school districts to actions by state agencies. Efforts to empower teachers, if initially successful, can lead to *proaction* for teacher empowerment, beginning at the bottom and moving toward the top of the hierarchy. If the control view is really incapable of solving the problems of modern education, it will fail at the state and national levels just as it has at the local level. A viable alternative, tested, proven, and supported by the educational community, eventually will be accepted by state and national policy makers.

Transition 2. From Separate Functions to Integrated Functions

For many university professors and practitioners alike, supervision is synonymous with direct assistance. Others discuss the relationship of supervision, staff development, and curriculum development, but carefully define these as separate processes. The new supervision views a whole range of curriculum and instructional leadership activities as interdependent and interactive, and calls for integrating these activities as functions of educational supervision. Integrated functions of the new supervision include the following:

- leadership development
- improvement of the school environment
- curriculum development
- schoolwide instructional improvement
- staff development

- classroom-based instructional assistance
- improvement of assessment, including student, formative teacher, and program assessment
- external relations, including parent-, community-, business-, and university-school relations

The new supervision recognizes that improvement efforts in any of these areas will affect and be affected by each of the other areas

Interactions between various parts of curricular-instructional systems have, of course, always been present. But in this age of restructuring they are becoming increasingly apparent, as educational leaders find that improvement efforts within one area have been impeded by failure to anticipate obstacles or side effects in other areas. The first step in dealing with the interactive nature of a curricular-instructional system is to recognize it as such, and to begin to develop a *supervision system* (in the ecological, not the mechanistic, sense) for dealing with all aspects of curriculum and instructional leadership. One primary purpose of a supervision system is to study the interactions already taking place and their effects on various subsystems. Another purpose is to coordinate supervision efforts so that they produce mutually consistent, balanced, and synergistic movement toward the school's educational goals.

Models connecting various supervisory functions are already being tested across the nation. For many years Joyce and Showers have been demonstrating the positive effects of linking in-service education and direct assistance through coaching.¹³ Variations of a model proposed by Glickman integrating direct assistance, staff development, curriculum development, and group development within an action research format have proven successful in a number of schools.¹⁴ Strategic improvement efforts focusing on student achievement and the integration of leadership development, curriculum development, improvement of instruction, staff development, and improvement of assessment have shown positive results.¹⁵ Hopkins has shown the relationship between teacher development and school improvement.¹⁶ As practitioners become more aware of the successes of integrated supervision, the trend toward integration will likely increase.

¹³Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, *Student Achievement Through Staff Development* (New York: Longman, 1988)

¹⁴Carl D. Glickman, *Shared Governance at Ogeethorpe County High School* (Athens, GA: Monographs in Education, 1989); Carl D. Glickman, *Supervision of Instruction*, 2nd ed. (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1990)

¹⁵Robert E. Blum and Anthony W. Kneidek, "Strategic Improvement That Focuses on Student Achievement," *Educational Leadership* 48 (April 1991): 17-21

¹⁶David Hopkins, "Integrating Staff Development and School Improvement: A Study of Teacher Personality and School Climate," in *Changing School Culture Through Staff Development*, ed. Bruce Joyce (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990), pp. 41-67

Transition 3: From Sameness to Diversity

If the purpose of supervision is control, it can be viewed as a fairly homomorphic process. All teachers are "in-serviced" in the same prescribed teaching behaviors, then inspected by supervisors to make sure they are correctly displaying those behaviors. Remediation is provided to those who are not. Exactly what the prescribed teaching behaviors and remediation should consist of has been problematic. Our profession has long searched for a "magic bullet," a set of generic elements of instruction that will assure effectiveness in all content areas, for all types of students. Similarly, we have searched for a model of instructional supervision that can be effectively used with all teachers in all situations.

Once a commitment is made to teacher empowerment and we begin to look at teachers as complex, diverse individuals, supervision itself becomes more complex. There is a growing recognition that there is not, and never will be, a single approach to instruction or supervision that can be applied effectively to all teachers, students, or learning content. Empowerment and diversity, taken together, imply that teachers should be allowed *choice* in terms of the instructional strategies they use and the supervisory assistance they are provided.

One response to the recognition of diversity has been to encourage teachers to develop a repertoire of teaching strategies rather than to focus exclusively on any single set of generic skills. Also, new models of supervision have been developed that recognize that teachers represent a wide diversity of developmental levels, needs, interests, and abilities. Glickman has described a model that calls for supervisors to master a variety of interpersonal approaches, including directive, collaborative, and nondirective, and to match particular approaches to teachers' developmental levels and educational situations.¹⁷ Glatthorn has discussed several supervision structures that can be matched with different teachers within the same school. These structures include clinical supervision, professional dialogue, curriculum development, peer supervision, peer coaching, action research, and self-directed growth following a goal-based or diagnostic-feedback model.¹⁸ Glickman's and Glatthorn's models, while more sophisticated than traditional supervision models, have only begun to deal with the reality of teacher diversity. As the paradigm

¹⁷Glickman's "controlling directive" and "informational directive" behaviors are variations of control supervision. However, the *direction* of Glickman's model is toward teacher empowerment and nondirective supervision. Glickman's own work with schools has focused on teacher empowerment rather than control. See Carl D. Glickman, *Supervision of Instruction*, 2nd ed. (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1990).

¹⁸Glatthorn's version of clinical supervision, which he refers to as "intensive development," represents control supervision. The remainder of the supervision formats he proposes, classified as either cooperative development or self-directed development, essentially are teacher-directed processes. Allan A. Glatthorn, *Supervisory Leadership* (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman and Company, 1990).

shift continues, we can expect the emergence of additional models focusing on other types of diversity.

It should be pointed out that recognizing diversity and allowing teacher choice do not conflict with the long line of research that tells us that educators in effective schools possess agreed-upon purpose.¹⁹ The key to a proper tension between the needs for commonality and diversity is to define common goals but to allow teachers choice in how they attain those goals. Two cautions are in order here. First, all teachers should be involved in deciding on the common goals, not just in reaching them. Second, the goals should not be so narrowly defined as to effectively prescribe the means by which they can be attained.

Transition 4. From Occasional Supervisor Assistance to Continuous Collegial Support Networks

The ratio of formally designated supervisors to teachers in almost all school systems severely limits the amount of time and energy that a supervisor can spend working with an individual teacher or even small groups of teachers. Additional duties not directly related to curriculum or instructional assistance further reduce the time that can be spent providing support. The concept of a peer support network is a logical extension of teacher empowerment and a way for teachers to give and receive assistance on a continuous basis.

Within schools, support networks can be formal or informal structures that facilitate collegiality and curriculum and instructional improvement. Specific activities that can take place in intraschool networks include sharing of methods and materials, discussion groups, reading groups, writing groups, peer observation, curriculum integration, instructional teaming, group problem solving, and action research.

Support networks can extend beyond schools and school districts. Regional and national networks can connect teachers interested in the same content areas, instructional innovations, and school improvement efforts. These networks are developed and maintained through conferences, seminars, workshops, computer links, audio- and videotapes, newsletters, and shared instructional materials.

Advantages of networks include increased dialogue, access to information, development of professional norms, a greater sense of efficacy, and recognition of individual and group progress.²⁰ The supervisor's role in developing support networks varies according to the type of network. The supervi-

¹⁹John I. Goodlad, *A Place Called School. Prospects for the Future* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1984); Frank C. Pratzner, "Quality of School Life: Foundations for Improvement," *Educational Researcher* 13 (March 1984): 20-25; Swan J. Rosenholtz, "Effective Schools: Interpreting the Evidence," *American Journal of Education* 93 (May 1985): 352-388.

²⁰Susan Loucks-Horsley, Catherine K. Harding, Margaret A. Arbuckle, Lynn B. Murray, Cynthia Dubea, and Martha K. Williams, *Continuing to Learn* (Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council, 1987).

sor can actively facilitate formal support networks for beginning teachers or experienced teachers involved with innovative programs. For informal networks, the supervisor can foster an environment for network growth by providing resources, moral support, and rewards for network members.

Transition 5: From Applied Science to Professional Inquiry

The old supervision includes the notion that external research can be applied directly to supervision and teaching within the local school and classroom. Applied science has taken many forms, including the scientific management movement, adoption of behavioral science methods, and application of effective teaching research. In recent years the effectiveness research has been the primary basis for instructional improvement models that supervisors have encouraged teachers to adopt. This "encouragement" has taken the form of social pressure as well as "research-based" teacher evaluation systems. Griffin cautions against overreliance on the teaching effectiveness studies.

Much research is correlational, the teaching behaviors associated with positive pupil outcomes were discovered in existing classroom settings. They were, if you will, naturally occurring phenomena in an untampered with context. Few studies have been designed to determine if the same behaviors, when introduced experimentally into classrooms, result in the same pupil outcomes. Also, much of the effective teaching research is situation specific, tied to certain grade levels with certain student populations in specific contexts. Therefore, the results may not be generalizable to other situations. Because a teaching behavior is found to be related to positive pupil outcomes in a third-grade inner-city mathematics class is probably insufficient reason to include it as a behavior standard for a new teacher in a suburban eleventh-grade social studies class.²¹

McNeil has offered five reasons why effective teaching research has made few contributions to teaching practice.²² These reasons are summarized as follows:

- The propositions produced by the research are small compared with the large number of judgments teachers must make.
- The research tends to confirm practitioners' "ordinary knowledge" rather than present new knowledge.
- Only a few teaching variables are tested by researchers, and fewer still are verified to a high degree.
- Research does not address the whole range of classroom problems. Additionally, practitioners do not agree that any research finding is the "final authority."

²¹Garv A. Griffin, "Teacher Induction. Research Issues," *Journal of Teacher Education* 36 (January-February 1985): 44

²²John D. McNeil, "A Scientific Approach to Supervision," in *Supervision of Teaching*, ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982), pp. 18-34

- Many research findings are inconsistent with each other. When findings are inconsistent, practitioners will act on those findings that agree with their ordinary knowledge and reject findings that don't.

An alternative to applied science is professional inquiry carried out by teachers in their own classrooms and schools. Professional inquiry involves teachers collaboratively creating their own knowledge base for professional practice, rather than being forced to adopt practices described in external research or theory. Soltis has described three perspectives on educational research: empirical, interpretive, and critical.²³ Holland and others have applied the three perspectives to teacher inquiry.²⁴ Brief discussions of each follow.

Empirical inquiry might involve teachers learning classroom observation techniques and collecting and analyzing observation data to increase their knowledge of effective teaching.²⁵ It also might take the form of action research, in which teachers define a problem, gather relevant data, consider alternative solutions, implement selected actions, collect data on the effects of those actions, and revise improvement efforts accordingly.

Interpretive inquiry could consist of teachers defining their "educational platforms" (their espoused beliefs about teaching), then exploring the influence of their platforms on their teaching.²⁶ Teachers also could compare platforms and actual teaching practice. Finally, teachers could examine verbatim transcripts or videotapes of their teaching, then interpret the meaning of interactions that take place during the lessons being analyzed.

Critical inquiry calls for teachers to identify and analyze external social, economic, and political interests that attempt to control the school culture, as well as oppressive power relationships within the school culture. According to the critical perspective, the supervisor's role is to empower teachers and students "as active participants in the more democratic creation and use of knowledge."²⁷

All three of these perspectives on professional inquiry have in common "conscious development of teachers' own theories of practice."²⁸ It is ironic

²³Jonas F. Soltis, "On the Nature of Educational Research," *Educational Researcher* 13 (December 1984) 5-10.

²⁴Patricia E. Holland, Renee Clift, and Mary Lou Veal with Marlene Johnson and Jane McCarthy, "Linking Preservice and Inservice Education Through Professional Inquiry," in *Supervision in Transition*, ed. Carl D. Glickman (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992), pp. 169-182.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Ibid., p. 174.

²⁸Ibid.

that the inquiry view, rooted in Dewey and reborn from decade to decade, may finally become standard practice as part of the "new" supervision.²⁹

Transition 6. From a Mechanical to an Organic View of Change

Our notion of change in education has tended to be that of a mechanical process. Under this view, the planning process consists of a set of discreet, linear components, with each component affecting the next component through a simple cause-effect relationship. This view is represented by the boxes and arrows on a flow chart illustrating a traditional improvement plan. These charts consist of component parts, each within its own "box," with the boxes arranged in a linear fashion and connected by one-way arrows. Such flow charts tend to focus on the desired changes only, and not on other aspects of the school as an organization. Once the planning process is complete, the written plan becomes a blueprint to be implemented by supervisors and teachers. A related concept discussed by David is the "project mentality," which views change efforts as consisting of "preallocated budgets, mandated requirements, fixed time lines, and limited scope."³⁰

An alternative view is that of change as organic process. Here the metaphor for change is the growth and development of a complex organism (for example, a human being) rather than the operation of a simple machine. A complex organism begins its life at a relatively small stage. Its development is not completely predictable. Its health requires interdependence, consistency, and balance among its various subsystems. Finally, organisms that flourish tend to be adaptable to changing environments. In fact, they are themselves in a constant state of change or "becoming."

The metaphor of the complex organism leads to a number of practical guidelines to be considered by supervisors and teachers involved in change efforts. Although it is impossible to predict with certainty the effects that any improvement effort will have, this does not mean that formal planning should not take place. However, a different type of planning is suggested, which includes the following features:

- An emphasis on medium-range planning (one to two years) rather than long-range planning (five to ten years).
- An analysis of the political, cultural, economic, and educational interactions that currently are taking place and that may take place as a result of the

²⁹John Dewey, *The Sources of Science Education* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1929); Stephen M. Corey, *Action Research to Improve School Practices* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953); Robert J. Schaefer, *The School as the Center of Inquiry* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967); Judith Warren Little, "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Work-Place Conditions of School Success," *American Educational Research Journal* 19 (Fall 1992): 325-340; Carl D. Glickman, *Supervision of Instruction*, 2nd ed. (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1990).

³⁰Jane L. David, "Restructuring and Technology: Partners in Change," *Pbi Delta Kappan* 73 (September 1991) 37-40, 78-80, 82.

change effort, with the results of that analysis serving as input for the planning process.³¹

- An emphasis on general goals, broad guidelines, and allowance for flexibility at the school and classroom level, rather than narrow objectives and prescribed behaviors.

- A formal plan that is viewed as tentative rather than fixed the initial plan as a starting point rather than an end point.

Implementation of change efforts should include the following considerations:

- Starting small, with a group of teachers who are interested in exploring the potentiality of new ways of doing things and of sharing their experiences and results with others.

- Continuous provisions for "feed-forward" and feedback designed to determine teacher concerns as well as anticipated and actual effects of change efforts, and to serve as bases for the mutual adaptation that characterizes successful change.³²

- An emphasis on process rather than product. Patterson and others illustrate this point in their discussion of strategic versus conventional planning:

the goal of strategic planning is to produce a stream of wise decisions designed to achieve the mission of the organization. Emphasis shifts from product to process. Just as the planning process builds in flexibility for adapting to changing conditions in and out of the organization, it also accepts that the final product may not resemble what was initially intended.³³

WILL THE NEW SUPERVISION PREVAIL?

A discussion of whether or not the emergent paradigm I call the new supervision will ultimately displace the old supervision should be prefaced by two points. First, several of the "new" views discussed above are not really new! Many have been proposed during one or more periods in the history of educational supervision and have been tried on a limited basis, but never fully accepted as part of standard practice. This does not mean that the new supervision is doomed to failure. Kuhn reminds us that it is quite normal for new paradigms to have been partially formulated and rejected in past peri

³¹Jerry L. Patterson, Stewart C. Purkey, Jackson V. Parker, *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986).

³²Gene E. Hall and Shirley M. Hord, *Change in Schools Facilitating the Process* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987).

³³Jerry L. Patterson, Stewart C. Purkey, Jackson V. Parker, *Proactive School Systems for a Nonrational World* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986), p. 61.

ods.³⁴ If the new supervision becomes the dominant paradigm, it will be because of the unique combination of the current educational crisis, failure of the old paradigm, and success of the new paradigm in addressing the crisis

The second preliminary point is that the new supervision is certainly not fully defined on these pages. Others will have different interpretations of the new paradigm, will classify the transitions taking place into different categories, and will use different terminology to describe those transitions. But Kuhn points out that a new paradigm can be identified and accepted without a full interpretation or standardization of the new model.³⁵ The new supervision can guide practice even if it is not reduced to a set of universally accepted assumptions or principles.

Although neither previous rejection of aspects of the new supervision nor its incomplete delineation are relevant factors in predicting the likelihood of its success, its acceptance by the professional community is by no means assured. We should not underestimate the tendency of many educators to dismiss the current crisis or to resist needed change, although the intense pressure from outside of education is making denial and resistance increasingly difficult. Another possibility is that a third and entirely different paradigm will displace both paradigms discussed here. In the final analysis, one can only discuss how the process of the paradigm shift will play out if it continues, not whether or not the new supervision will finally prevail.

The debate phase of the process is characterized by a great many circular arguments. Both proponents of the old and new supervision use their own paradigm to argue in favor of that paradigm. Since both groups are arguing from within the boundaries of their own paradigm, neither group is able to convince the other of points that seem perfectly obvious to the proponent group.³⁶ One aspect of these circular debates is disagreement not only about how to solve problems but the identification of the problems themselves! Language also becomes problematic:

Since new paradigms are born from old ones, they ordinarily incorporate much of the vocabulary and apparatus, both conceptual and manipulative, that the traditional paradigm had previously employed. But they seldom employ those borrowed elements in quite the traditional way. Within the new paradigm, old terms, concepts, and experiments fall into new relationships with one another. The inevitable result is what we must call . . . a misunderstanding between the two competing worlds.³⁷

Because of paradigm boundaries, circular arguments, and language barriers, it is not likely that research results or logical arguments alone will cause individuals to shift from one paradigm to another. Rather, individual change,

³⁴Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962)

³⁵Ibid

³⁶Ibid

³⁷Ibid, p. 148

if it occurs, will likely be in the form of "conversion" to the new paradigm.³⁸ The conversion likely will be caused by a combination of exposure to the new supervision and successful application of the new model to problems that the old supervision has been repeatedly unable to solve. The paradigm shift from the old to the new supervision, if it takes place, will be gradual in the sense that over time, increasing numbers of individuals will experience such conversions, and those committed to the new supervision will gradually become the majority.

Throughout this article, I have discussed the possibility of a paradigm shift within the supervision "community." Clearly, there are subcommunities within the community of professionals who are concerned with curriculum and instructional leadership. There are university professors who do a great deal of the teaching, research, and writing about supervision. There are professionals at state agencies who are concerned with leadership, service, and monitoring. Finally, there are the practitioners of supervision at the school district and building level. While new paradigms within communities of university scholars or within state agencies will certainly influence school practitioners, it is within the community of practitioners that the new paradigm must prevail if real changes in curriculum and instructional leadership are to take place. Moreover, significant numbers of *teachers* must become aware of and part of the new supervision if it is to succeed.

Carl Glickman once compared supervision to the glue that holds a school together, it's not highly visible, but it is essential. Everything falls apart if it ceases to bond effectively. Given the current crisis in education and the failure of the old supervision to meet that crisis, the new supervision can be viewed as the new improved glue necessary to restructure schools and teaching. One by one, educators will be exposed to the new supervision in one form or another. Whether or not they reject the old paradigm and accept the new, supervision may well determine if we can successfully restructure schools, teaching, and learning to overcome the crisis that confronts us

STEPHEN P. GORDON is Assistant Professor of Education, Curriculum and Supervision Program, College of Education, Pennsylvania State University, 222 Rackley Building, University Park, PA 16802.

³⁸Ibid

Copyright © 1992 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.