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ABSTRACT

This research was a case study of the post-conference interactions between two principal-teacher dyads. The purpose of the study was to address three questions suggested to be important by the literature. The research questions posed were:

1. Do principals relate differently to beginning teachers than to experienced teachers?
2. If differences do exist, what reasons do principals give to explain why they are relating differently?
3. How do teachers perceive the principals' behaviors in the conferences?

The main sources of data were video-recordings and transcriptions of four teacher-principal post-observation conferences, transcriptions of each of the eight stimulated-recall interviews, and follow-up interviews with each participant. The post-observation conference verbal behaviors were analyzed using Blumberg's System for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction (Blumberg, 1980). The data were also considered in terms of Glickman's (1990) concept of Developmental Supervision.

The following are the findings regarding principal-teacher interaction in the post-observation conference. First, the principals did not appear to consider level of teacher experience when formulating a supervisory approach. They based their supervisory approach mainly on their own philosophy of supervision and on their perceptions of the
teachers' needs at the time. Second, the principals did not seem to assume that teachers of varying levels of experience needed to be treated differently in the supervisory post-conference. Third, the teachers perceived principals' behaviors with varying degrees of accuracy. Their perceptions appeared to be influenced by previous supervisory experiences and by the present relationship they enjoyed with their current supervisor.

Four conclusions were derived from the findings. They were: (1) a developmentally appropriate supervisory approach should be based on more than the level of teacher experience, taking into account such factors as the teacher-supervisor relationship, the teacher's previous supervisory experiences, and current teaching assignment; (2) an open, trusting relationship between supervisor and teacher is crucial to the effectiveness of the supervisory process; (3) formal evaluation is counterproductive in the supervisory process if the goal of the supervision is professional growth; (4) the teacher's perception of the supervisor's behavior is critical to the effectiveness of the supervisory process and to the professional relationship between the supervisor and the teacher.

The main implication for theory is that, although level of teacher experience could make a difference in how teachers are treated in the post-conference, there appears to be other factors of equal, if not greater importance. It may be that the need for a directive approach with
experienced teachers is more common than the developmental theory articulated by Glickman (1990) suggests.

Several important implications for practice arise from the findings of this study. First, supervisors need to consider such factors as curriculum and teaching demands on teachers when formulating a supervisory approach, and develop a repertoire of approaches, rather than depending on any particular one. Second, supervisors need the time and opportunity to properly build and maintain the open, trusting relationship conducive to a successful supervisory experience. Third, a professional growth program which includes collegial supervision should be seriously considered as a replacement for formal, evaluative supervision.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background

The supervision of teachers is a timely issue in British Columbia. The new School Act (Ministry of Education, 1989) is silent on the issue of teacher supervision, and the matter is now open for negotiation between teachers and school boards.

Historically, teacher supervision has been tied to evaluation. Smyth (1984) describes traditional supervision as a way of controlling the "behavior of teachers through elaborate systems of prescription, inspection, and evaluation" (p.429). Clinical supervision was designed as an alternative to the inspectorial model of traditional supervision, with the goal of improving instructional practice (Cogan, 1973). However, it is not clear that clinical supervision is effective in achieving instructional improvement (Grimmett and Crehan, 1990). Although Cogan (1973) envisioned clinical supervision as a collegial and democratic process, Smyth (1984) suggests that its collegial and democratic nature has been contaminated by hierarchical and evaluative methods of supervision. He says of supervision that "we need to totally rethink our perspective, including the social, cultural, and pedagogical
relationships we believe are important and whatever we believe is indispensable about the nature of teaching and learning" (Smyth 1989, p.165). The issues around supervision are further complicated by Glickman's (1990) suggestion that beginning and experienced teachers prefer different supervisory behaviors, and that this preference has implications for the effectiveness of clinical supervision. The teaching profession, under current legislation, has the opportunity to create an innovative and effective supervisory system for promoting teacher growth and development.

Rationale

The research into post-observation supervisory conferences includes experiments, surveys, and questionnaires investigating the perceptions and reactions of teachers and supervisors to the conference interactions. Some researchers, such as Lortie (1975), have studied the sociology of school life, providing a description of the context in which supervision occurs. However, the study described in this thesis differs from others in that it examines in depth the interactions of two principal-teacher dyads engaged in a supervisory post-conference. One teacher is experienced, the other in her first year of teaching. This research seeks to add to the body of knowledge about
supervision by providing a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the principal-teacher interactions. This research addresses the role that principals might play in encouraging instructional improvement, and teacher growth and development through the use of appropriate supervisory behaviors. The findings could be useful in determining more effective and productive exemplars of supervision for both beginning and experienced teachers.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the interactions between principals and teachers in the post-observation supervisory conference in an attempt to address three specific research questions suggested to be important by the literature.

1. Do principals relate differently to beginning teachers than to experienced teachers?
   
   It may be that no deliberate differences exist. The literature reviewed in Chapter Two emphasizes the importance of an appropriate supervisory approach and seems to suggest that differences should exist.

2. If differences do exist, what reasons do principals give to explain why they are relating differently?
   
   It may be that, while differences exist, principals are not able to articulate reasons for the differences. This
research seeks to discover and explain the reasons for the existence or non-existence of differences from the principal's perspective.

3. How do teachers perceive the principals' behaviors in the conferences?

Research findings indicate that teachers' perceptions of supervisory behaviors are accurate reflections of that behavior (Blumberg, 1980; Link, 1974), and that the effectiveness of the supervisory process is related to the teachers' perceptions of the appropriateness of the principal's supervisory behaviors.

Limitations and Delimitations

The research described in this thesis is not a study of the post-supervisory conference in general, and the results are not necessarily generalizable to a larger population. Instead, the research focuses on two principal-teacher dyads and the nature of the interactions within those dyads. The role of gender in the interactions was beyond the scope of this study and therefore was not examined.

Thesis Overview

This section presents an overview of the rest of the thesis. Chapter Two reviews the literature on clinical
supervision, with special emphasis on the research related to the post-observation conference.

Chapter Three describes the research method and includes a description of the larger study in which this one is embedded. This chapter also provides a rationale for the choice of methodology.

Chapters Four and Five present the case study descriptions of the two dyads under investigation. Included in the case study are descriptions and analyses of the interactions of the participants, their perceptions of the interactions, and their reactions to the events of the post-observation conferences. Chapter Six presents a comparison of the two dyads. It looks at similarities and differences between and among the interactions of the two dyads.

Chapter Seven presents the conclusions and recommendations resulting from this investigation. This chapter relates the research findings to the literature and considers the relevance of the findings to the field of study in clinical supervision.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter relates to the topic of clinical supervision in general and supervisory conferences in particular. The review discusses the origins of, and research into, clinical supervision, which is the supervisory model employed by the participants in this study. The research section examines the topics of teacher and student teacher responses to supervisory behaviors, actual supervisory behaviors, and conflict for principals in their roles as helpers and evaluators. The final part of the review describes Glickman's (1990) concept of developmental supervision.

ORIGINS OF CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Clinical supervision was developed as an alternative to the hierarchical and authoritarian model of traditional supervision. Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) state that the purpose of clinical supervision is to improve teaching practices. Cogan goes further to suggest that clinical supervision should foster "the development of the professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his [sic] own performance" (p.12).
Cogan believes that a sustained program of supervision which consists of in-class observation is necessary to achieve those ends. He outlines eight phases or steps in the supervisory process. In actual practice those steps typically have been reduced to three: pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference.

The key to successful clinical supervision is the teacher-supervisor relationship. Cogan (1973) states that teachers distrust "direct supervisory intervention" (p.16) and need to have control over the supervisory practice as it applies to them. He suggests that the typical isolation of teaching makes teachers anxious about having other adults in their classrooms. Cogan believes that the success of the supervisory process is dependent on the relationship between the supervisor and the teacher both outside and within the supervisory context. Cogan states that the supervisory relationship should be person-oriented and should not threaten teachers' professional or psychological security or self-esteem.

Cogan suggests that an important aspect of the supervisory relationship is its degree of democracy or equality. He envisions a relationship in which teachers share equal responsibility for change. Cogan states that the "superior-subordinate relationship is considered counter-productive in clinical supervision" (p.59). Supervisors should treat teachers as colleagues, not as student-teachers. Cogan suggests that a supervisor who acts
in a directive way can cause a teacher to depend on, resist, or withdraw from, the supervisory process.

For Goldhammer et al. (1980), clinical supervision means a "face-to-face" relationship between the teacher and the supervisor, and they agree that the supervisor must reduce the teacher's apprehension about the supervisory experience. They point out the importance of mutual trust in the supervisory relationship. They state that mutual trust is developed through the setting of mutual goals and objectives; through professionalism and harmonious interaction; and through a certain human autonomy which enhances freedom for both the teacher and the supervisor to express ideas and opinions about how the method of supervision should be implemented to best improve teaching (p.4).

Cogan and Goldhammer et al. refer to clinical supervision as an essentially democratic model based on equality and mutual trust, the purpose of which is to improve teaching practices. Subsequent writings on clinical supervision have emphasized the development of teachers as thoughtful practitioners. Indeed, Smyth (1989) suggests that the whole concept of supervision needs to be reconsidered. He believes that the emphasis on the technical aspects of teaching practice is misplaced, and that supervision should be concerned with creating teachers who question the very foundations of schools as institutions, who are engaged in making sense of their teaching practice, and who understand the forces that press
upon them in the course of their working lives. Smyth describes his view as an "educative agenda for supervision" (p.162).

RESEARCH ON CLINICAL SUPERVISION

This section of the literature review examines the research on clinical supervision. The research is divided into five main themes: (1) teacher responses to perceived supervisory conference behavior, (2) student teacher responses to perceived supervisory conference behaviors, (3) supervisory effectiveness, (4) actual supervisory conference behaviors, and (5) the conflict principals experience in their roles as helpers and evaluators. Within each theme, sub-themes are identified by integrating, when appropriate, the ideas of several authors.

Teacher Responses to Perceived Supervisory Conference Behavior

If one accepts that the ultimate purpose of supervision is to increase student learning by improving teachers' instructional practices (Holland 1988), then it is important that supervisors use the supervision process to achieve that end. Some studies in the area of teacher supervision have examined teacher responses to perceived supervisory behaviors. The following sections discuss the
nature of supervisory conference behavior and the sub-themes of: (1) supervisors' use of indirect and direct behaviors, (2) teachers' granting of access to self, and (3) collegial and democratic supervisory conference behaviors.

Nature of supervisory conference behavior. Blumberg and Weber (1968) and Pajak and Glickman (1989) concluded that experienced teachers responded more positively to less directing supervisory behaviors. Blumberg and Weber studied teachers who perceived their supervisors to be behaving in directing and non-directing ways and compared their perceptions of the degree of directedness with their level of morale. The results indicated that teachers' morale increased in response to the amount of indirect supervisory behavior. They suggest that "a high morale situation exists where a relatively competent person has reasonable freedom of action, has a sense of being involved in problem-solving" and is "relatively free from external evaluation" (p.112). They conclude that the behavioral style of the supervisor is crucial to the interpersonal environment that develops in the supervisory process. Although they do not make an explicit connection between teacher morale and improved instructional practices, one is implied.

Link's (1974) study included a "re-investigation" of Blumberg's work. His results concerning the relationship between teachers' perceptions of supervisory behaviors and teacher reactions to the supervisory conferences were almost identical to those of Blumberg.
Link found that teachers who perceived supervisory behaviors as non-directive also rated more highly the productivity of the conference and the amount they had learned about themselves and their practice. Teachers who perceived the supervisory behaviors as directive also perceived the supervisors as controlling and evaluative. They felt constrained from initiating discussion about instructional problems.

In contrast to Blumberg and Weber who studied teachers' reactions to a range of directing and non-directing behaviors, Pajak and Glickman examined teacher responses to three sub-groups of directing behaviors. The directing behaviors were information only, information with suggestions, and information with directives. These verbal behaviors were recorded by supervisors on video-tape and viewed by teachers. Pajak and Glickman found that teachers preferred the least directing behaviors of information with suggestions and information only and that this preference resulted in positive feelings toward the supervisor and toward instructional change. They cite a theory by Deci and Ryan which suggests that greater control over one's work activities results in increased productivity and satisfaction. Both Blumberg and Weber, and Pajak and Glickman note that, although teachers reject controlling behaviors, they respond positively to suggestions about instructional improvement if the suggestions are accompanied by non-directing behavior and
control remains with the teacher. Pajak and Glickman also refer to other studies which indicate that teachers prefer collaborative discussions with supervisors. They conclude that "a climate that encourages freedom of choice appears more likely to improve teachers' receptivity to suggestions for improvement" (p.102). Desrochers (1982) concluded that, to be effective, non-directing behaviors should be accompanied by justification, which she defines as "rules or generalizations that constitute reasons for evaluative statements in a conference. (p.64).

The studies by Blumberg and Weber, and Pajak and Glickman relied on teachers' perceptions of the supervisors' behaviors. On the one hand, a person's perception is his or her reality, but on the other hand, there are other realities in a given situation. There was no independent check of the teachers' perceptions in the Blumberg and Weber study. By contrast, in the Pajak and Glickman study the degree of directing language was the independent variable. However, they studied a simulated situation and its generalizability to real situations was not established. In real situations, a teacher's ability to perceive and respond to different supervisory behaviors is very context-dependent. The authors noted some effect due to the order in which the subjects viewed the tapes.

Access to self. The importance of appropriate behaviors in the supervisory process is emphasized in a recent study by Blumberg and Jonas (1987). They suggest
that teachers control the supervisory conference by choosing whether or not to grant "access to self". Consistent with the evidence discussed above, Blumberg and Jonas found that teachers responded positively to behaviors such as non-punitive feedback, a collaborative approach to problem-solving, and a sense of being listened to. They go further to suggest that these behaviors caused teachers to grant supervisors "access to self" which resulted in a conference that teachers perceived as productive in terms of either instructional growth or increased personal insight. The subjects for this study were chosen because they were able to recall a productive supervisory conference. The evidence for the conclusion was therefore based on the subjective, personal views of the subjects. Nonetheless, this conclusion is important because it confirms the view that teachers' cooperation is necessary for a successful supervisory process.

Collegial and democratic supervisory conference behaviors. The findings of Blumberg and Weber, Blumberg and Jonas, and Pajak and Glickman are supported by Reavis' (1977) study. Reavis describes a project that was designed to see whether clinical supervision was more effective than traditional supervision. The two modes of supervision were differentiated by the amount of democratic verbal behavior. The supervisors were trained in both methods. The teachers were unaware that they were part of a study. The raters who analyzed the taped interviews were
not aware of the focus of the study. This study provides support for an emphasis on collegial and democratic behaviors in supervision. The results show that teachers reacted more positively to clinical supervision than to traditional supervision on all the dependent measures and to a significant degree on some dependent measures. According to Reavis, clinical supervision, in practice, tends to have an "authoritarian orientation", although it was designed to facilitate a "democratic, supportive supervisor-teacher relationship" (p.314). Nonetheless, he concludes that, relative to traditional methods, clinical supervision "tends to build more positive communication between supervisors and teachers, and that this is so perceived by teachers" (p.315).

Young and Heichberger (1975) surveyed elementary teachers in rural and suburban schools and graduate students in a course on supervision to determine their "perceptions of an effective school supervision and evaluation program" (p.10). Most respondents (82%) felt that supervision and evaluation programs were necessary, but at the same time, 72% felt that the supervisory situation was "potentially dangerous". Most (87%) felt that evaluation and supervision should be used mainly to improve instructional practices. Virtually all of the respondents wanted a helping or collegial relationship with the supervisor as distinct from an evaluative relationship. They indicated that effective communication was crucial to the
relationship between themselves and their supervisors. It should be noted that the respondents were reacting to choices presented in the questionnaire, not giving their unrestricted personal view. In the questionnaire, the most collegial option that the respondents could choose was operationalized as the supervisor and the teacher agreeing on instructional objectives and working together to evaluate the teacher performance in relation to the objectives, based on data from the observation. One cannot conclude that this degree of collegiality is an optimum one for teachers.

Student Teacher Responses to Perceived Supervisory Behaviors

Blumberg (1968) and others studied the responses of experienced teachers. Two investigations into student teacher responses to supervisory conference behaviors are discussed in this section. Each reaches a different conclusion regarding the most effective supervisory conference behaviors to use with student teachers.

Copeland and Atkinson (1978) conducted a study of student teachers to determine their responses to directive and non-directive supervisory behaviors. Their study sought to eliminate contextual factors and reliance on subject memory by conducting a controlled supervisory experience. The subjects were elementary student teachers who responded to audio-tapes of directive or non-directive supervisory
scripts. The subjects then rated the supervisors according to eight concepts such as expertness, trustworthiness, and utility. The subjects preferred the directive behaviors over the non-directive behaviors. The authors offer several possible explanations for their findings. They suggest that student teachers want concrete solutions from those whom they consider experts, that they are anxious to please the supervisor because of the latter's evaluation function, and that they lack the experience necessary to benefit from the indirect method. The findings may also reflect the context-free nature of the study. Copeland and Atkinson conclude that supervisors should choose an appropriate supervisory approach based on the teachers' needs. If the authors' speculations regarding the reasons for their findings are correct, this study indicates a likelihood that beginning teachers might respond much as do student teachers.

Martin, Isherwood, and Rapagna (1978) also investigated student teacher responses to direct and indirect supervisory conference behaviors. They concluded that there was "no significant difference between the effects of direct and indirect supervisor style" (p.85). The authors suggest that the controlled setting may have had an impact on the results since the element of judgement or evaluation was eliminated. This offers a possible explanation for the discrepancy between their findings and those of Blumberg and others regarding teacher responses to direct and indirect
supervisory styles. It may be that the lack of the evaluative aspect made the supervisory style unimportant.

In addition to analyzing student teachers' responses, Martin, Isherwood, and Rapagna (1978) also investigated whether supervisory behaviors actually changed student teachers' practices. They concluded that supervisors "can effect change in a given direction" (p.85).

**Supervisory Conference Behaviors**

The studies reviewed above, although not unanimous, suggest that collegial, non-directing behaviors are associated with experienced teachers' positive responses to the supervisory process, and, by implication, are most effective in fostering instructional improvement in experienced teachers. These findings can be compared with studies examining the actual behaviors employed by supervisors and those behaviors perceived by them as effective.

**Actual supervisor conference behaviors.** Blumberg (1970) examined the verbal behaviors of a non-random sample of teachers and supervisors in the supervisory conference. In his analysis of the taped conferences, he noted that supervisors were mostly directive in their behaviors. They tended to be evaluative and did not encourage the development of an understanding of the instructional problem that would lead to a plan of action. Blumberg and Cusick
(1970), reporting on the same study, note that the least used teacher behavior was that of asking the supervisor questions and the least used supervisor behavior was that of asking teachers for suggestions. Blumberg concludes that such supervisory behaviors would not lead to teacher growth, and would not result in a collaborative relationship with a teacher.

Perceived effective supervisor behaviors. Gordon's (1973) report indicates a potential explanation for the supervisory behaviors noted by Blumberg. Gordon describes a study that was conducted to discover which behaviors were thought by supervisors to be most effective when working with teachers in a supervisory conference. The information was gathered from supervisors in a questionnaire that asked them to judge which of their behaviors contributed to an effective supervisory conference. The survey revealed that supervisors perceived directing behaviors to be the most effective. This study relied on supervisors' perceptions of both the effectiveness of the conference and their own behaviors.

Gordon's results are contested by those of Isherwood (1983), who found that "supervisors who are "indirect" more than "direct" in working with teachers are perceived to be more effective by school principals" (p. 17). In reference to Gordon's findings, Isherwood speculates that while principals think that indirect behaviors such as informing
and advising are effective, they do not actually use them in their own practice.

Role Conflict in Supervision

Several authors suggest that the dual role of evaluator and helper presents problems for supervisors. This section considers some viewpoints on the role conflict in supervision.

**Building trust.** Salek (1975) considers the problems caused by the dual supervisory roles of evaluation and helping. He maintains that the evaluation aspect impedes the growth of the trusting relationship which must exist for effective supervision. He suggests a non-directive supervisory approach, which eliminates the judgmental aspect and creates a reciprocal trust situation. Salek describes the principal as a potential tool by which teachers are able to change their own behaviors.

**Perceptions of role conflict.** Kelly and Taylor (1990) investigated supervisors' and teachers' perceptions of the supervisors' dual roles and how supervisors resolved the potential role conflict. They distributed questionnaires to administrators, who in turn selected teacher respondents with whom they felt they had a good supervisory relationship. Almost half of the administrators perceived a potential role conflict and 70% felt that their perceptions of the role conflict differed from the teachers'
perceptions. Of the teacher respondents, almost half also agreed that there was a potential role conflict between the supervision and evaluation of instruction. In responding to questions about how administrators reduce role conflict, administrators and teachers disagreed. Administrators believe that they practice behaviors designed to reduce conflict more than was perceived to be case by teachers. The authors state that both teachers and administrators think that supervision and evaluation should be separate processes, and that both agreed "that communication was key to the elimination of the role conflict" (p.106).

**Supervisor authenticity.** Pajak and Seyforth (1983) suggest that supervisors are successful when they are authentic, that is, when they practice supervisory behaviors which have been assimilated into their belief and value systems, rather than practice in a way they feel is expected of them. The problem of inauthenticity is rooted in the conflicting role demands of being both helper and evaluator. Pajak and Seyforth say that both the teacher and the supervisor need to establish contact, that is, "each individual must establish and maintain contact with his or her personal feelings, needs, and wants, and be willing to make these known" (p.22). In an effort to be supportive, supervisors may avoid difficult issues and thereby send conflicting messages to teachers, resulting in confusion for the teacher and an unproductive conference. Pajak and Seyforth indicate that it may be
appropriate for the supervisor to use directive behavior, since the meaning and intentions of the supervisor are made clearer to the teacher.

Cogan (1973) also addresses supervisor authenticity when he suggests that supervisors must be aware of their own beliefs, values, and attitudes and how their own perceptions influence their judgements. On the one hand, Cogan says that supervisors must understand their own behavior and modify it appropriately. On the other hand, Cogan agrees that supervisors' behaviors should be consistent with their character and personality.

The literature reviewed thus far suggests that for supervision to be effective in fostering instructional growth, teachers must perceive the process to be democratic and collaborative, not controlling and evaluative. However, there is evidence that supervisors think that teachers want directing behaviors. Clearly, it is important to the effectiveness of the supervisory process that supervisors understand and practice appropriate supervisory behaviors.

DEVELOPMENTAL SUPERVISION

All of the studies reviewed above involve interactions between supervisors and either experienced teachers or student teachers. However, Glickman (1990) cites studies such as that of Copeland and Atkinson (1978), and Lorch
(1981), which support his conclusion that beginning teachers prefer a more directive approach. He cites one study (Humphrey, 1983) that suggests that student teachers prefer a collaborative approach. Glickman states that, to be most effective in fostering instructional change, supervisors should treat experienced teachers differently from beginning teachers. He says that some experienced teachers prefer a non-directive approach, but most prefer a collaborative approach. Beginning teachers "...initially prefer a directive-informational approach or collaborative approach by their supervisors" (1990, p. 176).

Glickman suggests that one of four supervisory approaches, directive-informational, directive-controlling, collaborative, or non-directive, is appropriate for a given teacher. According to Glickman, directive-controlling behaviors are appropriate when teachers do not have the inclination, awareness, knowledge, or skills to improve a situation that the supervisor perceives as a problem to the students, other teachers, or the community. A directive-controlling approach is characterized by the belief that the supervisor knows best. In a directive-controlling supervisory situation, the supervisor states the problem and provides the solution by giving the teacher concrete instructions and ensuring that the teacher has the resources to follow through. The teacher is given the opportunity to state his or her point of view on both the
problem and the solution, but is expected to agree to the solution plan.

Glickman's directive-informational supervisory approach views the supervisor as the source of information and expertise, but solicits teacher feedback, and allows the teacher some control in choosing which practices to implement. In a directive-informational supervisory conference, the supervisor gains understanding of the problem from the teacher's perspective and suggests several alternatives. The supervisor asks for teacher input into the suggested solutions, and asks the teacher to choose one or more for implementation. According to Glickman, this approach is particularly helpful to inexperienced teachers or those who are "confused, unaware, or simply at a loss" (P.158) about how to solve a classroom or school problem.

For Glickman, a non-directive supervisory approach is based on the assumption that an individual teacher knows best what instructional changes need to be made and has the ability to think and act on his or her actions (p.122).

The supervisor's role is to help the teacher identify problems and to encourage the teacher in developing solutions. In a non-directive supervisory conference, the supervisor withholds his or her own opinions and suggestions, and maintains a non-judgemental, neutral position. The supervisor uses questioning, paraphrasing,
and probing, to facilitate the teacher's understanding of 
the problem, and the development of possible solutions.

A collaborative supervisory approach is appropriate
when the teacher and the supervisor are equally 
knowledgeable and competent or when both are accountable for
the outcome. This approach involves a "frank exchange of 
ideas" (Glickman, 1990, p.137) between the supervisor and 
the teacher. In a collaborative conference, the 
supervisor, through questioning and encouraging behaviors,
helps the teacher to clarify the problem and verifies the 
teacher's perception, but also provides his or her own 
perceptions of the problem. The supervisor offers thoughts 
and suggestions, but only after the teacher has tendered his 
or hers. Essential to a collaborative approach is true 
equality between the participants. Collaborative 
supervision (which may involve disagreement and 
negotiation) leads to the development of solutions which 
are agreeable to both.

There are several implications which arise from 
Glickman's concept of "developmental supervision" and the 
literature reviewed thus far. First, if supervisors do not 
treat experienced teachers differently from beginning 
teachers, then it is less likely that the supervisory 
process will be effective. Assuming the validity of 
Glickman's concept, it is possible that an inappropriate 
approach to the supervisory process might lead 
experienced teachers to avoid full participation. Second,
Glickman suggests that teachers' preferences for supervisory approach vary within a given level of experience, and that underlines the importance of supervisors' having a good relationship with their teachers, and being alert to their supervisory preferences.

This chapter has reviewed the literature related to the topic of clinical supervision in general and supervisory conferences in particular. Chapter Three will discuss the design of this study and the larger research project of which it is a part.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Chapter Three outlines the research method of the present study. Since the present study is embedded in a larger study, the larger study is described first, followed by a description of the research design for this researcher's study.

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT STUDY

The purpose of the larger study (Grimmett and Crehan, 1990) is to shed light on the consultation process following a classroom observation, and to compare the relative effects of hierarchical and peer supervision on teacher professional growth and development.

Districts Involved

The participants in the larger study are teachers and administrators from two lower-mainland school districts of similar size. The two districts vary in at least one significant way for the purposes of this study. In District A, teacher supervision is tied to evaluation (Collective Agreement, 1988), and is done by principals or vice-principals operating in a hierarchical mode. In
District B, there is no routine evaluative supervision for teachers as of September, 1989. Instead, the teachers' collective agreement (1988) provides for teachers to develop, in consultation with principals, their own instructional improvement plan. The collective agreement makes it clear that the responsibility and the freedom of choice in formulating the plan lies with the teachers:

The areas of instructional improvement chosen for emphasis will be those identified by the teacher, and the plan of action will make provision for thoughtful self-assessment and professional feedback from those staff involved in whichever supervisory model has been chosen (p. 52).\(^1\)

**Population and Sample**

In both districts, a series of meetings, to which all teachers and principals were invited, was held to explain the project. This researcher attended two of the three introductory meetings held in District B. At both meetings, the new collective agreement provisions, along with their genesis and philosophical underpinnings, were explained. The teacher development project was described and volunteers were requested. In District B, this study was promoted as a way for teachers to fulfill the requirements of the collective agreement. Research team

---

\(^1\) The agreement does not preclude a formal evaluative report if requested by a teacher, or if deemed necessary by the principal because of a perceived deficiency not being resolved by the instructional improvement plan.
members working in pairs made school visits to speak with the potential participants to answer their questions, address their concerns, and determine if they met the research criteria. To be included in the project, volunteers filled in and/or signed the following:

a) a subject consent form which emphasized their right to withdraw at any time,

b) a teacher efficacy scale,

c) a paragraph completion test to determine their level of conceptual functioning, and

d) a demographic questionnaire.

The study subjects are volunteers. They constitute a purposive sample. This sample "is not intended to be representative or typical" (Guba, 1981, p.86), but rather consists of subjects who are involved in the activity under study. A purposive sample is based on the belief that people construct their own realities as they ascribe meaning to, and make sense of, their life experiences. Guba (1981) states that there are as many realities as there are people. A purposive sample seeks to discover these realities. Because a purposive sample is not representative or typical, it is "more likely to uncover multiple realities" and therefore increase the "range of data exposed" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p.40). People construct their realities within contexts. The subjects are in many school sites within the two districts. This
suggests that many different contexts, and therefore many different realities, will be encountered.

Procedure

The teacher development project consists of a series of four observation cycles between January, 1990 and May, 1991. Beginning after the first observation cycle, a series of workshops was conducted after each round of observations. The workshops, which constitute the treatment, were interspersed throughout the period of the study. The workshop topics focused on supervisory skills and strategies, and classroom management techniques.

The participants are in either teacher-teacher or administrator-teacher dyads. At any given lesson there is the teacher, an observer (either administrator or another teacher), and two members of the research team. The research team members function as non-participant observers during the lesson, recording field notes of classroom events, including student and teacher dialogue, interactions, and behaviors. The teacher and the observer function separately from the research team members. They participate in a normal supervisory cycle of pre-observation conference, observation (with the observer's focus chosen by the teacher), and post-observation conference.

The post-conference is video-taped with only the dyad members present. After the post-conference, one research
team member views the video-tape of the conference with each of the dyad members separately, listening to, and eliciting, reactions, thoughts, observations, and explanations related to the conference. These stimulated-recall interviews are audio-taped and later transcribed with the dialogue from both the post-conference and the stimulated-recall interviews included on one transcript. The present study focused on the relationship of the members of two dyads from the larger study.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The following section presents the study design of this research. It describes the sample selection procedure, the basis of the study design, and the study and data collection procedures. The final part of this section discusses the reliability and validity of the study, and the procedure for data analysis.

Sample Selection Procedure

This study focused on two principal-teacher dyads selected from the larger study, one dyad containing a beginning teacher in her first year of teaching, and one dyad containing an experienced teacher. This researcher worked with only one dyad containing a beginning teacher (female), so that dyad was included automatically. Of the
dyads with experienced teachers with whom this researcher worked, all but one were deemed unsuitable for the following reasons:

- this researcher's friendship with one teacher,
- illness of another teacher, and
- the friendship between the participants in the third dyad.

Both principals are experienced, one with 5 years experience, and the other with 10. The female principal is paired with the experienced male teacher and the male principal is paired with the beginning female teacher. One dyad is from District A and one from District B. The sample selection is non-random and therefore not necessarily representative of the population.

**Study Design**

This research is a case study design using ethnographic methods. Werner and Rothe (1980) define ethnography as a "description of situations". They say that an ethnographer should interpret or report on peoples' actions according to the way the people understand them. Spradley (1979) describes ethnography as "learning from people" (p. 3). He says that the ethnographer seeks to discover the meanings that places, events and actions have for the subjects. This is also called a phenomenological

---

2 Gender is not examined in this study.
approach, which Wiersma (1986) describes as an approach that attempts to understand behavior from the perspective of the subjects. A researcher using ethnographic methods should avoid forming preconceptions or hypotheses which might colour the observations and the data collection. Instead, hypotheses can be expected to emerge from the data as they are collected and analyzed. In ethnographic methods, hypotheses are formed and reformed throughout the study, and often indicate new areas for investigation. An ethnographic or phenomenological approach allows one to attempt to understand the participants' viewpoints in context. The delicate and unique nature of the relationships and interactions of the participants in this study should be considered in context, and each context is different. The contextual factors for this study include the district supervisory policy, the school setting, the principal-teacher relationships outside the supervisory process, and the specific events of the supervisory cycle.

The case study design is suitable for this research because it enabled the researcher to examine how the subjects perceive and interpret the behaviors in the supervisory conference, how the perceived behaviors affect the subjects, how decisions are made, and the philosophical and practical motivations of the subjects. It also enabled this researcher to provide the "thick description" essential for determining transferability to other contexts (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Wolcott (1987) states that ethnography
attempts to determine the participants' "personal version" of how things work in their group or culture. Wilson (1977) suggests that schools "exert many powerful forces on participant behavior" (p.247). The principal-teacher relationship within the culture of the school is a very important aspect of the supervisory relationship.

Procedure

Each of the dyads participated in two observation cycles, one in either January or February 1990, and one in either April or May 1990. Each observation cycle consisted of the events described above: the pre-observation conference, the observation, the video-taped post-observation conference, and the two stimulated-recall interviews. The time and focus of each lesson were decided by the participants and the research team members were agreeable to any arrangements provided that the requirements of the larger study were met. This researcher conducted all four stimulated-recall interviews with the participants. Subsequent research interviews were conducted in September, 1990.

Data Collection

Six types of data were collected for the present study. They were:
1. demographic questionnaire,
2. two transcripts of each of the four classroom observations completed independently by each of the research team members (non-participant observers),
3. diagram of the classrooms,
4. video-recording of the teacher-principal post-observation conferences,
5. transcriptions of each of the eight stimulated-recall interviews, and
6. follow-up interviews with each participant.

This researcher analyzed the video-taped post-conferences and the stimulated-recall interviews conducted with the four subjects. The video tapes were analyzed using Blumberg's System for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction (Blumberg, 1980). This scale is based on the premise that communicative freedom is necessary for fostering instructional growth in the supervisory conference.

The Blumberg Scale (1980) was used to categorize the verbal behaviors of the participants during the post-observation conferences. The scale has fifteen categories, ten concerned with the supervisor's behavior, four with the teacher's behavior, and one to indicate silence or confusion (See Appendix C).

Supervisor behaviors. Category 1 contains support-inducing communications which are designed to establish rapport with the teacher. This category includes words of
encouragement and acceptance. Category 2 is for statements of praise, defined as verbal behaviors which convey a positive value judgment toward a teacher's actions, thoughts, or feelings. Category 3 is for verbal behaviors in which a supervisor accepts, uses, or expands upon a teacher's idea. In Category 4 are questions asking for information, clarification, or orientation about the topic under discussion. Category 5 contains statements which give information to the teacher, including summarizing and orienting. Category 6 is for questions which ask the teacher to give opinions, evaluate, or analyze a classroom event. In Category 7 are statements which ask for suggestions from the teacher with regard to how things may be done differently. Category 8 is for behaviors in which the supervisor analyzes or evaluates a classroom event or the interaction taking place between the teacher and the supervisor. In Category 9 go behaviors in which the supervisor gives suggestions about doing things. It "...has an action orientation, past, present, or future" (Blumberg, 1980 p.115). Category 10 is for supervisory behaviors which give negative value judgments about the teacher or the teacher's behavior in the classroom that might produce a defensive or aggressive attitude.

Teacher behaviors. Category 11 corresponds to Categories 4, 6, and 7. In this category go statements of the teacher asking for information, opinions, or suggestions. It contains "...task-oriented behavior on the
part of the teacher" (p. 116). Category 12 is for behaviors in which the teacher gives information, opinions, or suggestions. It corresponds to Categories 5, 8, and 9. Category 13 contains positive social-emotional teacher behaviors which help "...build the supervisory relationship" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 116). Category 14 behaviors are negative social-emotional statements by the teacher which tend to produce tension or "...disrupt the supervisory relationship" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 116).

**Category 15.** Category 15 indicates silence (operationalized by this researcher as pauses of three seconds or more). It can also be used when both people are talking at once so that it is impossible to categorize the specific behaviors. For the conferences in this study, it always indicates silence.

The Blumberg Scale is designed to be completed by supervisors themselves following a conference, but it was used by this researcher to examine the interactions in the video-taped conferences. The scale provided quantitative data (Blumberg 1980) about the subjects' verbal behaviors. The data were used to compare with the subjects' perceptions of their verbal behaviors and interactions. In addition, the scale provided some qualitative data. Blumberg suggests that this scale can provide some insight into how the supervisor uses his [sic] behavior by shifting from one category to another, how the teacher reacts to the various kinds of supervisor behavior, and what kinds
of supervisor behavior are elicited by teacher responses (p. 122).

Although the Blumberg scale provided some quantitative data, the main intent of the research was to understand how the participants understand the post-conference process.

Blumberg's instrument was used in a non-standard way (that is, by the researcher, rather than by the principals themselves, to classify the behaviors). However, Blumberg and Cusick have used it in just such a manner (Blumberg and Cusick, 1970), although they recorded behaviors every three seconds and this research recorded every behavior. Furthermore, it is the only published instrument which quantifies principal-teacher supervisory interactions and therefore it offers a way of categorizing the behaviors for purposes of analysis.

This researcher also reviewed the video tapes for behaviors and incidents to be pursued in further interviews with the subjects. Interviews allow the subjects to reflect on and interpret events and experiences, and help the researcher to discover the participants' frame of reference (Werner and Rothe, 1980). They allow the researcher to find out how the participants define their actions and what they themselves know (Spradley, 1979). The goal of these interviews was to gain insight into the subjects' perceptions of the principals' behaviors, and gain knowledge of the subjects' motivations, understandings, and feelings about the conference behaviors and their effects.
The questions, formulated as a result of the analysis of the video-tapes and stimulated-recall transcripts, were of an open-ended, exploratory nature (see Appendix A).

This researcher attempted to assume a noncommittal, neutral position in the stimulated-recall interviews. This position was adopted to encourage deeper insight by the participants into the conference events, behaviors, and interactions without introducing researcher bias. It was maintained in all the research interviews, including the follow-up ones.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the degree to which a study can be replicated (Wiersma, 1986). This study may be replicable using subjects with the same amount of experience. However, the uniqueness of each relationship and its context prevents an exact duplication and therefore external reliability is doubtful. Internal reliability, which refers to the degree to which there is consistency of findings and interpretations, was addressed through triangulation, subject confirmation, and review by a fellow researcher from the larger study who is familiar with the subjects and the context of the supervisory experiences to confirm agreement on interpretations.

Triangulation means comparing the various sources to confirm the consistency of the data and their
interpretation. In this case, the transcripts of the research interviews, the stimulated-recall interviews, and the Blumberg scale were compared. One concern with triangulation was that two of the sources reflected the subjects' perceptions, but the third source was the researcher's perception. This was remedied through the interviews, which allowed the researcher to confirm or disconfirm her own perceptions through the questions posed to the subjects.

The researcher's versions of the follow-up interviews were given to the participants during a subsequent interview. They were asked to read them and provide any further information or clarification they wished. This researcher also had the opportunity to clarify and further probe information which was not clear. This procedure helped ensure that the subject's view had been captured accurately by the researcher, and allowed the subject to have control over the data (Werner and Rothe 1980).

Validity

Internal validity was established to the best degree possible through a careful consideration of the factors that could account for the data. To determine external validity, or generalizability, the data were compared to the findings of other researchers. However, the concept of generalizability is not particularly relevant to case study
methods. Instead, the concept of transferability is more suitable. Transferability, the degree to which the findings discovered in one context apply to another, is dependent on the degree of similarity of the two contexts. This researcher cannot make statements about the transferability of the study results, since such judgements require knowledge of both the sending and the receiving contexts (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Data Analysis

The data analysis considered evidence gathered from stimulated-recall transcripts, conference video-tapes, Blumberg's scale, and research interviews. The analysis included this researcher's interpretations and perceptions of the data. The data were examined for patterns of behavior, subjects' perceptions, understandings, motivations, and changes in behavior. The result is a description of the interactions of the subjects within the two dyads, their understandings of these interactions, and some conclusions as to the significance of their understandings for teachers' work lives and principal-teacher relationships.
SUMMARY

This study will examine the behaviors and interactions of two dyads, each consisting of a principal and a teacher. One teacher is in her first year of teaching; the other is experienced. The data will be gathered from transcripts of four post-conferences, six stimulated-recall interviews, and two follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher several months after the post-conferences were concluded.

The next two chapters will present the data for each of the dyads. The data from the post-conferences will be analyzed using the Blumberg Scale, and will be compared with data from the stimulated-recall and follow-up interviews.
CHAPTER FOUR

DYAD 1: COLIN AND LISA

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the interactions of Colin and Lisa in their supervisory relationship. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the setting of the study. The second and third sections present the findings from the first two observation cycles of the study. The findings include the quantitative information from Blumberg's System for Analyzing Supervisor-Teacher Interaction (hereafter referred to as the Blumberg Scale), and the participants' perceptions of their behaviors as gathered from the stimulated-recall interviews and the follow-up interviews by this researcher.

THE SETTING

This section describes the district in which Colin and Lisa work and its teacher evaluation policy. It also describes the study participants and their relationship outside the specific supervisory experience of the study.
District Context


Evaluation Context

In District A, teachers usually are evaluated summatively a maximum of once every five years. The evaluation process is prescribed by the collective agreement (1989). It requires that teachers be notified, "... at least ten (10) working days prior to commencing classroom observations, that an evaluation is to be conducted" (Collective Agreement 1988, p.47). Only one of at least three formal classroom observations must be at a time "...mutually agreed upon between the teacher and the evaluator" (Collective Agreement 1988, p.48). Thus, the timing of the supervisory experience may be controlled by the supervisor. Pre- and post-observation conferences are required and their content is prescribed (See Appendix B). One purpose of the pre-conference is to discuss the criteria.

---

3 All student enrollment and teacher employment data for Districts A and B are as of Sept. 30, 1989. Data regarding principals and vice-principals are as of Sept. 30, 1988.
for evaluation. The "Criteria of Evaluation" referred to in the Collective Agreement were developed by a joint teacher-School Board committee. Staff members are to be issued a copy prior to the commencement of the supervision process in the school. The purpose of the post-conference, as outlined in the collective agreement, is to review and discuss the data collected during the classroom observation "...with the objective of identifying specific strengths to be maintained and/or areas that need improvement" (Collective Agreement 1988, p.48).

Dyadic Context

The information for this section comes from two sources. The data regarding length of service comes from the demographic questionnaire completed by each participant. Information about the participants' views of, and experience with, supervision comes from the follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher.

Participants. The participants in Dyad One are Colin, the principal, and Lisa, the teacher. Colin has taught intermediate grades for nine years, was a vice-principal for five years, and has been a principal for ten years, all of them in District A. The year of the observations, 1989-90, was his first year as principal of this school. Colin believes that the principal sets the tone of the school and
should model to both students and staff those behaviors which reflect his educational philosophy.

Principal's supervisory philosophy. Colin has a clearly articulated philosophy of teacher supervision which is at odds with that of the district. He believes that principals do not have time to conduct a formal clinical supervision process with teachers and that "...writing reports is a waste of time" (Follow-up Interview, P. 4). He writes reports only because formal teacher evaluation is required. He prefers to be invited into the classroom to observe a particular lesson or event, followed by an informal discussion with the teacher. In addition, he sometimes makes brief visits to classrooms, uninvited and unannounced. Glatthorn (1984) refers to visits such as these as administrative monitoring. Colin believes that control of the supervisory process should remain with the teacher. He observes that teachers are more critical of themselves than he is, and that he often assumes a supportive role in the post-visit conference. If he has concerns about what he observed during the visit, he approaches the teacher informally. He uses the same supervisory methods with all teachers, and normally does not treat beginning teachers differently from experienced teachers.

Teacher's supervisory experience. Lisa was in her first year of teaching during the study observations. Prior to her teaching assignment, she was unaware that teachers
were supervised and evaluated. Her only previous experience with supervision and evaluation was as a student teacher. In Colin's opinion, Lisa was "at risk" (FI, p. 5) of not having her contract renewed for the following school year. He thought that she lacked confidence and was so afraid of making mistakes that she failed to act decisively.

Relationship. From the beginning of their relationship, Colin was aware of Lisa's need for nurturing and he worked at establishing a trusting relationship with her. Colin reports feeling frustrated by Lisa's lack of response to his attempts to discuss her teaching informally. He felt that their discussions "...always seem one way, a sentence from me and a one word response [from Lisa]" (FI, p. 2). He was striving for a collegial relationship with Lisa, but he felt that she was maintaining a boss-employee relationship. Lisa was formally evaluated during 1989-90, but the clinical supervision process, which culminated in a satisfactory report, was carried out by the vice-principal. This was a deliberate strategy by Colin in an attempt to remove the threat this posed to their relationship, thereby allowing Lisa to feel relaxed with him, and encouraging her to seek his help and advice.

Lisa reported that, by the time of the study observations, she felt comfortable approaching Colin with problems. She appreciated his positive responses, which made her feel supported. She stated that "...[I] can
ask him anything if I have any trouble and he's always very positive" (Fl, p. 1).

FIRST OBSERVATION CYCLE: BLUMBERG'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS

This section will present the data from the first cycle of observation, post-conference, and stimulated-recall interviews. There will be a brief description of each post-conference, followed by the Blumberg Scale analysis of the post-conference interactions.

Post-Conference Description

Lisa had asked Colin to observe the behavior of the Grade Four students when she left them to teach a lesson to the Grade Fives. She wanted suggestions from Colin on how to encourage them to work independently when she was not available.

Colin started the post-conference with a description of the general student behavior. He acknowledged that their "bouncing off the wall" behavior was due to a performance the students had just attended in the gym. Then he said, "I see what you mean about your Grade Fours ... they're really clingy" (p. 1). He continued describing the student behaviors, and then asked Lisa how she felt about the lesson. When she answered, "It was typical of" (p. 1), Colin completed her sentence for her. Lisa went on to
discuss the students' knowledge of the subject matter, but did not comment on student behavior.

This interaction was typical of the rest of the post-conference. Generally, it was characterized by long stretches of talk by Colin describing student behavior. He stated his observations about student behavior in general and also commented on the behavior of specific students. Lisa gave short, infrequent responses. When she did expand, Colin often interrupted or finished her sentences for her.

Once, when Colin asked, "Do you have any questions of me?" (p. 13), Lisa first responded, "No" but after a short silence, raised an issue of concern regarding her practice. She wondered, "Is it wise to... they already know how to multiply, but they may not have understood what they were doing" (p. 13). Colin said that, when he had taught Math, he found "... they [the students] don't want to know the why, all they want to do is they want to know the answer and ... I used to find that frustrating" (p. 13). He suggested that Lisa needed to use her own "judgement ...how much you belabour the point" (P.14).

Colin gave Lisa several suggestions on dealing with the Grade Four students who could not work independently while she was teaching the Grade Fives. He frequently proceeded his suggestions with words such as "... what I used to do was ..." (p. 6), "I guess what I would try to do would be ..." (p. 7), "...maybe you could..." (p. 7), and "...it might be interesting to try..." (p. 17). His
suggestions did not come with specific instructions for implementation. Once Colin said, "I don't know what else to tell you" (p.11).

Although most of Colin's talk was directed to the focus of the lesson observation, several times Colin digressed into areas of classroom management not related to the focus of the lesson observation. Once he discussed how he, as a teacher, had dealt with the issue of having pencils available for students who needed them, at the same time keeping them from being stolen. Another time he gave her a suggestion for marking Math seatwork with the whole class.

Many of Colin's questions came in clusters, often being rewordings of the same basic question. For example, he asked, "... what are you going to do with the Grade Fours? Load them down with lots of multiplication questions?" (p. 16). Once Colin asked Lisa, "... how do you think you could deal with that problem?" (p. 4) and Lisa replied, "I don't know" (p. 4). Colin seemed taken aback by this response, but proceeded to give her some suggestions. However, few of his questions seemed designed to foster reflection. Many questions were requests for information about classroom routines or about specific students.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data were compiled by assigning each instance of verbal behavior or silence to a category. If a verbal
behavior contained two or more thoughts, each was categorized separately (Blumberg 1980, p. 119). Statement fragments caused by interruptions or speaker silences were also categorized separately. The assigned categories, in pairs of tallies, were then entered onto a matrix (see Appendix C) and totalled. The category totals indicate the participants' dominant behaviors. The matrix is divided into sections which indicate the supervisor's extended behaviors, the teacher's extended behaviors, the teacher's reactions to the supervisor's behaviors, and the supervisor's reactions to the teacher's behaviors.

**Total Behaviors**

For the first observation cycle, the conference between Colin and Lisa contained 558 instances of verbal behaviors, including silences. Of the 558 instances, 335 (60%) were made by the principal and 35% by the teacher. The remaining 5% were silences. None of the verbal behaviors was in Category 10, criticism by the supervisor, or in Category 14, negative social-emotional behavior by the teacher.

**Principal Behaviors**

As shown in Table 4.1, most of Colin's behaviors were directive ones which gave information, suggestions, and opinions. Twenty-three percent of his behaviors were in
Category 5, giving information, which includes reporting on data and observations. Next, at 19%, was Category 9, giving suggestions. Category 8, giving opinions, was next, at 17%.

Table 4.1: Principal Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total principal behaviors

Twelve percent of Colin's verbal behaviors were in Category 4, asking for information. The least used behaviors were praise (Category 2), and asking for opinions or suggestions (Categories 6 and 7). The behaviors in these categories ranged from less than one percent to three percent. Colin asked Lisa for suggestions (Category 7) only twice during the first conference. Both were actually reworded versions of the same question.

These data clearly indicate Colin's dominance in the conference. He talked more than Lisa did, and most of his verbal behaviors were directing ones of giving information, opinions, and suggestions. One aspect of the directive nature of his talk was that he did not just present the
data, but rather presented an interpretation of the data to Lisa. The questioning behaviors that might have encouraged Lisa to talk were rare.

**Teacher Behaviors**

Table 4.2 indicates that Lisa's predominant behavior during the first conference was that of giving information, opinions, or suggestions (Category 12), at 64%, followed, at 33%, by positive social-emotional behavior (Category 13). Only 3% of her behaviors were questions. Lisa asked for help or advice only once. Her other questions were requests for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total teacher behavior

**Extended behaviors**

The Blumberg Scale matrix is divided into certain areas, a concentration which indicates that "...the supervisor is making extended use of a particular kind of behavior" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 122). "Extended use" means the behavior occurred ..."for more than just a brief moment"
Colin exhibited extended use in areas C and E. Area C is concerned with providing informational, non-evaluative data; Area E, with "methodology and/or control" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 122). Extended talk by the teacher is indicated by Area G.

**Area C.** Tallies in Area C indicate that Category 4 and 5 behaviors (asking for, and giving, information) occurred in an uninterrupted, or extended manner. As Table 4.3 shows, of the 117 instances of Category 4 and 5 behaviors, 41% occurred for an extended time. This means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>11,12,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Category Behaviors</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that in asking for information, Colin usually asked several questions at once, or rephrased his questions in several ways. This reduced the amount of information actually elicited by the questions and discouraged teacher response. In addition, many were confirming questions, such as, "...you're cramped for board space, aren't you?" (p. 6), which did not seemed designed to elicit new or enlightening information. Some questions were about classroom management, such as, "...do they already have activities?"
Only two questions were not information-seeking. Once Colin asked Lisa "...how do you think you could deal with that problem?" Another time he asked Lisa to evaluate by saying "...how did you feel about the whole lesson?"

Area E. Area E is concerned with methodology and/or control of the teacher by the principal. Here the principal gives opinions or suggestions. Of the 118 instances of Colin's opinion or suggestion-giving behaviors, 44% were in Area E. Another 28% followed Category 13 behaviors by the teacher. In other words, if Lisa had not made encouraging or agreeing sounds during his talk, a further 28% of Colin's opinion- and suggestion-giving behaviors would have been coded in Area E, for a total of 72%. This indicates a lack of dialogue between the principal and teacher. Colin's extensive talking did not allow for meaningful response from Lisa.

Area G. This area shows the amount of extended teacher talk. Entries in this area indicate whether or not the teacher takes "...a good bit of time with his [sic] questions, answers, agreements, or disagreements" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 123). In the first observation cycle, Lisa showed some concentration only in Category 12, and that represented just 27% of the total number of entries in that category. In other words, Lisa usually responded to Colin's questions with short answers.
Reaction Behaviors

The Blumberg Scale allows one to see how the participants react to each other's behavior. Area I of the matrix, which shows the supervisor's reactions to the teacher behaviors, contains 154 verbal behaviors by Colin. Of these reactions, 32% were support-inducing behaviors. The next largest category, at 19%, was expanding behaviors, that is, using Lisa's ideas. Clustered together at 12% are Colin's reactions of information-, opinion-, and suggestion-giving. Lisa reacted to Colin mostly with information (57%), and with agreement (41%). She made no commitment to try any of Colin's suggestions, and he did not require any.

Silences

Area J of the matrix indicates the "nature of supervisor behavior which tends to produce [teacher] silence or confusion" (Blumberg, 1980 p. 123). Of Lisa's silences, 33% were a reaction to Colin's support-inducing behaviors, 11% were responses to information and expansion, and 22% each were responses to opinion- and suggestion-giving.

Area K of the matrix gives insight into the supervisor's reaction to the teacher's silences. In the first observation cycle, Colin reacted to Lisa's silences with information 64% of the time, with asking behaviors 18%
of the time, and by giving opinions or suggestions nine percent of the time.

Colin was silent in response to Lisa's information-giving and agreement. Area M indicates that Lisa reacted to Colin's silences once with a question, otherwise with information.

SIMULATED-RECALL INTERVIEWS: FIRST CYCLE

The stimulated-recall tapes for the first observation cycle for Dyad One are missing. The data for this section come from the participants' recall of the post-conference during the follow-up interviews seven months later.

Colin felt that he dominated the conference in terms of the amount of talk and this feeling is confirmed by the data. Colin talked 60% of the time compared to Lisa's 35%. He also stated that he allowed "pause time" (FI p. 15) as a way of encouraging Lisa to respond. The data show that only once did Colin allow a silence to stretch after asking a question, and that was for only five seconds. Lisa reacted to the silence by asking for advice about an instructional matter. Another time Colin was silent for about three seconds with the apparent intent of eliciting information from Lisa, after it appeared that she was about to say something. She didn't, and Colin resumed talking. All his other silences, which ranged from 3 to 18 seconds, either preceded his own remarks, or occurred during his
periods of extended talk, where they appeared to be times of thinking about his next remarks.

SECOND OBSERVATION CYCLE: BLUMBERG'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS

This section presents the data for the second cycle of observation, post-conference, and stimulated-recall interview. A brief description of the second post-conference will be followed by the analysis of the data. Included in this section are data from the follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher several months after the completion of the second cycle.

Post-Conference Description

The focus of this lesson observation was Lisa's responses to student answers. Lisa wanted suggestions for responses she could use, other than "good". Colin recorded her responses during a group discussion. He started the post-conference with a description of Lisa's behaviors at the beginning of the lesson, and commented that he was distracted by the noise from an adjoining classroom. There was a brief discussion then about the fact that not all the students could see the book Lisa was displaying as she read from it, during which Lisa explained her rationale for her practice. Colin commented, "... you really had their attention" (p. 2) and continued with his description of the
lesson. This was interspersed with observations about specific students, such as, "Jamie doesn't take over in Language Arts, does she?" (Colin: p. 3)

Colin then stated some of Lisa's verbatim responses. He followed this by saying, "I think if you had have been trying to come up with an alternate positive...you'd have to be terribly creative...I have no problem at all with how you responded" (p. 5). Colin continued to report her verbatim responses, interspersed with comments about individual students. Lisa spoke very little. She gave a few explanations about the classroom situation, and occasionally corrected Colin when he misidentified students or couldn't remember all the details about a lesson event. The focus of the post-conference discussion shifted to the next lesson segment, when the students broke into groups to write cooperative stories. Colin described Lisa's behavior as she monitored the group work and commented favourably on the technique she used for getting their attention focussed on the board for the third lesson segment. He said, "...so you're getting your routines down really well" (P.11).

Colin then asked Lisa, "...what would you change?" (p. 12) Lisa responded, "I'd change, well I'd give them more time to come up with a story in a group or in their pairs, I think. But I don't know if I like them writing in pairs so much." Colin stated, "...you want them to do it on their own" and Lisa agreed. Colin said, "Well I think if that's what you want, try it." Colin did not comment on her
concern, nor did he ask any follow-up questions or offer further advice or suggestions. Instead, he suggested ways for Lisa to expand the activity and to get the students to share their stories with the Primary students. Colin and Lisa also discussed some individual students.

Lisa showed evidence of reflection several times. When Colin commented, "Now you said to them, in your groups, take one of your morals or one of the ones that are on the board and put it in a story." Lisa responded, "Hmm, yeah, I think that was a mistake now because I found they didn't want to share their ideas...they were scared another person would take their idea" (p. 8). She got no encouragement or expansion from Colin in this exploration. Instead, he said, "Steal their idea. That was the only place that I saw, that I saw starting to break down a little bit...that's the whole process, what you're trying to do is to learn what will work with them."

The post-conference discussion then returned to the focus of the lesson observation. Colin remarked that he thought her responses were "appropriate", but Lisa again expressed concern by saying, "It's just that I always hear people say you shouldn't always say good" (p. 17). Colin did not give her any suggestions, but repeated his advice about getting her students to publish and share their stories with the Primary students.
Total Behaviors

In the second post-conference there were 499 instances of verbal behaviors, including silences. Colin had 67% of the behaviors and Lisa, 29%. Four percent were silences.

Principal Behaviors

Again, as indicated in Table 4.4, Colin's predominant behaviors were directive ones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total principal behavior

Thirty-six percent of his total talk was information-giving, compared with 23% during the first conference. Giving opinions and suggestions were the next most frequent behaviors at 21% and 19% respectively. The least frequent behaviors were asking for opinions and suggestions, at less than 1%, and criticism, of which there was none.
**Teacher Behaviors**

Table 4.5 shows that Lisa's predominant behaviors were information-giving, at 42%, and positive social-emotional behavior at 46%. She did not ask Colin any questions in this post-conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total teacher behavior

**Extended Behaviors**

As indicated in Table 4.6, Colin's extended behaviors were concentrated in Area C, asking for, and giving information, and in Area E, methodology and/or control. Of all Colin's verbal behaviors which asked for or gave information, 47% occurred in an extended manner. Of all Colin's verbal behaviors giving opinions or suggestions, 45% occurred in an extended manner. As in the first observation cycle, the extended nature of Colin's behaviors served to discourage dialogue. In Area G, Lisa gave information in an extended manner 31% of the time.
Table 4.6: Extended Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category(ies)</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>11,12,13,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Category Behaviors</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Behaviors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reactions

Area I indicates that Colin reacted to Lisa predominantly by giving suggestions (26%), stating opinions and giving information (each 18%), and with Category One behaviors of support-inducing communications. Thirteen percent of his reactions were expanding on Lisa's ideas. The least used verbal reactions were praise and questioning.

Data from Area H show that Lisa reacted to Colin predominantly with agreement (62%), followed by information-giving at 38%. She did not ask any questions of Colin.

Silences

The supervisory behaviors that produced silences in Lisa (Area J) were mainly Category One (60%), support-inducing communication. Colin reacted to Lisa's silences (Area K) mostly with Category Five behaviors of giving information.
Stimulated-Recall Interviews

Lisa. During the second stimulated-recall interview, Lisa reported that an important outcome of the conference was that Colin had alerted her to a different perspective on a student through a casual remark. "...it was good for him to point that out to me. I don't usually see her like that" (p. 2). However, the post-conference appeared to make Lisa anxious in several respects. First, Colin did not share his data notes from the observation with her, and she expressed a rather apprehensive curiosity about them. Second, Lisa reported feeling anxious when Colin mentioned an incident. The incident occurred when, in the context of the class discussion, a student said that teachers should be nice. Lisa was afraid that Colin would think that his remark had been prompted by her own behavior towards the student, and she stated, "...so now I'm wondering what he's thinking" (p. 15). Third, Lisa reported feeling unsure of Colin's message when he was describing another incident during the lesson. She stated, "...I'm still not sure what he was thinking then, if he thought that I should have forced an answer or if I should have done what I did..." (p. 6).

For this observation, Lisa wanted feedback on different ways to respond to student contributions to class discussions, other than saying "good". She expressed dissatisfaction with Colin's statement that he had "...no
problem at all with how you responded" (p. 5). She said, "... I still think there must be another word" (p. 20).

Colin. Colin remarked that he was still doing most of the talking, but he thought that they were beginning to have an actual discussion. Colin believed that "...there's a lot more two-way communication" (p. 21) in the second conference. This perception was not borne out by the data from the Blumberg Scale. The data show that, during the second conference, Colin spoke more overall, and that he spoke more in extended periods. He also perceived that Lisa was more trusting and relaxed. This perception was confirmed by Lisa.

Follow-up Interviews

In the follow-up interview Lisa reported that she did not feel threatened by the supervisory experience within the study because the vice-principal, not Colin, had done her evaluation report. If Colin had been in charge of doing her "official evaluation", she would have felt vulnerable, and not have revealed any weaknesses. She thought the study experience was not "...real, it didn't seem real" (p. 2) because it did not involve evaluation. If Colin had done her official evaluation Lisa "...may have felt threatened" and it "...could have ruined things" (p. 2). For Lisa, evaluation was threatening. Lisa had good reason for feeling this way, since an unsatisfactory report might have
resulted in the non-renewal of her temporary contract.

Lisa stated that, if she were being evaluated, she would tend to choose an observation focus which revolved around things about which she felt confident. For the study, however, she chose as the focus classroom problems that she "...honestly wanted help in" (p. 4). She hoped that the experience would contribute to her professional growth. She stated that, in an evaluative situation, she would hesitate to bring a perceived problem to the supervisor's attention in case it hadn't been noticed. However, she also stated that, ultimately, in a supervisory situation, trust in the supervisor was more important than whether or not the situation was evaluative in determining her willingness to be open about problems.

Lisa perceived a conflict in her reaction to the supervisory experiences. One the one hand, Lisa reported that she had particular foci on which she wanted feedback and she wanted very specific suggestions for improvement. She wanted Colin to be more directive than he was. On the other hand, she appreciated Colin's encouragement.

Lisa was concerned that Colin might have observed other incidents during the lesson and that since they always stuck to the topic, she might not have received all the feedback possible or necessary for her professional growth. She had hoped to be given direction, or "one specific thing to work on" (p. 6). Although Lisa reported that she had not received specific direction for
improvement, she did have a new perspective on several students as a result of Colin's comments.

Colin did give many suggestions to Lisa, but she appears not to have perceived them as such. Perhaps this is due to his tentative language or perhaps to the fact that the suggestions were not aimed at the foci she had chosen, but on other classroom events that Colin had observed and reported on.

Lisa seemed to have an accurate perception of the interactions between herself and Colin. She states that she trusts him, and her actions bear that out. First, she asked for his advice about an instructional matter during the first post-conference, and shared some concerns about her relationship with a particular student. Second, she corrected Colin's errors when he was describing classroom events.

For his part, Colin's goal was to build up Lisa's trust in him so that she would go to him to "... ask for help or ask for suggestions". He is not sure that he has succeeded. He believes that Lisa is more relaxed, but her lack of response frustrates him. He would prefer a more collegial and open relationship with her. He hoped that the study post-conferences would help Lisa relax and develop some trust in him. But when questioned about his plan of conduct for the conferences, he responded that he did not follow any particular approach.
Although Colin states that he wants a more open relationship, some of his behaviors served to frustrate that end. He kept the data sheets to himself instead of sharing them with Lisa. He made inferences and drew conclusions from the data rather than allowing Lisa to do so. He asked few questions and allowed few silences at key times.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Colin did most of the talking and the amount of his talk increased rather than decreased in the second conference. His talk was mostly directing. His perception that Lisa's responses were longer the second time is not supported by the data. Although more of Lisa's information-giving behavior was of an extended nature in the second observation cycle, the total amount of her extended behavior decreased slightly from the first observation cycle.

Lisa experienced anxiety in the post-conferences for several reasons. First, she was not shown the observation data that Colin held in his lap, and she was curious about them. Second, when Colin commented on her interactions with particular students, Lisa felt unsure about his opinion. Third, Lisa wanted more direction from Colin, and although he made suggestions, they appeared not to be concrete enough to meet her needs. Lisa's impression that Colin did not give her suggestions for improvement is inaccurate,
since on several occasions he did indeed make suggestions. However, they tended to be vague, and usually couched in tentative language, such as "...if you do [try it]...". Colin does not appear to have perceived Lisa's need for concrete suggestions.

Both Lisa and Colin agree that Lisa was more relaxed for the second post-conference. Colin's main goal in his relationship with Lisa was to establish trust. Lisa sees trust as the most important element in a satisfactory supervisory relationship, but she also wants specific directions for improvement. Colin's positive approach, although successful in building trust, left Lisa not knowing what she should "work on".

This chapter has described the behaviors and interactions of Colin and Lisa during two supervisory post-conferences. It has presented the participants' perceptions of the behaviors and interactions as revealed through the Blumberg Scale, the stimulated-recall interviews, and the follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher. Chapter Five will present the findings for Dyad Two.
CHAPTER FIVE

DYAD 2: HENRY AND BARBARA

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the interactions of Henry and Barbara in their supervisory relationship. This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section describes the setting of the study. The second and third sections present the findings from the first two observation cycles of the study. The findings include the quantitative information from the Blumberg Scale, and the participants' perceptions of their behaviors as gathered from the stimulated-recall interviews and the follow-up interviews by this researcher.

THE SETTING

This section describes the district in which Henry and Barbara work and its teacher evaluation policy. It also describes the study participants and their relationship outside the specific supervisory experience of the study.

District Context

Henry and Barbara work in District B, a large lower-mainland district with a student enrollment of about 17,800
students\(^4\) (Ministry of Education, 1989) in 50 schools (BCTF, 1990). District B employs about 1100 teachers (Ministry of Education, 1989), 47 principals, and 10 vice-principals (Ministry of Education, 1988). In District B, the elementary schools have Head Teachers instead of vice-principals. Head Teachers are not administrative officers, they belong to the local Teachers' Association. However, they do carry out some administrative tasks, such as dealing with textbooks and supplies, and assisting the principal with behavior problems among students. They may perform a leadership role in matters such as professional development. They have no formal supervisory or hierarchical role.

Evaluation Context

Teachers are not routinely evaluated summatively in District B. Instead, teachers are responsible for developing, in consultation with principals, their own instructional improvement plans. Formal summative evaluation occurs only by teacher request, or when there is a perceived deficiency in the quality of teaching that is not being remedied by the instructional improvement plan. The instructional improvement plans may include peer observations.

\(^4\)All student enrollment and teacher employment data for Districts A and B are as of Sept. 30, 1989. Data regarding principals and vice-principals are as of Sept. 30, 1988.
In most years, District B sponsors a Supervisory Skills workshop for teachers and principals. The workshop teaches verbal and body language communication skills and encourages teachers to arrange classroom observations among themselves.

Dyadic Context

The information for this section comes from two sources. The data regarding length of service comes from the demographic questionnaire completed by each participant. Information about the participants' views of, and experience with, supervision comes from the follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher.

Participants. The participants in Dyad Two are Henry, the teacher, and Barbara, the principal. Barbara has taught primary and intermediate grades for 18 years. She was a Head Teacher for seven years, and has been an elementary principal for five years. At the time of the study she had been principal of her current school for three years.

Henry has been teaching intermediate grades for 14 years. He is currently in his third year as Head Teacher and intermediate classroom teacher at this school.

Principal's supervisory experience. As a teacher, Barbara was issued summative evaluative reports without formal classroom observations or prior discussion with the principal. Later in her teaching career, she participated
in Supervisory Skills workshops as both a participant and facilitator.

Principal's supervisory philosophy. Barbara believes that the key to successful supervisory conferences is good, "active" (Follow-up Interview, p. 3) listening by the supervisor. She characterizes good listening as more than active listening behaviors such as paraphrasing and summarizing. The listener must be authentic in his or her interest and responses. She believes that her strengths as a supervisor lie in the intense focus that she directs towards the teacher in the conference and her ability as a good, active listener. She believes that questions she asks as an administrator, directing the conference and eliciting concerns, are critical to a productive conference. Barbara believes that questions provide the stimulus that cause teachers to reflect on their teaching. She tries to ask a variety of questions, some open-ended and some more direct or closed. In the supervisory conference, Barbara wants the teacher to do the talking and sees questions as the vehicle for encouraging teacher talk. She prefers an informal approach to supervision, but allows the teacher's comfort level to determine her approach. For example, Barbara enjoys "wandering in and out of classes" (Fi, p. 9), but whether she does or not depends on the teacher's attitude.

Teacher's supervisory experience. Henry has received three teacher reports during his career. The first report was written without his participation in the process. The
other two resulted from a clinical supervision process. Henry has participated in two Supervisory Skills workshops. He also participated in role-playing for an instructional video on collegial supervision.

**Teacher's supervisory philosophy.** Henry believes in collegial, rather than hierarchical, supervision. He believes that teachers being supervised must have a "strong sense of trust and openness" (Fl, p. 14) in the supervisor, and must feel that their own goals are being met. Henry thinks that the supervisory experience should be more spontaneous and less structured than traditional approaches. Supervision should be casual and approached in a manner that the teacher finds comfortable. He believes that principals bring an element of judgement to the process, which he finds intimidating. Teacher colleagues are, he believes, more focussed on fostering professional growth, and less concerned with how the teacher enhances the school program and reputation. Henry thinks that teacher-observers would be more forthright and honest in their feedback, and that they wouldn't "beat around the bush" (Fl, p. 14).

**Relationship.** Henry and Barbara have a long-standing professional relationship. They have worked on committees together, and are currently in their third year as principal and head teacher. They also have some mutual friends and occasional social contact.
Barbara describes their professional relationship outside the supervisory experience as one of "respectful distance" (Fl, p. 1). She admires Henry's high integrity and his concern for, and valuing of, teaching.

Henry considers that he has "quite a good relationship" (Fl, p. 1) with Barbara. On the one hand, he thinks they have many similar qualities. They both like to laugh, are good listeners, and are quite open, which Henry characterizes as a willingness to express their opinions. Henry describes Barbara as "fun to work with" (Fl, 1) and he likes her very much. He also says he is learning a lot from her in their principal/head teacher relationship. On the other hand, he detects a major difference between them in regard to administrative style. Henry believes in an administrative style which emphasizes collegial decision-making and "high levels of involvement" (Fl, p. 1) among staff members. He thinks that administrators should develop a collegial environment in which people are encouraged to work together, establishing qualities of trust, honesty, and openness. Henry thinks that Barbara's administrative approach is not as team-oriented as it should be. He describes her as tending to "run along on her own a bit" (Fl, p. 1). Through modelling, he is attempting to influence Barbara toward adopting a more collegial administrative style.
FIRST OBSERVATION CYCLE: BLUMBERG'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS

This section will present the data from the first cycle of observation, post-conference, and stimulated-recall interviews. The post-conference interactions were analyzed using the Blumberg Scale. The analyses will be preceded by a description of each post-conference.

Post-Conference Description

Barbara began the post-conference by asking, "How did you come to the decision of using that technique?" (p. 1) Henry responded with an explanation, and a brief discussion ensued. Barbara asked Henry more questions about instructional matters related to the lesson and Henry answered. For example, she wanted to know why he was reading the novel to the students, instead of having the students reading it themselves. Barbara then commented on the data she was collecting, and although she did not state what the focus of the lesson observation was, it seems that she was looking at student on-task behavior. Henry spent some time describing the novel, particularly its appeal to the students.

Barbara then asked him, "... what was your objective?" (p. 7). Henry responded, and a discussion ensued about the lesson. Barbara, commenting on the data she had collected, remarked, "... the timing of the lesson was perfect" (p. 8).
Barbara continued by asking questions about how the cooperative group technique worked, such as "Do you do that with each of the lessons?" (p. 4), and Henry explained. He described how the cooperative groups worked, what he did to organize the students, and the fact that group composition was determined by the students themselves. Barbara asked Henry if the students "...reflect on how they were in their roles as checker and presenter ". Henry replied, "No, we haven't really gotten to that because I've only been just doing role assignment in the last ... month" (p. 10). At one point Barbara expressed concern about the accuracy of her data, given the difficulty of determining from a distance on task behavior in a cooperative group. There was also some discussion about individual student behavior during the lesson. She described the behavior of a student, and commented, "... throughout the period [he] had some times of listening" (p. 11). The discussion concluded with a discussion of the follow-up lesson for the next day.

Data Analysis Procedure

The data were compiled by assigning each instance of verbal behavior to a category. If a verbal behavior contained two or more thoughts, each was categorized separately (Blumberg 1980, p. 119). Statement fragments caused by interruptions were also categorized separately. The assigned categories, in pairs of tallies, were entered onto a matrix (see
Appendix C) and totalled. The category totals indicate the participants' dominant behaviors. The matrix is divided into sections which indicate the supervisor's extended behaviors, the teacher's extended behaviors, the teacher's reactions to the supervisor's behaviors, and the supervisor's reactions to the teacher's behaviors.

Total Behaviors

For the first observation cycle, the post-conference between Barbara and Henry contained 500 instances of verbal behaviors. Of the 500 instances, 263 (53%) were made by the principal and 237 (47%) by the teacher. There were no instances of confusion and no silences (defined by this researcher as pauses of three seconds or more). There were no instances of criticism by the principal or negative social-emotional behavior by the teacher.

Principal Behaviors

As shown in Table 5.1, most of Barbara's behaviors (36%) were directive ones which gave information. The second most frequent behaviors (30%) were support-inducing ones. These included agreeing, encouraging, and making emotionally responsive remarks such as "gee" (p. 10). Barbara's next most frequent behaviors (14%) were giving opinions. She made comments such as "I think it was because
you were standing right there" (p. 12), and "I was really impressed..." (p. 14). She did not give Henry any suggestions.

Table 5.1: Principal Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total principal behaviors

Eleven percent of Barbara's verbal behaviors were questions. Her questions fall into four main categories: questions about the novel being used in the lesson, general questions about the students, questions about the management and organization of the lesson, and questions concerning the reason and planning behind the lesson. Of all the questions, 43% were in the latter category. They included questions about the lesson objectives, and the reason for choosing the particular strategy. She did not ask Henry for his opinion.
Teacher Behaviors

Table 5.2 indicates that Henry's dominant behavior during the first post-conference was that of giving information (67%). He asked only one question, to clarify a question that Barbara had asked him. He and Barbara contributed about equally to the positive social-emotional atmosphere.

Extended Behaviors

The Blumberg Scale matrix is divided into areas which

Table 5.2: Teacher Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total teacher behavior

Table 5.3: Extended Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (i.e.)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>11 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Category Behaviors</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Behaviors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicate extended use of certain behaviors. Table 5.3 indicates that Barbara exhibited significant extended behaviors mainly in Area C, and to a lesser degree in Area E. Area G indicates the teacher's extended behaviors.

Area C. Tallies for Area C indicate that some Category 4 and 5 behaviors (asking for, and giving, information) occurred in an uninterrupted manner. Of the 124 behaviors in those categories, 57, or 46%, occurred for an extended time. Most (44) of the 57 instances were in Category 5. This indicates that Barbara presented almost half of the data in a manner that did not allow for responses from Henry. Of the Category 4 behaviors, 46% occurred in an extended way. This means that, although Barbara asked a total of 28 questions, almost half the time she asked two or more questions at once, and that when this happened, the questions were really the same one, rephrased. If the repeated questions are condensed, the number of different questions is reduced to 19. Thus, extended behaviors decreased Henry's opportunity for response and reduced the variety of information solicited.

Area E. Area E shows that Barbara expressed opinions in an extended way only 19% of the time. Opinion-giving made up 14% of her total verbal behaviors.

Area G. This area shows the amount of extended teacher talk. Entries in this area indicate whether or not the teacher takes time with answers. In the first
observation cycle, 26% of Henry's responses were extended. His extended responses for Category 12, giving information, represented 38% of the category total. This means that Henry often responded with full explanations.

Reaction Behaviors

The Blumberg Scale allows one to see how participants react to each other's behavior. Area I of the matrix, which contains the supervisor's reactions to the teacher behaviors, shows 174 instances of verbal behavior. Of these, the two largest categories were support-inducing behaviors at 46% and information-giving at 25%. Henry reacted to Barbara with information-giving 56% of the time and with positive social-emotional behavior 43%. He asked only one question, and that was a clarifying one right at the beginning of the interview.

Stimulated-recall Interviews

This section will describe the participants reactions to the first post-conference. Their feelings and thoughts about the post-conference are revealed in the stimulated-recall interviews.

Henry. Henry has recently begun to embrace whole language instructional strategies. He stopped using his basal reading program abruptly and plunged headlong into
whole language. Henry expressed amazement at the amount of data Barbara had recorded during the lesson. He thought that the data were "appropriate" (p. 5). They confirmed his perceptions of his students, although there were one or two surprises. He appreciated the positive nature of the feedback from Barbara, and her focus on the "positive aspects" (p. 2) of the lesson. Her feedback made him feel good and he "enjoyed her enthusiasm" (p. 2). However, he expressed discomfort about Barbara's question concerning his objectives for the lesson. He described the question as "clinical" and said that such questions made him "sometimes feel threatened" (p. 7). Henry commented on the fact that the conference had strayed off topic, but thought that was a "nice comforting thing" (p. 6).

Barbara. Barbara stated that during the post-conference, she had focussed on "asking questions to have him reflect on his teaching or decisions" (p. 1). Once, in the stimulated-recall interview, Barbara commented that she had asked a particular question "to determine whether that indeed was a strategy" (p. 3). She also noted that the strategies Henry used in the lessons were directly related to workshops that he had recently attended. She was impressed with his dedication to instructional improvement. She noted that "he's obviously wanting to improve his strategies that are new to him" (p. 8). Although Barbara was satisfied that Henry had talked about his teaching in the post-conference, she wasn't convinced that reflection,
as distinct from explaining, had occurred. Barbara felt that her questions had been successful in conveying two messages to Henry regarding his instructional practices: "be prepared" and "be with the kids" (p. 16).

SECOND OBSERVATION CYCLE: BLUMBERG'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS

This section presents the data for the second cycle of observation, post-conference, and stimulated-recall interview. Included in this section are a description of the post-conference dialogue and data from the follow-up interviews conducted by this researcher several months after the completion of the second cycle.

Post-Conference Description

After a brief statement about the data, Barbara asked Henry why he "chose to do this style of lesson" (p. 1). Henry described previous class activities that related to this lesson. When Barbara asked, "... what was different about this lesson for you?" (p. 3), Henry began discussing his conflict between his desire to have the students put their hands up before responding, and the more "spontaneous" method required by his whole language strategy.

The next stage of the post-conference occurred when Barbara asked, "What did you do to prepare for this lesson that was different then?" (p. 7) Henry responded by
describing the materials that he had prepared. Barbara went on to ask, "Now what did you do in terms of thinking about this lesson?" (p. 8) Henry said that he had thought about the lesson in terms of motivating the students for reading their new novel. They then discussed the follow-up lessons. Barbara shifted the conversation when she said, "One of the things I noticed is that you did most of the physical work" (p. 11). There ensued a discussion about the classroom arrangement and the degree of active student involvement. Barbara then pointed out Henry's inconsistency in asking the students to put up their hands, but responding to students who called out. This was followed by discussion about individual students. The post-conference ended with a brief discussion of the content of follow-up lessons.

Total Behaviors

In the second post-conference there were 421 instances of verbal behaviors, including instances of confusion, during which both persons were talking at once. Barbara had 52% of the behaviors and Henry 47%. Just under one percent were instances of confusion.

Principal Behaviors

As shown in Table 5.4, Barbara's predominant behaviors were information- and opinion-giving, and support-inducing.
Nine percent of her verbal behaviors were questions. Barbara believes that the questions the principal asks in the post-conference are vital to encouraging reflection in the teacher. Of the 22 questions Barbara asked Henry, 16 seemed designed to encourage reflection. For instance, she asked Henry "why did you choose to do this style of lesson?" (p. 1) and "what did you do in terms of thinking about this lesson?" (p. 8)

Table 5.4: Principal Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total principal behavior

Nine of her other questions were confirming types, or expansion on his previous remark. Examples include, "but you printed all those words?" (p. 7), and "was he here today?" (p. 20)

Teacher Behaviors

As indicated in Table 5.5, Henry's predominant behaviors were information-giving, at 57%, and positive
social-emotional behavior at 42%. Henry had clear explanations for what he was doing in the lesson, and had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Behaviors</th>
<th>Percent*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent of total teacher behavior

justification for his choices. He asked only one question of Barbara, and that was just a clarifying question in response to one of hers.

Extended Behaviors

As in the first observation cycle, Barbara's extended behaviors were concerned with asking for, and giving, information, and methodology and/or control. Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category(ies)</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Category Behaviors</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Behaviors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicates that of all Barbara's verbal behaviors which asked for, or gave, information (Area C), 37% occurred in an extended manner. Of all behaviors which gave opinions or suggestions (Area E), 23% occurred in an extended manner. This means that Henry was able to respond to Barbara's questions and information-giving behaviors frequently.

Henry's extended behaviors represented 20% of his total responses. Of all his information-giving behaviors (Category 12), 35% were of an extended nature. This confirms the reciprocal nature of their dialogue.

**Reaction Behaviors**

Area I shows that Barbara reacted to Henry predominantly with Category 1 behaviors of agreement (36%). The next most prevalent behavior was Category 5, giving information, at 24%, and Category 8, giving opinions, at 22%. Barbara did not ask Henry for his opinion and asked for a suggestion only once. Area H indicates that Henry reacted mostly with information-giving (47%) and positive social-emotional behaviors (53%). He asked only one question, and that was to clarify Barbara's question to him.
Stimulated-recall Interviews

Barbara. Barbara's goal for the post-conference was to ask questions which would encourage reflection "on the students' behavior and his planning, rather than his particular behavior in the room" (p. 26). The data collected during the observation was not her main focus or interest. That is, Barbara was not using the post-conference just to address the data, but rather to advance her more broad agenda of practicing her questioning and listening strategies and thereby promoting reflection. Her dilemma was whether she should use questions to set a topic and a focus for the conference or she should "just let teachers talk at random and then make a question up based on their last comment" (p. 26). She wondered if having her own agenda decreased the effectiveness of the post-conference for Henry.

During the second stimulated-recall interview, Barbara was critical of herself for expressing opinions. She also wondered about the timing of the post-conference. Barbara suggested that perhaps she shouldn't be giving suggestions to Henry before he had had a chance to reflect on his lesson. She thought that maybe it was better for Henry "... to reflect on it as part of his next lesson than immediately after..." (SR 2, p. 13). Her remark followed an incident during the post-conference in which Barbara pointed out to Henry that he was doing most of the "physical work"
and suggested that having the students do the necessary movement might "get those less active ones involved" (Pc 2, p. 12). Henry replied that he "thought it would be less disruptive than the kids going up and down..." (Pc 2, p. 12). Barbara said, "So you wouldn't change that...?" (Pc 2, p. 13), to which Henry replied, "...I mean, if somebody suggested that maybe it would be better to have the kids go put..." (Pc 2, p. 13). Barbara finished his sentence with, "Or even having say one child in a location, you look after this group, Susan..." (Pc 2, p. 13). Henry responded with, "Oh, that's a good suggestion" (Pc 2, p. 14).

Barbara stated that the post-conference was of value for Henry in two ways: (1) it gave him a chance to reflect and to affirm that "he did achieve what he wanted" in the lesson and (2) it gave her the opportunity to suggest that the room arrangement may have affected the students' involvement in the lesson. Barbara remarked that opportunity for reflection is valuable and not normally available to teachers.

Despite the positive aspects of the post-conference and the opportunity it provided Henry for reflection, Barbara was not convinced that effective reflection occurred. "I don't know where the growth is going to be for Henry" (p. 25). She acknowledged Henry's risk-taking in trying new strategies, especially within the context of the study.

Barbara thought that she and Henry generated an easy
comradeship. Henry was not "uptight about laughing or ...being silly" (p. 26).

For Henry, one area of the lesson caused him problems. He gets "uptight" when students speak out a lot, yet student freedom to call out is part of the strategy he was using in the lesson. He states, "I'm quite a structured person and ...you...have to ...let the kids be fairly spontaneous with their suggestions. ...I have to get used to it" (Pc 2, p. 4,5). He is "having to loosen up on some of the traditional methods and let the kids be more expressive..." (Pc 2, p. 4). He's not sure how far he should go in letting the students call out. This tension between his old way of teaching and his new makes him "uncomfortable". He said, "I'm not really comfortable with the kids shouting out and yet ... it's part of that kind of strategy" (p. 6).

Henry thought that Barbara was presenting only data. He did not perceive that she was offering her own opinions. He appreciated receiving the data from the observation and Barbara's "positive way" of giving him information. He observed that when Barbara gave him a message, "it's always very graciously done" (p. 24). He thinks that the post-conference represented "the way that kind of activity should go" (p. 24).

Henry reported that the post-conference was "really useful". He reported that Barbara's feedback made him more aware of the students' responses. He found "this part is
good because I think she was making me aware of some things to look out for" (p. 20). Henry appreciated Barbara's suggestions, although he thought that she was "subtle" about making them. At one point in the post-conference, Henry misinterpreted one of Barbara's remarks. She was suggesting to him that he was being inconsistent in wanting the students to put up their hands, but acknowledging students who did not. When Barbara said, "Twice he called out and you responded to him", Henry replied, "Oh, good" (Pc. 2, p. 14). Barbara stated in the stimulated-recall that she "meant to reprimand him" and his response made her think that "he thought it's a good thing" (p. 15). But in the stimulated-recall Henry recognized his misinterpretation and said, "I think [Barbara] was trying to tell me to be more consistent with him..." (p. 15). He showed his willingness to accept her implied suggestion when he said, "I guess I'll have to deal with [that]" (p. 16). Later in the stimulated-recall he said, "But she was suggesting that ...if I assign one person at the end of each row and pass it to that person and go from there. And actually that would have been a good tool for keeping those kids on task, too" (p. 23).

Follow-up Interviews

Barbara. In the follow-up interview, Barbara reported that she found her relationship with Henry during the post-
conferences to be comfortable and easy. This she attributed to Henry's openness and enthusiasm. Barbara thought that both of them were learning to accept criticism "better than we have in the past" (p. 1). Since Henry did not offer any criticism during the post-conference, it appears that the remark refers to other aspects of the relationship. Barbara reported feeling that the supervisory experience resulted in an increased professional understanding between her and Henry.

Barbara's goal during these post-conferences was to improve her questioning and to listen to Henry in order to respond with questions that would allow Henry to analyze his own teaching practices. Barbara thought that the conferences would be successful if her questions caused Henry to continue reflecting after the post-conference and if he left with a reinforced sense of being a good teacher. She also thought that the conference was productive if Henry had a renewed commitment to innovation and the improvement of his teaching practices.

Barbara had planned "structured but informal" (p. 9) post-conferences. During the post-conferences, she felt confident of the direction they were taking, and was aware of the need for closure at the end. She noticed differences between the first and second post-conferences. She characterized the first conference as exploratory, as "checking the scenery" (p. 5). The first conference raised her awareness of her own thoughts and body moves, which she
subsequently monitored during the second conference. Furthermore, the first conference gave her an opportunity to reflect on the framing of her questions. She felt that her questions were better in the second conference. By this she meant that they were more effective in leading Henry to increased reflection about his practice. The data show that in the second conference, Barbara asked considerably more questions about Henry's thinking and planning for the lesson and fewer questions requesting information about classroom management and student behavior. For example, in the second post-conference, Barbara asked Henry why he "...chose to do this style of lesson" (p. 1) and "Now what did you do in terms of thinking about this lesson?" (p. 7).

In future post-conferences, Barbara would want Henry to talk more, not just superficial conversation about the lessons, but about more substantial matters, which she characterized as "the stuff we should have been talking about" (p. 11). She was not sure that Henry's talk during the conferences was analytical enough. She was concerned that she did not ask the right questions to get Henry to probe into, reflect on, or gain new insights into his teaching practices. The conference data demonstrate that Henry was able to justify his instructional practices in response to Barbara's questions. However, her questioning and suggestion about his classroom arrangement seemed to give him pause. Barbara's question, "...what was different about this lesson for you?" (Post-conference 2: p. 3) caused
Henry to verbalize his conflict between his need for control and his desire for more spontaneity in the lesson.

Barbara saw several positive outcomes of the post-conferences. First, she believed that, as a result of the study, Henry would promote the idea of having someone, either the principal or another teacher, in the classroom to collect data and give feedback as a way of fostering professional growth. Second, she thought that the post-conferences had an impact on his relationship with his students by increasing his confidence about his new teaching practices, thereby encouraging further risk-taking. Third, she believed that the post-conferences made Henry feel good about his teaching practice and let him know that he was held in high regard.

Henry. Henry participated in the study primarily because he wanted to contribute to a "better understanding of what makes effective supervisory skills" (p. 8). A secondary consideration was the opportunity for Henry to get feedback and improve his skills as he worked on his own professional goal of improving his whole language techniques. He hoped to gain more confidence about his new teaching practices.

Henry describes the feedback from Barbara as positive and thorough. However, he is concerned that perhaps Barbara was not totally honest with him and he wonders if sometimes she was not "really saying what she wanted to" (p. 16). He felt at times that Barbara was giving him subtle messages
and he thinks that perhaps she should have been more forthright rather than making him "read between the lines" (p. 13).

Henry found being observed by Barbara more "intimidating" (p. 4) than being observed by a colleague and he experienced a sense of discomfort. He attributed this discomfort to their differences in hierarchical status, to Barbara's administrative style, and to his perception that she was not totally honest. However, he felt that Barbara had encouraged him to state his opinions and he did not feel dominated by her.

Henry felt that the feedback was effective in making him aware of particular areas to improve. The first post-conference gave Henry confidence in using his new teaching practices and encouraged him to continue his innovations, which he sees as beneficial for the students. The second post-conference raised his awareness of the conflict between his "tight" classroom management style and his desire to encourage student enthusiasm. His reflection led him to conclude that he must find a comfortable balance between the two.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The talk was quite evenly divided between Barbara and Henry during both post-conferences. Barbara gave twice as many opinions during the second post-conference, and made
some suggestions. During the first post-conference, 43% of Barbara's questions were designed to encourage Henry to reflect on his teaching. This increased to 70% during the second.

Henry generally approved of Barbara's approach during the post-conferences, although he thought that she was not honest or blunt enough sometimes. Although 14% and 24% of her verbal behaviors during the two conferences were opinion-giving, Henry appeared not to have noticed, and he thought that Barbara did not give her opinion.

Henry and Barbara have high regard for each other. Both were committed to achieving professional growth for themselves from this experience, and Barbara wanted to be instrumental in promoting Henry's professional growth.

This chapter has described the behaviors and interactions of Barbara and Henry during two post-conferences. The behaviors and interactions were analyzed using the Blumberg Scale. The participants' perceptions of their behaviors and interactions were revealed by the Blumberg Scale and the stimulated-recall and follow-up interviews. The next chapter will compare the interactive behaviors of the two dyads.
CHAPTER SIX

COMPARISON OF THE DYADS

This chapter will examine similarities and differences in certain behaviors and interactions of the participants. Specifically, the chapter will compare and contrast: (1) certain verbal behaviors of the participants in the post-conferences, (2) the post-conference goals and perceptions of principals Barbara and Colin, and (3) the post-conference needs and perceptions of teachers Henry and Lisa. Finally, the chapter will discuss selected themes which have emerged.

PARTICIPANTS' VERBAL BEHAVIORS

Principals

Principal directiveness. Principal directiveness was a feature in all four post-conferences. Most of Colin's and Barbara's behaviors were information-giving. In both dyads, the percentage of directive verbal behaviors increased in the second post-conferences. Barbara's directive talk increased from 50% to 60% from the first post-conference to the second. Colin's increased from 58% to 76%.

In Dyad One, the conversations were very one-sided, with Colin talking about twice as much as Lisa. In Dyad
Two, the participants contributed almost evenly to the conversations.

Extended behaviors. Both principals used extended behaviors in Areas C, information-giving, and E, methodology, but there were differences. In both post-conferences, almost half of all Colin's information-giving and methodology behaviors were of an extended nature. The proportion of Colin's extended behaviors increased during the second post-conference.

Almost half of Barbara's information-giving behaviors during the first post-conference were likewise of an extended nature, but that decreased to about 37% during the second. About 20% of her methodology behaviors in both post-conferences were of an extended nature, considerably less than Colin's. This means that Henry had much more opportunity than Lisa to respond to any suggestions, and this may have contributed to his feeling of not being dominated by Barbara. Colin's greater use of extended behaviors denied Lisa the same opportunity to respond to suggestions and engage in dialogue.

In Area B, accepting and clarifying the teachers' ideas, there were few behaviors by either principal. This means that Barbara and Colin reacted to the teachers' ideas with short responses, but did not respond in ways which would require Henry and Lisa to expand upon, or explain, their ideas.
Questioning. Although Barbara and Colin asked a similar number and percentage of questions during the post-conferences, the types of questions differed. Colin's questions were largely related to the general behavior of the students and to solving specific student behavior problems. He did not ask many questions about the particular lessons. For the first post-conference, only nine of 44 questions related directly to the lesson. Of those nine, two asked for Lisa's opinion and feeling about the lesson, four asked about student behavior during the lesson, two asked for information about the subsequent lesson, and one asked for specific information about the current lesson.

In the second post-conference, eight out of 23 questions related to the lesson. Only one, "...what would you change?" (Colin: Post-conference 2, p.12) required Lisa to think about the lesson. The rest were requests for information about the students or the lesson.

In contrast to Colin's questions, Barbara's tended to be about the specific lesson itself. In the first post-conference, half of her questions referred to the lesson, and most of the remaining questions referred to Henry's and the students' routine lesson behaviors; for example, "So you have the children...?" (Barbara: Pc 1, p.1) Of the fourteen questions about the particular lesson, three asked Henry for objectives ("...what was your objective for the lesson?" Barbara: Pc 1, p.7), and for the rationale behind
his teaching practices, three asked about the novel being used in the lesson, and the rest were about the management of the lesson.

Again, in the second post-conference, half of Barbara's questions related directly to the lesson. All but one of the those asked Henry for the rationale behind his teaching practices, or asked him to consider changes. Barbara asked him questions such as "Why did you choose to do this style of lesson?" (Barbara: Pc 2, p.1) and "Now what did you do in terms of thinking about this lesson?" (Barbara: Pc 2, p.8).

**Teachers' Behaviors**

**Teacher reaction.** Henry and Lisa were remarkably similar in their reaction behaviors. They were both able and willing to justify their teaching decisions. They asked few questions during the post-conferences and reacted to the principals' behaviors almost exclusively with information-giving and positive social-emotional behaviors. Both Henry and Lisa responded with less information and more agreement behaviors during the second post-conference.

**Extended talk.** Extended teacher talk refers to the number of teacher verbal behaviors that occurred in an uninterrupted manner. There was more extended teacher talk in Dyad Two than in Dyad One. The proportion remained constant at about 16% for Dyad One for both conferences,
but decreased from 26% to 20% for Dyad Two during the second post-conference. In other words, Henry was more extensive in his responses than Lisa was, although his extensive behaviors decreased during the second post-conference.

Silences. The data on silences (pauses of three seconds or more) show major differences between the two dyads. In Dyad One, there were 28 silences in the first post-conference and 19 in the second. These constituted 5% and 4% respectively of the total verbal behaviors in the conferences. Almost all of the silences were Colin's. Although some were clearly deliberate "pause times" to allow Lisa to respond to his questions, most preceded his own statements or came in the midst of them. This may be an indication of Colin's care in choosing his words, or a reflection of his usual verbal style.

In Dyad Two, there were no silences in the first post-conference, and only 4, or less than one percent of the verbal behaviors, in the second post-conference. Henry and Barbara engaged in an easy-flowing dialogue, with no evidence of awkwardness. This may be due to their easy relationship and their self-confidence.
Principals' Goals

Both Barbara and Colin had definite goals for the post-conferences. Colin wanted to boost Lisa's self-esteem and Barbara wanted to encourage Henry to reflect on his teaching. Colin had no other goal for the post-conferences. Barbara not only wanted to encourage Henry to reflect on his teaching, but she also wanted to develop her own questioning abilities.

Although Colin did not have a specific plan for achieving his goal, Barbara did. She wanted her questions to establish a "focal point" for the post-conference. For example, when she asked Henry what was different about the strategy he had used in the lesson, she was deliberately trying to find out "what did he have in mind, how had he planned the lesson differently so that he can really analyze his own change of teaching strategy" (Barbara: Stimulated Recall Interview 2, p.4). She realized that her focus on framing her questions at times led her to miss details of Henry's answers.

Principals' Perceptions

Colin. Colin wanted to establish trust between himself and Lisa, and he was confident that he had
succeeded. Lisa confirms the accuracy of his perception.

Not all of Colin's perceptions, however, were as accurate. First, he wanted Lisa to engage in dialogue with him, but he seemed unaware that his behaviors did not serve that goal. His extended behaviors did not facilitate dialogue and few of his questions encouraged lengthy or thoughtful responses.

Second, although Colin correctly perceived Lisa's need for reassurance and a trusting relationship, he did not perceive her need for straightforward and specific teaching suggestions. Colin was so engrossed in his primary purpose of encouraging trust and boosting self-esteem, that he did not recognize that Lisa needed something more substantial. On the one hand, when she asked for a specific suggestion, he did not provide one. Lisa wanted Colin to suggest responses to students' statements other than the word 'good'. Instead, he told her that what she was doing was fine, but she was not convinced ("...I still think there must be another word other than 'good' that's equivalent to good" Lisa: SRI 2, p.20). On the other hand, he gave her several unsolicited suggestions. To these, Lisa had a confused response. She states that "...he did make a lot of suggestions" (Lisa: Follow-up Interview, p.7), particularly with regard to specific students, but says that "... there was never anything for me that I thought I could improve on" (Lisa: FI, p.5).
Third, Colin thought that Lisa was more verbal during the second post-conference. He said, "...there's a lot more two-way communication..." (Colin: SRI 2, p.21). He thought she was "...starting to respond" (Colin: SRI 2, p.21). In fact, the data show that Lisa's share of the verbal behaviors decreased during the second post-conference.

Barbara. Colin viewed himself as Lisa's mentor and support, although he wanted their relationship to become more collegial than it was. Barbara perceived that her relationship with Henry was already collegial. For example, Barbara considered Henry a colleague who, with her, was learning to "accept criticism" (Barbara: FI, p.1). She seized the study experience as an opportunity for her own "... growth as well as his" (Barbara: FI, p.1). Barbara perceived that her questions were better in the second post-conference than the first, a perception that is supported by the data. She had correctly perceived Henry's preference for an informal approach to the supervisory conference, but thought that he would prefer a structured process. However, Henry prefers a "less structured and ... [a more] casual" process (Henry: FI, p.5). At the same time, Barbara did not seem aware of Henry's feelings toward the imbalance in hierarchical authority between them, and she treated Henry as if there were no positional barrier. Barbara was aware that perhaps her subtle messages to Henry had not been understood.
Teacher Needs

Relationship. Lisa and Henry both needed a trusting relationship with their principal. Henry believes that "being totally comfortable" (Henry: FI, p.14) and feeling that his objectives were being met are major ingredients in a successful supervisory conference. Lisa believes that trust is the major factor in how vulnerable she will allow herself to be. Both Henry and Lisa believe that evaluation or judgement in the supervisory process undermines trust, creates a threat, and reduces its effectiveness.

Supervisory process. Both Henry and Lisa saw the supervisory process as a way of promoting their professional growth. The structure of the supervisory process itself was important to Lisa. She appreciated the opportunity the pre-conference provided for her to explain her teaching practices; knowing the focus of the lesson observation was reassuring for her. A major attraction for Lisa of the supervisory process was the opportunity to talk. She thinks that time for talk is an important part of building trust.

For Henry, the actual model of supervision is much less important than the relationship between himself and the supervisor. He believes that a trusting relationship is more easily established between teachers than between principals and teachers.
Feedback. Both Henry and Lisa wanted help. Henry, though, was more adept at recognizing suggestions and implied criticism and could immediately relate the feedback to future lessons. He was well aware of the changes he had to make for his chosen strategies to work. By contrast, Lisa was not adept at recognizing suggestions and thinking of how to use them in her practice, but she did value Colin's observations about the students, and used the information to think about her students in a new light. Furthermore, she gave evidence of reflection in the second post-conference when she stated "... I think that was a mistake now" (Lisa: Pc 2, p.8).

Direct vs indirect. Lisa and Henry both wanted honest feedback about their teaching practices, but there were differences in their needs within that similar purpose. Lisa needed very specific suggestions. Henry wanted honest and straightforward feedback, but did not always need the degree of specificity that Lisa required. Henry detected subtle criticisms, but preferred a more direct approach. He thought, "Maybe it would have been just better [for Barbara] to say it" (Henry: FI, p. 13). However, he was able to interpret correctly some of Barbara's subtle remarks, and relate them to his teaching.

There is evidence, however, that Henry might also need very specific directions. On one occasion, Barbara tried to indicate a problem in the way he had conducted the lesson and said, "I was wondering how the room arrangement...might
have been different so to get those less active ones involved" (Barbara: Pc 2, p. 12). After Henry justified his current practice, Barbara asked, "So you wouldn't change that...?" (Barbara: Pc 2, p. 13). Henry responded, "...if somebody suggested that maybe it would be better to ..." (Henry: Pc 2, p. 13). Barbara followed up with a suggestion, which Henry accepted without question. Although Henry had changed his pedagogy, he still maintained some aspects of traditional classroom management. It seems that, although Barbara recognized that further changes were necessary, Henry did not.

Teacher Perceptions

Hierarchical authority. Henry thinks that Barbara was positive in her approach, and thought that she raised issues that needed to be discussed. On the one hand, he was very aware of differences in their hierarchical authority. Henry found the supervisory process with a principal more intimidating than with a teaching colleague. "...it's pretty hard to just escape from that whole concept of not being totally on the same level" (Henry FI, p.4). On the other hand, he remarked that the post-conferences seemed "very equal" in terms of the amount of talk, and that perception is supported by the data.

Lisa appears to be more concerned with evaluation than with hierarchical position in her feelings about authority.
One reason she felt comfortable with Colin was because he was not writing her official evaluative report, and therefore did not appear to pose a threat. Because she was a beginning teacher on a temporary contract, a negative evaluation could have resulted in the non-renewal of her contract for the following year.

This difference in attitude may be due to several factors. First, Henry had more experience in the school system. He was more aware of the influence a principal has over one's work life (Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986). Lisa was a beginning teacher, with limited supervision experience, and possibly unaware of Colin's power to influence her work life. Furthermore, Colin was her main mentor and support from the beginning of her teaching career.

Insecurity. Lisa perceived that Colin was positive and supportive. Nonetheless, she revealed much insecurity. First, she wondered about the notes he had made during the lesson observation. She stated that she "...always wanted to read them" (Lisa: SRI 2, p.3). Second, on several occasions, she wondered what he was thinking about her "So now I'm wondering what he's thinking..." (Lisa: SRI 2, p.15). Third, Lisa was not convinced that she should have control over the focus of the observation. "Sometimes I wish he would give me more input about what he wanted to see" (Lisa: FI, p.3).
Henry was not "totally comfortable" during the study post-conferences because of the inherent hierarchical differences between himself and Barbara. He mistakenly understood when he joined the study that he and Barbara would be observing each other, that "...it would be working both ways" (FI, p. 3). Without the reciprocity, he "...found the situation limiting" (FI, p. 3).

Otherwise, he exhibited insecurity on only one occasion. Barbara asked him, "...what was your objective?" In response, Henry stated, "Well the objective was to get them predicting and also using their a priori knowledge to help them with their predictions" (Pc 1, p. 7). But in the stimulated-recall, he commented that, "At this point you always think, oh my God, what were my objectives. That's the time ... when you do sometimes feel threatened. Like what was your objective, like, it's getting clinical...boy you can't blow this one or you'll look like you don't know what you are doing" (Henry: SRI 1, p.7). He responded to Barbara with confidence, but clearly, her question caused him some stress.

Suggestions. Lisa has several misperceptions about the feedback Colin gave her. First, she complained that Colin did not give her any specific suggestions, yet it is clear that he did. Perhaps her perception is due to his tentative language, or to the fact that the suggestions did not apply to the chosen focus of the observation. Second, Lisa thought that "... we always stuck to the topic" (Lisa;
Fl, p.6), but that was not the case. In fact, Colin, in introducing a suggestion during the post-conference, said to her, "...this is not part of what you and I [chose as the focus]..." (Colin: Pc 1, p.5). Although some of Colin's suggestions were related to the chosen observation topic, others were aimed at more general areas of classroom management. Colin said that he "...didn't just stick with [what she wanted him to look at]" (Colin: SRI 2, p.3).

EMERGENT THEMES

This section will examine certain themes that have emerged from the above discussion and which have implications for teacher supervision. The themes are: (1) principal directiveness, (2) questioning, and (3) teacher needs.

Principal Directiveness

Principal directiveness was a feature of all four post-conferences. Studies by Blumberg and Weber (1968), Pajak and Glickman (1989), and Reavis (1977), show clearly that, at least for experienced teachers, directive behaviors undermine the effectiveness of the supervisory process. However, the teachers in this study did not seem to notice or resent the directiveness. Lisa, as a beginning teacher, wanted directive behaviors. This is consistent with the
findings of Copeland and Atkinson (1978). But Henry is an experienced teacher, and he does not appear to have interpreted Barbara's behaviors as directive. Furthermore, although Henry sometimes picked up on subtleties, at other times he indicated a need for specific direction. This may be due to the fact that he was learning to teach in a whole new way, and was, in some ways, like a beginning teacher.

Questioning

Questioning in the post-conference is important in encouraging teacher talk and reflection. Questioning is an important aspect of Glickman's developmental approach to supervision with both directive and non-directive methods. Blumberg (1970) believes that, without questioning, teacher growth can not be facilitated.

There were marked differences in the amount and kinds of questions that Barbara and Colin asked. However, this is not particularly surprising given the differences in their goals. For the most part, although Barbara's percentage of questioning was the same as Colin's, her questions were suited to furthering her goal of encouraging teacher reflection. For Colin, difficult, challenging questions might have undermined his relationship with Lisa. Nonetheless, questioning might have encouraged her to engage in dialogue, since Lisa often responded to the opportunity
to talk, and since she valued "the opportunity to explain why I do what I do" (Lisa: FI, p.8).

Neither Barbara nor Colin made much use of Category Three behaviors (accepting or using the teacher's ideas). By asking more probing, clarifying, and expanding questions, they might have realized their goals to a much greater extent.

Teacher Needs

This section will describe two needs which surfaced as important for the teachers in the supervisory process. They are teacher-principal relationship and conference content.

Relationship. Teacher-principal relationship has emerged as an important theme in this study. Trust in their principal was important for both Henry and Lisa. Goldhammer et al. (1980) suggest that mutual trust is important to the success of the supervisory relationship. Young and Heichberger (1975) point out that teachers distrust supervisory situations and feel threatened by them. Lisa viewed a trusting relationship as the key to whether or not she would expose a perceived weakness to her principal. Henry expressed some wariness of principals because of their hierarchical authority, although he and Barbara had established a relationship which encouraged him to participate in the study. Building trust, then, becomes of the utmost importance to the supervisory process.
Conference content. The actual content of the supervisory conference is the other aspect of teacher needs to emerge. It seems that awareness of professional growth needs is not dependent on teacher experience. Lisa knew what she wanted to learn. Furthermore, she was not particularly receptive to feedback that did not correspond to her needs.

Henry presents a more complex situation. Although Lisa needed very specific suggestions, Henry responded to subtle suggestions and criticisms, as well as to more direct ones. He was able to adapt feedback to his teaching practices. However, like Lisa, he showed that he could also be unreceptive to feedback. On the occasion when Barbara said, "I was wondering how the room arrangement to your movement...might have been different" (Barbara: Pc 2, p. 12), Henry appeared at first not to recognize that Barbara wanted him to consider possible instructional changes, then stated that he would change if told to do so. Only when Barbara actually made a direct suggestion, did Henry recognize it as such and respond positively. However, Henry did not always need direct suggestions. When Barbara's question caused him to verbalize the conflict between his need for control in the class and his desire to use strategies which required more student freedom, he recognized that the conflict existed and that he had to resolve it.
SUMMARY

This chapter has compared and contrasted the behaviors, interactions, and perceptions of the study participants. The important themes that emerged were discussed. Chapter Seven will review the questions that this research attempted to address, and will present the conclusions and recommendations arising from the data.
CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The previous three chapters have presented the research findings. This chapter will summarize the findings which relate to each of the research questions stated in Chapter One and present the conclusions and implications for theory and practice suggested by the findings.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This section will summarize the findings for each of the research questions. The findings will be presented in terms of the similarities and differences between the dyads.

Research Question One

Research Question One asked if principals relate differently to beginning teachers than to experienced teachers? Barbara and Colin each have preferred supervisory approaches, which do not appear to consider the level of teacher experience. Neither indicated that teacher experience level was a factor in determining his or her supervisory approach. For this research, both principals used the clinical supervision model required by
the study, and based their post-conference approaches on their perceptions of the teacher's needs and wishes. Although neither of them mentioned teacher experience as a factor in formulating their approach, Lisa's need for support, and therefore Colin's approach, resulted from her inexperience. Therefore, it seems that, in the Colin-Lisa case, teacher experience was a factor only incidentally, because of the effect it had on the individual teacher and her way of interacting with the principal. This point notwithstanding, teacher experience was not specifically considered as a vital factor in determining supervisory approach by either of the two principals in the study.

Research Question Two

Research Question Two asked that, if differences did exist in the way principals treat beginning and experienced teachers, then what reasons did they give for relating differently? The two principals in this study did not appear be aware that beginning and experienced teachers should be treated differently and they based their approach on factors that had little to do with the teacher's level of experience. They each had philosophies and preferred methods of supervision which determined their supervisory approach. They indicated that their perceptions of the teachers' needs and personality were other factors that influenced their decisions with regard
to supervisory approach. It seems that the principal's decisions about the teacher's needs were based on such factors as his or her relationship with the teacher, and knowledge of what was happening in the teacher's classroom. Both Colin and Barbara perceived that they were being sensitive to the needs and wishes of the teachers in choosing a supervisory approach for this study, and although they did display sensitivity towards their respective teachers, their actions were strongly influenced by what they believed to be the best approach to supervision in general and the post-conference in particular. It seems then that factors other than level of teacher experience influenced the way that the principals related to the teachers in the post-conference. The other factors were the principals' personal philosophies of supervision, their own personalities, their perception of the teacher's needs, and their general relationship with the teacher.

Research Question Three

Research Question Three asked how teachers perceive principals' behaviors in supervisory conferences? The findings show that the teachers' perceptions of the principals' behaviors in this study were sometimes accurate and sometimes not. The factors which seemed to have influenced their perceptions were their previous supervisory
experiences, and the present relationship with their principal.

Henry. Henry had mixed feelings about the supervisory experience with Barbara. On the one hand, he and Barbara had a good working relationship and many positive feelings towards each other. This may account for the fact that Henry perceived the post-conferences to be mostly "democratic" and that he felt like her equal, even though Barbara was somewhat directive in her behaviors. On the other hand, he was mistrustful of hierarchical supervision in general, and preferred teacher-teacher supervision. Henry was knowledgeable about both hierarchical and collegial models of supervision through personal experience and through participation in the district's Supervisory Skills workshops, and he preferred a collegial model. He perceived Barbara's indirect criticisms and suggestions to be a sign of insincerity, rather than an indication of her respect for his experience and professionalism. This attitude seems to stem from his preference for directiveness and his belief that a colleague in a non-hierarchical position would be more blunt and honest. It seems that Henry's relationship with Barbara and his previous supervisory experiences with both hierarchical and non-hierarchical supervision affected his perceptions of the conferences.

Lisa. Lisa, as a beginning teacher, had had only formal evaluation, both as a student-teacher and as a
beginning teacher, prior to her involvement in the study. The notion of collaboration, especially with a person in an authority position, was probably unfamiliar to Lisa. She did not realize that the conferences could have been less one-sided, and so remained positive in her perceptions of Colin and their relationship. She also wanted, needed, and expected directive behaviors from Colin. When she did not get the concrete feedback, however, her attitude toward authority rendered her unable to persist in asking for the directive suggestions she needed and wanted.

CONCLUSIONS

This section will present the conclusions which arise from the findings described above. The conclusions are presented in relation to the relevant literature.

Conclusion One: Supervisory Approach

The first conclusion is that the appropriate approach to supervision cannot be determined solely on the basis of the teacher's level of experience. According to Glickman (1990) and Copeland and Atkinson (1978), level of teacher experience should determine the supervisory approach. However, the findings of this study indicate that supervisors should consider other factors in addition to level of experience. Glickman (1990) suggests that,
although most experienced teachers prefer non-directive or collaborative supervisory approaches, a small number prefer a directive approach. He states that the supervisor should consider the level of teacher expertise as a factor in determining whether or not to be directive with an experienced teacher. The data from this study support Glickman's position. This researcher believes that certain situations may create a preference for a directive approach among experienced teachers. These include teachers being assigned to new subjects or grade levels, reentering the profession after time off for other pursuits such as child-rearing, or implementing new curriculum and teaching practices. Other factors such as the teacher's previous supervisory experiences, and the current supervisor-teacher relationship should also be considered in determining an appropriate supervisory approach.

Conclusion Two: Nature of Supervisory Relationship

The second conclusion is that an open, trusting relationship between supervisor and teacher is crucial to the effectiveness of the supervisory process. Trust is important for several reasons. First, several researchers (e.g., Ashton and Webb, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Feiman-Nemser and Floden, 1986; Lieberman and Miller, 1984) point out the isolation in which most teachers work and the consequences of that isolation. The lonely nature of teaching means that
most teachers are not accustomed to having other adults in their classrooms, and may feel vulnerable teaching in front of others. Furthermore, teacher isolation often causes a norm of non-interference to develop in schools which may be violated by the supervisor's presence. An open, trusting relationship outside the supervisory process may alleviate teachers' fears, and help establish an atmosphere in which supervisors are welcomed into classrooms as promoters of teachers' professional growth. Isherwood (1983) suggests that teachers "would approach clinical supervision with less trepidation if an outside-of-class relationship with the principal was founded on more than a formal basis" (p.19).

Second, trust is important in creating a deeper understanding between the teacher and supervisor and encouraging teachers to expose their vulnerabilities. Henry had a basic distrust of principals as supervisors because of their hierarchical position, but he trusted Barbara. That trust allowed him to try new teaching practices during her observations, and therefore get feedback from her on the areas in which he needed help. Lisa was also willing to depart from safe practices during Colin's observations, and to express her concerns and doubts about her teaching to Colin at times other than during the supervisory process. It seems clear that the post-conferences in this study were perceived by the participants to be successful to the degree that the
principal understood and cared about the teacher and the teacher trusted the principal.

Conclusion Three: Formal Evaluation

The third conclusion is that formal evaluation is counterproductive in the supervisory process if the goal of the supervision is professional growth. The importance of a trusting relationship between supervisor and teacher has been discussed above. Supervision for formal evaluation purposes may be destructive of the supervisory relationship and impair the effectiveness of the supervisory experience (Salek, 1975; Young and Heichberger, 1975). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) state that "the heart of clinical supervision is an intense, continuous, mature relationship between supervisors and teachers with the intent being the improvement of professional practice" (p.357). A mature relationship, it could be argued, implies an equal one. Lisa would not have demonstrated teaching practices in which she felt weak if Colin had been involved in her formal evaluation. Henry believes that supervision between colleagues is preferable to supervision by a principal because the principal may have "a tendency to judge rather than just be there to assist and help people grow" (Henry: FI, p.6). Furthermore, it seems clear that formal evaluation is not necessary for teachers to take responsibility for
their own professional growth. Henry was committed to learning whole language techniques and introducing a literature-based program into his classroom without the "threat" of evaluation. Lisa was aware of weaknesses in her teaching and viewed the study experience as a way of improving. The data from this study indicate clearly that evaluation threatens the trust necessary in the supervisor-teacher relationship and may shift the emphasis of supervision away from improvement of professional practice to a meaningless bureaucratic routine.

Conclusion Four: Teacher Perception

The fourth conclusion is that a teacher's perception of the supervisor's behavior is critical to the effectiveness of the supervisory process and the general relationship between the supervisor and the teacher. Blumberg and Weber (1968) state that supervisory behavior has a major impact on the supervisory relationship. It follows that the teacher's perception of these behaviors is equally as important as the actual behaviors themselves. Link (1970) found that teachers who perceived indirect supervisory behaviors regarded the conference as more productive and the supervisor-teacher relationship as more positive than teachers who perceived direct supervisory behaviors. Henry perceived his relationship with Barbara as democratic, and did not feel dominated by her during the
post-conferences, although her behaviors were largely directive. In this case it was his perception of non-directiveness, although inaccurate, that affected his feelings toward Barbara and the supervisory process. He seems to have realized that he could accept or reject Barbara's suggestions. His correct perception that she was not always straightforward in her criticism made him feel anxious. Lisa correctly perceived and appreciated Colin's attempts to support her. Her incorrect perception that he made no suggestions whatsoever caused her dissatisfaction.

IMPLICATIONS

Implications for Theory

This section will discuss the findings and conclusions in relation to the formulations used to frame this study, namely the Blumberg Scale and Glickman's concept of Developmental Supervision. It will also raise questions about these two frameworks.

Blumberg Scale. The Blumberg Scale was useful in providing a framework for quantifying the principal-teacher interactions in the post-conferences. It clearly demonstrated the directive behaviors of the two principals, when observations of the interactions between the principals and the teachers might have suggested otherwise. The scale also demonstrated the extended nature of some
behaviors, which exacerbated the directiveness of the principals' behaviors.

There were, however, difficulties with the Blumberg Scale which may have affected its usefulness. One problem is the lack of definitions for "question" and "silence". In the post-conferences studied by this researcher, not all requests for information were framed as questions, and some questions appeared to be rhetorical. This researcher made arbitrary definitions of what constituted a question and a silence, and applied them consistently. A statement was deemed to be a question if the apparent intent was to solicit information. For example, the statement by Barbara, "I was wondering how the room arrangement ... might have been different..." (Pc 2, p. 12), encouraged Henry to explain his practice. Questions that seemed rhetorical, or support-inducing and did not yield information were categorized as statements. Barbara's question "... they're really good then, aren't they?" (Pc 1, p. 10) was deemed an expression of opinion, rather than an attempt to solicit information. Although the issue of what constituted a question arose in this particular context, the problem has likely been encountered by other users of the Blumberg Scale.

The definition of silence was also developed contextually. Silence was defined as a pause of three seconds or more. In the conference transcripts, three seconds seemed to this researcher to constitute a
sufficiently noticeable pause. However, a five second pause was a significant silence and more likely to encourage a response. Therefore, a silence of five seconds may be a more appropriate definition.

The Blumberg Scale would have been more useful if the number of teacher response categories were increased to parallel the supervisor's categories. For instance, whereas the supervisors' behaviors of information-, opinion-, and suggestion-giving are categorized separately, for teachers they are all in one category. It might be instructive to see if there are differences between experienced and beginning teachers in the nature of their responses. For example, it seems likely that experienced teachers are more apt to give opinions and suggestions than are beginning teachers.

Developmental Supervision. The data from this study clearly demonstrated that experience does make a difference in how teachers should be treated in the supervisory post-conference. However, it may be that the need for a directive approach with experienced teachers is more common than Glickman suggests. This implies that more investigation is needed to understand the contextual factors which might determine the choice of supervisory approach for experienced teachers. It may also be that supervisors should treat experienced and beginning teachers differently within a directive approach. For example, teachers
experienced in terms of years of teaching but who are implementing new curriculum or incorporating new strategies into their practice may react to suggestions differently than beginning teachers. The experienced teachers are likely to assume immediate ownership of a suggestion, but beginning teachers may need a plan of implementation. Furthermore, the data from this study clearly demonstrated that factors such as supervisor-teacher relationship must be considered when determining supervisory approach.

**Implications for Practice**

The following section will suggest implications for practice which arise from the findings of this study. These implications concern supervisory behaviors, supervisor-teacher relationship, and formal evaluation.

**Supervisory behaviors.** The findings and conclusions from this study have some major implications for practice. First, supervisors should be aware of new teaching practices and curriculum. If the conclusions of this study are accepted, then an appropriate supervisory approach should be based, at least in part, on what the teacher is doing in the classroom. In British Columbia, the "Year 2000" program is requiring teachers to abandon old teaching methods and practices and adopt new ones. This has important implications for supervision. Experienced
teachers who need specific direction as they implement new teaching strategies or curriculum may become frustrated by a collaborative or non-directive approach, and lapse into old and comfortable practices. Teachers who meet with failure rather than success as they implement changes are less likely to try other new practices. Supervisors unfamiliar with the new curriculum and practices should consider promoting another method of supervision such as some form of peer collaboration.

Second, supervisors must be aware of the teacher's assignments. A teacher with a new grade or subject area is not likely to feel as competent or secure as one who is teaching in his/her area of expertise. Therefore, a supervisor may, on occasion, need to treat such a teacher with a directive approach, as if he or she were inexperienced.

Third, supervisors need a repertoire of supervisory approaches, rather than depending on a particular one (Glickman, 1990; Glatthorn, 1984). Different teachers, depending on factors such as career stage and previous supervisory experience, will have different supervisory preferences. Teachers and supervisors together should discuss and plan the supervisory approach for each teacher.

**Supervisor-teacher relationship.** There are several implications for practice in the area of the supervisor-teacher relationship. If the relationship between teacher and supervisor is important to the effectiveness of the
supervisory experience, as suggested by both this study and the literature, then supervisors need the time, willingness, and sensitivity necessary to establish trust with teachers. They need time and opportunity to interact with teachers outside the supervisory relationship and come to understand the personality and needs of the teachers. This need for time has implications for change in the roles of both principals and vice-principals. For example, if principals spend more time fostering supervisor-teacher relationships, vice-principals may have to assume more administrative duties.

Formal evaluation. The findings of this study have implications for the practice of formal teacher evaluation. In District A, regular formal evaluation of teachers is done by the principal or vice-principal. In District B, there is no regular formal evaluation. It has been replaced by a program of professional growth that teachers are responsible for developing for themselves. The findings of this study suggest that a program, such as that in District B, should be considered as a replacement for regular, bureaucratically-imposed evaluation. Such a change also implies changes in district attitude toward teachers and their professional growth, and a changing role for supervisors.

This thesis has attempted to explain some of the supervisor-teacher dynamics in the supervisory post-conference. At a time in British Columbia when teachers can
bargain the supervisory process as part of their collective agreements, and when massive program changes are being implemented, it is critical that the most effective way of promoting professional growth be found. This study has shed some light on important aspects of the supervisory process, and suggested ways to make it more effective.
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APPENDIX A

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

General:

1. Describe your professional relationship with ______ outside the supervisory relationship.
2. Is there anything about your relationship outside the supervisory experience you wish were different?
3. Describe your relationship with ______ within the supervisory experience.
4. Is there anything about your relationship within the supervisory experience you wish were different?
5. Describe your experience and background with supervision.
6. What were your expectations of these supervision conferences?
7. Did you have any particular objectives for the conferences?
8. How do you feel about the feedback you gave/received in the conferences?
9. What did you hope would happen as a result of the conferences?
10. Were your expectations met in the conferences? As a result of the conferences?
For the Principals:

1. What do you consider to be the strengths of your conferencing skills?

2. Describe your preferred way of conducting supervisory conferences.

3. Do you use the same approach with all teachers? If not how does your approach differ? On what basis do you choose your approach?

4. For ________ what approach did you intend to take in the first conference? Why? Did you follow your plan or change? Why? In the second conference? Why? Did you follow your plan or change? Why?

5. Upon reflection, is there anything you wish you'd done differently in the first conference with _____? In the second conference?

6. Is there anything else you can tell me to help me understand the conferences from your perspective?

7. What dilemmas were presented by each supervisory conference? How did you resolve them?

For the Teachers:

1. How do you want to be treated by an administrator during a supervisory conference? What makes you feel comfortable/uncomfortable during a supervisory conference? Should a principal treat all teachers the same?

2. How do you feel about the approach that took in your first conference? In the second conference? Did you notice any changes from the first to the second?

3. What do you feel you learned from the first conference? From the second conference?

4. Is there anything you wanted to get from the conferences, but didn't? Did you have expectations as a result of the first conference that were or were not met by the second?

5. What is important about the supervisory conferences from your perspective?

6. Do you think the first conference had an impact on your teaching practices? On your relationships within the school with the principal, the other teachers, the students? Same for the second?

7. Is there anything else you can tell me to help me understand the conferences from your perspective?
APPENDIX B

TEACHER EVALUATION CLAUSES FROM THE COLLECTIVE AGREEMENTS OF DISTRICTS A AND B
DISTRICT A
EVALUATION CLAUSES

ARTICLE 4: EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

4.1 General Considerations

4.1.1 All reports on the work of a continuing or temporary teacher shall be in writing. This clause does not preclude clarification or discussion of material presented in the report.

4.1.2 A teacher shall not be evaluated more than once every five years unless:

a. A report issued pursuant to this article is less than satisfactory, or

b. A teacher requests that a report be written, or

c. A written request is made by the superintendent, the Board of School Trustees, the Minister of Education, or by the College of Teachers established under the Teaching Profession Act. A copy of such a written request will be sent to the association president.

4.1.3 Each report shall be based on a reasonable number of personal observations which reflect the teacher's assignment.

4.2 Evaluation Process

When observations are undertaken for the purpose of an evaluative report on a teacher, the following shall apply:

4.2.1 Informing the teacher

a. By the end of September, and at least 10 working days prior to the commencement of the first classroom observations, the evaluator will call a meeting of the total teaching staff and describe the purposes and process for formal evaluation. At this time, each teacher shall be given a copy of the "Criteria of Evaluation".

b. A teacher shall be notified at least 10 working days prior to commencing classroom observations, that an evaluation is to be conducted.
4.2.2 Pre-observation Conference

a. A pre-observation conference shall be held with the teacher before classroom observations begin. This meeting will include a discussion of the following:

i. the criteria of evaluation
ii. the classroom observation process
iii. the data gathering/sharing process
iv. the draft report
v. the presentation of the final report
vi. the expected timeline of the process

b. Subsequent pre-observation conferences which focus on 4.2.2 (a) (ii) above will be held prior to each classroom observation if requested by the teacher. These conferences may be combined with the post-observation conferences described in clause 4.2.4

4.2.4 Post-Observation Conference

a. A post conference will be held at an appropriate time as soon as practicable after each classroom observation.

b. During this conference the data should be reviewed and discussed, with the objective of identifying specific strengths to be maintained and/or areas that need improvement. This information shall be provided to the teacher in written form on or attached to a district "Comments on Observation" form. This information shall be provided to the teacher prior to the meeting, upon request.

c. If desired, a teacher may respond in writing to the post-observation conference information.

4.2.5 Draft Report

a. A draft report will be written, presented and discussed with the teacher at least three working days prior to the preparation of the final copy.

b. Specific strengths, weaknesses and/or recommendations for improvement should be stated and discussed.

c. The report should reflect any differences between the teacher's assignment and professional training and/or experience.

d. When suggestions for amendments to the draft report are not agreed upon, the teacher has the right to make
a written response which will be filed with the final report.

4.2.6 Final Report

a. The final report shall be shown to the teacher prior to its submission to the superintendent of schools.

b. The final report shall be filed pursuant to the School Act and Regulations. The original copy shall be sent to the superintendent of schools. One copy shall be given to the teacher at the time of filing, one copy shall be retained by the author of the report for his/her record, and one copy shall be sent to the secretary-treasurer.

4.3 Recognizing the voluntary nature of extra-curricular activities, the evaluator may choose to commend the teacher's contribution to school activities if agreed to or requested by the teacher.
IX. TEACHING PERFORMANCE: SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION

A. SUPERVISION, PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND ASSESSMENT

This provision applies to all temporary contract and continuing contract teacher.

Recognizing that continual improvement of instruction is a major goal in schools, the parties commit themselves to an ongoing supervision and assessment program which incorporates active involvement and reflective self-assessment, on the part of each teacher. This program is primarily intended to be developmental, providing for professional growth within a cooperative, supportive environment.

In this context, the board will make available to school staffs appropriate professional literature dealing with effective teaching and its constituent elements. In addition the parties will establish a committee charged with outlining and making available for the use of staffs a number of well recognized supervisory models. The professional literature and the information about the supervisory models are intended to provide a practical conceptual base for improvement of instruction in the schools. Additionally, the parties acknowledge that a commitment of time and will is essential to the success of the program. Further, success is dependent on the board providing appropriate financial resources.

At the school level, each teaching staff will form a school-based instructional improvement team, which will include the school principal. It will be the responsibility of this team to bring the literature mentioned above to the attention of the teachers, and to assist staff in the review and examination of both the information on effective instruction and the models for improvement of instruction.

Thereafter, and in consultation with the principal, each teacher will select the supervisory model considered to be most appropriate for his/her teaching-learning situation. Based on this model, it will then be the responsibility of the teacher in consultation with the principal to draft a plan of action aimed at the improvement of his/her instruction. The areas of instructional improvement chosen for emphasis will be those identified by the teacher, and the plan of action will make provision for thoughtful self-assessment and professional feedback from those staff involved in whichever supervisory model has been chosen. A
written outline of the plan will be retained by both the teacher and the principal, and it will be in place by November 1, 1990 of the first year of operation and by November 1 of each year thereafter. This is intended to allow time for sufficient involvement of staff at both the school and district level for skill development, the implementation of the program, staff familiarization with the process involved and time to allow other preparation.

Periodically, the teacher and the principal will meet to discuss progress and to examine whether modifications to the plan and/or areas of focus might be advisable. It is also expected that the teacher will exercise his/her professional responsibility as he/she independently assesses progress, evaluates the plan of action, and makes tentative plans for future development on an ongoing basis.

Notwithstanding the above, a teacher may request and then receive a formal written report for the school principal at least once in a three-year period. It is further recognized that the principal will continue to be expected to fulfill the normal responsibilities of his/her position regarding supervision of program, staff and student.

B. FORMAL EVALUATION

In the event that a principal believes that a specific area needs to be addressed beyond the process outlined in the Supervision, Professional Growth and Assessment section, then he/she will commence a formal process by sending a memo on the appropriate district form to the teacher requesting a meeting.

1. Step 1
   a) At the meeting, the principal will identify and clarify the area(s) of concern with the teacher. The teacher will provide his/her views in response to the principal.

   b) If any area of concern remains, then the principal and teacher will discuss, informally, joint strategies to address the area(s) of concern.

2. Step 2
   a) If the concern is not remedied at Step 1 or if the problem recurs, then the principal will meet again with the teacher to discuss the situation.

   b) Following the meeting, the principal will provide the teacher with a descriptive memo outlining the areas of concern, and the evaluation and observation processes (including a time frame) that will be used in
analyzing and evaluating the teaching situation. Further, the memo will outline the expected standards of performance or objectives to be met by the teacher and possible means of achieving them.

c) The supervisory and evaluative process referred to in this step shall include a formal written report. If the formal report is "less than satisfactory" a copy will be forwarded to the superintendent's office. Further, any written response by the teacher to the written report will also be forwarded to the superintendent's office.

3. Step 3

a) If the teacher is evaluated as less than satisfactory in a report pursuant to Step 2 above, then the principal, a representative of the superintendent's office, the teacher, and a representative of the [Teachers' Association], will meet to discuss the situation. Following the meeting the principal will identify in a descriptive memo the areas of concern, the expected standards of performance or objectives to be met and applicable time frames.

b) Possible means of addressing the concern within the established time frame will be discussed and the teacher, in consultation with the principal and other appropriate district resource people mutually agreed upon, will develop a plan of remedial action.

c) In pursuing this plan of remedial action, the teacher will have access to existing staff support resources and consultative services. Further, the teacher may be given the opportunity to observe teachers in similar assignments, or the teacher may be given the opportunity to attend workshops related to the problem.

d) The principal shall keep the superintendent's office advised on the progress of the plan of action and the teacher will keep the [Teachers' Association] president similarly advised.

e) The supervisory and evaluative process referred to in this step shall include a second formal written report by the principal.

4. Step 4

a) If the teacher is evaluated as less than satisfactory in a report pursuant to Step 3 above, then the principal, a representative of the superintendent's office, the teacher and a representative of the
[Teachers' Association] will meet to discuss the advisability of an alternate assignment.

b) If a teacher who has received a "less than satisfactory" report in Step 3 desires a reassignment, he/she will request a reassignment in writing to the superintendent's office indicating the reasons.

c) If a teacher receives a "less than satisfactory" report in Step 3, he/she may request within three weeks unpaid leave of absence of up to one year (effective at a mutually agreeable date) to take an approved program of professional or academic instruction. If the leave is approved, the time between the request for leave of absence and the return of the teacher shall not be counted as part of the timelines governing report writing. The return from leave of absence will coincide with the beginning of a school term or semester as applicable. Observations for a subsequent formal report shall not begin earlier than two months after the teacher has returned to teaching duties.

d) It is noted that in the event that a personal leave of absence could address a factor contributing to the problem, then such teacher may request a leave of absence for personal reasons.

e) The supervisory and evaluative process referred to in this report shall include a third formal written report by a superintendent or director of instruction. The three reports shall not be written by the same person.

C. General

1. Following each observation made pursuant to the Formal Evaluation section, the evaluator shall discuss with the teacher his/her observations and impressions. Upon request, such observations and impressions will be provided to the teacher in the form of a written anecdotal statement which shall be reviewed with the teacher prior to the next formal supervisory visit and finalization of a formal written report.

2. Criteria for the evaluation shall be reasonable. The teacher will be made aware of the areas of competence in which he/she must improve in order to have his/her teaching performance found to be satisfactory. The timing and number of observations used to support a report will be such that the evaluator will be able to make a well-informed and professional judgment on the learning situation. Further, the timing and number of observations will be reasonable for the teacher.
3. All formal reports and responses shall be in writing.

4. Involvement or non-involvement in extra-curricular activities, or other matters not related to teaching duties are outside the scope of evaluating and reporting on the work of the teacher.

5. Three consecutive "less than satisfactory" reports shall constitute basis for termination of the teacher. The three reports shall fall within a period of not less than 12 months and not more than 36 months unless mutually agreed otherwise by the parties. This time period is exclusive of unpaid and paid absences from work.

6. A grievance regarding the termination of a teacher shall be decided based on the real substance at issue. No teacher will be terminated without just cause.
APPENDIX C

BLUMBERG SCALE
BLUMBERG SCALE MATRIX CATEGORIES

Supervisor Behaviors

Category 1 contains support-inducing communications which are designed to establish rapport with the teacher.

Category 2 is for statements of praise, defined as verbal behaviors which convey a positive value judgment toward a teacher's actions, thoughts, or feelings.

Category 3 is for verbal behaviors in which a supervisor accepts, uses, or expands upon a teacher's ideas.

Category 4 are questions asking for information, clarification, or orientation about the topic under discussion.

Category 5 contains statements which give information to the teacher, including summarizing and orienting.

Category 6 is for questions which ask the teacher to give opinions, evaluate, or analyze a classroom event.

Category 7 are statements which ask for suggestions from the teacher with regard to how things may be done differently.

Category 8 is for behaviors in which the supervisor analyzes or evaluates a classroom event or the interaction taking place between the teacher and the supervisor.

Category 9 is for behaviors in which the supervisor gives suggestions about doing things.

Category 10 is for supervisory behaviors which give negative value judgments about the teacher or the teacher's behavior in the classroom that might produce a defensive or aggressive attitude.

Teacher Behaviors

Category 11 corresponds to Categories 4, 6, and 7. In this category go statements of the teacher asking for information, opinions, or suggestions.

Category 12 is for behaviors in which the teacher gives information, opinions, or suggestions. It corresponds to Categories 5, 8, and 9.

Category 13 contains positive social-emotional teacher behaviors.
Category 14 behaviors are negative social-emotional statements by the teacher which tend to produce tension.

Category 15

Category 15 indicates silence. It can also be used when both people are talking at once so that it is impossible to categorize the specific behaviors.

Extended Behaviors

Area A is concerned with behaviors which build and maintain interpersonal relationships.

Area B indicates behaviors which make use of the teacher's ideas.

Area C is concerned with providing informational, non-evaluative data.

Area D shows behaviors which are concerned with evaluation.

Area E is shows behaviors which are concerned with methodology.

Area F indicates behaviors which control the teacher's behaviors

Area G indicates the amount of extended talk by the teacher.

Area H shows how the teacher reacts to the supervisor's behaviors.

Area I shows how the supervisor reacts to the teacher's behaviors.

Area J shows the kind of supervisory behaviors which cause silence or confusion.

Area K shows how the supervisor reacts to silence or confusion.

Area L shows which teacher behaviors cause silence or confusion in the supervisor.

Area M shows how the teacher reacts to silence or confusion.