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ABSTRACT

Throughout the history of theological education there have been many articles written about field education and the need for effective supervision, but few works describe research on the role functions of the supervisory conference. Studies have suggested that examining the supervisory process is complex and not easily researched. For accreditation, the Association of Theological Schools requires field education and supervision as an integral part of the Master of Divinity degree. The purpose of this study was to further the understanding of supervision from the perspectives of supervisors and students engaged in the process of theological field education.

An exploratory field research methodology was used. Previous research in theological field education supervision proved inadequate for hypotheses testing. The specific purpose of the study was to search for answers to two questions. First, how do supervisors and students describe the role functions of the supervisory conference? And second, what are the relationships between the role functions of the supervisory conference and conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, personality type, age, gender, educational level, and experience?

Interviews of supervisors and students were the source of data for the study. The interviews included asking demographic information, asking the role functions of the supervisory conference, and administering four instruments: the Paragraph Completion Test, the Preactive Behavior Instrument, the Supervisory Beliefs Inventory, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. The role functions were content
analyzed and correlated with age, gender, experience, educational level, conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality types. Analyses were performed on the aggregated groups of supervisors and students, and on nine individual supervisor/student pairs.

The results of the study indicated general agreement between the field education supervisors and their students in understanding the role functions of the supervisory conference. The mean scores on conceptual level for supervisors and students were not significantly different. Supervisors rated themselves higher in constructive openness than their students. Students estimated their supervisors to be more directive than the supervisors believed themselves to be. The personality types of supervisors and students were similar on the perceiving and judging preferences.

When the data were examined by supervisor/student pairs, a more precise description of the supervisory interaction became apparent. For example, the effects of different conceptual levels and personality types became evident in the supervisory relationship. This finding suggests that future research in supervision should use individual pairs instead of aggregated groups.

Two important role function themes mentioned least often by students were "relating of religious traditions and values to the human and social needs which have been identified in the ministry placement" and the "linking of theology with the practice of ministry." These two themes represent key strategies for those preparing for future ministry, and should play an integral part in field education.
This study has raised several questions for future research: Is the supervisor the key element in the learning of the student? Or is the context of field education the key to learning? What does the student learn from the supervisory conference and the field placement? And finally, is the articulation of the supervisor's own theology and experience an essential component in the supervisory process, and therefore, a component in supervisor training programs?
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

A number of church-related seminaries, colleges and universities offer theological education leading to the Master of Divinity degree. This degree combines academic (theology) courses with practical (field education) courses to train both ordained and non-ordained personnel for full-time ministry in the church. It is the responsibility of the theological school to provide its own program of supervised theological field education (TFE). In addition to this type of school program there is another independent organization offering chaplaincy training that shares this responsibility. Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) provides parallel training to the theological school or seminary. The National Association of Clinical Pastoral Education certifies CPE supervisors, who work with students in clinical settings, such as hospitals, correctional institutions, and counseling agencies. Since 1917, the National Association of Clinical Pastoral Education has provided a set of standards for both CPE supervisors and training centers. However, these standards do not apply to TFE supervisors or field placements.

This study centers on the field education component of theological education. Field education allows students to practice their future ministry role in a supervised work environment conducive to personal growth and professional identity.

Within the theological school, the Director of Field Education is responsible for the overall direction and coordination of the program. The TFE supervisors, responsible to the director, work directly with students in a placement outside the theological institution. The parish is the ordinary context for TFE, although for specific student needs another setting may be more appropriate, for example a
diocesan or conference religious education department. Supervision is defined as a "method of education designed to effect those personal changes which will permit the integration into practice of self-understanding, relevant theory, substantive knowledge, and functional skills" (Klink, 1966, p. 177).

The basic theoretical model for TFE supervision varies with the seminary or school. If there is a strong CPE influence within the school, the basic theoretical model of supervision is taken from the fields of psychiatry and psychology with a primary focus on individual growth and professional socialization. When CPE does not form the framework, the theoretical models for supervision can be found within the social sciences. These include teacher training and instruction, adult education, professional training, family therapy, social work, cultural context and social analysis, social field theory, and counseling psychology.

The Association for Theological Field Education (ATFE) provides its members with a set of guidelines developed by Ellis L. Larsen (1983) as criteria for field education programs accredited by the Association of Theological Schools. These guidelines have not been officially approved by ATFE, and Larsen recommends much more discussion before seeking approval. The guidelines suggest several objectives for TFE. Two of these objectives were found important for this study. The objectives are: first, "to bring together the activities of thinking and acting theoretically (theory and praxis), along with allowing life to inform theology;" second, "to relate students to a competent supervision process which will support personal and spiritual formation, critical reflection, shared ministry, and professional competence" (Larsen, 1983, p. 162). The same guidelines (p. 164)
state the following about supervision:

The students shall work and learn in relationship with qualified supervisors. Such supervision shall include:

1. Regularly held conferences . . .
2. Conferences which focus upon the following, as they emerge from the work setting itself: a) the student’s personal development behaviorally, affectively and cognitively; b) the student’s ability to function as a pastoral theologian, to 'do' theology; c) the student’s spirituality and its development.
3. An openness on the part of the supervisor also to submit his or her own experiences and development for examination -- while nevertheless putting the prime focus on the supervisee.

The guidelines give some direction, but Directors of Field Education have continued to express concern about the quality of supervision and the training of supervisors. Field education supervisors shared a similar concern. At an in-service meeting of TFE supervisors, a number commented on the differing expectations they and their students had regarding supervision. This problem is not unique to TFE. In teacher education, Staab (1984) found differing expectations among student teachers, university supervisors, and sponsor teachers regarding student preparation for instruction. Perrine (1984) also found differing perceptions of role between science teachers and their supervisors. Thus, it is not surprising to find differing expectations or perceptions between theological field education supervisors and their students.

From these observations, and from personal experience working in TFE, it became important to the researcher to determine whether differing expectations could be accounted for in at least two ways. One, whether the supervisors and students held common or diverse understandings of the role functions of the supervisory conference. Two, whether thinking, verbal communication, supervisory
style and personality influenced expectations. Accordingly, an exploratory research design, using an interview, was constructed.

How a person thinks, influences the way he or she understands a context and participates in events. In this study, conceptual level, derived from information processing theory (Schroder, Driver, & Strufert 1967), was used to understand how a person thinks.

Language influences the communication between two or more people. Wallen (1972) suggested that positive, freeing language encouraged and supported trusting relationships, while negative, binding language inhibited trust. Grimmett (1982) used Wallen's idea of freeing and binding verbal communication and found a close relationship between how a person thinks and speaks: he named this relationship "constructive openness."

How a supervisor approaches supervision influences the perceptions and expectations within the supervisory interaction. Glickman (1981) described this interaction as directive, collaborative or non-directive.

A great variety of studies suggest that personality influences the interactions between people. Personality type as described in the work of Isabel Briggs Myers (Myers & McCulley, 1985) indicated the influence of personality type on career choices, work-patterns, as well as, on supervisory relationships.
A. PURPOSE AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the effect of four independent variables, namely, conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type, on the understandings of supervisors and students of the role functions of the TFE supervisory conference.

The research questions were:

1. How do supervisors and students in TFE describe the role functions of the supervisory conference?

2. What are the relationships between these descriptions of the role functions of the supervisory conference and
   a. the conceptual levels of supervisors and students?
   b. the constructive openness of supervisors and the supervisors' constructive openness as estimated by students?
   c. the orientation to supervision of supervisors and the orientation to supervision experienced by the students?
   d. the personality types of supervisors and students?
   e. the supervisor' and students' demographic characteristics of age, gender, educational level, the number of years supervisors have engaged in supervision at the school, and the number of years students have worked before entrance into theological education.

Role and function are considered as separate concepts in role theory (Gross, 1958). In TFE literature role and function are generally considered within the concept of role (Bunting, 1979). However, for the purposes of this study they
were used as a single concept -- role functions.

B. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are the general definitions used in this study.

Theological Field Education Supervision: A method of education designed to enable personal change under supervision; it includes the integration into the practice of the ministry, self-understanding, relevant theory, substantive knowledge, professional skills and strategies. This educational method takes place within a theological education context.

Role functions: The actual performance of an incumbent in a position which can be referred to as an expectation for an incumbent in that position (Gross, 1958).

Supervisory conference: The weekly, formal interaction between the supervisor and the student; the interaction is based on the student's learning covenant or contract.

Previous experience: In this study, previous experience is used in two different ways:

1. the number of years the supervisor has supervised for the school.
2. the number of years the student has worked before entrance into theological education.

The following definitions are specific to the instruments used in this study.

Conceptual Level: "A characteristic based on a developmental personality theory that describes persons on a developmental hierarchy of increasing conceptual complexity, self-responsibility, and independence" (Hunt et al., 1978b, p. 78).

Constructive Openness: A measure of the degree to which the supervisor uses freeing or binding verbal communication.
1. **Freeing verbal communication** is a way of responding which results in growth-producing relationships.

2. **Binding verbal communication** is a way of responding that can diminish autonomy in a relationship (Wallen, 1972).

**Orientation to supervision:** Orientation to supervision is based on three approaches:

1. **Directive**, the supervisor is in charge of the direction of the supervisory process;

2. **Collaborative**, the student and supervisor mutually develop a contract;

3. **Non-directive**, the student is in charge of the direction of the supervisory process, the supervisor acts as a facilitator (Glickman, 1981).

**Personality type:** A description of "the way individuals prefer to use their perception and judgment" (Myers & McCulley, p. 1, 1985).

1. **Perception** is the many ways to become aware of things, people, happenings, or ideas.

2. **Judgment** is the variety of ways to come to conclusions about what has been perceived.

**C. JUSTIFICATION OF STUDY**

Existing TFE literature dealt with such topics as the need for supervision (Hoover, 1980), models of supervision (Beers & Schaper, 1984), and supervisory training programs (Bunting 1979). But nowhere were the role functions of the supervisory conference described from the perspectives of those engaged in supervision, namely, supervisors and students. Nor was there any exploration of the possible influences of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to
supervision, and personality type on the supervisory interaction. If this study found that these characteristics did, in fact, influence the supervisory conference, there would be sufficient evidence for more care in the selection, training, and placement of students with supervisors.

D. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This introductory chapter has stated the purpose, background, definition of terms, assumptions, and justification of the study. Chapter Two provides a review of the literature pertaining to the historical development of TFE supervision, research on differing perceptions of supervision, four individual characteristics that influence supervision, and TFE supervision. Chapter Three outlines the research design, describing the sample, data sources and collection, and the data analysis. Chapter Four describes the findings in relation to the research questions proposed in Chapter One. Chapter Five presents the conclusions of the study, its limitations, and implications and recommendations for theological field education.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature review is organized into the following parts: First a historical overview of theological field education; second, differing expectations and perceptions of supervision; third, the influence of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type on supervision; four, current understandings of the role functions of TFE supervisory conference; and five, a summary.

A. HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION

Since 1921 the field education component to theological studies has been recognized as a powerful aid in helping students coordinate their learned knowledge with practical experience (Boisen, 1951). Theological field education (TFE) has theoretical roots in the "practical" field of theology (Blakemore, 1949). Blakemore's reference to the practical however referred to classroom courses which explained and analyzed the practice of ministry. Glen (1953) recommended that field work be accompanied by pastoral supervision, but he neither defined nor described supervision.

Wise (1954) distinguished between clinical training supervision and field work supervision. According to him, the aim of clinical supervision was to gain understanding of persons, both as an individual and as groups; the aim of field supervision was to overcome "certain fundamental inadequacies of students" (p. 191). Froyd (1955) traced the historical development of speculative and practical theology and in so doing, posed the question, "What is the function of field work supervision?"
In the early 1960's clinical supervision for TFE supervisors was specifically encouraged by Furgeson (1961) and Southard (1963). The first director of field work was appointed in 1964. Palmer (1964) was convinced that a vital field experience properly supervised could bring about a competence that could never be developed in the seminary alone.

In 1966, The Association of Theological Schools commissioned a study of theological education. Fielding (1966) edited this study which subsequently influenced the development of theological education. The section on field education was written by Thomas Klink (1966) writing from a CPE perspective, defined supervision in terms of "an educational procedure" (p. 176). He addressed techniques and principles of supervision, supervision as career preparation for ministry, the choices a supervisor makes in educational practice, in-service education and finally learning style. Klink's contribution to the study ultimately became the reference for further development of the modern practice of TFE supervision.

The societal changes of the sixties were reflected in TFE literature. No longer could classroom discussions alone meet the training needs of the students (Ashbrook, 1966 and Zimmerman, 1968). Rather, students were required to experience the practice of ministry in the field. Once this became the accepted practice, the need for supervision became apparent, and a variety of supervisory models quickly developed. Models were taken from professions which required field work. Among those professions were teacher education, adult education, social work, psychiatry, and family therapy.
With the development of these models came the pressing need to train supervisors. Rohlfs (1978) among others, addressed this concern. At the same time, there was a gradual development in the content and process of supervision. Mackie (1966) encouraged supervisors to help students reflect on experience as a way of learning. Gessell (1968) and Bergland (1969) both recommended reflecting theologically on experience, and added the idea of relating experience to religious tradition.

By the early seventies theological reflection was essential to supervision. In fact, for Hunter (1976) one criteria for site selection was the opportunity for theological reflection. And Larsen (1983) included it as a component of supervision in the Association for Theological Field Education program guidelines, thus assuring its place in TFE supervision.

Training to be aware of the societal mission of the church has become the ministry focus of the eighties. Seabright (1983) developed a model of supervision to integrate social justice concerns with ministry functioning. Cartwright (1983) added the dimension of focusing on the cultural context of the field placement. The 1985 theme for the 10th Biennial Consultation of the Association for Theological Field Education was "Who is my neighbour?" emphasizing social and global concerns.

The role of supervisor has been variously defined. Lowndes (1969) followed Klink in defining supervision in an educational mode, referring to the supervisor as teacher. Whitehead and Whitehead (1975) suggested that the role of supervisor
was helper. Way (1970) defined the role as one of "working alongside" the student. Stewart (1971) delineated supervision in terms of styles of supervision, "institutional model . . . guide . . . peer to peer" (p. 25). Beisswenger (1974) wrote about the various modes of supervision. He described the role of supervisor as 1) an evaluator of work, 2) an instructor, 3) an apprentice relationship, 4) a trainer, 5) resource person for the student, 6) a consultant to the student and 7) a spiritual guide. Beisswenger's work has influenced the subsequent training of supervisors. His article has been included in materials used in training supervisors at Saint Thomas Theological Seminary and Iliff School of Theology in Denver, Colorado. Finally, Sanderson (1978) suggested that the supervisor was a role model for those preparing for ministry.

This review of the historical development of TFE supervision traced the growth of field education from an academic study of the practice of ministry to an experiential model of learning by practice of ministry in a supervised placement. There appeared to be no agreed upon definition of supervision nor was there total agreement on the role functions of the supervisory conference. Since theological field education is still in a formative period, the present study was intended to contribute to its development.

**B. RESEARCH IN DIFFERING PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISION**

A number of research studies investigated the differing perceptions of supervision. Cross and Brown (1983) had supervisees in counselor supervision judge the perceived effectiveness of supervision, they found differing perceptions of effectiveness between supervisors and supervisees. From their study of specific
counselor supervisory theory in practice, Goodyear, Abadie, and Efros (1984) also
found differing perceptions of supervision. Their results confirmed "that theoretical
orientation is related to a supervisor's manifest behaviors, roles, and attitudes"
(p. 234).

Leithwood and Montgomery (1984) studied the obstacles preventing school
principals from becoming effective. Principals and their administrators perceived
different impediments to effectiveness. The principals saw school board relations
as the most difficult of obstacles. Administrators saw a lack of school board
knowledge and skill as the most difficult obstacle facing the principals.

In elementary science supervision, Perrine (1984) contrasted the teachers' ideal
supervisory interaction and their actual experience with supervisors, as well as
supervisors' ideal interaction and their actual interaction. He found that teachers
had higher expectations of supervisors than supervisors had of themselves. In
speech and hearing research involving supervisors and supervisees, Roberts and
Smith (1982) found that the supervisors set the content and interaction pattern
of the supervisory conferences, and that the supervisees followed their supervisors
lead. This finding was contrary to the assumption that the supervisees should
become more self-directing and independent (Glickman, 1981). Differing perceptions
of student teachers were found in a study by Staab (1984). Sponsor teachers
and university supervisors had differing perceptions of the student teachers'
preparation for instruction.

Two studies found some congruence instead of differences of perception. Stahl,
Querin, Rudy, and Crawford (1983) found congruence between head nurse role activities and supervisory expectations. But then suggested that there were several areas of potential conflict: role overlap, role definition, and organizational structure. Worthington (1984) found "changes in supervisees' perceptions of supervisory behavior as the counselors gain experience were . . . relatively congruent with previous research and theory" (p. 63).

The literature in this section has indicated that both difference and congruence were possible in the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding supervision. However, there appeared to be more research indicating differences, than congruence of perceptions. It was to be expected that supervisors and students in theological field education would reflect the same types of perceptions.

C. FOUR INFLUENCES ON SUPERVISION

Theological field education borrowed extensively from other professional training programs to develop its own supervisory models. This section of the literature review considered four individual characteristics that have been shown to influence supervisory practice. They are conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type.

1. Conceptual Level

An early research study "Abstract and Concrete Behavior: An Experimental Study With Special Tests" (Goldstein & Scheerer, 1941) demonstrated two modes of behavior. Concrete behavior was characterized by a realistic attitude that lacked conscious activity in the sense of reasoning, awareness or self-account of one's
doing. Experience was used unreflectively, and apprehension was confined to the immediate situation. Abstract behavior was characterized by an attitude of consciousness and volition. It included the ability to detach the ego from outer-inner experience, to assume a mental set, to account for acts to oneself, to simultaneously hold in mind a number of thoughts while considering future plans, and the ability to think and act symbolically (p. 239 ff). Bieri (1955), and Harvey and Schroder (1963) continued to develop and refine this early work of Goldstein and Scheerer.

Information processing psychology contributed greatly to the theoretical development of conceptual level. Joyce, Lamb, and Sibol (1966) used information processing theory to study teachers' effectiveness and found that concrete level thinking teachers were not able to use information to increase student effectiveness. However, abstract level teachers could take more definite actions as they received more information about their students.

A significant contribution to information processing and testing came from the work of Schroder, Driver, and Streufert (1967). They studied conceptual level with the "emphasis on how a person thinks or uses an attitude as a structure for processing new information, as opposed to emphasis upon content, upon what a person thinks, what his attitudes are, and so forth" (p. 5). They further suggested not just two levels of conceptual development but four. Table 1 describes the four levels and the behavioral properties of each level.

In counseling supervision, Lichtenberg and Heck (1979) found a relationship
### Table 1

**Behavioral Properties of Four Conceptual Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>CONCEPTUAL STRUCTURES</th>
<th>BEHAVIORAL PROPERTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Level One: Simple Conceptual Structure</td>
<td>Categorical (black/white) thinking; Exclusion of conflicting information; Little self-concept (behavior anchored in externals).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Level Two: Moderately Simple Conceptual Structure</td>
<td>Less absolutism; Some awareness of self as a causal agent; Instability and noncommitment; Negativistic (rebellious) orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Level Three: Moderately Complex Conceptual Structure</td>
<td>Less deterministic or judgmental; Several perspectives on each situation; Considerable awareness of self as causal agent; Adaptive behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Level Four: Complex Conceptual Structure</td>
<td>Effective adaptation to complex changing situations; High tolerance for ambiguity; Theoretical outlook; Acute awareness of self; No complete closure in decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores are taken from the seven point scale of the Paragraph Completion Test. Table adapted from Silver (1975, pp. 51-52).

between the level of cognitive complexity and the style of counseling that was used. Higher cognitive complexity counselors were able to respond to clients with a greater degree of variability than lower cognitive complexity counselors. Blocher (1983) found similar relationships between cognitive level and the process of counselor supervision. In the learning environment the importance of challenge, involvement, support, structure, feedback, innovation, and integration were stressed. These elements were also found at the higher levels of abstraction. Southern (1984) suggested a cognitive-structural approach to counselor supervision that emphasized the influence of language.
In the training of school administrators, Silver (1975) found a positive relationship between conceptual level and ability to deal with a complex environment. The higher the conceptual level score, the greater the ability of the principal to deal with the complex setting of a school.

Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthal (1980) researched the cognitive conceptual level of supervisors and the effects of conceptual level on supervisory interaction in teacher training. They found that evaluations by high conceptual level supervisors of high conceptual level students showed the students to be flexible, innovative, and responsive; while low conceptual level supervisors rated high conceptual level students as average to mediocre to limited. Grimmett (1984) explored the relationship between clinical supervision and the supervisors' and supervisees' conceptual development. He found abstract conceptual level supervisors more effective than concrete conceptual level supervisors.

Olsen (1970) studied the Lutheran internship experience in terms of the conceptual levels of the interns and supervisors. The findings indicated that high conceptual level students had high satisfaction in complex environments while low conceptual level students were less satisfied in similar environments. The same finding applied to the supervisors in Olsen's study. This study of conceptual level and placement satisfaction appeared to be a unique contribution to theological field education.

Glickman (1985a) demonstrated that a relationship existed between orientation to supervision and conceptual level. Those who used a directive approach to
supervision, characteristic of low level abstraction, tended to generate solutions to problems for teachers. Those who used a collaborative approach to supervision, characteristic of moderate level abstraction, negotiated agreements to the solution of problems and suggested changes needed for future action. Those who used a non-directive approach to supervision, characteristic of high level abstraction, actively facilitated the teachers' own perception of issues and problems, leading to teacher self-planning.

Thies-Sprinthall (1984) sums up the influence of conceptual level in a basic assumption: "Humans behave in accord with the level of complexity of their mental structures. Those at less complex levels of cognitive capacity tend to exhibit rigid, concrete and less adaptive behavior in problem solving situations" (p. 53).

This review of conceptual level literature and its impact on supervision in counseling, administration and teacher training indicated the importance of this characteristic in the supervisory interaction. It was assumed by the researcher that the same dynamic would contribute to an understanding of TFE supervision.

2. Constructive Openness

The literature background for the concept of constructive openness was based on the works of Wallen (1972) and Grimmett (1982). In his work in teacher training, Wallen (1972) developed what he called a continuum of the interpersonal effect of various responses. He theorized that effects of "freeing responses" would be "certain ways to respond which will result in a growth-producing relationship."
These ways free the other individual to grow by making him feel that he can change or not as he pleases" (p. 86). At the other end of the continuum, he described "binding responses," as "responses have a binding or cueing effect on the individual. These kinds of responses diminish the other person's autonomy by making him feel controlled or the object of someone else's impulses" (p. 88). Figure 1 summarizes Wallen's continuum.

Figure 1. The Freeing and Binding Responses of Various Verbal Communications. (Adapted from Wallen, 1972. Scores from the Preactive Behavior Instrument, Grimmett, 1982)
In his continuum, Wallen (1972) suggested eight freeing responses and ten binding responses of verbal communication, and ordered them in a descending manner, with the most freeing verbal communication at the top, and the most binding at the bottom. Using Wallen's eighteen statements in a random order, Grimmett (1982), developed the Preactive Behavior Instrument to measure constructive openness of the supervisory interaction. This instrument was designed to measure how constructive and open the verbal communication was between supervisor and student during a supervisory experience. It was first used with supervisors to predict how open they thought they would be in a supervisory conference, which was then compared to the observed conference. The results indicated that the instrument was a good predictor of supervisor interactive constructive openness (Grimmett, 1982). He also found a positive relationship between constructive openness and conceptual level with both students and supervisors.

If constructive openness can be a predictor of supervisory interaction, it is an important influence to consider when studying supervision. The researcher found no library follow-up references for the use of the Preactive Behavior Instrument.

3. Orientation to Supervision

In his work with supervisors of teachers in the educational system, Glickman (1981) developed the Supervisory Beliefs Inventory to measure the beliefs of supervisors about their orientation or approach to supervision. He proposed a continuum to indicate supervisor-student responsibility for ten supervisory behaviors. At one end of the continuum, the student has the most responsibility
and the supervisor the least; at the other end the supervisor has the greatest responsibility and the student the least. Placement of supervisor's behavior along the responsibility continuum indicates the supervisor's orientation or approach to supervision. The orientations can be directive, collaborative, or non-directive. Figure 2 presents the responsibility continuum, the ten supervisor behaviors, and the end product for each interaction.

The behaviors characteristic of a directive orientation to supervision are: clarifying, presenting, directing, demonstrating, standardizing, and reinforcing. The product of this process is an assignment for the student from the supervisor. The behaviors characteristic of a collaborative orientation to supervision are: presenting, clarifying, listening, problem solving, and negotiating. The product of this process is a supervisor and student contract. The behaviors characteristic of a non-directive orientation to supervision are: listening, encouraging, clarifying, presenting, and negotiating. The product of this process is a student self-plan.

Responses to the Supervisory Beliefs Inventory, indicated to the supervisor his or her beliefs about supervision. The scores suggested the percentage of time a supervisor used a directive, collaborative, or non-directive approach to supervision. Glickman (1981) did not give the meaning of "percentage of time" in reference to the use of a specific orientation. It needs to be noted that this instrument measured self perception, not actual behavior.

Becoming a self-directed individual appears to be Glickman's intention for students in using a non-directive approach to supervision. This idea was supported by
### MAXIMUM STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Directive Orientation</th>
<th>Collaborative Orientation</th>
<th>Non-Directive Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Supervisor listens to student.</td>
<td>Supervisor listens attentively to student concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>Supervisor clarifies student's problem.</td>
<td>Supervisor asks student to present perceptions of areas for improvement.</td>
<td>Supervisor asks questions and rephrases student statement to make sure problem is clearly understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor encourages student to elaborate on concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting</td>
<td>Supervisor presents ideas on what and how data will be collected.</td>
<td>Supervisor presents perceptions of areas for improvement.</td>
<td>When asked by student, supervisor offers thoughts and possible solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Supervisor and student propose alternative actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiating</td>
<td>Supervisor and student revise, reject, and agree on plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor asks student to determine what actions will be taken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating</td>
<td>Supervisor demonstrates appropriate behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>Supervisor directs student on what actions will take place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardizing</td>
<td>Supervisor sets baseline data and standard for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcing</td>
<td>Supervisor uses material or social incentives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product of interaction</td>
<td>Assignment for student by supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisor and student contract</td>
<td>Student self-plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAXIMUM SUPERVISOR RESPONSIBILITY

Figure 2. The Supervisory Responsibility Continuum Indicating Orientation to Supervision (adapted from Glickman 1981, pp. 22-34).
Armstrong and Shanker (1983), they found the non-directive approach to supervision generally satisfactory for supervising undergraduate research students. Flanders (1976) found those clinical supervisors who rated "low involvement" were described in a way similar to non-directive supervisors. Glatthorn (1984) described differential supervision, and his description of supervision for "self-development" was similar to Glickman's non-directive orientation.

The Supervisory Beliefs Inventory can suggest to supervisors what they believe about supervision. In its present form there were some difficulties with the accuracy of "percentage of time" and with using scores that add to one hundred percent with the possibility of equal percentages on all three orientations. However, these limitations considered, this instrument can provide an agenda for discussion between supervisor and student, and among supervisors to help them clarify their own supervisory orientation.

4. Personality Type

In the psychological literature, there are many and varied descriptions of personality. For the purposes of this study the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was used for the following advantages: a) the functions of personality are integrated; b) the instrument is comprehensive, and describes the functioning of all people; c) it is essentially "value free," that is, no one personality function is better than any other; d) the instrument is relatively easy to administer and to score (Kleiner, 1983).

The MBTI, based on Jungian dimensions of mental functioning, was developed by
Isabel Myers and her daughter, Katharine Briggs (1943). Personality type consists of four essential processes: sensing, intuition, thinking, and feeling; two attitudes: extraversion and introversion; and two orientations to the outer world: judgment and perception. All processes, attitudes, and orientations are used by everyone, everyday. People differ primarily in the priority they give to each of them (Myers & McCulley, 1985). Table 2 provides an introduction to the Myers-Briggs four preferences of personality type theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Preferences between</th>
<th>Affects Choices as to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI E Extraversion or I Introversion</td>
<td>Whether to direct perception judgment mainly on the outer world (E) or mainly on the world of ideas (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN S Sensing Perception N Intuitive Perception</td>
<td>Which kind of perception is preferred when one needs or wishes to perceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF T Thinking Judgment F Feeling Judgment</td>
<td>Which kind of judgment to trust when one needs or wishes to make a decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP J Judgment P Perception</td>
<td>Whether to deal with the outer world in the judging (J) attitude (using T or F) or in the perceptive (P) attitude (using S or N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adapted from Myers and McCulley, 1985, p. 3.

Extraversion suggests that a person's interest and energy flow mainly from the outer world of actions, objects, and persons. Introversion suggests that a person's interest and energy flow mainly to the inner world of concepts and ideas. Everyone uses both attitudes, but individuals usually prefer one direction more than the other.

Sensing and intuition are two ways of perceiving or taking in the world. Sensing
people prefer to use their five senses to establish what exists, and what is occurring in the present moment. Intuitive people prefer to look at the possibilities, meanings, and relationships by way of insight.

Thinking and feeling are the rational ways of bringing life events into harmony with reason -- the judging, evaluating, or decision making functions. Thinking is the logical reasoning process, and links ideas together by making logical connections. Feeling is the way to come to decisions by weighing relative values and relationships. It is a subjective decision making process.

Judgment oriented persons prefer to live in a planned, orderly way with an interest in controlling events. Perception oriented persons prefer to live in a flexible, spontaneous way, with interest in understanding and adapting to events.

When the eight preferences are used in all possible combinations, sixteen basic personality types are produced. Table 3 gives a brief description of the sixteen types.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator has been used in educational research to help teachers understand childrens' learning patterns and styles (Golay, 1982; Lawrence, 1979), and in teacher training to determine how teacher personality affects the classroom environment (DeNovellis & Lawrence, 1983). Personality type theory has been used by personnel management in business (Hartzler & Hartzler, 1982; Hirsh, 1985; Kleiner, 1983), as well as in career development (Keirsey & Bates, 1984; Hughes, Mosier & Hung, 1981).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>Intuitive, innovative ORGANIZER; aggressive, analytic, systematic; more tuned to new ideas and possibilities than to people's feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>Fact-minded, practical ORGANIZER; aggressive, analytic, systematic; more interested in getting the job done than in people's feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>Inquisitive ANALYZER; reflective independent, curious; more interested in organizing ideas than situations of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>Practical ANALYZER; values exactness; more interested in organizing data than situations or people; reflective, a cool and curious observer of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>REALISTIC ADAPTER in the world of material things; good natured tolerant, easy going; oriented to practical, first hand experience; highly observant of details of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>REALISTIC ADAPTER in human relationships; friendly and easy with people, highly observant of their feelings and needs; oriented to practical, first hand experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>Analytical MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; dependable, decisive, painstaking and systematic; concerned with systems and organization; stable and conservative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>Sympathetic MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; concerned with peoples' welfare; dependable, painstaking and systematic; stable and conservative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Observant, loyal HELPER; reflective realistic; empathic; patient with details, gentle and retiring; shuns disagreements; enjoys the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>Imaginative, independent HELPER; reflective, inquisitive, empathic, loyal to ideals; more interested in possibilities than practicalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>Practical HARMONIZER and worker with people; conscientious, realistic and well tuned to the here and now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>Imaginative HARMONIZER and worker with people; sociable, expressive, orderly, opinioned, conscientious; curious about new ideas and possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>People-orientated INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, quietly forceful and persevering; concerned with the common good, with helping others develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>Logical, critical, decisive INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, intent, highly independent, concerned with organization determined and often stubborn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>Warmly enthusiastic PLANNER OF CHANGE; imaginative, individualistic; pursues inspiration with impulsive energy; seeks to understand and inspire others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Taken from Lawrence, 1982, p. 15.
A new area of research with personality type has been the attempt to determine the ease of verbal communication between types. Yeakley (1983, 1982) has proposed to relate psychological type to communication level. He defined communication as the "process of creating an acceptable degree of shared meaning between people" (1983, p. 23). Yeakley believes that

for two people to communicate effectively, they have to use the same communication style at the same time. Communication tends to break down when people are using different styles and especially when they are using opposite styles. Effective communication demands adjustment. (1982, p. 34)

And "when dyad members are identical in psychological type they are also identical in communication style preferences and therefore have the lowest possible adjustment index" for communication (1982, p. 35). As Yeakley continues to work on communication adjustment, there may develop more accurate ways of looking at the level of communication between supervisors and students.

The MBTI has been used in education, management and career development. It has been successful in establishing understandings of the interaction between students and teachers, better working relationships in organizations, and helping people to choose a career. The most helpful aspect of the theory was its ability to describe accurately, in simple terms, the very complex processes of human behavior. The sixteen descriptions of personality type enabled people to have a common language to talk about their differences in a non-threatening way, because each type has its own strengths and weaknesses. The foregoing research has indicated that understanding personality type contributed to better working relationships among people. Theological field education supervision can share these
benefits by use of the instrument.

D. THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION SUPERVISION

The role functions of the supervisory conference have been variously described in the TFE literature. Becker (1967) based supervisor training on the supervisor's role as teacher; Goodwin (1969) suggested the role of "helper;" Lowndes (1969) took the view that the supervisor was the "overviewer" of the student's work; Oates (1975) suggested the model of a "coach;" Beisswenger (1974) suggested a variety of supervisor modes, each with an experiential basis; Bunting (1979) saw the primary concern of the supervisor as helping the student reflect on the context and person of the student; Klink (1966) considered the process of supervision in educational terms; Sanderson (1978) was cautious in calling the supervisor a role model for students; and Stewart (1971) emphasized the need for the supervisor to be sensitive and personal. However, the clearest and most developed presentation of a framework for the role functions of the supervisory conference came from the work of George I. Hunter (1982).

Hunter (1982) agreed with Klink (1966) that theological field education was essentially an educational process and that the supervisor was first and foremost a teacher or educator (Becker, 1967; Southard, 1963). Hunter suggested four educational roles for the supervisor: First, the supervisor was to teach the student "to link theology with the practice of ministry." Second, the supervisor was to help the student "to relate religious traditions and values to the human and social needs which have been identified in the ministry setting." Third, the supervisor was "to select appropriate resources for understanding and responding
to actual occasions/events of ministry." Fourth, the supervisor was "to integrate feed-back, consultation, and supervision with assessment of ministry and the planning for new ministry" (p. 33).

Each of these educational roles of the supervisor can be supported in TFE literature. For example, linking theology and practice was affirmed in Goodwin (1969), Seabright (1983), Whitehead and Whitehead (1975). The concept of relating religious values to social justice was supported and encouraged by Beers and Schaper (1984), and Conlon (1983). The supervisor as a resource for the student was suggest by Beisswenger (1974), Froyd (1963), Klink (1966), and Steere (1969). And giving appropriate feedback to the student was important in works by Bunting (1979), Gessell (1968), and Hoover (1980).

Among those who supported Hunter's idea that the supervisor was to serve as a role model for the student are Froyd (1963), Mackie (1966), and Sanderson (1978). In order for the supervisor to be effective in a placement, he or she must be able to manage the relationships between the student, the lay training committee and the parishioners. It was assumed that the supervisor had the authority within the setting to assign and oversee the work of the student. The supervisor also needed to be able to work in a collegial manner with both student and staff. These supervisor requirements were also suggested by Lowndes (1969), Nace (1975), Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary (1985), Sanderson (1978), and Telfer (1974).

Hunter (1982) stated that of all the supervisors' relationships, the most important
was the personal one with the student. This relationship had three characteristics: a) it was intensive, with the relationship concentrating on the present reality of the student’s field experience; b) it was intimate, suggesting that the supervisor and student had a close working association that was somewhat informal; and c) it was holistic, recognizing the intellectual and affective life of the student as well as professional skills and strategies (p. 39).

The importance of the relationship between supervisor and student has appeared in theological field education literature. Adams (1971) described the relationship as intensive when he suggested that the supervisor be a consultant to the student. Gilmore and Justes (1983) suggested the need to investigate the area of intimacy between men supervisors and women students. Rhodes and Finson (1986) were concerned about the role models for women in church leadership, new issues in supervision regarding sexism, and issues regarding the influence of feminist theology on supervision. Hoover (1980) suggested the interpersonal nature of the relationship, while Oates (1975) emphasized the pastoral nature of the relationship. As a final example, Weeks and Johnston (1986) proposed a personal relationship that allowed the supervisor to intervene in the student’s development in order to increase the likelihood of the student’s growth.

According to Hunter, supervision was intentional, not a casual encounter between the supervisor and student. Supervision was structured, the covenant agreement formed the foundation of supervision, and conferences were scheduled regularly. Supervision was disciplined, students were expected to set goals and objectives for their field experience (1982, p. 39). These ideas found support in Klink (1966)
and Larsen (1983), who gave specific guidelines for the supervisory conference. Steere (1969) and Weeks and Johnston (1986) addressed the need for "regular" (structured) supervision.

For Hunter the supervisor provided an introduction and orientation when the student first entered the field education placement. The supervisor, in consultation with leaders or committees within the placement, and with the student, arranged for actual ministry tasks for student engagement. The process of supervision included techniques for recovering data -- case studies, verbatims -- to be used during supervisory conferences. During the supervisory conference there was opportunity for supervisor and student to analyze and reflect on the student's personal, theological, and professional experience in field education. At other times during the conference the supervisor and student had time to assess and evaluate the student's personal, theological, and professional growth and development. Finally, the supervisor and student planned for new ministry interventions that called for a change in goals or other experiences that would assist the student's growth (1982, p. 41).

The above functions of supervision were found scattered throughout the field education literature. Becker (1967), Hampton and Pregnall (1975), and Telfer (1974) suggested the case method as a way of recovering data for supervision. Theological reflection was encouraged as part of the conference by Bergland (1969), Dawson (1986), and St. Clair (1969). In addition to theological reflection, Conlon (1983) emphasized the analysis of the social context of ministry. Birtch (1966) addressed the need to assess student involvement in ministry. Both Klink
(1966) and Oates (1975) insisted that student evaluation be a part of the supervisory conference. Larsen (1983) strongly suggested the need to initiate the student into the placement as well as to develop a learning covenant. Southard (1963) suggested the need for analysis of student work. Steere (1969) developed a Supervisory Assessment Questionnaire to detect different perceptions of supervision in eight areas similar to the areas suggested by Hunter. And Whitehead and Whitehead (1975) listed the importance of personal, theological, and professional growth of the student as the focus of supervision.

In summary, the theological field education literature affirms and supports Hunter’s (1982) twenty-two themes or categories describing the role functions of the supervisory conference. Because of Hunter’s clear descriptions and the support found in the literature, his work was used in the present study as the categories for content analysis to be described in Chapter Three.

E. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review considered the historical development of theological field education. It reviewed the gradual change in theological education, from lecturing on the practical in the classroom, to working in the field, to supervised field education as a requirement of the Master of Divinity degree. Theological field education took from Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) the need for personal relationships, appropriate feedback, a strong emphasis on the need for individual supervision, especially a regular supervisory conference, and a clear process for bringing data to the conference in the form of case studies and verbatims.
Differing perceptions of supervision by supervisors and students were found in
counselor supervision. Principals and administrators perceived different impediments
to effectiveness. Elementary school science teachers and supervisors had differing
perceptions of the ideal and the actual supervisory interaction. In speech and
hearing research the perception was that supervisors set the content and direction
for the conference.

To understand the role functions of the supervisory conference in TFE, it was
deemed important to consider four individual characteristics found to influence field
supervision in related disciplines. The four individual characteristics were
conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality
type. Teacher education suggested that high conceptual level supervisors were
better able to judge and encourage student progress than lower conceptual level
supervisors. The work on constructive openness demonstrated that the kind of
verbal communication used in a supervisory interaction influenced trust between
individuals. The approach to supervision (directive, collaborative, and non-directive)
influenced how students can become independent and self-directing in a
supervisory relationship. Finally, the Myers-Briggs approach to personality type
provided the student and supervisor with a common language to understand and
describe their differences.

The final section of the review considered the role functions of the supervisory
conference as suggested by George I. Hunter, and as substantiated by other
writers in TFE. Hunter’s (1982) contribution is important because he brought
together in an orderly and developed way many of the ideas present in the
literature. He suggested the fundamental approach to supervision was an educational process, with experiential learning as the method of learning. The responsibility of the supervisor was to provide the tools and environment for student learning, especially the supervisory conference. The conference was the classroom where experience was assessed, analyzed, evaluated, reflected upon and used as the basis for change and growth.
CHAPTER III. RESEARCH DESIGN

Since previous research in TFE had not provided enough information for hypothesis testing, the researcher chose an exploratory methodology for the research design (Borg & Gall, 1983). This allowed investigation of a variety of supervisory relationships with a view to finding answers to questions rather than developing hypotheses. The relationships and interactions examined in this study have appeared in the research of other professions having a field education component.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: a description of the sample, the sources and procedures for data collection, and the process used for content analysis of the interviews. A final section mentions several design limitations.

A. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

The sample used in this study consisted of 30 students and 28 supervisors in Level III of TFE at a Canadian school of theology, Fall 1986. This school is accredited by the Association of Theological Schools. Table 4 reports the demographic characteristics of the group, including age, gender, supervisory and work experience, educational level and Church affiliation.

Supervisors and students were close in age within a range of seven years. Eighty-nine percent of the supervisors were men. Eighty-six percent of the women students were supervised by men, although three women were supervised by the three women supervisors.
Table 4.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Supervisors N=28</th>
<th>Students N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory experience in years</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work experience in years</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College equivalent</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Divinity</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licentiate</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Divinity</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denomination:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Church of Canada</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Church of Canada</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist Church</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian-Canada</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian-USA</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of the Nazarene</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors' experience ranged from one to three years. Forty-three percent had supervised for less than one year. The students averaged fifteen years of work experience before coming to theological education. Seven percent of the students had less than a year of work experience.

Sixty-four percent of the supervisors held masters degrees in divinity and/or
theology. Twenty-one percent had degrees beyond the masters level. Sixty-three percent of the students had baccalaureate degrees, twenty-three percent had a masters degree. Most of the students expected to graduate in the Spring of 1987 with a Master of Divinity degree.

Church denomination was ecumenical, with the largest representation from the United Church of Canada.

B. DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION

Data sources included interviews of supervisors and students, instruments measuring conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision and personality type, and the researcher’s rating of the supervisors’ professional effectiveness.

1. Description of Interviews

Supervisors were interviewed during the six weeks following the completion of field education; students at the end of evaluation week following the completion their field education experience. The interview schedules are found in Appendix B.

Interviews involved four steps. Step one: demographic information was elicited. Step two: the participant was asked to describe the role of supervisor, to name the most important functions of supervision, and to prioritize three of these functions. Step 3: supervisors and students were asked to relate an incident critical to learning. Probing questions were than asked regarding the perceptions of both supervisors and students. These questions asked the focus of the incident,
the students' ability to integrate, the role and functions of the supervisor during the supervisory conference, and the perceived growth of the student. Step 4: was given over to assessments of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type. The following instruments were used:

1. The Paragraph Completion Test (Hunt et al., 1978b)
2. The Preactive Behavior Instrument (Grimmett, 1982)
3. The Supervisory Beliefs Inventory (Glickman, 1981).
4. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Form G (Myers & McCulley, 1985)

Those interviewees who had not already taken the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator were asked to do so. The researcher administered and scored these tests, except for the Paragraph Completion Test, which was scored by a trained scorer. The researcher also took notes and taped comments made during the interviews.

2. Description of Instruments

a. Paragraph Completion Test: Conceptual Level

The Paragraph Completion Test (Hunt et al., 1978b) was designed to measure complex, integrative thinking. It was used to assess the conceptual level of the participants. The instrument consisted of six sentence stems related to three interpersonal relations: uncertainty, conflict, and authority. Each stem called for a timed three sentence response. Each paragraph was judged on its cognitive structure, not content. The scores were obtained by averaging the highest three responses.

Validity, as described by Gardiner and Schroder (1972) was established in over a hundred studies in which the test consistently predicted behavioral performances
congruent with theoretical expectations. Reliability was also satisfactory; the five sentence stems in current use typically correlate in the .60 to .75 range indicating relative homogeneity of the sampled stimulus.

b. Preactive Behavior Instrument: Constructive Openness

This instrument was used to assess constructive openness. It was designed to predict the level of freeing or binding responses that supervisors thought they would use in a conference. Grimmett (1982) randomly ordered Wallen's (1972) eighteen freeing and binding items so that they could be rated on a Likert scale which indicated frequency of agreement or disagreement.

The instrument was piloted with sixty-six graduate students. Fifty-two percent scored at the predicted level and forty-nine percent within one level of the predicted level. These findings were taken as evidence that the Preactive Behavior Instrument was adequate for measuring, with reasonable accuracy, participant level of constructive openness.

The researcher adapted the instrument by substituting TFE language for teacher training language. For example "pastoral" was substituted for "teaching" behaviors in statement number five. See Appendix C: Instruments for copies of the adaptations and procedures for scoring.

c. Supervisory Beliefs Inventory: Orientation to Supervision

This inventory was designed for supervisors to assess their own beliefs about supervision and staff development. It consists of fifteen forced-choice statements which reflect attitudes that are either directive, collaborative, or non-directive. The results, reported in percentages, indicated the proportion of time the supervisor
used one of these approaches. In this study, supervisors answered according to their own beliefs, while students answered according to how they experienced their supervisor.

A reasonable estimate of reliability for the Supervisory Beliefs Inventory was based on item descriptions which showed clear distinctions between directive, collaborative, and non-directive orientations. Responses between options indicated "good" item discrimination. According to the author, Glickman (1981), a "good" item discrimination indicated internal consistency and was considered a reasonable estimate of validity.

Inventory scores were indicated in percentages, representing the total amount of time a supervisor used a specific orientation. Thus making it possible to have the same percentage of time for each orientation.

The instrument was designed for teachers' professional development. Again the researcher substituted TFE language for teacher language. Statements about staff development were included in the adaptation even though it was not applicable to all TFE placements. Participants were instructed to respond "as if" the situation with a staff member occurred in their own setting. See Appendix C: Instruments for copies of the adaptations and scoring procedures.

d. **Myers-Briggs Type Indicator: Personality Type**

This instrument was used to assist participants in recognizing their own basic preferences on perception and judgment. The MBTI has 126 forced-choice statements. Scoring identifies both individual preferences and the strength of
preferences. Split-half reliability for internal consistency, using males and females from ages 9 to 60+ was given according to the dichotomies: Extraversion-Introversion .82, Sensing-Intuitive .84, Thinking-Feeling .83, and Judging-Perception .86. Validity was determined by the ability of the indicator to demonstrate relationships and outcomes predicted by the theory. The MBTI was significantly correlated with 39 different personality instruments measuring the same or similar items.

3. Effectiveness of Supervisors

After the interviews were completed, the researcher in consultation with the director of field education, rated the supervisors' professional effectiveness. A Likert scale of 5 to 1 was used; 5 equalling excellent and 1 unacceptable. The criteria for rating depended upon how effective the supervisor was in carrying out responsibilities to the student and to the school.

A rating of excellent indicated that the supervisor was a "natural" in interaction with the students. Good indicated effectiveness with regard to both the student and the school. Adequate indicated that the supervisor fulfilled responsibilities with some difficulty. Acceptable indicated that the supervisor needed frequent help from the director. Unacceptable indicated that the supervisor was less than effective.

Four months after the first ratings, the researcher re-rated the supervisors. Intra-rater reliability was .78 an acceptable level for reliability.
4. Dependent-Independent Variables

The interviews provided the data for the dependent variable, that is the role functions of the supervisory conference. The four instruments provided the data for the independent variables: conceptual level (Paragraph Completion Test), constructive openness (Preactive Behavior Instrument), orientation to supervision (Supervisory Beliefs Inventory), and personality types (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator). The demographic questions provided the data for the explanatory variables of age, gender, experience, and educational level.

5. Confidentiality

The confidentiality of all interviews and test results was assured by the following procedures:

1. The subjects’ names were not reported. Each subject was assigned a code number. Data collection tools used only the code number. The key to the code was destroyed upon completion of the study.

2. Individual test scores were not available to persons outside of the researcher’s thesis committee.

The certificate of approval for this study from the University of British Columbia Behavioral Sciences Screening Committee is included in Appendix A.

C. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Content analysis was used to quantify answers for statistical manipulation. The specific kind of content category used was "thematic analysis" (Budd, Throp & Donohew, 1967). The initial set of theme categories which emerged from this analysis was very similar to Hunter’s (1982) description of the role functions of
the supervisory experience. The researcher adapted this description to form a set of twenty-two theme categories.

Intra-coder reliability was determined by selecting a random sample of ten interviews coded by the researcher. These were re-coded three months later using the same theme categories and coding criteria. A reliability co-efficient of .75 was established. See Appendix D for this set of theme categories and their indicators.

After analyzing the interviews, the frequency of role functions themes was recorded. Each theme frequency was than calculated by groups of supervisors and students. The groups were compared for differences using the t-test for two independent groups. A second t-test was used to compare the groups for differences of perception on constructive openness, and supervisory beliefs. The supervisors' scores represented the supervisors' judgments of their own verbal communication and their beliefs about supervision. The students' scores represented their estimates of constructive openness and orientation to supervision of their supervisors.

Pearson correlations were used to determine the relationships between supervisors' and students' age, gender, educational level, experience, conceptual level, constructive openness, and orientation to supervision. A second Pearson correlation was used to determine the relationship between the twenty-two role functions of the supervisory conference, and the variables of age, gender, experience, conceptual level, constructive openness, and orientation to supervision of both supervisors and students.
Personality type, measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, was analyzed by comparing type descriptions. A general description of the sample was determined by examining the two processes of perception (sensing or intuition), and judgment (thinking or feeling). These descriptions were then compared with the type and career choice descriptions in Myers and McCulley, 1985, p. 257.

Content analysis was also used to categorize the answers to the probing questions asked during the interviews. The categories were as follows:

a. What was the focus of the conference? 1) practical; 2) theological; 3) both practical and theological; 4) the relationship between student and supervisor; 5) student's personal growth; 6) unfocused.

b. Did the student exhibit integration of academic and field experience? 1) much evidence; 2) evident; 3) some evidence; 4) not evident.

c. What type of growth did the student exhibit? 1) deeper supervisor-student relationship; 2) student gained insight for future action; 3) student was affirmed and supported by supervisor; 4) student and supervisor became more mutual; 5) unclear about student growth.

d. Were there any impediments to the student's growth? 1) yes; 2) no.

These categories were derived from interview discussions of the supervisory conference. The categories were cross-tabulated by supervisors and students groups to obtain a Chi-square test of significance. The variables used in the cross-tabulation were the event description categories and educational level.

During the analysis of the probing questions, it was discovered that within each
of nine pairs, supervisor and student identified the same conference and supervision issue or field event. This finding prompted the researcher to explore further. These nine individual pairs were separated from the other nineteen pairs to see if those who coincidentally chose to discuss the same conference were any different from those who chose to discuss a different conference. Of particular interest to the researcher was the possibility of investigating the supervisor's perceptions of the student's ability to integrate academic background with current field placement experience. Also to consider how supervisors perceived the focus of the conference, the kind of growth the student exhibited, and whether or not the supervisor recognized any impediments to the student's growth. These were compared with the student's answers to the same questions.

An ANOVA was used to test for the differences between the nine and the nineteen pairs of supervisors and students, and the thirty variables used in this study. Each of the nine pairs were described on the same independent variables. From these nine pairs, the researcher selected three to illustrate the masking effect of data aggregation: for one pair the data were of the same order, for a second pair the data were of different orders, and for a third pair the data had some commonalities.

D. DESIGN LIMITATIONS

The research design was limited in several ways. In using Hunter's (1982) description of the role and functions of supervision, the researcher may have divided the descriptions into categories too narrowly defined, resulting in only a few answers in some categories. The timing of the student interviews may have
influenced the responses due to "evaluation" fatigue. A final limitation was the interview instrument itself. There may have been different responses if there had been clearer distinctions between role and function.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

This chapter reports the content analysis of the interviews, and the themes that were consistently used by the participants to describe the role functions of the supervisory conference. It presents the relationships found between the dependent variable of role functions themes, and the independent variables of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type. Correlations are reported between the themes and the demographic and individual characteristics of both supervisors and students. Correlations are also reported showing the relationships between the researcher's ratings of the supervisors' effectiveness and the demographic data, individual characteristics, and the students' report of integration. The findings regarding the pairs where both supervisor and student described the same incident during the interviews are reported. There is an account of how supervisors and students prioritized the functions of supervision as described in the interviews. The final section presents a summary of the findings.

A. ROLE FUNCTION THEMES DESCRIBING SUPERVISION

Role function themes were determined by content analysis of the responses of students and supervisors during their interviews. They were asked to describe the role of the supervisor, state the functions of supervision and prioritize what they considered to be the three most important functions. They also described an incident which occurred in a field placement conference that they felt led to insightful learning. Finally, they described the role of the supervisor and functions of supervision as experienced in that specific conference.
From the participants’ responses, the following consistent themes emerged:

**The supervisor**

1. is a teacher.
2. teaches the student to link theology with the practice of ministry.
3. helps the student relate religious values to society’s needs.
4. selects appropriate resources for the student.
5. gives appropriate feedback to the student.
6. is a role model for the student.
7. manages the student in the placement.
8. has the authority in the placement to make student assignments.
9. works in a collegial manner with both staff and student.

**The relationship between the supervisor and student is**

10. personal,
11. intensive,
12. intimate, and
13. holistic.

**Supervision is**

14. intentional,
15. structured, and
16. disciplined.
17. Supervisor provides an entry for student into the placement.
18. The student engages in actual ministry experience in the placement.

**During the supervisory conference**

19. the student presents data about his or her ministry experience.
20. student experience is analyzed and reflected upon.
21. supervisor and student assess and evaluate student’s growth.
22. supervisor and student plan for future changes.

The means and standard deviations for the frequencies with which supervisors and students mentioned the twenty-two themes in their descriptions of the role functions of the supervisory conference are reported in Figure 3. These data
Legend: ‘N’ = Number of times mentioned  't' = t-test  'df' = degrees of freedom  'p' = significance level (* p<<.05)

Conference analysis/reflection
Supervisors  M=2.46, SD=1.77  69
Students  M=1.50, SD=1.28  45
\( t = 2.36 \) df=48.87 p=.022*

Conference assessment/evaluation
Supervisors  M=1.86, SD=1.60  52
Students  M=1.63, SD=1.35  49
\( t = 0.57 \) df=52.98 p=.596

Relationship is intimate
Supervisors  M=1.29, SD=1.36  26
Students  M=1.10, SD=1.40  33
\( t = -1.19 \) df=55.93 p=.239

Relationship is holistic
Supervisors  M=1.73, SD=1.51  52
Students  M=1.63, SD=1.35  49
\( t = 0.57 \) df=52.98 p=.596

Supervision is intentional
Supervisors  M=1.25, SD=1.14  35
Students  M=0.87, SD=0.78  26
\( t = 1.48 \) df=51.83 p=.144

Supervisor is collegial
Supervisors  M=0.82, SD=1.22  23
Students  M=1.23, SD=1.41  37
\( t = -1.19 \) df=55.71 p=.237

Supervisor is role model
Supervisors  M=0.89, SD=0.99  25
Students  M=0.87, SD=1.11  26
\( t = 0.09 \) df=55.93 p=.925

Supervisor provides student entry
Supervisors  M=0.96, SD=0.99  27
Students  M=0.63, SD=0.93  19
\( t = 1.30 \) df=54.86 p=.198

Student is engaged in ministry
Supervisors  M=1.04, SD=1.50  29
Students  M=0.57, SD=1.10  17
\( t = 1.35 \) df=49.40 p=.184

Conference data is recovered
Supervisors  M=1.04, SD=1.14  29
Students  M=0.53, SD=0.63  16
\( t = 2.06 \) df=41.45 p=.046*

Supervisor is teacher
Supervisors  M=0.86, SD=1.58  24
Students  M=0.47, SD=0.86  14
\( t = 1.16 \) df=41.08 p=.254

Relationship is intensive
Supervisors  M=0.71, SD=0.98  20
Students  M=0.43, SD=0.63  13
\( t = 1.29 \) df=45.48 p=.202

Supervisor has authority
Supervisors  M=0.57, SD=0.86  16
Students  M=0.47, SD=0.78  14
\( t = 0.46 \) df=51.99 p=.651

Supervisor gives feedback
Supervisors  M=0.36, SD=0.56  10
Students  M=0.57, SD=0.77  17
\( t = -1.19 \) df=52.76 p=.240

Student plan for change
Supervisors  M=0.61, SD=0.69  17
Students  M=0.50, SD=0.65  9
\( t = 1.75 \) df=55.19 p=.086

Supervisor is manager
Supervisors  M=0.50, SD=0.69  14
Students  M=0.40, SD=0.86  12
\( t = 0.49 \) df=54.97 p=.626

Supervisor resources student
Supervisors  M=0.21, SD=0.57  6
Students  M=0.57, SD=0.77  17
\( t = -1.99 \) df=53.13 p=.052

Supervision is disciplined
Supervisors  M=0.36, SD=0.62  10
Students  M=0.30, SD=0.70  9
\( t = -0.33 \) df=55.85 p=.744

Links theology and practice
Supervisors  M=0.46, SD=0.92  13
Students  M=0.07, SD=0.25  2
\( t = 2.20 \) df=30.81 p=.035*

Supervision is structured
Supervisors  M=0.21, SD=0.42  6
Students  M=0.10, SD=0.31  4
\( t = 1.18 \) df=49.21 p=.243

Supervisor is personal
Supervisors  M=0.11, SD=0.32  3
Students  M=0.17, SD=0.46  5
\( t = -0.58 \) df=54.40 p=.566

Relationship is personal
Supervisors  M=0.04, SD=0.19  1
Students  M=0.00, SD=0.00  0
\( t = 1.00 \) df=27.00 p=.326

Figure 3. Role Function Themes in Order of Frequency
were taken from interview questions eight and nine (see Appendix B: Interview Schedules).

As a result of t-tests, the data indicated that supervisors and students differed significantly on three role function themes. Supervisors reported more frequently than students the themes of "analysis and reflection" on student growth ($t=2.36$, $df=48.87$, $p=.002$), the "recovery of data" from the student's experience for use in the supervisory conference ($t=2.06$, $df=41.45$, $p=.046$), and the "linking of theology with the practice of ministry" ($t=2.20$, $df=30.81$, $p=.035$). They were similar on at least seven role function themes: the supervisor is a role model ($t=0.09$, $df=55.93$, $p=.925$), the supervisory relationship is holistic ($t=0.14$, $df=51.83$, $p=.892$), supervision is disciplined ($t=0.33$, $df=55.85$, $p=.744$), the supervisor has authority ($t=0.46$, $df=51.99$, $p=.651$), the supervisor is a manager ($t=0.49$, $df=54.97$, $p=.626$), during the conference there was assessment and evaluation ($t=0.5$, $df=52.98$, $p=.596$), and the personal nature of the relationship ($t=0.58$, $df=51.43$, $p=.566$).

The data from question eight, describing role functions in a general way, was separated from question nine, describing role functions in these specific supervisory conferences (see Appendix B). This separation was done in order to identify additional themes on which supervisors and students differed significantly. The separated data are not reported in Figure 3.

The results of the t-tests for question eight indicated significant differences on two themes. Supervisors again mentioned more frequently than students the
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linking of theology with practice of ministry \( t=2.05, \) \( df=30.21, \) \( p=.049 \). Students, however, mentioned more often than supervisors the theme stating that the supervisor is a resource for the student \( t=2.37, \) \( df=47.00, \) \( p=.022 \). In a general way, supervisors saw themselves helping students link theology to the practice of ministry, while students saw their supervisors more in terms of resources for information and direction. These themes focus on the practice of professional ministry.

The results of the t-test for question nine indicated significant differences on three themes. The recovery of data for supervision was again mentioned more frequently by supervisors than by students \( t=2.18, \) \( df=43.77, \) \( p=.035 \). Supervisors more often than students considered themselves a teacher \( t=3.10, \) \( df=27.00, \) \( p=.004 \). Students mentioned more often than supervisors that the supervisory relationship was characterized as intimate \( t=2.29, \) \( df=43.22, \) \( p=.027 \). In specific terms or from the perspective of an actual conference, supervisors saw themselves as a teacher, eliciting data from the student for the conference, and students were concerned about the intimacy of their relationship with the supervisor. These themes focus on the supervisory relationship.

In summary, it was evident that supervisors spoke about their role functions primarily from the perspective of their supervisory responsibilities. That is, they saw themselves as teachers, helping students to recover data from their experience in order to link it with their theology, as well as helping the student with analysis and reflection. The students, on the other hand, focused on the intimacy or closeness of the supervisory relationship, and saw their supervisors
as a resource for information and direction within their placement.

B. INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS INFLUENCING SUPERVISION

In addition to their descriptions of the role functions of the field education supervisory conference, both supervisors and students were influenced by other individual characteristics. The four characteristics used in this study were conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type.

Scores on conceptual level and personality type were used to compare supervisors and students. When constructive openness and orientation to supervision were used to compare supervisors and students, supervisors' scores were used, and the students' estimates of their supervisors' scores were utilized. Table 5 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and ranges of these individual characteristics.

1. Conceptual Level

Results of the Paragraph Completion Test showed that supervisors and students did not differ significantly on conceptual level (see Table 5). The average conceptual level was Level Two, indicating moderately simple conceptual structure. This conceptual level indicated that supervisors and students had the potential to recognize and accept alternatives. But they were reluctant to assign items to rigid categories, and found it difficult to assign alternative perspectives; to use conditional statements; to project hypothetical outcomes; to make exceptions to certain rules, and to tolerate some ambiguity (Silver, 1975).
Table 5
Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Conceptual Level, Constructive Openness, and Orientation to Supervision for Supervisors and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual level</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1.70-3.00</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive openness *</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>4.05-6.78</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction **</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>00.00-46.90</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>14.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative ***</td>
<td>41.88</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26.80-53.60</td>
<td>33.95</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Directive</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20.10-60.30</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The students' scores on constructive openness and orientation to supervision are estimates of their supervisors' constructive openness and orientation to supervision.

* Supervisors' constructive openness was significantly higher than students' estimates (t=2.17, df=27, p=.039)
** Supervisors' directive orientation was significantly lower than students' estimates (t=-3.13, df=27, p=.004)
*** Supervisors' collaborative orientation was significantly higher than students' estimates (t=3.43, df=27, p=.002).
2. Constructive Openness

The results of the Preactive Behavior Instrument indicated a significant difference between how supervisors rated themselves on constructive openness and how students rated their supervisors (see Table 5). Supervisors considered themselves to be constructively more open ($M=5.62$) in their verbal communication than students experienced them ($t=2.17$, $df=27$, $p=.039$). Grimmett (1982) characterized a high constructive openness score of seven as follows:

Communication is deemed more helpful if statements are specific rather than general, tentative rather than absolute, and informing rather than ordering. The most helpful kinds of information are seen to be 1) behaviour description—the reporting of specific acts, 2) description of one's feelings, 3) perception-checking responses, and 4) paraphrasing the other's comments in order to ensure that one understands in the way intended. (p. 76)

Students experienced their supervisors' verbal communication ability as less open ($M=4.84$). A low constructive openness score is characterized as follows:

[such communication can] coerce the supervisee into a state of dependency upon the authority figure . . . Supervisee feelings are unwittingly or wittingly denied, supervisors express value judgments from their own frame of reference, evincing approval or disapproval of the . . . behaviour of supervisees. Because they are ultimately responsible for the maintenance of the instructional program, supervisors may lose all patience and use their authority to command supervisees to make certain changes. (Grimmett, 1982, pp. 78-79)

The above verbal communication behaviors are at the more extreme ends of Wallen's (1972) freeing and binding continuum (see Figure 1 in Chapter Two). The TFE supervisors' perceptions of themselves were in the upper middle range ($range=4.05$ to 6.78, $M=5.62$), the students' perceptions of the supervisors were in the lower middle range ($range=0.85$ to 6.78, $M=4.84$) with scores in the
very low ranges (0.85). These scores indicated that supervisors did not rate themselves as using binding communication, while certain students reported definitely experiencing binding verbal communication.

3. Orientation to Supervision

On the Supervisory Beliefs Inventory, supervisors rated themselves as using a directive orientation to supervision about 17% of the time. But students estimated their supervisors' use of a directive orientation to be 27% of the time (see Table 5). Glickman (1981) described a directive orientation to supervision with the following supervisory behaviors:

Supervisors were engaged primarily in the behaviors of clarifying and presenting her [or his] thinking, directing what will happen, demonstrating appropriate teaching [pastoral] behaviors, and standardizing a target level of student progress. The supervisor used praise and rewards as an incentive or reinforcement for carrying out the plan. (p. 21)

Supervisors believed that they were using a collaborative orientation about 42% of the time, while students experienced it only 34% of the time. Glickman (1981) characterized collaborative supervision as a joint supervisor and student responsibility:

A. The supervisor encounters the teacher [student] with his or her perceptions of the instructional [pastoral] area needing improvement (presenting).
C. The supervisor listens to teacher [student] perceptions (listening).
D. Supervisor and teacher [student] propose alternative actions for improvement (problem solving).
E. Supervisor and teacher [student] discuss and alter actions until a joint plan is agreed upon (negotiating). (p. 30)
Both supervisors (41%) and students (40%) reported using or experiencing a non-directive orientation to supervision. Glickman (1981) describes non-directive supervision in the behavioral terms of

listening, encouraging, clarifying, presenting and problem solving . . .
to create a teacher [student] self-plan. (p. 36)

In summary, theological field education supervisors viewed themselves as being collaborative while their students experienced them as directive.

4. Personality Type

According to Myers and McCulley (1985), there are sixteen personality types. These types are determined by various combinations of extraversion and introversion, sensing and intuition, thinking and feeling, and judging and perceiving. A short description and the frequency of the types for supervisors and students in this study are given in Table 6.

It was difficult to describe the personality type of the two groups of supervisors and students in general terms because of the small percentage of each type. Therefore, in order to get a general understanding of the two groups, personality was examined according to the supervisors and students process preferences of perception (sensing and intuition) and judgement (thinking and feeling). See Table 2 in Chapter Two for a description of these two process preferences. The adaptation of personality type to the process preferences is shown in Table 7.

It was clear from Table 7, that supervisors and students shared general preferences for the processes of intuition and feeling. Sixty-three percent of the
Table 6

Description and Frequency of Myers-Briggs Personality Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supervisors N=27</th>
<th>Students N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>Imaginative harmonizer</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>Enthusiastic planner of change</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>Imaginative helper</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>People-oriented innovator</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>Sympathetic manager of facts</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>Practical harmonizer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>Decisive innovator</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>Analytic planner of change</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>Analytic manager of facts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>Inquisitive analyzer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>Practical organizer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>Innovative organizer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>Observant helper</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>Practical analyzer</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>Realistic adapter to things</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>Realistic adapter to people</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One supervisor did not return the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator. Table adapted from Lawrence (1979).

The total sample was described as preferring the intuitive-feeling process. This percentage was higher than the fifty-five percent national average of intuitive-feeling types found among clergy of all denominations (Myers & McCulley, 1985, p. 257).

The intuitive-feeling personality types were described in the following terms: This type tends to have personal warmth, to see possibilities, to be enthusiastic and
insightful, and to be most satisfied when understanding and communicating with others. From an educational perspective, Myers and McCulley (1985) described the intuitive-feeling type teacher as flexible, offering encouragement, inspiration, variety and creativity; as getting ideas from subject content, courses, readings and knowledge of student development; and as planning weekly with general goals, and with student needs and personal growth in mind.

Nineteen percent of the supervisors and students were intuitive-thinking processing types. The description of the intuitive-thinking educational setting was similar to the above description of the intuitive-feeling, except the thinking preference encouraged the use of synthesis, logic and more order than the feeling preference.

Fourteen percent of both groups were sensing-feeling. Teachers were described as role models; as obtaining ideas from curriculum, manuals, textbooks, workshops, and other’s experience; as planning yearly with detailed objectives for lessons, while taking student abilities into consideration. Success was contributing to the students’ education.
The above descriptions of teacher behavior according to type was helpful in considering the teaching behaviors of field education supervisors. Considered from a field education perspective the supervisor obtained ideas from actual situations in the field placement or from case studies and verbatims by the students. Evaluation of students was based on the competencies acquired by the student, and by feedback given to the supervisor by parishioners and the supervisors' own observations.

In addition to the educational behavior, other differences in personality type affect the way individuals interact with others and the environment. For example, from this study intuitive-thinking supervisors focused their attention on possibilities and approached their supervision with impersonal analysis; while sensing-feeling students focused on facts and approached supervision looking for personal warmth. The influence of personality type on the supervisory interaction became more evident when individual pairs of supervisors and students were analyzed.

C. DEMOGRAPHIC AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS CORRELATIONS
This section of the findings first, indicates the relationship between age, gender and experience, and the role functions themes; and second, indicates the relationship between conceptual level, constructive openness and orientation to supervision, and the role function themes. Pearson correlations, with significance level set at p<.05, were used to determine the relationships between the themes describing the role functions of the supervisory conference and the demographic and individual characteristics. Table 8 reports the correlations of role functions themes with the demographic characteristics of supervisors and students.
### Table 8
Correlations of Role Function Themes with Demographic Characteristics of Supervisors and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Supervisory Experience</th>
<th>Student Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>Stu</td>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>Stu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor is teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Links theology and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relates values to society</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor resources student</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor gives feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role model</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Collegial</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Holistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intentional</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Structured</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.55*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervisor provides entry</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Student engage in ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Data is recovered</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Analysis/reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assessment/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Plan for change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlations are significant at p<.05 or beyond.
**Age**

The age of the supervisor related significantly to four role functions themes (see Table 8). Older supervisors discussed more frequently than younger supervisors the themes relating to their authority \( (r = .39, p < .05) \) and the personal nature of the supervisory relationship \( (r = .38, p < .05) \). The same group mentioned less often the theme of collegiality \( (r = -.47, p < .01) \). Younger supervisors mentioned more frequently than older supervisors the theme of relating religious values to society's needs \( (r = -.32, p < .05) \). This same theme represented only 3.3% of the supervisors. The personal nature of the supervisory relationship theme represented 10%. Therefore these two themes need to be interpreted with some caution.

Only one theme influenced older students more than younger ones. The older students were more concerned about planning for change with their supervisors \( (r = .42, p < .01) \).

**Gender**

The gender of the supervisors correlated significantly with three themes (see Table 8). Women supervisors mentioned more frequently than men the need for a disciplined \( (r = -.55, p < .01) \) and structured \( (r = -.38, p < .05) \) supervisory conference, and for the supervisory relationship to be intimate \( (r = -.36, p < .05) \). The gender of the students did not correlate significantly with any of the role functions themes.

**Experience**

The experience of the supervisors correlated significantly with three themes (see
Table 8). Supervisors with more experience were found to mention more often than less experienced supervisors the following themes: their responsibility to assist the student to analyze and reflect (r = .39, p < .05); the personal nature of the supervisory relationship (r = .39, p < .05); however, more experienced supervisors had less need to give appropriate feedback to the student (r = -.36, p < .05). Students with more years of work experience before coming to theological education than students with fewer years of experience reported less often the theme of recovering data for supervision (r = -.43, p < .01).

Individual characteristics of conceptual level, constructive opennessness, and orientation to supervision were correlated with the role function themes, these are reported in Table 9.

**Conceptual Level**

Both supervisors and students with higher conceptual levels mentioned the need to give students appropriate feedback (supervisors, r = .37, p = .025 and students, r = .37, p = .023). Higher conceptual level supervisors mentioned more often than lower conceptual level supervisors the need for students to be engaged in actual ministry (r = .36, p = .029). At the same time, higher conceptual level students did not mention this theme in any significant way, but they did mention the theme of intentionality (r = .35, p = .030). Intentionality was not a significant theme for supervisors.

The data indicated that higher conceptual level supervisors and students were able to give and receive feedback, but they differed on two other themes. Higher
### Correlations of Role Function Themes with Individual Characteristics of Supervisors and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Conceptual Level</th>
<th>Constructive Competence</th>
<th>Orientation to supervision</th>
<th>Non-Constructive Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor Sup</td>
<td>Student Stu</td>
<td>Supervisor Sup</td>
<td>Student Stu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor is teacher</td>
<td>-.03 .07</td>
<td>-.01 -.22</td>
<td>-.11 .35*</td>
<td>-.15 -.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Link theology and practice</td>
<td>-.16 -.24</td>
<td>-.18 -.08</td>
<td>.21 .37*</td>
<td>.10 .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Relates values to society</td>
<td>-.05 .00</td>
<td>.01 .00</td>
<td>-.17 .00</td>
<td>.32* .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor resources student</td>
<td>-.11 -.26</td>
<td>-.01 -.11</td>
<td>.07 .25</td>
<td>.09 -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisor gives feedback</td>
<td>.37* .37*</td>
<td>.10 .28</td>
<td>-.21 -.41*</td>
<td>-.22 -.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role model</td>
<td>.03 .03</td>
<td>-.12 .09</td>
<td>-.22 -.17</td>
<td>.09 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Manager</td>
<td>-.17 .05</td>
<td>-.50* .19</td>
<td>.23 -.08</td>
<td>-.07 -.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Authority</td>
<td>-.20 -.30*</td>
<td>-.29 -.41*</td>
<td>.28 .31*</td>
<td>-.11 .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Collegial</td>
<td>.05 -.05</td>
<td>.28 .26</td>
<td>-.27 -.51*</td>
<td>-.25 .33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal</td>
<td>.25 -.06</td>
<td>.09 .00</td>
<td>.16 .03</td>
<td>-.30 -.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intensive</td>
<td>-.10 .21</td>
<td>.05 -.04</td>
<td>.09 .01</td>
<td>.14 -.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Intimate</td>
<td>.21 .16</td>
<td>.23 .01</td>
<td>-.16 -.15</td>
<td>-.03 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Holistic</td>
<td>.12 .12</td>
<td>.12 -.18</td>
<td>-.05 .05</td>
<td>.14 .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Intentional</td>
<td>-.06 .35*</td>
<td>-.18 .13</td>
<td>.17 -.18</td>
<td>-.08 .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Structured</td>
<td>.06 -.10</td>
<td>-.31 .16</td>
<td>-.11 -.10</td>
<td>.12 -.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Disciplined</td>
<td>.00 .08</td>
<td>-.08 .24</td>
<td>-.15 -.20</td>
<td>.14 -.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Supervisor provides entry</td>
<td>-.14 .11</td>
<td>.02 .08</td>
<td>-.16 .18</td>
<td>.08 -.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Student engage in ministry</td>
<td>.36* -.14</td>
<td>-.04 -.29</td>
<td>-.18 .21</td>
<td>.25 -.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Data is recovered</td>
<td>-.03 .09</td>
<td>-.10 .11</td>
<td>.20 .04</td>
<td>-.16 -.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Analysis/reflection</td>
<td>.07 -.30</td>
<td>-.04 -.50*</td>
<td>.12 -.29</td>
<td>-.10 -.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assessment/evaluation</td>
<td>-.03 .10</td>
<td>.26 -.03</td>
<td>-.12 -.18</td>
<td>-.02 .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Plan for change</td>
<td>-.30 -.04</td>
<td>.14 .08</td>
<td>-.00 -.02</td>
<td>-.31 .16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlations significant at p<.05 or beyond.

Conceptual level supervisors and students differed respectively on how often they mentioned the themes of students' engagement in actual ministry and the intentionality of supervision.

In order to understand the differences between supervisors and students with the same conceptual level, the researcher reviewed the interview data for examples of
how higher conceptual level interviewees described these two themes. Higher conceptual level supervisors described pastoral care crises and alternative decisions in tentative and conditional terms. Higher conceptual level students did not describe pastoral care crises in the same tentative or conditional terms. Their responses tended to be more rigid. This may be an indication of the domain specific characteristic of the Paragraph Completion Test. For example, a person can function at a higher conceptual level in some domains and not in others (D. Pratt, personal communication, March 1987).

A second theme on which higher conceptual level supervisors and students differed was intentionality of supervision. For example, higher conceptual level supervisors described intentionality in conditional terms, like "we do supervision between appointments, or when an issue comes up." Higher conceptual level students described intentionality in terms of the supervisor providing them with options, resources, and an opportunity to develop their own gifts. The differences may be the result of different understandings of intentionality, or the fact that the category was imprecise, or it may be an indication of domain specific behavior.

**Constructive Openness**

Verbal communication in a supervisory relationship is very important (see Table 9). Supervisors with lower constructively open communication mentioned more frequently than other supervisors the theme concerning their management role with students, lay training committee members, and parishioners \(r = -0.50, p = 0.003\). Students who rated their supervisors as having lower constructive
openness focused on the authority of the supervisor ($r = -0.41$, $p = 0.013$). Low constructive openness was characterized by communication that diminished the students' autonomy by increasing their sense of subordination. From the interviews it was found that low constructively open supervisors used words such as "strong supervision," "confrontation," "being frank" to describe their supervision. Students who rated their supervisors low in constructive openness used phrases like "my supervisor was autocratic," "I felt like I was on trial," and "we had a communication problem."

Finally, students who rated their supervisors as being high in constructive openness felt free to mention the theme of analysis and reflection as an important role function of supervision ($r = 0.50$, $p = 0.002$). Students who experienced open and trusting communication on the part of their supervisors were able to analyze and reflect on their pastoral behavior in an environment that increased their autonomy and sense of equality. In the interviews, these students described their supervisory experience in the following ways: during the conference "we reflected on my agenda," "I was left to do what I felt was necessary," the supervisor "modeled" how to do analysis, and the words "shared," and "affirmed," "supported" were frequently used during the interviews.

**Orientation to Supervision**

Three orientations to supervision were explored in this study (see Table 9). Each orientation was correlated with the themes describing the role functions of the supervisory conference in the context of TFE. When directive supervisors were correlated with the twenty-two themes, no significant relationships were found.
When students who believed their supervisor used a directive approach were correlated with the themes, four significant relationships were found. The more directive the students found their supervisors, the less mention they made of collegiality ($r = -0.51, p = .002$) and feedback ($r = -0.41, p = .012$), and they more often mentioned the supervisor as teacher ($r = 0.35, p = .028$) with the authority to make student assignments ($r = 0.31, p = .048$). These findings are congruent with the description of a directive orientation to supervision as described by Glickman (1981).

There was an apparent contradiction in the role of supervisor as teacher between the more directive supervisors ($r = -0.17$) and students ($r = 0.35$) who estimated their supervisors as directive. Information from the interviews did not give insight into these differing understandings of the teacher role. The students mentioned that the supervisor was a teacher or educator; one student suggested that the supervisor was authoritarian as a teacher. The directive supervisors described the teacher role as "suggesting to the student how to deal with a problem" and gave a sense that the supervisor was the one to tell the student "how to do" ministry.

Students who experienced collaborative supervisors, expressed the theme of collegiality more often than students who experienced other orientations to supervision ($r = 0.33, p = .036$). However, they expressed less often the need for students to be engaged in actual ministry ($r = -0.38, p = .020$) and the role of supervisor as "teacher" ($r = -0.32, p = .044$).
Both non-directive supervisors and students who experienced non-directive supervision mentioned significantly more often than other orientations the need for appropriate feedback to the student (supervisors, \( r = .39, p = .020 \); students, \( r = .52, p = .002 \)). And both groups mentioned less often than other orientations, the need to link theology with the practice of ministry (supervisors, \( r = -.33, p = .045 \); students, \( r = -.43, p = .009 \)). Non-directive supervisors mentioned more often than supervisors using other orientations, the need to be collegial in supervisory relationships (\( r = .55, p = .001 \)). Students experiencing non-directive supervision made less mention of the authority of the supervisor to make student assignments (\( r = -.39, p = .016 \)).

In summary, the demographic and individual characteristics of supervisors and students related to fifteen of the twenty-two themes. The themes that related to demographic characteristics were: younger supervisors worked collegially, older supervisors mentioned their authority, and older students were more conscious of planning for change. Women supervisors were concerned about the intimacy of the supervisory relationship, and more concerned than men that supervision be structured and disciplined. More experienced supervisors considered it important to provide feedback, analysis and reflection for the student while maintaining a personal relationship. Students with less years of work experience were more concerned about ways to bring data to the supervisory conference.

The themes that related to the individual characteristics were: High conceptual level students and supervisors were both interested in appropriate feedback. Higher conceptual level supervisors wanted to be certain that students were
engaged in actual ministry, while higher conceptual level students wanted supervision to be intentional. Regarding constructive openness, the more open the supervisor the less concern for the role of manager; while students who rated their supervisors more open, were less concerned about the supervisors' authority and more interested in analysis and reflection on their work.

Orientation to supervision was related to the supervisory relationship. Students who experienced directive supervision characterized the supervisor as a teacher with authority to make assignments, as less collegial, and less interested in giving feedback. Students who experienced collaborative supervision characterized their supervisors as collegial, with less emphasis on the supervisor as teacher, and less interested in engaging in "actual" ministry. Non-directive supervision was characterized by both students and supervisors as a time for appropriate feedback, with little mention of the need to link theology with the practice of ministry. Non-directive supervisors saw themselves as collegial, while the students of non-directive supervisors were not concerned about the authority of the supervisors to make student assignments.

D. DIFFERENT VS. SAME INCIDENTS

During the interviews supervisors and students were asked to describe an event which was critical to their learning. The following areas were probed: the focus of the incident, the integration of the student's academic background and field experience, the positive growth of the student, and any impediments to the student's growth. No significant differences were found between the answers of the supervisors and those of the students. Table 10 presents a description in
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### Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Supervisors N=28</th>
<th>Students N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kind of event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral concern</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
<td>10 35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear expectations</td>
<td>9 32.1%</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of conflict</td>
<td>5 17.9%</td>
<td>5 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student growth</td>
<td>6 21.4%</td>
<td>5 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different</td>
<td>19 67.9%</td>
<td>19 67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same</td>
<td>9 32.2%</td>
<td>9 32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus of event</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>14 50.0%</td>
<td>16 57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological</td>
<td>4 14.3%</td>
<td>2 07.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both practical and theological</td>
<td>6 21.4%</td>
<td>5 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory relationship</td>
<td>1 03.6%</td>
<td>4 14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student growth issue</td>
<td>3 10.7%</td>
<td>0 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much evidence</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
<td>5 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evident</td>
<td>10 35.7%</td>
<td>12 40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some evidence</td>
<td>7 25.0%</td>
<td>7 23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not evident</td>
<td>3 10.7%</td>
<td>6 20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive student growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeper supervisory relationship</td>
<td>5 17.9%</td>
<td>12 42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater student insight</td>
<td>14 50.0%</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affirmed</td>
<td>3 10.7%</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>1 03.6%</td>
<td>0 --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student growth impeded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 53.6%</td>
<td>8 28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13 46.4%</td>
<td>20 71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percentages of how supervisors and students answered the probing questions describing a supervisory conference event.

There were twenty-eight pairs of supervisors and students in this study. Within nine pairs both supervisor and student described the same event or incident. The researcher wanted to see if the nine pairs in which both supervisor and student described the same incident (to be referred to as the "same incident group") were any different from the nineteen pairs in which both supervisor and student described different incidents (to be referred to as the "different incident group"). It was of interest to the researcher to discover if those pairs in which both participants described the same incident might indicate some uniqueness in their supervisory experience. Two additional analyses were made to determine differences between the two groups. The first, an ANOVA was used to analyze the variance between the participants in the "different incident group" and the "same incident group," and age, educational level, conceptual level, constructive openness and orientation to supervision. A second analysis, using all of the independent variables examined the "same incident group" to discover the interaction patterns between supervisor and student that were not apparent when the pairs were aggregated. Three of these pairs were described.

There was a four year difference between the supervisors in the same and different incident groups. Students in both groups were 42 years old. All three women supervisors were in the same incident group. Eighty-eight percent of the same incident group were women students. There was no difference in educational background between supervisors in the same and different groups and the total
group of supervisors. Both held a Master of Divinity degree or higher. Students in the different group had a baccalaureate degree or higher, while the students in the same incident group had a baccalaureate degree or less.

In both the same and different groups, conceptual levels were not significantly different. In both groups, however, supervisors rated themselves significantly more open in their constructive openness than their students did \( (F=4.50, F_{(prob)} = .039) \). Students who shared the same incident as their supervisors, estimated their supervisors' openness closer to the way the supervisors rated themselves \( \text{different supervisors Mean}=5.63, \text{different students Mean}=4.61; \text{same supervisors Mean}=5.61, \text{same students Mean}=5.49 \).

Supervisors in both groups saw themselves significantly less directive than their students \( (F=6.28, F_{(prob)} = .015) \). This was similar to the findings in the total sample. Students in the same incident group rated their supervisors significantly less collaborative than students in the different group \( (F=11.25, F_{(prob)} =.001) \). There were no significant differences in the non-directive orientation to supervision between this group or between supervisors and students of other orientations.

Regarding the role functions of the supervisory conference both supervisors and students in the same incident group mentioned the need to link theology with the practice of ministry significantly more frequently than supervisors and students in the different group \( (F=4.55, F_{(prob)} = .038) \). And supervisors mentioned the theme more frequently than students in both groups. Supervisors and students in the same incident group significantly differed regarding the recovery of data for
supervision. Supervisors mentioned it more often than students \( (F=4.05, F_{(prob)}=0.049) \). Supervisors mentioned the recovery of data more often in both groups, but in the same incident group the difference was greater.

Supervisors in the same incident group mentioned the need for analysis and reflection more frequently than supervisors in the different group. Supervisors in the same incident group mentioned analysis and reflection significantly more often than the students in the same incident group \( (F=4.85, F_{(prob)}=0.032) \). With regard to assessment and evaluation, supervisors in both groups mentioned it more often than students, but there was a greater difference in the frequency of mention in the group that did not share a common incident \( (F=6.48, F_{(prob)}=0.014) \). These findings did not add any new insights into how supervisors and students described the role functions of the supervisory conference.

After analyzing the nine individual pairs, three pairs were selected to illustrate interaction patterns not apparent when the aggregated group of supervisors and students were analyzed. These three cases were selected because they represented pairs that were matched or mismatched on a number of variables. Table 11 describes these three pairs and compares them to the total sample of supervisors and students.

Pair A supervisor and student were 46 years old. The supervisor had supervised for five years and the student had worked for 20 years prior to theological education. The supervisor had a Master of Divinity degree and the student had a baccalaureate degree. Both supervisor and student characterized their experience
### Table 11
Demographic and Individual Characteristics of Three Supervisory Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Sup A</th>
<th>Stu A</th>
<th>Sup D</th>
<th>Stu D</th>
<th>Sup H</th>
<th>Stu H</th>
<th>Total Sample Means</th>
<th>Total Sample Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience (years)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive Openness</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Directive</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MDiv +</td>
<td>BA +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myers-Briggs Personality Type</td>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>NF</td>
<td>NF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as rewarding.

The same incident they described dealt with the expectations of a small group of parishioners who disagreed with how the student was functioning in a specific situation. Hard feelings were generated that primarily involved one parishioner. The supervisor and student analyzed and evaluated the situation. As a result of the conference, the student was able to work out a solution with the group and the person involved. Both supervisor and student were satisfied with the resolution. They both named the incident "pastoral." They agreed that the student evidenced integration of her academic background with the present situation, and that there was growth on the part of the student. They disagreed on the focus of the conference. The supervisor saw the interaction as a practical resolution of a problem, while the student saw it in terms of relationship building between supervisor and student. The supervisor thought there were some impediments to the student's growth, while the student was unaware of any.

Both supervisor and student in Pair A scored at a conceptual level of Two. They were both lower than the mean of the total sample. The supervisor rated himself as being 10% more open than other supervisors. The student rated her supervisor 19% more open than other students rated their supervisors. They agreed that the orientation to supervision used by the supervisor was primarily non-directive. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator designated the supervisor an ISFJ and the student INFJ. Their types showed agreement on three preferences: introversion or the inward orientation to concepts and ideas; feeling or decision making based on personal values rather than logic; and judgment, living their
lives in a planned and orderly way. They disagreed on how they find things out. The supervisor used his five senses to tell him what was actually present in the environment, while the student used intuition to look for possibilities.

A good indication of the "judgment" preferences of the two personality types in pair A was reflected in the themes used to describe the role functions of the supervisory conference. They both mentioned the following themes as ways of regulating and controlling the situation: the supervisor has authority to make student assignments; supervision is intentional and disciplined; the student is adequately initiated into the placement; and analysis, reflection and planning are part of the conference. In addition, the supervisor mentioned the need for supervision to be structured, and the conference to include assessment and evaluation. The student mentioned the need for feedback, the need for supervisor to be role model, and need for the student to be engaged in actual ministry. Because both supervisor and student made decisions based on personal value, it was not unexpected to find that both mentioned the supervisory relationship as intensive and holistic. The student, in addition, indicated that it should be intimate, a characteristic response of the women students and supervisors in this sample. There were no unusual problems or concerns in this pair.

Pair D exhibited a stormy relationship and were atypical of the group that described the same incident (see Table 11). The male supervisor was 59 years old and the female student was 50 years old. This was the supervisor's first supervisory experience; the student had more than double the work experience of other students. The supervisor had an equivalent to a Master of Divinity, while
the student had not completed college.

The incident that Pair D described concerned the ability of the student to receive and integrate evaluative feedback from the supervisor. Both supervisor and student agreed that the incident was one of conflict between themselves; that the student had demonstrated some integration of academic background with the present situation; and that there were definite impediments to the student's growth. They disagreed on the focus: the supervisor saw the personal growth of the student as the focus; the student saw the focus on practical issues. As a result of this supervisory interaction, the supervisor considered that their relationship had deepened; the student felt more affirmed and supported.

The supervisor's conceptual level (2.5) was 20% higher than other supervisors, while the student's conceptual level (1.7) was 25% lower than other students. Both supervisor and student were lower on constructive openness scores than their peers; the supervisor 15% lower and the student 31% lower. The supervisor rated himself collaborative, and the student rated him directive.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator of personality designated the supervisor an ENTJ and the student an ESFJ. This combination of personality types indicates differences in two critical areas: they were opposite in both the way they perceived the world, and the way they made decisions. The supervisor focused on the possibilities and the student focused on the facts. The supervisor made decisions based on logic and the student made decisions based on personal value and relationships.
Pair D described the role functions of the supervisory conference as follows: the supervisor was a resource to the student, and a manager with authority to make assignments. The relationship was intensive, intimate, and holistic. Supervision was intentional; and the supervisor was responsible for initiating the student into the placement. In addition, the supervisor mentioned the following themes: the supervisor as role model; structured supervision; the student engaged in actual ministry; data recovered for the conference with focus on analysis, reflection, assessment, and evaluation. One theme mentioned by the student and not the supervisor was the teaching role of the supervisor.

There appeared to be agreement regarding the role functions of the supervisory conference, but the stress and tension in the relationship had to be explained by some other factors, such as the differences in educational level, in conceptual level, in constructive openness, in orientation to supervision, and in personality. The student rated the supervisor 31% lower than her fellow-students estimates of their supervisors' constructive openness, indicating that this student perceived "binding" language rather than "freeing" language. This agreed with the supervisor's own self rating of 15% lower than his fellow-supervisors on constructive openness, indicating that he tended to use binding language.

In Pair H the student worked closely with the supervisor as a colleague on a common project (see Table 11). They both experienced a rather congenial working relationship, but an unsatisfying supervisory relationship. The male supervisor was 50 years old, and the female student was 35. The supervisor had three years experience as a supervisor, while the student had 10 years of work experience.
before coming to theological education. The supervisor had a doctorate, while the student had a baccalaureate degree.

The incident that this pair described dealt with a misunderstanding of the role of the supervisor. Pair H agreed that the incident they both described was pastoral; the focus was both practical and theoretical; integration was evident; and there seemed to be no impediment to the student's growth. However, they disagreed about the kind of growth that took place in the student.

The conceptual level of the supervisor was near the mean of the other supervisors (supervisor = 2.2, Mean = 2.08); the student was 21% lower than her peers (student = 1.8, Mean = 2.28). The supervisor rated himself less open than his peers by 5%. The student rated her supervisor 15% higher in constructive openness than other students. Both supervisor and student ratings of constructive openness were almost the same (supervisor = 5.36, student = 5.65). The supervisor considered his dominate orientation to supervision to be directive, more than double that of other supervisors. The student was confused about her supervisor's orientation, rating him the same for both directive and collaborative (40.2% of the time for both).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator designated the supervisor an ENFP and the student an ENFJ. This pattern can be compatible, except when it comes to controlling and ordering the world. The supervisor was more flexible and unplanned, while the student preferred a schedule and the setting of specific times for supervision. These different characteristics of the personality type may
have contributed to the uneasiness of the supervisory relationship.

The supervisor and student agreed on the themes of linking theology with practice, the holistic characteristics of supervisory relationship, and analysis and reflection. This supervisor's directive approach to supervision may account for his mention of his role as manager, the intentionality of supervision, the students' engagement in actual ministry, assessment and evaluation. These themes fit within the description of a directive supervisor. The student experienced a more collaborative supervision, and in addition mentioned the themes of supervisor as resource and role model; a collegial relationship, a disciplined supervisory conference, and initiation into the placement. Though the work project expectations seemed to be clear, there was an underlying uneasiness during the field placement regarding supervision. This unease was dealt with only at the last supervisory session. The tension was resolved, but it did not come soon enough for the student or supervisor to change their behavior toward each other.

The three illustrative cases added new understanding of the extent to which the role functions of the supervisory conference were related to conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type. Conceptual level was found related to other variables in each of the three pairs. In Pair A conceptual level was nearly the same (supervisor = 2.0, student = 2.3), the relationship was strong and generally smooth. In Pairs D and H conceptual level was found to be at two different levels (supervisor = 2.5, student = 1.7) (supervisor = 2.2, student = 1.8) respectively, the relationships were reported as less than satisfying.
Constructive openness influenced the supervisory relationship of these pairs. As the "freeing" language increased so did trust, when "binding" language was used trust decreased and the relationship was not as productive. For example, in pair D, the constructive openness score for the supervisor was below the mean (Mean = 5.62, supervisor = 4.80) and the student's experience of her supervisor's verbal communication was also lower than the mean for students (Mean = 4.90, student = 3.39), tension and mistrust lasted beyond the conference.

Regarding orientation to supervision Pair A had a good relationship that reflected the characteristics of collaborative, non-directive orientations and both supervisor and student agreed on the percentage of time each orientation was used. The student in Pair D was confused in describing the supervisory orientation. The supervisor saw himself using the collaborative orientation while the student experienced the directive orientation to supervision. Pair H agreed that the orientation to supervision was directive, but the student apparently experienced more collaboration than the supervisor reported. This may account for some of the tension about supervisory expectations.

Personality type was more clearly related to the supervisory interaction when studied in the individual cases, than in the aggregation of groups. In Pair A the ESFJ and the INFJ have similar preferences, the difference in perception can be complementary, grounding the "intuitive" person in reality and helping the "sensing" person see possibility. Pair D an ENTJ and an ESFJ, indicated the need for good communication for the relationship to develop because they used opposite processes for perception and judgment. Pair H an ENFP and an ENFJ,
had much in common, but because of the differences in their attitude toward the world, their supervisory experience differed. The student's "judging" attitude preferred order and work done on time, while the supervisor's "perceiving" attitude preferred not having a schedule or if there was one, changing it easily.

In summary, the investigation of the characteristics of the nine pairs of supervisors and students who both described the same incident during their interview indicated some difference from the nineteen who described different incidents. The differences between these same and different groups, although statistically significant, were in the same areas as the differences in the total sample, and therefore did not greatly increase the understanding of the supervisory experience. However, when the nine pairs were studied as individual pairs a greater understanding of the supervisory experience was possible. The influences of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type were demonstrated in more detail, than when the pairs were aggregated.

E. EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPERVISORS

Shortly after the interviews and before the analysis of data, the researcher rated the supervisors on a Likert scale: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = adequate, 2 = acceptable, 1 = unacceptable. The ratings represented the researcher's judgment of supervisor effectiveness in consultation with the director of field education at the school. The underlying question for the rating of supervisors was: how effective was this supervisor during theological field education? Four months after the first ratings the researcher re-rated the supervisors, intra-rater
reliability was .78. The mean of effectiveness was 3.3 which indicated that the supervisors were, on the whole, more than adequate.

Correlations of effectiveness ratings were made with demographics, individual characteristics, and the students' integration. Five significant relationships (p<.05) were found. The higher the supervisors’ conceptual level, the higher the rating (r=.36, p=.031); the higher constructive openness, the higher the rating (r=.49, p=.003); the more directive the supervisor, the lower the rating (r=-.44, p=.010); the more non-directive the supervisor, the higher the rating (r=.42, p=.013). Supervisors who reported that their students gave evidence of the ability to integrate academic background with their field experience, had a lower rating (r=-.40, p=.017). The ratings are congruent with the other findings in this study.

**F. THE MOST IMPORTANT FUNCTIONS OF SUPERVISION**

One of the interview questions for both supervisors and students was: "If you had to choose three functions of supervision as most important, which ones would you choose?" Table 12 lists the words used by supervisors and students to describe the most important functions of supervision.

Supervisors listed the most important functions of supervision to be reflection with the student on experience, development of student learning goals, support for the student, and student evaluation. Students listed the most important functions of supervision to be the need for affirmation and support from the supervisor, the need for the supervisor to listen and communicate, the importance of
supervision, and student evaluation. Supervisors saw their functions in terms of what they do with the student. Students saw the functions in terms of relationship and the atmosphere created in the field setting.

G. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings of this study suggest answers to the two questions posed in Chapter One. First, how do supervisors and students in TFE describe the role functions of the supervisory conference? Second, what are the relationships between the descriptions of the role functions of the supervisory conference and
a. the conceptual levels of the supervisors and students?
b. the constructive openness of the supervisor and the constructive openness of the students estimate of their supervisors?
c. the supervisors' orientation to supervision and the students' estimate of
their supervisors' orientation to supervision?

d. the personality types of the supervisor and the students?

e. the supervisors' and students' demographic characteristics of age, gender, educational level, number of years supervisors have engaged in supervision at the school, and the number of years students have worked before entrance into theological education?

Supervisors and students agreed on how they described the role functions of the supervisory conference. The themes they shared most frequently focused on the supervisor as role model, the personal and holistic nature of the relationship, the fact that supervision should be disciplined, the authority and management role of the supervisor, and assessment and evaluation during the conference.

Significantly different relationships were found between the following role functions themes and the independent variables.

1) The supervisor is teacher was mentioned by students who experienced directive and collaborative supervision.

2) Linking theology with the practice of ministry was suggested by supervisors and students using or experiencing directive supervision.

3) Relating religious values to society's needs was mentioned by collaborative supervisors.

4) Feedback to students was important to higher conceptual level supervisors and students, non-directive supervisors and students, and to experienced supervisors.

5) Supervisor is a manager of student placement assignment was a concern for
low conceptual level supervisors.

6) The authority of the supervisor was mentioned by students who experienced directive supervision.

7) The collegiality of the supervisor was mentioned by younger supervisors, non-directive supervisors, and students' experiencing collaborative supervision.

8) The personal nature of the supervisory relationship was a concern to experienced supervisors.

9) Intimacy in the supervisory relationship was mentioned by women supervisors.

10) Intentionality of supervision was important to high conceptual level students.

11) The structure and the discipline of the supervisory conference were mentioned by women supervisors.

12) Student engagement in actual ministry was voiced by high conceptual level students.

13) Analysis and reflection during the conference was important to students who rated their supervisor high on constructive openness, as well as to experienced supervisors.

14) Plan for change was mentioned by older students.

While working on the above research questions, the researcher discovered that within nine of the twenty-eight pairs both supervisor and student described the same incident during the interview. The twenty-eight pairs were then divided according to whether the both supervisor and student described the same incident or a different one during the interview. The group of nine pairs and the group of nineteen pairs were analyzed using an ANOVA. The two groups of nine and nineteen pairs were not found to be significantly different from the original two
groups of supervisors and students. A final analysis was made of the nine individual pairs of supervisors and students. This case analysis specified in more detail the relationship of conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, personality type, age, educational level, and experience on both the interaction of the pairs and of the role functions themes that were named. Pairs A, D, and H were used to illustrate the characteristics of the same incident group.

The researcher’s ratings of the supervisors’ effectiveness indicated that supervisors who rated high also rated high on conceptual level, constructive openness, and non-directive supervision. These findings were congruent with the other findings in this study.

The supervisors’ prioritization of functions indicated that they were concerned about what they do with the students. Students’ prioritization indicated that they were more concerned with relationship and atmosphere created in the field placement.
CHAPTER V. CONCLUSIONS

In this final chapter there is a restatement of the problem, methodology, and results, followed by discussion of the conclusions. The limitations of the study are delineated. Implications and recommendations are suggested for theological field education supervision.

A. CONCLUSIONS

Practical training for ordained ministry has progressed over the years from being a subject discussed in the classroom to experiential education in the field. This development continues to produce a concern about the meaning and quality of supervision within theological education. The Association for Theological Field Education does not have an approved set of standards for field education. Directors of field education still struggle with the nature of supervision and their own preparation in field education. Supervisors themselves are concerned about their preparation and the quality of their supervision. The search for an understanding of the role functions of the supervisory conference has taken an eclectic approach, using ideas and processes from other fields, such as teacher education and counselor training. Often among directors, supervisors and students, the question is asked: how do supervisors see their role functions and how do students experience supervision?

This study adds to the growing literature on theological field education supervision by describing how supervisors and students, engaged in the practice of supervision, experienced the role functions of the supervisory conference. In addition, it explored the relationship between conceptual level, constructive
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opportunity, orientation to supervision, personality type, age, gender, educational level, and experience with the descriptions of the role functions of the supervisory conference from the perspective of supervisors and students.

An exploratory methodology was selected for two reasons: First, previous research in TFE supervision provided little information or direction for hypotheses development and testing. Second, the methodology provided the researcher with the freedom to explore a variety of variables for a better understanding of supervisory interactions.

Interviews were conducted, asking interviewees to describe the role and functions of the supervisory experience. These interviews were content analyzed using the categories suggested by George I. Hunter (1982). Four instruments were used. For cognitive development, the Paragraph Completion Test was used (Hunt et al., 1978b). The Preactive Behavior Instrument (Grimmett, 1982) was used to measure verbal communication in terms of constructive openness. The Supervisory Beliefs Inventory (Glickman, 1981) characterized the orientation to supervision used by supervisors. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers & McCulley, 1985) was used to describe personality type. Pearson correlations, t-tests, and cross tabulations were used to determine the relationships between the themes of the role functions of the supervisory conference and the independent variables. An ANOVA was used to determine the relationships between the themes of the role functions, the supervisor/student pairs, and the independent variables.

The initial impetus for this study was the researcher’s experience as a field
education director concerned with issues of supervision. Why did some pairs of supervisors and students have difficulty working together in field education supervision? Was it a lack of clarity about the role functions of the supervisory process? Analysis of the interview data revealed the following results.

The first research question asked: How do supervisors and students in TFE describe the role functions of the supervisory conference? The results of this study show that supervisors and students describe the role functions in the following way. The supervisor is a role model for the student, their relationship is personal and is characterized as holistic, that is, a recognition of the intellectual and affective life of the student as well as professional skills. Although the relationship is personal, it is clear to both supervisor and student that the supervisor has the authority, within the placement to assign and manage the work of the student. Regarding the supervisory conference, both supervisors and students describe it as a disciplined process, that is, students are expected to set goals and objectives, and to carry them out. Thus, during the supervisory conference these can be assessed and evaluated. On the other hand looking at the differences, supervisors were concerned about the students bringing data to the conference in order for the supervisor to help the student link theology with the practice of ministry and to work with the student to analyze and reflect on experience.

Both supervisors and students mentioned often the role function theme of "assessment and evaluation" of student growth. This particular theme emphasis may have been mentioned so often because the students were interviewed at the
end of a week of field education evaluations and the supervisors were interviewed within six weeks following their evaluations of students. Evaluation was the last experience of the students and the last interaction between the supervisors and students at the end of field education.

Although both mentioned the theme of "analysis and reflection" often, supervisors mentioned it significantly more often than students. While students were engaged in field education, they also were taking a course at the school titled "Pastoral Case Conference." This course provided them an opportunity to bring an incident from the field to a small group for discussion, analysis and reflection. Students were able to practice analytic and reflective strategies in the classroom, but they did not necessarily practice these same strategies during the supervisory conference.

Supervisors and students failed to mention in any consistent way the two themes of "relating religious values to society's needs" and "linking theology with the practice of ministry." This was particularly surprising because a key objective in the guidelines of the Association for Theological Field Education is to enable students to bring together the activities of thinking and acting theologically, thus, allowing life to inform theology. The theological field education literature of the last few years has suggested that the context of ministry be taken into consideration during field education supervision.

The total context of field education may account for why these two themes were not mentioned more frequently by supervisors and students. During field education
students were taking another course titled "The Church and Societal Change." This course was intended to give them an opportunity to "identify, reflect upon and begin to prepare for the implications of the societal dimension of the Church's mission for congregational life and work for the ministry of the clergy" (course description). Since this course provided the students with the opportunity to develop the strategies required to relate religious values to societal needs and to link theology with the practice of ministry, they did not perceive a need to repeat the process during field education supervision. Another reason why these two themes may not have been mentioned more frequently, particularly by supervisors, was the fact that nearly half (43%) of the supervisors were new to supervision and they may not have had the necessary training to help students to develop these key strategies. Regardless of the above mentioned circumstances, the strategies of thinking and acting theologically appeared not to be taking place between supervisor and student within the placement.

The following significant relationships, found in more than one category, answer the second research question: What are the relationships between role functions themes and conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, personality type, age, gender, and experience?

Appropriate feedback to the student appeared as the theme with the most number of significant relationships. More experienced supervisors mentioned it less often than new supervisors, perhaps because 43% of the supervisors were new, they were more conscious of their role as giver of feedback, where as more experienced supervisors took giving feedback for granted and therefore did not
mention it. Both supervisors and students with higher conceptual levels mentioned feedback more frequently than lower conceptual level supervisors and students. This is congruent with characteristics of high conceptual level persons. They have the ability to be adaptive, less deterministic or judgmental, and more tolerant of ambiguity. These characteristics are needed to give and receive feedback appropriately. The type of supervision also affected feedback from the perspective of the student. The students who experienced directive supervision, that is when the supervisor controlled the relationship, were less concerned about feedback and collegiality, and more concerned about the supervisors' authority and linking theology with the practice of ministry. The supervisors for these students would have told the students how to link theology to the practice of ministry rather than both working together in a mutual way to develop this key strategy. On the other hand, non-directive supervisors and students who experienced non-directive supervision both valued the giving and receiving of appropriate feedback. Students experiencing non-directive supervision were not concerned about the authority of the supervisor. Collegiality was important to students experiencing collaborative supervision, and to both supervisors and students of non-directive supervision.

Curiously, non-directive supervisors and students experiencing non-directive supervision did not focus on the strategy of linking theology to the practice of ministry. Perhaps because the supervisor was non-directive and the students were learning this strategy at school, the students did not bring it to supervision, therefore, it was not dealt with in field education. Finally, it was not surprising that students who both experienced directive supervision and rated their
supervisors as less constructively open were concerned about the authority of the supervisors. These supervisors tended to be older in age and more authority conscious and less able to treat the student as a colleague.

The findings of this study indicated that this particular group of supervisors and students shared common descriptions of the role functions of the supervisory conference. When individual characteristics relating to the supervisory interaction were considered, conceptual level and personality type were similar, while constructive openness and orientation to supervision were different.

An opportunity to explore differences in more detail presented itself during the study. In the total sample, it was discovered that within each of nine pairs the supervisor and student identified the same conference and supervision issue or field experience. After comparing the nine same incident pairs with the nineteen different incident pairs, it was evident that the groups were not statistically different. The only difference was that within the nine pairs both supervisor and student described the same incident. To follow-up on this finding, the researcher analyzed the nine pairs as individual cases to determine if there were differences not apparent in the aggregated group data.

The mean score of supervisors and students indicated that they had the same conceptual levels, thus masking relationships within particular pairs. When individual pairs were considered, the relationship between conceptual level and the other variables became apparent. Pairs A, D, and H were selected to illustrate this masking effect. Pair A scored at the same conceptual level, and reported a
good experience of supervision. In pairs D and H, the supervisors scored higher on conceptual level than the students. These two pairs reported experiencing tension during the supervisory conference. This finding is in the direction of affirming the research of Thies-Sprinthall (1980) who found that high conceptual level supervisors and students were flexible, innovative and responsive, while lower level relationships were characterized as more rigid and less able to deal with the interactions and complexities of supervision.

Analyzing individual pairs made it possible to consider all four preferences of the Myers-Briggs personality type, rather than only the two processes of perceiving and judging. The use of sixteen type descriptions gave a more accurate understanding of the relationship between personality and the supervisory interaction. The study revealed that individual supervisors and students, who did not have similar judging and perceiving preferences reported tension in their supervisory relationship. The use of personality type in career counseling and in personnel management offers TFE directors models for adopting the instrument in training supervisors and in preparing students for supervision. The relationship of personality type and ability to communication needs to be further researched, similar to the work of Yeakley (1982, 1983).

A major finding of the nine pair analysis was that the more similar the supervisor and the student, the more likely they were to have a good relationship. Again using A, D and H as examples, pair A were similar on conceptual level, constructive openness, orientation to supervision, and personality type. They were in general agreement on the role functions of the supervisory
conference. During both interviews, they agreed on positive value and success of the experience.

Pair H shared common constructive openness scores. They differed on conceptual level, the supervisor being higher than the student, and they differed in orientation to supervision, the supervisor emphasized a directive approach, the student experienced a more collaborative approach. Their personality types differed in their judging preferences indicating that the supervisor was more spontaneous and unorganized, while the student was more organized and appreciated a well kept schedule. During the interview, both supervisor and student mentioned tension in the supervisory relationship.

The supervisor and student in pair D had the least in common. There were differences in their educational levels, the supervisor had an equivalent of a Master of Divinity degree while the student had only two years of college. The supervisor scored at a higher conceptual level than the student. The student assessed the supervisors constructive openness lower than her fellow-students. They differed on orientation to supervision, the supervisor saw himself as collaborative and the student experience directive supervision. Their personality types were the opposite in the key preferences of perceiving and decision-making. They did agree on eight themes for the role functions of the supervisory conference. None-the-less, during the interview both the supervisor and student in pair D expressed difficulty in the supervisory relationship. It can be concluded that sharing an understanding of the role functions of the supervisory conference does not guarantee a good supervisory experience.
Conclusions

The above three pair summaries suggested the following questions. Should supervisors and students in theological field education be matched on as many variables as possible for a "good supervisory relationship?" Do tension and struggle in certain areas increase the student's learning? Does a supervisory conference create for the student an adequate learning environment, that is does it create an environment similar to the "real world of ministry?" These questions were not answered in this study but they should be considered for future investigation.

B. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to one class of theological students and their supervisors, therefore generalizations to other theological field education programs is limited. The cooperation of both supervisors and students was excellent. They were interested in the research questions, and readily responded to the invitation to be interviewed.

When using the Paragraph Completion Test, the directions to write complete sentences to the stem should have been stressed. Scores on the test may have indicated lower conceptual levels than reality, simply because some sentences were not completed. The two minute time limitation also caused stress. More recent research using the Paragraph Completion Test has indicated that the sentence stems used in this study may not have adequately related to the supervisors and students (S. Bluck, personal communication, February 3, 1987). More thought needs to be given to this test before it is used in subsequent studies.
Several supervisors and students had difficulty with one of the statements in the Preactive Behavior Instrument (see Appendix C). Item 15 of this instrument is expressed as a double negative statement, thus making it difficult to decide how to answer.

The Supervisory Beliefs Inventory was easy to score but difficult to use because the scoring was based on one hundred percent over all three orientations. It was possible for an individual supervisor or student to use all three orientations equally, or to use two equally in the same conference. This could be interpreted in several ways: the supervisor did not make clear distinctions between orientations when completing the instrument; the supervisor used all three orientations depending on the needs of the student; or the supervisor generalized to all supervisory situations where all three of the orientations might have been appropriate. If the instrument had been designed to measure only one orientation, interpretation of the findings may have been more usable in investigating relationships.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered for other purposes before the interviews took place. Therefore, most of the strength of preference scores were unavailable to the researcher. These scores would have been helpful in the analysis of pairs in order to determine if differences in personality type were different because of strong or weak preferences. Future researchers, using this instrument, may want to take the strength of these preference scores into consideration.
The probing questions should be re-worded in order to eliminate ambiguity. In addition to the re-wording of the probing questions, the researcher would have added a question about ranking the satisfaction of the supervisory experience and a question regarding the type of student learning.

Determining the categories for content analysis posed some initial problems. Future researchers should consider determining their categories from the data, making certain that all categories are mutually exclusive. Using pre-designed categories may have misplaced some important themes. The use of Hunter's (1982) descriptions proved to be adequate for this study, however several of the categories were found to overlap. This overlapping was particularly apparent in the section on the supervisory relationship: the category "personal" may have included some items listed under intensive, intimate, and holistic.

C. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this study, it was clear to the researcher that supervision is a complex process that cannot be explained by any one methodology. A recommendation for future research in theological field education supervision is to use a combination of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. For example, by using ethnographic research methodologies, direct observations of the supervisory interaction would be possible, thus providing data on actual patterns of the role functions of the supervisory conference, rather than self-report data. From this more accurate data, additional guidelines and training programs could be developed.
Implications and recommendations for theological field education are further suggested by this study. First, the lack of a strong incorporation into the supervisory conference of the two themes of "relating religious values to society's needs" and the "linking of theology with the practice of ministry" should be considered by the members of the Association for Theological Field Education. As a recommendation from this study and from the literature, these two key strategies need to be developed in the field as well as in the classroom. Supervisors need to be trained to articulate and reflect on their own strategies in these areas so that they can enable students to develop them within the context of the field placement.

A second implication of the findings from this study suggested the importance of the relationship between conceptual level and supervisory interaction. Theological field education directors should consider offering several types of supervisor training that would take conceptual level into consideration. For example, for lower conceptual level supervisors the strategies might include repetition of certain supervisory skills; sequencing learned skills to assure a gradual building on previously developed skills; and journal writing using specific questions to answer rather than open-ended questions. For higher conceptual level supervisors, strategies might include opportunity for optional readings; open-ended journal writing; optional practice sessions with colleagues rather than with training groups.

A third implication of the findings from this study suggested the importance of the relationship between constructive openness and supervisory interaction. In this
study, supervisors considered themselves to be more open than students reported them to be. The verbal communication of low constructively open supervisors impeded the relationship between supervisor and student particularly as exemplified in pair H. Theological field education directors should consider the general verbal communication of supervisors including constructive openness, especially during supervisor training programs. Directors could point out areas of closed or binding communication and affirm opened or freeing communication.

A fourth implication and recommendation is to use the Myers-Briggs personality type at the beginning of and as preparation for the supervisory experience. This instrument can give both supervisors and students a common language to talk about their differences and similarities. An understanding of how personality type affects work-patterns and decision-making can lessen tension in a supervisory relationship.

A last issue or concern for theological field education is the fact of the increasing number of women entering a male dominated career. The Association of Theological Schools reported that the number of women enrolled in preordination degree programs has increased 110% in the last ten years, while the enrollment of men has been in a slow decline. The ratio of men to women supervisors in all schools of theology is not known, but if the school in this study is typical, research similar to the work of Rhodes and Finson (1986) on the relationship between men supervisors and women students should be continued. From the above concern about men/women relationships, two specific recommendations are made for field education directors. First, encourage
supervisors and students to discuss this gender issue. Second, inform supervisors of specific policies regarding nonsexist language, so that students can be supported in their efforts of consciousness raising.

Further research is needed to answer the questions: Is the supervisor the key element in the learning of the student? Or is the context of field education the key element in learning? What does the student learn from the supervisory conference, and the field placement? Why are supervisors not engaging students in developing the strategies for relating religious values to society’s needs and linking theology to the practice of ministry? This leads to a final question: Is the articulation of the supervisor’s own theology and experience an essential component in the supervisory process, and therefore, a component in supervisor training programs? Theological education needs to provide the funding and opportunity for these questions to be researched.
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APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW SCHEDULES

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION SUPERVISORS

The wording in brackets [], and coding definitions are for the interviewer's coding purposes and recording.

Demographic Information:

1. Supervisor code number: _____ code = 01 - 60
2. Age: ____________ code = years
3. Gender: ____________ code 1 = female
   2 = male
4. Denomination: ____________ code:
   1 = Presbyterian (Canada)
   2 = Presbyterian (USA)
   3 = United Church of Canada
   4 = Anglican Church of Canada
   5 = United Methodist Church
   6 = Church of the Nazarene
5. Marital status: ____________ code: 1 = single
   2 = married
   3 = widower
   4 = divorced
   5 = Other
6. Educational level: ____________ code: 1 = BA
   2 = MA
   3 = MDiv
   4 = DDiv
   5 = PhD
   6 = Other
7. Years of experience of supervising at VST? code: * years ______
8. Describe the role of supervisor.
   a. [Description:]

Describe the most important functions of supervision:

b. [Functions:]
   1)
   2)
   3)
   4)
   5)
If you had to choose three functions as most important, which ones would you choose?

C. [Prioritized functions:]
1) 
2) 
3) 

9. Tell me about an event in your relationship with your student that was critical to the learning of your student.

[Probing questions: (To be used only to elicit enough information from the student to clarify the event.)] Was the focus of the event on theological issues or practical issues? Can you explain how you were able to integrate the student's academic background and the field placement experience? How do you define your role in this event? What supervisory functions did you use? What was positive about this event? What was negative in this event that may have prevented student growth?

[Critical event description:]
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR THEOLOGICAL FIELD EDUCATION STUDENTS

The wording in brackets [], and coding definitions are for the interviewer's coding purposes and recording.

Demographic Information:

1. Student code number: ______ code = 01 - 60
2. Age: ________ code = years
3. Gender: ________ code 1 = female
                            2 = male
4. Denomination: ________ code:
                          1 = Presbyterian (Canada)
                          2 = Presbyterian (USA)
                          3 = United Church of Canada
                          4 = Anglican Church of Canada
                          5 = United Methodist Church
                          6 = Church of the Nazarene

5. Marital status: ________ code: 1 = single
                           2 = married
                           3 = widow(er)
                           4 = divorced
                           5 = Other

6. Educational level: ________ code: 1 = BA
                                2 = MA
                                3 = MDiv
                                4 = DDiv
                                5 = PhD
                                6 = Other

7. Years of work experience before coming to theological education: ________ code: = years

Kind of work: ______________________

8. Describe the role of supervisor.
   a. [Description: ]
Describe the most important functions of supervision.

b. [Functions:]
   1)
   2)
   3)
   4)
   5)

If you had to choose three functions as most important, which ones would you choose?

c. [Prioritized functions:]
   1)
   2)
   3)

9. Tell me about an event in your relationship with your supervisor that was critical to your learning.

[Probing questions: (To be used only to elicit enough information from the student to clarify the event.) Was the focus of the event on theological issues or practical issues? Can you explain how you were able to integrate your academic background with your field placement experience? How do you define your supervisor’s role in this event? What functions did the supervisor use with you? What was positive about this event? What was negative in this event that may have prevented you growth?]

[Critical event description:]
SUPERVISORY BELIEF INVENTORY

Supervisor instructions: Circle either A or B for each item. You may not completely agree with either choice, but choose the one that is closest to how you feel.

1. A. Supervisors should give supervisees a large degree of autonomy and initiative within broadly defined limits.
   B. Supervisors should give supervisees directions about methods that will help them improve their pastoral ministry.

2. A. It is important for supervisees to set their own goals and objectives for professional growth.
   B. It is important for supervisors to help supervisees reconcile their personalities and pastoral styles with the philosophy and direction of the parish.

3. A. Supervisees are likely to feel uncomfortable and anxious if the objectives on which they will be evaluated are not clearly defined by the supervisor.
   B. Evaluations of supervisees are meaningless if supervisees are not able to define with their supervisors the objectives for evaluation.

4. A. An open, trusting, warm, and personal relationship with the supervisee is the most important ingredient in supervising students.
   B. A supervisor who is too intimate with supervisees risks being less effective and less respected than a supervisor who keeps a certain degree of professional distance from supervisees.

5. A. My role, as supervisor, during supervisory conferences is to make the interaction positive, to share realistic information, and to help supervisees plan their own solutions to problems.
   B. The methods and strategies I use with supervisees in a conference are aimed at our reaching agreement over the needs for future improvement.

6. In the initial phase of working with a supervisee:
   A. I develop objectives with the supervisee that will help accomplish parish goals.
   B. I try to identify the talents and goals of individual supervisees so they can
work on their own improvement.

7. When several staff and supervisee have a similar pastoral problem, I prefer to:
A. Have the staff and supervisee form an ad hoc group and help them work together to solve the problem.
B. Help each one, on an individual basis, find their strengths, abilities, and resources so that each one finds his or her own solution to the problem.

8. The most important clue that a certain type of workshop or meeting is needed is when:
A. The supervisor perceives that several staff and supervisee lack knowledge or skill in a specific area which is resulting in low morale, undue stress, and less effective pastoral ministry.
B. Several staff and supervisee perceive the need to strengthen their abilities in the same pastoral area.

9. A. The supervisor should decide the objectives of a workshop or meeting since they have a broad perspective of the supervisee's and staff abilities and the needs of the parish.
B. Supervisee, staff and supervisor should reach consensus about the objectives of a workshop or meeting before it is held.

10. A. Supervisees who feel they are growing personally will be more effective in the parish than supervisees who are not experiencing personal growth.
B. The knowledge and ability of pastoral strategies and methods that have been proven over the years should be practiced by all supervisees to be effective in their ministry.

11. When I perceive that a supervisee might be correcting a staff person unnecessarily:
A. I explain, during a conference with the supervisee, why the behavior was excessive.
B. I ask the supervisee about the incident, but do not interject my judgments

12. A. One effective way to improve supervisee performance is to formulate clear behavioral objectives and create meaningful incentives for achieving them.
B. Behavioral objectives are rewarding and helpful to some supervisees but
stifling to others; also, some supervisees benefit from behavioral objectives in some situations but not in others.

13. During a pre-observation conference:
A. I suggest to the supervisee what I could observe, but I let the supervisee make the final decision about the objectives and methods of observation.

B. The supervisee and I mutually decide the objectives and methods of observation.

14. A. Improvement occurs very slowly if the supervisee is left on his or her own; but when a supervisee and a staff group works together on a specific problem, the supervisee learns rapidly and his or her morale remains high.

B. Group activities may be enjoyable, but I find that individual, open discussion with a supervisee about a problem and its possible solutions leads to more sustained results.

15. When a workshop or meeting for supervisee and staff development is scheduled:
A. The supervisee and all staff who participated in the decision to hold the workshop or meeting should be expected to attend it.

B. Staff and supervisee, regardless of their role in forming a workshop or meeting, should be able to decide if the workshop or meeting is relevant to their personal or professional growth and, if not, should not be expected to attend.
SUPERVISORY BELIEFS INVENTORY

Student instructions: Circle either A or B for each item, based on HOW YOU EXPERIENCED YOUR SUPERVISOR’S BELIEFS AND VALUES ABOUT SUPERVISION while working with you. You may not completely agree with either choice, but choose the one that is closest to your supervisor’s beliefs and values.

My supervisor believes that....

1. A. Supervisors should give supervisees a large degree of autonomy and initiative within broadly defined limits.

B. Supervisors should give supervisees directions about methods that will help them improve their pastoral ministry.

2. A. It is important for supervisees to set their own goals and objectives for professional growth.

B. It is important for supervisors to help supervisees reconcile their personalities and pastoral styles with the philosophy and direction of the parish.

3. A. Supervisees are likely to feel uncomfortable and anxious if the objectives on which they will be evaluated are not clearly defined by the supervisor.

B. Evaluations of supervisees are meaningless if supervisees are not able to define with their supervisors the objectives for evaluation.

4. A. An open, trusting, warm, and personal relationship with the supervisee is the most important ingredient in supervising students.

B. A supervisor who is too intimate with supervisees risks being less effective and less respected than a supervisor who keeps a certain degree of professional distance from supervisees.

5. A. His or her role, as supervisor, during supervisory conferences is to make the interaction positive, to share realistic information, and to help supervisees plan their own solutions to problems.

B. The methods and strategies he or she uses with supervisees in a conference are aimed at our reaching agreement over the needs for future improvement.

6. In the initial phase of working with a supervisee:
A. He or she develops objectives with the supervisee that will help accomplish
parish goals.

B. He or she tries to identify the talents and goals of individual supervisees so they can work on their own improvement.

7. When several staff and supervisee have a similar pastoral problem, I prefer to:
A. Have the staff and supervisee form an ad hoc group and help them work together to solve the problem.
B. Help each one, on an individual basis, find their strengths, abilities, and resources so that each one finds his or her own solution to the problem.

8. The most important clue that a certain type of workshop or meeting is needed is when:
A. The supervisor perceives that several staff and supervisee lack knowledge or skill in a specific area which is resulting in low morale, undue stress, and less effective pastoral ministry.
B. Several staff and supervisee perceive the need to strengthen their abilities in the same pastoral area.

9. A. The supervisor should decide the objectives of a workshop or meeting since they have a broad perspective of the supervisee's and staff abilities and the needs of the parish.
B. Supervisee, staff and supervisor should reach consensus about the objectives of a workshop or meeting before it is held.

10. A. Supervisees who feel they are growing personally will be more effective in the parish than supervisees who are not experiencing personal growth.
B. The knowledge and ability of pastoral strategies and methods that have been proven over the years should be practiced by all supervisees to be effective in their ministry.

11. When he or she perceives that a supervisee might be correcting a staff person unnecessarily:
A. He or she explains, during a conference with the supervisee, why the behavior was excessive.
B. He or she asks the supervisee about the incident, but does not interject his or her judgment.
12. A. One effective way to improve supervisee performance is to formulate clear behavioral objectives and create meaningful incentives for achieving them.

B. Behavioral objectives are rewarding and helpful to some supervisees but stifling to others; also, some supervisees benefit from behavioral objectives in some situations but not in others.

13. During a pre-observation conference:
A. He or she suggests to the supervisee what he or she could observe, but let's the supervisee make the final decision about the objectives and methods of observation.

B. The supervisee and he or she mutually decide the objectives and methods of observation.

14. A. Improvement occurs very slowly if the supervisee is left on his or her own; but when a supervisee and a staff group works together on a specific problem, the supervisee learns rapidly and his or her morale remains high.

B. Group activities may be enjoyable, but he or she finds that individual, open discussion with a supervisee about a problem and its possible solutions leads to more sustained results.

15. When a workshop or meeting for supervisee and staff development is scheduled:
A. The supervisee and all staff who participated in the decision to hold the workshop or meeting should be expected to attend it.

B. Staff and supervisee, regardless of their role in forming a workshop or meeting, should be able to decide if the workshop or meeting is relevant to their personal or professional growth and, if not, should not be expected to attend.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING THE SUPERVISORY BELIEF INVENTORY:

Step 1. Circle your answer from the Inventory in the columns below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column I</th>
<th>Column II</th>
<th>Column III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>5A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>6B</td>
<td>7A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>7B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>8B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>9B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>10A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>11B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12A</td>
<td>12B</td>
<td>13B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>13B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14B</td>
<td>14A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15A</td>
<td>15B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2. Tally the number of circled items in each column and multiply by 6.7:

2.1 Total responses in Column I \( \times 6.7 = \) 

2.2 Total responses in Column II \( \times 6.7 = \) 

2.3 Total responses in Column III \( \times 6.7 = \) 

Step 3. Interpretation:

The product you obtained in step 2.1 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a DIRECTIVE approach to supervision, rather than either of the other two approaches. The product you obtained in step 2.2 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a COLLABORATIVE approach, and step 2.3 is an approximate percentage of how often you take a NON-DIRECTIVE approach. The approach on which you spend the greatest percentage of time is the supervisory model that dominates your beliefs. If the percentage values are equal or close to equal, you take an eclectic approach.
## PREACTIVE BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT

*(Supervisors)*

Each question is to be answered choosing one of the following categories *A.F.O.S.N.*

- **Always (A)**
- **Frequently (F)**
- **Occasionally (O)**
- **Seldom (S)**
- **Never (N)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would advise and even attempt to persuade the supervisee if considered necessary.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would directly report my feelings.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would show my desire to understand the supervisee as a person by checking my perception of his or her inner state.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would frankly tell the supervisee what to do if he or she were floundering.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would praise the supervisee when he or she displays insights into what I consider to be effective pastoral behavior.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would attempt to use silence as a deliberate response.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would attempt to explain or interpret the supervisee's behavior.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would offer information relevant to supervisee concerns which may or may not be used.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would try to take a general perspective when the supervisee expresses feelings.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I will disapprove of supervisee insights that do not adhere to what I understand by effective pastoral behaviors.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would suggest alternatives that could be tried.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would test to ensure that the message I receive is the one the supervisee sends.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would attempt to agree as much as possible with the supervisee.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would ask questions directly relevant to what the supervisee says.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would not shrink from arousing feelings of shame and unprofessionalism in the supervisee if I considered the pastoral performance less than satisfactory.</td>
<td>A F O S M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I would share information that has influenced my feelings and viewpoints.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would remind the supervisee of his or her expectations and mine.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I would change the subject without explanation, if I considered it necessary to do so.</td>
<td>A F O S N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREACTIVE BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT
(Students)

Answer each question as you experienced your supervisor functioning during supervision. Each question is to be answered choosing one of the following categories A.F.O.S.N.

Always (A) Frequently (F) Occasionally (O) Seldom (S) Never (N)

1. He or she would advise and even attempt to persuade the supervisee if considered necessary. A F O S N
2. He or she would directly report his or her feelings. A F O S N
3. He or she would show his or her desire to understand me as a person by checking his or her perception of my inner state. A F O S N
4. He or she would frankly tell me what to do if I were floundering. A F O S N
5. He or she would praise me when I displayed insights into what he or she considered to be effective pastoral behavior. A F O S N
6. He or she would attempt to use silence as a deliberate response. A F O S N
7. He or she would attempt to explain or interpret my behavior. A F O S N
8. He or she would offer information relevant to my concerns which may or may not be used. A F O S N
9. He or she would try to take a general perspective when I express feelings. A F O S N
10. He or she will disapprove of my insights that do not adhere to what he or she understands by effective pastoral behaviors. A F O S N
11. He or she would suggest alternatives that could be tried. A F O S N
12. He or she would test to ensure that the message he or she received is the one I sent. A F O S N
13. He or she would attempt to agree as much as possible with me. A F O S N
14. He or she would ask questions directly relevant to what I say. A F O S N
15. He or she would not shrink from arousing feelings of shame and unprofessionalism in me if he or she considered the pastoral performance less than satisfactory. A F O S M
16. He or she would share information that has influences on his or her feelings and viewpoints. A F O S N
17. He or she would remind me of my expectations and his or hers. A F O S N
18. He or she would change the subject without explanation, if he or she considered it necessary to do so. A F O S N
INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING THE PREACTIVE BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT:

1. Circle the following question numbers:
   3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17

2. Put and * in front of the circled item number if you responded:
   S (Seldom) or N (Never).

3. Count up the * in front of 3, 6, 12, 14.  Total = ___ (Maximum of 4)

4. Count up the * in front of 4, 5, 9, 10, 15, 17. Total = ___ (Maximum of 6)

5. For all 18 items, put a "1" in front of the question number if you responded: A (Always) or F (Frequently).

6. Transfer the "1"s from Step 5 to the box below.

7. Multiply the transferred "1"s by the given weight to arrive at an adjusted score for each question.

8. To the "Freeing" column, add the total from Step 4.

9. To the "Binding" column, add the total from Step 3.

10. Total adjusted scores plus respective totals from Step 3 or Step 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Adjusted Score</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Adjusted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total from Step 4 = ___</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Total from Step 3 = ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine constructive openness level, plot total adjusted freeing and binding scores on the Levels of Preactive and Interactive Verbal Communication (Constructive Openness) chart and draw a straight line between the two points.
Levels of Preactive and Interactive Verbal Communication (Constructive Openness)
# APPENDIX D: CATEGORIES FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES (THEMES)</th>
<th>DESCRIPTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor is teacher</td>
<td>educator, guide, coach, trainer, leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Responsible for linking theology with practice of ministry</td>
<td>praxis, theologizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responsible for relating religious values to needs of society</td>
<td>values, social justice, social awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resource for students</td>
<td>inform, information, resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Feedback to student</td>
<td>feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Role model for student</td>
<td>expert, competent, mentor, counselor, facilitator, sounding board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisor is manager</td>
<td>time keeper, overseer, administrator, director, data collector, advisor, systems analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisor has authority</td>
<td>liaison, link, advocate, father, priest, pastor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervisor is collegial</td>
<td>partner, team, co-worker, co-pastor, mutual, cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Relationship is personal</td>
<td>personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Relationship is intensive</td>
<td>accept, enable, empower, help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Relationship is intimate</td>
<td>trust, friend, care, concern, available, encourage, empathy accompany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Relationship is holistic</td>
<td>support, nurture, affirm, realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Supervision is intentional</td>
<td>planned, clear expectations, growing edges, self-directed, allow student to develop own gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supervision is structured</td>
<td>conference arranged, agenda planned, organized meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Supervision is disciplined</td>
<td>ordered, regular, commitment, weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Student entry into ministry</td>
<td>initiate, getting started, work out expectations, set learning goals, covenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Engagement in actual</td>
<td>scheduled work or tasks, observe student doing ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Recovery of data</td>
<td>written material, case study, listen, communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Analysis and reflection on student experience</td>
<td>share data, discuss, dialogue, interpretation, theological reflection, involved in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assessment and evaluation of student growth</td>
<td>examine experience, critique, in put from others, challenge, accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Plan for future</td>
<td>change goals, follow-up, suggestions, alternatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>