

THE ROLE OF CONTENT AND PROCESS IN PRINCIPAL'S SUPERVISORY
INTERVENTION ON THE CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
OF TEACHERS: THREE CASE STUDIES

by

CAROL-ANN HAYCOCK

B.Ed., The University of Alberta, 1971

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Department of Administrative, Adult and Higher Education

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

APRIL 1987

© Carol-Ann Haycock, 1987

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of *Administration, Adult, and Higher Education*
The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date *April 27, 1987*

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effects of the supervisory process on classroom teaching. Through examination of the supervisory conference setting, this study examined whether effective supervision required supervisors who practiced certain strategies as they dialogued with teachers in the conference, or whether discussion of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning alone was sufficient to bring about an improvement in classroom teaching practice.

This study also examined the effects of an intervention on school principals in their performance of the supervisory task. That is, the study sought to determine if supervisors transferred the research-verified knowledge and/or process strategies presented in workshop programs to the supervisory task, and, if so, what effect, if any, this had on teachers' classroom teaching performance (classroom management practices).

The research design was a case study of three supervision dyads which included two different treatments. Pre- and post-test data sources included supervisee classroom management performance, supervisory post-observation conferences, and conference participants' independent post-conference reactions.

Data analysis explored the relationships between classroom observation data and supervisory conference data, in each case, for evidence of improved practice on the part of the teacher in the classroom and on the part of the principal in the supervisory conference. The relationships among the teacher's classroom management practices, the supervisor's process strategies, the substantive content focus of the conference, and the differential treatments (workshops) received

careful examination. Through this approach the effects of many variables on teachers' classroom management performance were explored.

The supervisory experience appeared to be affected by the experience and/or professional confidence levels of both supervisors and supervisees, the openness of both supervisors and supervisees (as evidenced in the interactive nature of the conference), the level of content knowledge and supervisory process strategies employed by the supervisor in the conference setting, and the facilitating role played by the supervisor.

Where teachers were experienced and professionally confident, they appeared to find the supervisory process less threatening, and were more open and interactive in the conference setting, rendering the supervisory experience more effective.

Where supervisors were perceived as less threatening (low in experience and/or level of confidence), more knowledgeable, and sincere in their facilitating efforts (process strategies), the supervisory experience also appeared more effective.

The effects of the treatments on supervisors also appeared to be related to their level of experience and/or confidence, as well as their degree of openness. While the supervisors in this study transferred the knowledge and/or strategies learned to their performance of the supervisory task, the levels of application differed considerably.

The implications for practice, based on the limited findings of this study, suggest that the improvement of current supervisory practice may require a combination of several staff development programs designed to provide both partners involved in the supervisory process with opportunities to develop and/or enhance both the knowledge and/or the skills that appear necessary for effective supervision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|---|--|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | | xii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | xiii |
| | | |
| 1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE | | 1 |
| Background to the Study | | 1 |
| Purpose | | 1 |
| Research Questions | | 3 |
| Significance | | 3 |
| Assumptions and Limitations | | 5 |
| | | |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW | | 6 |
| Research on Clinical Supervision | | 6 |
| Studies of Participants' Perceptions | | 6 |
| Exploratory Studies of the Factors Contributing to Successful Clinical Supervision | | 8 |
| Studies of the Efficacy of Clinical Supervision | | 11 |
| Studies of Interpersonal Relationships in Clinical Supervision | | 12 |
| Studies of Classroom Management | | 15 |
| Summary | | 17 |
| | | |
| 3. RESEARCH DESIGN | | 19 |
| Data Sources | | 19 |
| Data Collection | | 20 |
| Reliability and Validity of Data-Gathering Devices | | 21 |
| Classroom Observation Instruments | | 21 |
| Post-Observation Conference Instruments | | 21 |
| Post-Conference Recall Instruments | | 21 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Data Analysis | 22 |
| Classroom Observation Data | 22 |
| Post-Observation Conference Data | 22 |
| Post-Conference Recall Data | 23 |
| Relationships Between Observation Data and Supervisory Conference Data | 23 |
| 4. CASE STUDY A | 25 |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 1) | 25 |
| Management of Instruction | 25 |
| Student Monitoring and Question Distribution | 26 |
| Organization of Students and Materials | 28 |
| Use of Time | 30 |
| Summary | 31 |
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 1) | 32 |
| Principal's Process Strategies | 32 |
| Questions | 33 |
| Feedback | 40 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 42 |
| Responses Expressing Agreement | 42 |
| Responses Providing Information | 43 |
| Responses Providing a Rationale | 44 |
| Reactions to the Principal's Feedback | 44 |
| Reactions to the Supervisory Experience | 45 |
| Summary | 47 |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 2) | 49 |
| Management of Instruction | 49 |
| Student on-task and off-task Behaviour | 49 |
| Student Behaviour and Teacher Positioning and Questioning | 54 |
| Gaining Student Attention | 55 |
| Summary | 56 |

| | |
|--|----|
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 2) | 57 |
| Principal's Process Strategies | 58 |
| Questions | 58 |
| Feedback | 59 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 61 |
| Responses Expressing Agreement | 61 |
| Responses Providing Information | 62 |
| Responses Providing a Rationale | 62 |
| Comparative Recall Data | 63 |
| Reactions to the Two Lessons | 64 |
| Reactions to the Supervisory Experience | 65 |
| Summary | 66 |
| | |
| OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE | 67 |
| Category Means and Change Scores Across All Categories | 68 |
| Mean Scores | 68 |
| Change Scores | 68 |
| No Change Categories | 68 |
| Positive Change Categories | 71 |
| | |
| 5. CASE STUDY B | 73 |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 1) | 73 |
| Management of Student Behaviour | 73 |
| Feeling Tone | 73 |
| Handling Inappropriate Student Behaviour | 74 |
| Management of Instruction | 77 |
| Standard Procedures | 77 |
| Lesson Pacing | 77 |
| Summary | 78 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 1) | 79 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Principal's Process Strategies | 81 |
| Questions | 81 |
| Feedback | 83 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 85 |
| Confused Expectations | 85 |
| Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Music | 88 |
| Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Teacher's Philosophy of Student Behaviour Management | 90 |
| Summary | 93 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 2) | 94 |
| Management of Student Behaviour | 95 |
| Classroom Routines | 95 |
| Handling Inappropriate Student Behaviour | 95 |
| Feeling Tone | 97 |
| Management of Instruction | 98 |
| Time on-task | 98 |
| Lesson Pacing | 99 |
| Summary | 100 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 2) | 101 |
| Principal's Process Strategies | 102 |
| Questions | 102 |
| Feedback | 103 |
| Recall Data | 107 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 108 |
| Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Music | 109 |
| Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Teacher's Philosophy of Student Behaviour Management | 111 |
| Recall Data | 112 |
| Summary | 114 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE | 115 |
| Category Means and Change Scores Across All Categories | 116 |
| Mean Scores | 116 |
| Change Scores | 119 |
| No Change Categories | 119 |
| Positive Change Categories | 119 |
| Negative Change Categories | 120 |
| | |
| 6. CASE STUDY C | 122 |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 1) | 122 |
| Management of Instruction | 122 |
| Transitions/Monitoring | 122 |
| Pacing | 125 |
| Questioning Strategies | 126 |
| Planning | 128 |
| Summary | 129 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 1) | 130 |
| Principal's Process Strategies | 132 |
| Questions | 132 |
| Feedback | 134 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 138 |
| Responses Providing a Rationale | 138 |
| Responses Providing a Rationalization | 139 |
| Recall Data | 139 |
| Summary | 141 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT (Round 2) | 142 |
| Management of Instruction | 142 |
| Pacing | 142 |
| Appropriateness of Student Activities | 147 |
| Transitions | 153 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Summary | 155 |
| | |
| PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES (Round 2) | 156 |
| Principal's Process Strategies | 156 |
| Questions | 157 |
| Feedback | 157 |
| Recall Data | 164 |
| Teacher's Process Strategies | 166 |
| Responses Providing Information | 166 |
| Responses Providing a Rationale | 167 |
| Responses Expressing Agreement, Surprise and/or Interest | 168 |
| Recall Data | 169 |
| Summary | 170 |
| | |
| OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE | 172 |
| Category Means and Change Scores Across All Categories | 173 |
| Mean Scores | 173 |
| Change Scores | 176 |
| No Change Categories | 176 |
| Positive Change Categories | 176 |
| Negative Change Categories | 178 |
| | |
| 7. INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS | 179 |
| CASE STUDY A | 179 |
| Substantive Content of Conference Discussions | 179 |
| Observed Classroom Performance | 179 |
| Supervisor's Process Strategies | 180 |
| Differential Treatment | 183 |
| | |
| CASE STUDY B | 185 |
| Substantive Content of Conference Discussions | 185 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Observed Classroom Performance | 185 |
| Supervisor's Process Strategies | 186 |
| Differential Treatment | 187 |
| | |
| CASE STUDY C | 190 |
| Substantive Content of Conference Discussions | 190 |
| Observed Classroom Performance | 190 |
| Supervisor's Process Strategies | 191 |
| Differential Treatment | 193 |
| | |
| COMPARATIVE FINDINGS | 195 |
| Supervisors' Experience and Confidence Levels | 195 |
| Supervisors' Roles | 196 |
| Supervisors' Roles and Treatments Received | 197 |
| Teachers' Experience and Confidence Levels | 198 |
| Teachers' Roles | 199 |
| Overall Effects of the Supervisory Experience | 201 |
| | |
| 8. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS | 203 |
| Summary | 203 |
| Conclusions | 206 |
| Confirmation of Previous Research Findings | 206 |
| Participants' Perceptions | 206 |
| Factors Contributing to Successful Clinical Supervision | 206 |
| The Efficacy of Clinical Supervision | 207 |
| Interpersonal Relationships in Clinical Supervision | 208 |
| Contributions to Knowledge | 210 |
| The Combination of Process Strategies and Content | 210 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Need for Content Knowledge in Teachers | 210 |
| The Experience and Professional Confidence Levels | 210 |
| The Impact of the Teacher's Role | 211 |
| The Need for a Conscious Supervisory Strategy | 211 |
| The Need to Move Beyond Teacher Awareness | 211 |
| The Teaching of Process Strategies and Content Knowledge to Supervisors | 211 |
| Implications | 212 |
| Implications for Further Research | 212 |
| Implications for Practice | 212 |
| REFERENCES | 215 |
| APPENDICES | 219 |

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 4.1 | Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher A's Observed Performance: An Overview of All Categories | 69 |
| 4.2 | Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher A | 70 |
| 5.1 | Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher B's Observed Performance: An Overview of All Categories | 117 |
| 5.2 | Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher B | 118 |
| 6.1 | Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher C's Observed Performance: An Overview of All Categories | 174 |
| 6.2 | Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher C | 175 |
| 7.1 | Direction of Change Within Category and Across All Categories by Teacher | 181 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to gratefully acknowledge the support of a number of people in seeing me through this process:

Peter Grimmett, my advisor, who inspired me to initiate such an undertaking and whose patient and wise counsel saw me through to completion. The breadth and depth of his knowledge, his conceptual ability, and his teaching ability are all truly awe-inspiring. I look forward to a continued professional association.

Ken Haycock, my husband, who is the light of my life in all things. His constant challenges, coupled with his constant belief and pride in me, ensure that I continue to grow in many ways.

Eirian Tzetzos and Donna Goldhawke, who put in countless hours of work on manuscript preparation. Their patience and calm is much appreciated.

Thank you all, for everything..

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Background to the Study

Debate about supervisory practice occurs at many levels in the educational system. Teachers deem it less than satisfactory and indicate it has little or no effect on their classroom teaching performance. Blumberg (1974, pp. 16-18) points out that teachers are critical of supervisors for being out of touch with the classroom, for communicating procedural trivia, and for engaging in a democratic game which makes the whole process artificial. Principals in ten British Columbia school districts reported supervision - related topics as top priorities in a study that analyzed their professional development needs (Storey, 1978, pp 92-93). And university-level educators would like to incorporate research-verified knowledge and skills that would stand the test of practice in administrator preparation programs (Hills, 1975, p.1).

Yet there is a lack of empirically based knowledge about the supervision process. More importantly, there is a lack of knowledge about its effects on classroom teaching. If supervision does, or can, contribute to teacher development, as evidenced by improved classroom teaching performance, then what are the strategies and/or knowledge that supervisors utilize in bringing about this effect?

Purpose

This study seeks to examine the effects of the supervisory conference process on supervisee classroom teaching. It also seeks to examine the impact of an intervention (i.e., a workshop or workshops) on school level supervisors and the

transfer of this effect to their supervision of teachers.

It builds on a preliminary study (Grimmett, 1982) which found that certain supervisory process strategies (questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) were used by supervisors whose supervisees showed some evidence of developmental growth as a result of the supervision experience. The questioning strategies identified were: open-ended, apprising, focusing and task-orienting. The exploration procedures identified were: holding questions in abeyance; retrieving questions to be probed; probing for teacher clarification, analysis and insight; supervisor "press" towards teacher autonomy; and withholding expertise but not support. Since these supervisors were also capable of functioning at a highly complex conceptual level, it was tentatively concluded that for instructional supervision to be effective, supervisors must be capable of understanding and practicing the complex process strategies and procedures involved in the supervisory intervention.

What the previous study did not take into account was the role played by the content of conference discussions in the developmental growth of supervisees. Accordingly, this study seeks to examine the effects of supervisor process strategies and content knowledge about teaching and learning on the observable classroom performances of supervisees.

If the assumption is made that a process in and of itself, without content, is not very helpful, the question that may be posed is, "Is content alone enough?". If the assumption is also made that supervisors have a grasp of the content, then, in comparing and contrasting process plus content versus content alone, this study seeks to determine the extent to which the process strategies facilitate the internalization of content knowledge by supervisees.

The purposes of this study, then, are to investigate the relationship between:

- a) supervisory process strategies accompanied by research-verified content knowledge about teaching and learning (i.e., process and content);
- b) supervisory research-verified content knowledge about teaching and learning (i.e., content alone)

and effective supervision, as indicated by an improvement in supervisee classroom management practices, in terms of physical room arrangement, management of student behaviour, and management of instruction.

Research Questions

1. What is the impact of research-verified content knowledge about classroom management and process strategies combined on the supervisory conference, as indicated by improved supervisee classroom management practices?
2. What is the impact of research-verified content knowledge about classroom management only (as distinct from classroom management knowledge and process strategies) on the supervisory conference, as indicated by improved supervisor classroom management practices?

Significance

The significance of this study lies in the findings it may provide about the relationship between supervisory process strategies used, content knowledge about teaching and learning, and supervisee developmental growth. This process plus content versus content alone investigation is examined in light of positive effects on supervisee teaching.

Specifically, the study examines whether effective supervision requires supervisors who practice certain strategies and procedures as they dialogue with teachers in

the conference, or whether research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning (for example, the role of classroom management in student learning) alone, is sufficient to bring about an improvement in the classroom teaching of supervisees.

The study could demonstrate that process strategies combined with content are associated with positive effects on supervisee teaching. If this is the case, this would hold implications for the training of instructional supervisors. It would suggest that supervisors need to be exposed to more than just the substantive findings emanating from recent research on teaching. Rather, they need, as well, to acquire the process strategies that enable them to elicit a considered analysis of teaching behaviour from the supervisee, based on such findings, in a situationally meaningful way.

The study could, however, demonstrate that content knowledge about teaching and learning alone is associated with positive effects on supervisee teaching and that process strategies are not that consequential. If this is the case, then the training of supervisors could be designed around the presentation of current classroom research findings as a means of facilitating supervisory observation and analysis of teaching-learning situations.

This study may contribute, then, to an understanding of the role played by supervision in affecting teacher classroom performance. Where a role is clearly established, it may contribute to an understanding of how supervisory practice can be made more effective. The significance of this study, then, lies in its examination of the factors which render the supervisory process effective and, more importantly, in its examination of whether or not those factors, when introduced to supervisors, are / can be transferred by them to their performance

of the supervisory task. Such findings may have significance for peer supervision as well as for in-service training of teachers. The findings, more importantly, may also have implications for in-service training of supervisors.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions

The following assumptions underlie this study:

1. That the relationship that exists between supervisors and supervisees can be examined through an analysis of overt conference behaviour and concurrent thought processes.
2. That the verbal reports of conference interactive thoughts, elicited from supervision participants through the introspective research method called stimulated recall, may be regarded as accurate representation of the actual thought processes.
3. That the effects of treatments on supervisory practice in some way influence teachers' classroom practice.
4. That if teachers display certain classroom practices, those associate with improved student learning.

Limitations

The use of a case study approach means it is not possible to know how generalizable these findings are beyond the cases looked at. The voluntary nature and small size of the sample also restricts the generalizability of the findings. Further, contextual variables, such as type of school, grade level, etc., were not controlled in order to standardize the task environment in which supervisory intervention takes place.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision was first conceived as an educational idea in the late 1950's and early 1960's by Morris Cogan, Robert Goldhammer, and Robert Anderson through their work with graduate intern teachers at Harvard. Based on the principles of collegiality and collaboration, clinical supervision implies an open, supportive supervisory relationship which is based on mutual trust and respect. The fivestep process proposed by Goldhammer has as its goal the improvement of teachers' instructional analysis skills and, subsequently, their classroom teaching performance.

While much has been written about clinical supervision, there is a paucity of empirical research in this area. Research studies that have been conducted fall into four categories: studies of participants' perceptions of clinical supervision, studies which explore the factors contributing to successful clinical supervision, studies of the efficacy of the clinical approach to instructional supervision, and studies of the interpersonal relationships in clinical supervision. The studies in each of these categories are reviewed here, as a background to this study. As well, the current research on classroom management is reviewed.

Studies of Participants' Perceptions

Most of these studies consist of surveys (i.e., questionnaires and opinionnaires) which provide self-report data about the extent to which the basic assumptions and procedures of clinical supervision are acceptable.

Eaker (1972) examined teachers' and administrators' level of agreement with a hypothetical description of clinical supervision, through a questionnaire. Teachers agreed more strongly with the assumptions of clinical supervision than with its procedures. Administrators were stronger in their agreement with both the assumptions and procedures than were teachers.

Myers (1975) examined the effect of general and clinical supervision on the attitude of teachers towards supervision and on teacher self-image. The attitude of teachers involved in clinical supervision was found to be more positive, but no significant difference was found in teacher self-image.

Arbucci (1978) examined the relationship between the implementation of clinical supervision and the attitude of staff toward supervision. Findings indicated no significant difference in attitude scores between the control and experimental group. There was a significant difference in the time spent on supervision between the two groups. Lack of time was identified as an impediment to the practice of clinical supervision. Arbucci concluded that the school context could strongly influence the adoption or rejection of clinical supervision.

Smyth and Strachan (1981) studied participants' perceptions following training in clinical supervision and its implementation in elementary school settings. Participants reported they valued the collegial interaction afforded by the clinical supervision process and appreciated its focus on data rather than on impressionistic value judgements. Teachers indicated they found clinical supervision valuable as a method of focusing on their own classroom concerns and as a form of professional development.

Bisbee (1983) examined teacher attitudes toward clinical supervision following

participation in it, in conjunction with a staff development program on teacher effectiveness. While the study revealed a positive attitude towards clinical supervision, the effect of the staff development program was unclear.

Scime (1984) investigated the differences in perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the extent to which the objectives of clinical supervision were being met. Administrators felt the objectives of clinical supervision were being met to a greater extent than did teachers. Teachers perceived clinical supervision as supportive and as helpful in increasing their awareness and understanding of their teaching behaviours. However, teachers also perceived a lack of increase in trust, rapport, and communication between administrators and teachers in the clinical supervision process.

In general, these findings indicate that the basic assumptions of clinical supervision are more acceptable to teachers and administrators than the actual procedures at a practical level. These studies, then, contribute little to knowledge of the practical operation of the clinical supervision process.

Exploratory Studies of the Factors Contributing to Successful Clinical Supervision

Several studies in this category examined the factors contributing to effective clinical supervision. Mershon (1972) explored the analysis process used in clinical supervision and identified fourteen analytical subskills used to facilitate the discussion of teaching-learning situations. Mattalino (1977) also explored the key competencies required for effective supervision and concluded that the lack of definitive competencies makes clinical supervision less accepted than it could be. In a more recent study, Kilbourn (1982) identified three important factors which contribute to successful or effective clinical supervision: (1) autonomy, or the

teachers' ability to analyze and control their own teaching, (2) evidence, from observation and data analysis, providing the basis of changes and actions, and (3) continuity, so that any point in the clinical supervision process honors the context of events leading to it.

Boulet (1981) explored the process of clinical supervision through case studies and found that administrators accepted clinical supervision as a valid alternative and favoured a priority shift, to allow more time for supervision. Teachers in this study also expressed satisfaction with changes in supervisory practices by administrators.

Other studies examined the supervisor-teacher relationship in the setting of the clinical conference. Pierce (1978) studied the relationship between administrators' pedagogical moves and aspects of their managerial abilities and found a significant relationship between the moves of structuring and reacting and the administrator's degree of decisiveness.

Cook (1976) examined whether supervisors evidenced changes in perception and behaviour while being trained in clinical supervision. As a result of training and increased understanding and acceptance of the complexity of the supervisory role, developmental changes, such as "other-centredness", were demonstrated by supervisors in their relationships with teachers in the supervisory conference.

Zonca (1972) explored the effects of openness in the clinical supervision relationship on the teacher. Openness was defined in terms of disclosure, directness, and honesty. Openness had positive effects on the supervisee's attitude towards supervision and on their ability to analyze their own classroom teaching, but not on their ability to analyze changes made in their classroom teaching. Squires (1978) found that a collegial relationship begins to develop as

the supervisee becomes more autonomous. In light of these findings, communication patterns that elicit a considered analysis of teaching behaviour from the supervisee may be more effective than "openness", in terms of honest directness.

T. G. Kerr (1976) explored whether teachers with high and low dogmatism scores could, as a result of clinical supervision, move from direct to indirect teaching behaviours. He found that all teachers could adopt more indirect teaching patterns. He also found that more open-minded teachers displayed a greater willingness to enter into a dialogue with supervisors.

Grimmett (1982) explored how participants mediated their behaviour as they dialogued in the supervisory conference. He found that supervisors "read" and "flex" to supervisees and supervisees exert "pull" on supervisors. Grimmett and Housego (1983) and Grimmett (1984) found that supervisee growth occurred where supervisors were constructively open in their verbal communication and conceptually complex in their thought processes and used adaptation procedures that facilitated development in supervisees.

Champagne and David (1985) examined the development of the supervisory relationship over time. The two factors of importance to the supervisory relationship were teacher trust in the supervisor (based on the supervisor's willingness to spend time observing and discussing the instructional situation) and the teacher's view of the supervisor as competent. Supervisors perceived three things as helpful to the supervisory relationship: (1) the teacher's interest, (2) reciprocal liking and teacher approval of supervisor's methods, and (3) teacher attempts to implement ideas discussed.

These exploratory studies contribute to an empirical knowledge of the analytical

competencies required for successful implementation of clinical supervision and to an understanding of the supervisory relationship in the conferencing process.

Studies of the Efficacy of Clinical Supervision

The studies in this category examined the effects of clinical supervision on supervisory practice, supervisors' behaviour and classroom teaching behaviour. Coffey (1967) found some changes in teachers' verbal classroom behaviour as a result of clinical supervision. However, these effects were the result of a single session in-service program. The effects of an on-going supervisory cycle were not measured. Garman (1971) found teachers receiving clinical supervision and methods courses were able to implement behaviours which those teachers receiving only methods courses were not. Rather than demonstrating the effects of clinical supervision on classroom teaching behaviour, however, this study demonstrates the usefulness of supervision as opposed to no supervision.

Skarak (1973) examined the differential effects of clinical supervision and clinical supervision combined with the use of immediate secondary reinforcement strategies during classroom observation, on classroom teaching behaviour. Clinical supervision was found to be as effective alone as in combination. Shuma (1973) found students perceived changes in teacher behaviour where they had been supervised along clinical as opposed to traditional lines. The Hawthorne effect must be taken into account in this study though, since students were aware their teachers were receiving special supervision.

B. J. Kerr (1976) investigated the effects of using feedback data within the clinical supervision process to facilitate teachers' individualization of instruction. It was found that feedback data used in the supervisory conference increased teacher awareness of, and ability to evaluate, their instructional processes and to

choose appropriate teaching strategies for further individualizing instruction. Krajewski (1976), in studying the differential effects of clinical supervision accompanied by training in interaction analysis, found significant changes in the experimental group's teaching behaviours. However, training in the Flander's interaction analysis system could have influenced these findings.

Reavis (1977) examined the differences in verbal exchanges between supervisors and teachers in both clinical and traditional supervision. Significant differences were found in the clinical supervision situations. Since this study compared the same supervisors exhibiting two alternative patterns of supervision, it may have tested whether supervisors could adopt different patterns of behaviour rather than testing the effects of different approaches to supervision.

As indicated, several of the studies in this category were subject to methodological weaknesses or the possibility of the Hawthorne effect. While the findings may be viewed with some reservations, they do lend support to the efficacy of clinical supervision in changing teacher classroom behaviours and in providing an instructional supervision process with assumptions, goals and procedures which are acceptable to teachers and administrators.

Studies of Interpersonal Relationships in Clinical Supervision

Several researchers examined interpersonal relationships in the context of clinical supervision.

Squires (1978) examined supervisors' perceptions of a positive supervisory experience and found the collegial relationship between supervisor and supervisee increased as supervisee autonomy increased and concern about evaluation decreased as supervisee trust and technical competence increased.

Witt (1978) examined the relationship between supervisors' leadership behaviour and their supervisory conference behaviour, as perceived by teachers. Teachers perceived no relationship between leadership behaviour and supervisory conference behaviour. The researcher indicates these findings may have been affected by the sample size (152 teachers and 18 supervisors) and low reliability scores.

Mears (1981) examined the supervisory relationship of student teachers and supervisors and found a significant relationship between supervisee perceptions of the conference and supervisee morale and interaction with the supervisor.

Desrochers (1982) explored conference behaviours and verbal interaction. The hypothesis that the supervisor's verbal behaviour in the supervisory conference affected the teacher's perceptions of the supervisor's credibility was tested. Teachers rated those supervisors who used a direct style in their verbal interaction as more credible than those who used an indirect style. Justified recommendations were perceived by teachers as more credible than unjustified ones. The researcher concluded that supervisors who do not use justification should be direct and supervisors who use an indirect supervisory style should use justification to be viewed as credible by supervisees.

O'Neal and Edwards (1983) examined verbal interaction and conference content. Supervisory conferences were analyzed from the point-of-view of "process" (who did the talking and to whom talk was directed) and from the point-of-view of "content" (the nature of the topics discussed). "Process" referred to the flow of verbal interactions rather than "communication skills", such as questioning strategies or exploration procedures. Supervisors tended to dominate the conference "process" (i.e., verbal interactions) by reviewing or commenting on

classroom events and/or giving specific directions. Conference "content" was most often about teaching activities.

Two other studies focused on conference content. Sahling (1981) compared the clinical supervision process as applied in a New York City school system with the formulations of Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969), the initiators of clinical supervision. Conferences were dominated by supervisors, who asked nine out of ten questions and structured three out of four topics. Thus it was the supervisor who tended to dictate what was and was not discussed. Although teachers talked more than supervisors, it was about topics introduced by the supervisor. Teachers basically played a reflective role. Such findings indicate the basic principle of collegiality, espoused by Goldhammer and Cogan, was not evident.

Conference content related to teacher activities rather than to students' involvement and interaction in the lesson. Given this missing element in conference discussions, the findings indicate the basic objectives of improving instruction, also espoused by Goldhammer and Cogan, were not fully realized. While some aspects of the clinical supervision process examined in this study coincided with the intentions of Goldhammer and Cogan, several areas did not. Sahling suggests that the major difficulty appeared to be in the attempt to combine supervision for the improvement of instruction with supervision for teacher evaluation.

Jacobson (1984) examined the content, source, and type of evaluation information provided in the supervisory conference. Feedback, though deemed as insufficient by supervisees, was viewed as relevant, and supervisees were satisfied with what happened during the conference.

Grimmett (1982) examined the clinical supervision conference relationship, focusing on participant's verbal dialogue and thought processes. He found that differences in supervisory conference performance could be explained by "structural variations" in participants' dialogue and thoughts. Certain "process strategies" (i.e., questioning techniques and exploration procedures) were utilized by supervisors whose supervisees showed some evidence of developmental growth as a result of the supervisory conference experience.

McNergney et al (1983) examined the relationship between training in clinical supervision and supervisors' abilities to work with teachers. The prevalent patterns evident in supervisor-teacher behaviour were as follows. Supervisor talk related to the giving of and asking for information, making supportive statements, and giving opinions. Teacher talk responded to the supervisor's initiations and included positive comments related to the social-emotional climate of the conference. The problems expressed by supervisors were feelings of anxiety, equipment failure, concentrating on the task, and conference timing and logistics problems. Supervisors proposed the improvement of conference techniques by making them more collaborative, establishing better rapport, and asking for more information.

These studies suggest that evidence of a collegial relationship in the supervisory conference setting increases with increased supervisor competence and credibility and increased supervisee autonomy and trust.

Studies of Classroom Management

A review of the research findings related to classroom management shows that it consists of more than strict discipline and control of behaviour problems when they arise (i.e., desist techniques or reactive responses). Rather, studies indicate

that effective classroom management is preventative.

Kounin (1970) and his associates examined video-tapes of eighty classrooms to study discipline; particularly how teachers handled misbehaviour. They observed that effective and ineffective classroom managers were similar in their handling of discipline problems when they arose. Kounin went on to discover that the preventative nature of a teacher's classroom organization meant fewer disruptions and less inappropriate student behaviour. Through his analysis, he identified the dimensions of classroom management that consistently related to good behaviour and student work involvement. Kounin defined and described those characteristic behaviours that effective classroom managers have in common as: withitness, overlapping, smoothness and momentum, group alerting and accountability, valence and challenge arousal, seat work variety and challenge. Kounin also found a significant relationship between effective classroom management and student ontask behaviour.

Arlin (1979) found that when teachers structure transitions by providing directions and/or close monitoring and feedback, off-task rates are significantly reduced.

The most significant current research on classroom management is coming out of the Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education at the University of Texas, Austin. This research supports and builds on Kounin's findings. Evertson, Emmer et al (1982, 1984) report both longitudinal descriptive studies and experimental field studies that focus on how teachers organized and managed a class at the beginning of the year and maintained the management throughout the year. This research resulted in the production of a manual for elementary teachers and one for junior high teachers, describing effective classroom management principles and providing guidelines.

The Texas research demonstrates that effective classroom managers identify rules and procedures early, teach these during the first days or weeks of school, and monitor student compliance with the management system throughout the year.

Based on the Kounin and Texas research, classroom management, for purposes of this study, is operationally defined as consisting of those factors affecting room arrangement, student behaviour management and instructional management.

Summary

Studies of participants' perceptions indicate that the basic assumptions and procedures of clinical supervision are acceptable to teachers and principals at the level of logic, rather than in actual practice.

Exploratory studies of the factors contributing to effective clinical supervision identify teacher analysis and control of their teaching, change based on observation data and analysis, and continuity in the supervision process. Other factors identified include supervisor communication patterns that demonstrate "other-centredness" and constructive openness and teacher communication patterns that demonstrate low dogmatism and a high level of trust in the supervisor.

Studies of interpersonal relationships in clinical supervision suggest that evidence of a collegial relationship in the supervisory conference setting increases with increased supervisor competence and credibility and increased supervisee autonomy and trust.

Studies of the efficacy of clinical supervision suggest this instructional supervision process can effect positive changes in teacher classroom behaviour.

Studies of classroom management indicate that effectiveness is related to the establishment and maintenance of a preventative management system rather than to the use of reactive responses.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research design is a case study of three supervision dyads where comparison of the differential effects of two treatments with no treatment is made. The study includes two different treatments and three different dyads. These dyads, each consisting of a supervisor and supervisee, are referred to as Case A, Case B, and Case C. The following table depicts the design:

| | |
|--------|--|
| Case A | Treatment 1 (supervisor receives workshops on process and content) |
| Case B | Treatment 2 (supervisor receives workshops on content only) |
| Case C | No treatment |

The two treatments are the independent variables. The intervening variables are the extent to which the supervisor can practice the process strategies and/or utilize the content that s/he has been exposed to. The classroom performance of supervisees in classroom management is the dependent variable. All three dyads are tested on the dependent variable using a pre-test and post-test.

Participants for the study were selected by the district to be representative of the total population of teachers and administrators in the district.

Data Sources

Three major sources of data were used in this study. They are:

- 1) supervisee classroom management performance in the three areas of:

- a) physical classroom arrangement: traffic patterns, degree of visibility;
 - b) management of student behaviour: appropriate and inappropriate, disruptions and interruptions, transitions and group management;
 - c) management of instruction: learning objectives, rules and procedures, clarity of directions, transitions, pacing, monitoring, use of instructional time.
- 2) supervisor/supervisee post-observation conferences
 - 3) supervisor and supervisee independent post-conference reactions.

Data Collection

Three instruments were used to collect the data, which are both quantitative and qualitative. They are:

- 1) a coding instrument to measure the quality of the teacher's classroom management practices (See Appendix)
- 2) a video-tape of the supervisor/supervisee post-observation conference
- 3) an audio-tape of supervisor and supervisee independent reactions to the supervision experience and, specifically, the supervisory conference.

Pre-test data were gathered as follows:

Supervisee classroom performance was observed and coded at the same time as the supervisor was observing. The ensuing post-conference was video-recorded. The video-recorded session was viewed with the supervisor and supervisee independently and their reactions to the conferencing process audio-recorded.

Post-test data were collected in the same manner, following the different treatments. In all, six classroom performances were observed and coded and six

post-conferences were video-recorded, and twelve responses to the post-conferences audio-recorded over a period of three to four months. Each classroom and conference coding was undertaken by at least two coders.

Reliability and Validity of Data-Gathering Devices

Classroom Observation Instruments Reliability of the classroom observation data were established as follows: Observation data was recorded by two recorders. Immediately following the observation the two recorders dialogued about their independent observations and their ratings on the component rating scale.

The validity of the component rating scale was established through the research on classroom management conducted by The Research and Development Centre for Teacher Evaluation at the University of Texas, Austin.

Post-Observation Conference Instruments Reliability of the post-observation conference was established through video recording the conference. Validity was established through using the video camera only (i.e. an operator was not present) for recording purposes. After two or three minutes the participants tend no longer to be conscious of the camera, while they may be affected by a camera operator throughout the recording session.

Post-Conference Recall Instruments Validity of the post-conference reactions was established through the researcher making no attempt to initiate discussion of the video-taped post-observation conference. Each participant viewed the tape independently, with the researchers, and was asked to stop the tape and comment when they recalled thoughts processed during the conference and/or they had reactions to the supervision experience as they viewed it. The researchers only commented, or asked questions, on those parts in the conference raised by participants. In this way, it is hoped the limitations of self-report data, where

participants attempt to answer questions in the way they think the interviewer is leading them, particularly in socially threatening situations such as supervision, were offset.

Reliability of the post-conference reactions was established through more than one person coding the contents of the audio-tapes.

Data Analysis

Classroom Observation Data

Classroom observation records and component rating scales were analyzed to ascertain both qualitatively and quantitatively whether or not (and if so, to what extent) there were changes in the observed classroom management practices of the teachers from the first to the second observation. An overall "before" and "after" profile was created for each teacher by computing a mean score from the component rating scales.

Post-Observation Conference Data Conference video-tapes were analyzed to ascertain both qualitatively and quantitatively whether or not there were changes in the interaction of supervisor and supervisee in terms of a) substantive focus on classroom management, and b) process skills.

- a) Substantive focus on classroom management: Each video-tape was analyzed for the amount of specific substantive content about classroom management that took place in the conference dialogue.
- b) Process strategies: Each video-tape was analyzed for the nature and extent of process strategies (questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) employed by the supervisor.

Post-Conference Recall Data

The stimulated recall and interview transcripts developed from the pre and post audio-tapes, were analyzed for a) the substantive content that emerged in the recalled thoughts, comments and reactions of each participant, and b) indicators of process strategies being employed by the supervisor, as they watched the video of the conference.

Relationships Between Observation Data and Supervisory Conference Data

This analysis explored the relationships in each case for evidence of improved practice on the part of the teacher in the classroom and on the part of the principal in the supervisory conference. The relationships among the teacher's classroom management practices, the supervisor's process strategies, the substantive content focus of the conference, and the differential treatments (workshops) received careful examination. Through this approach the effects of many variables on a teacher's classroom management performance were explored.

Initially, a comparative analysis of the data from the first and second rounds of conferences and classroom observations was undertaken. The classroom management practices identified by the principal in the supervisory conference setting were partialled out from the conference data sets and the classroom observation data. A comparative analysis of the resulting data sets identified the changes in the teacher's classroom management practices that may be linked to the principal's performance as an instructional supervisor.

Next, the identified changes were analyzed in terms of evidence of supervisor process strategies, and/or content knowledge. The results of this analysis permitted inferences regarding which of these variables or combinations thereof had an impact on the teacher's classroom management practices.

Finally, the results of this analysis were further examined in terms of study grouping, or workshop "intervention", to determine the differential effects of the treatments on the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task.

Chapter 4

CASE STUDY A: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF CONFERENCE DISCUSSION (ROUND 1)

The lesson under discussion in this twenty-three minute conference is a grade four/five math lesson. The grade four lesson deals with the concept of congruency among various geometric shapes. The grade five lesson deals with the concept of division with fractions. The math lesson begins with all students involved in a daily review of the basic operations with different groups working under different time constraints for the drill. The teacher then spends some direct instructional time with each grade level, while the other grade level is working on independent practice.

The content of the conference discussion revolves around the classroom management theme of managing instruction. The principal opens the conference with reference to the pre-conference discussion of purposes for the observation. The principal proposed to identify those things in the lesson which were related to the research on classroom management and its bearing on teaching effectiveness. The teacher asked that the principal also observe the behaviour of a particular student. The latter does not become a significant part of the conference discussion, since the principal did not observe the student engaged in any disruptive behaviour during the lesson.

Management of Instruction

The focus on this theme throughout the conference involves discussion of student monitoring and question distribution, the organization of students and materials, and the use of time.

Student Monitoring and Question Distribution

Both conference participants use the terms "getting around" and "checking" in reference to monitoring.

The teacher suggests that monitoring is,

"quite easy with the split. Because I'm only ever working with thirteen or fourteen kids at the most, I can get around to everybody, without everybody sitting waiting for me to finish." (126-129).

In the discussion the principal focuses on the static positioning of the teacher when monitoring.

P: "I had one question on the monitoring. When you were going around, you were going around and checking on the work, and I just wanted to know if you realized that you tended to be standing in one spot most of the time?" (229-232)

The teacher responds in surprise at this feedback.

T: "No I didn't. That's good to know. I went to Susan's desk a lot because Susan has difficulty. I always do tend to go around that area. I think it's partly because of the way the kids are sitting ... But I should move around more I think, yes." (233-240)

In the recall data, the teacher comments further on her positioning while teaching and wonders if it is subject specific or generalizable.

"I would like to have more observations to see if I am indeed always going to the same spot ... in math I do tend to hang around there. That's the way I teach math most effectively. But it would be interesting to see if I do the same thing with other subjects." (255-261)

The principal goes on to relate the teacher's static positioning to the distribution of questions in working with each of the grade levels.

"... it seemed to me that at times you were concentrating your questions, which were good, in the grade fours anyway, with the people at the back. Ah, and it seemed to be the opposite with the grade fives, at times concentrating on the front people." (286-290)

In the recall data the principal further elaborates on this point.

"It became evident when she was teaching the grade fours she was standing in one spot and she seemed to be keying on the back people only. There were four. And, you know, when she would monitor she would try to look at kids' books over other people's. You know, that sort of thing. And that's what I was trying to get at there" (970-975)

Later, in the interview, he goes on to suggest why he thinks the teacher used the monitoring and questioning patterns she did in the lesson.

"I suspected she would normally not do that. But, being aware of us, she may have felt a bit insecure, and it seems to me that she was going for the right answer ... She actually ignored one girl who had her hand up at the front ..." (1329-1336)

In the teacher's recall data she also makes reference to her questioning distribution. Although she speaks in non-specific terms about her reason for the patterns identified, what she says does not appear to correspond to the rationale proposed by the principal.

"... when he said I was directing my questions to the back of the grade four group, it's nice to know I'm doing it, and I think I'm doing it for a reason, but it's nice to have that sort of verbalized. I wasn't aware that I was doing it. Um, and I don't actually think in that case that there was anything wrong with it. I was doing it for a reason, but it's nice to know that you're doing these things and it's also nice if you can justify why you're doing it." (671-678)

One of the interesting features of this aspect of the conference dialogue is that, although claiming twice that her question distribution has a rationale, at no time does she explicate it. The teacher thereby acknowledges her static positioning during questioning while appearing to refute the need to do anything about it. In the conference session the principal further pursues the teacher's questioning, with a specific reference to wait time.

"I'm thinking of Tony Parker, where you asked a question and ah, he, he wasn't, he immediately didn't answer, and you allowed another student to answer." (310-313)

The teacher agrees with this observation.

"I know, and that's a fault that I do have; that I don't wait long enough. I don't give kids long enough, sometimes, to marshall their thoughts." (318-321)

The principal makes further reference to this incident in his recall data.

"... when she did ask Tony Parker ... who had trouble. You know, she didn't have that wait time ..." (1339-1341)

In the teacher's recall data she comments.

"It's really good for me to sit in this situation and be reminded of that, because I know it's a fault ..." (324-325)

"Wait time", then, becomes a construct around which both supervisor and teacher see needed improvement. Whether both operationalize it in terms of the teacher not allowing weaker students sufficient time to marshall their thoughts is not clear. In other words, the shared understanding about "wait time" may indeed be quite superficial.

Organization of Students and Materials

The initial discussion here relates to the organization of students and teaching time in a "split class".

P: "And withitness means you're aware of what's going on at all times and you, you demonstrated that where you had to tell students ... for example, in the grade fives, 'I'll be with you in a minute, and you did it in a very calm way that didn't really detract from what you were trying to do with the grade fours. (341-343) (362-364)

T: "No, they're used to being in a split ... They're pretty aware of that fact, that when I'm teaching a group it's very important, that they just have to wait ..." (366-368)

Further discussion ensues and the teacher concludes,

"It's organization. It's basically organization. Once the kids understand that you have a limited amount of time to give them, then they learn to use that time fairly wisely, and it is organization skills you know." (393-396)

The organization of student materials for the lesson is also discussed.

P: "Research has stated that sometimes a lot of time is wasted shifting materials and books. Maybe you just get the kids to have their books ready and their text books and everything." (399-407)

T: "The problem with that math book business is that their desks aren't big enough to keep both their books in their desks. And so we had to decide which one we don't use very often and, unfortunately, it was the one we wanted today, so they all had the one we normally use ready and they had to go and find the other one. But that's a physical problem as well." (408-413)

The principal selects the teacher's organization of materials for teaching the concept of division of fractions to the grade fives as a major focus of the conference discussion.

P: "You know perhaps I missed it. You know, you had them cutting out the circles and then dividing them into thirds." (443-444)

P: "... you had the example four times three times one-half equals six, and the kids had made six two-thirds, right? ... Now did you, did you point that out? That it works out mathematically and it worked out manually? They got the same answer? Do you see what I mean?" (461-463) (465-467)

T: "Yes and I probably didn't. I think I did as I was going around to some of the kids, but I don't think I did with the class and that's a good point ... see that's the whole point for doing this." (468 ... 480)

The principal goes on to make a specific suggestion about how the concept might be made much clearer through the use of concrete visual aids.

"Yeh, and maybe a way to do it is to, I don't know, an opaque projector, you'd have the working parts and could actually show them the relationship." (483-387)

The teacher agrees and points out that she did have the equipment available and decided not to use it because she had used that approach in the previous lesson. She goes on to indicate that the teaching of that concept is not completed.

"... I do feel that I missed that out, but I also think I probably would have picked it up. Like I don't feel that I've finished that lesson. I don't, like, want you to think that I've finished the lesson." (505-508)

Both conference participants make further reference to this in the recall data.

P: "Okay, this is my major concern. Alright? I may have missed it, I don't think I did. This is my major, ah, I guess thing to be considered, because it dealt with the actual learning of a concept." (1177-1180)

T: "This is really important. This was something he noticed that I had failed to do and it was a really important part of the math concept, so I was really glad he picked up on it. I had not related the answers back to the concrete circles they were using ... so I was really pleased to hear that, 'cause that's something I can pick up on on Monday." (446-455)

Both supervisor and teacher agree, then, on the need to relate the concept being taught more directly to the concrete materials the students are manipulating. This lack of clear integration represents a serious omission in both their opinions.

Use of Time

The teacher's major focus in the discussion of time is on running out of time in the lesson, which is also related to the teaching of the concept of division of fractions.

T: "I ran out of time. Like I would have liked more time because normally my math period goes right through and so I would have had more time to finish. So my lesson plan was too long." (12-15)

T: "... I didn't find it an uncomfortable situation. Except at the end, when I was running out of time. I thought, 'Uh oh, I'm not going to be able to get all this done.' But I thought, 'well, that's the way it goes.' And the grade fives anyway, I wasn't expecting to complete the concepts. I'll be reviewing it again in the next couple of days." (436-441)

The principal's focus is on student attentiveness, which he refers to as "time-on-task".

P: "... they seemed really on-task. They all knew what was expected of them." (27-28)

P: "It seemed to me that your students were generally well on-task ..." (62-63)

P: "And then, when you were introducing the new term congruent, kids seemed to be on-task. It seemed that, you know, research says ... that academic learning time, when kids are actually on-task, ... the

higher it is, the better the results. It was evident to me that that was happening." (162-168)

Although the supervisor's feedback suggests a high degree of task-oriented student behaviour, the teacher's focus around use of time relates to her concern about her inability to effect closure at the end of the lesson.

Summary

Management of instruction is the theme which constitutes the main focus of this conference discussion. The sub-themes receiving attention are student monitoring and question distribution, the organization of students and materials, and the use of time. The teacher's static positioning in instructing and monitoring each of the grade levels, her distribution of questions to a few students in each of those groups, and her organization for teaching the concept of division of fractions to the grade five group each receive considerable emphasis in the conference discussion.

**CASE STUDY A: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE
(ROUND 1)**

This conference takes place over the lunch hour in a separate, closed area, as the lesson observed was taught in an open area. The participants are seated in chairs placed side-by-side, on an angle, so eye contact is possible, but they are not directly facing each other. The teacher appears relaxed, but the principal holds his conference notes on his crossed leg or in his lap. The principal expresses some discomfort with the conference situation in his recall data.

"You see I, I was aware of the camera more than she was. Look at her. She's completely relaxed and I'm, I see now, playing with my shoe, and, you know, I wasn't totally nervous, but I was conscious of it." (912-915)

The principal's opening remarks are content related. He thanks the teacher for the opportunity to observe her lesson, elicits the teacher's reaction to the lesson, states the focus of the observation, and begins providing feedback.

The conference discussion is perhaps best characterized by the theme of open communication. Within the limits of their ability to do so, both participants appear to be attempting to be open in their discussion of the lesson observed.

Neither subtle nor deliberate efforts to block communication are detected in the conference dialogue. Neither are such efforts alluded to, or identified by, the conference participants in the recall data. A line count of the conference dialogue indicates 191 lines of principal talk and 215 lines of teacher talk. In other words, the conference session is highly interactive in nature.

Principal's Process Strategies

The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of the questions he asks and the nature of the feedback he provides.

Questions

The principal asks seven questions during the conference. His first question elicits the teacher's reaction to the lesson.

"Um, how did you generally feel about how the lesson went today?"
(9-10)

His second question requires the teacher to identify those students still needing help with the daily review material.

"Just as a matter of interest. Did you notice any of those kids today? Did you pick out any that weren't quite sure at the beginning?" (79-81)

In the recall data, the principal identifies this as a leading question.

"Okay. I don't know. I wasn't trying to entrap her, but I just wanted to double check to see if she was aware of that this morning..." (850-851)

The principal's third question relates to the static positioning of the teacher when monitoring students. This represents one of the major points of discussion in the conference dialogue. Monitoring has been included several times in the discussion up to this point. For example, with reference to the split grade, the teacher comments,

"I can get around to everybody, without everybody sitting waiting for me to finish." (128-129)

With reference to the grade five group, the principal comments,

"I see, you gave, you provided guided practice and you were going around to them, seeing that the kids knew how to do it. You had them cut out circles, and then divide it into thirds, and you went around checking to see if they got it." (157-160)

The principal appears to hold the point he wants to make in abeyance. When he does bring monitoring up for discussion, he is tentative, informing the teacher of her static positioning but, at the same time, asking her if she was aware of it.

"I had one question on the monitoring. When you were going around, you were going around and checking on the work, I just wanted to know if you realized that you tended to be standing in one spot most of the time?" (229-232)

The teacher accepts the feedback, indicating she was not aware of it.

"No I didn't. That's good to know." (233)

She then goes on to provide a rationale, but does not appear defensive.

"I went to Susan's desk a lot. Because Susan has difficulty. I always do tend to go around that area. I think it's partly because of the way the kids are sitting. Chris and Susan both usually need a lot of help with new concepts. But I should move around more I think, yes, and I get something out of that." (235-241)

However, the teacher goes over the point again, suggesting possible discomfort with this disclosure about her static positioning. This possibility is suggested again, in the teacher's recall data.

"That's another thing that would be picked up in a series of observations rather than just one. I would like to have more observations to see if I am indeed always going to the same spot. But it's difficult, on one basis, because in math I do tend to hang around there. That's the way I teach math most effectively. But it would be interesting to see if I do the same thing with other subjects, and that's something that I have to look out for." (254-262)

The principal moves from monitoring to the teacher's question distribution, linking the two together. Questioning is another point for discussion that he holds in abeyance and retrieves at the appropriate time. Earlier in the conference dialogue the principal provides feedback in the form of analysis and appraisal.

"I liked your questioning techniques..." (168)

The teacher responds by providing the purpose for the types of questions she asks of students. The principal then refers to holding this point in abeyance.

"Okay, I'd like to come back to that in a moment." (185)

He goes on to establish the teacher's static positioning in her instruction and monitoring before discussing questioning further. The principal's strategy when he

introduces this part of the discussion is to apprise the teacher of her actions.

He retrieves the topic, then tentatively informs the teacher of his observation.

"I mentioned the questioning earlier. Now, you know, given that we were there, trying to be flies on the wall. I don't know if that has any bearing on it or not, but it's partly management. But, it seemed to me that at times you were concentrating your questions, which were good, in the grade fours, anyway, with the people at the back. Ah, and it seemed to be the opposite with the grade fives, at times concentrating on the front people." (283-290)

The teacher muses on which students were seated in those areas and goes on to provide a tentative response.

"Um, I'm doing a lot of this without realizing I'm doing it." (300)

Although the teacher gives no indication of defensiveness, the principal maintains his tentativeness and chooses to go on to provide an appraisal of other parts of the lesson, rather than pursuing this point.

"You know, why I, you know, it's just something for you to consider and, uh, I generally was quite impressed, you know, the way you handled the four-five split and taught two lessons, kept the kids on task, and I guess what I'm getting into now is just maybe suggestions, just you know, just little pointers." (304-309)

In the recall data, the principal provides a rationale for forfeiting the opportunity to probe this issue, suggesting the teacher was going for right answers because she was under the pressure of being observed:

"I suspected perhaps she would normally not do that. But, being aware of us, she may have felt a bit insecure, and it seems to me that she was going for the right answer." (1329-1331)

"She actually ignored one girl who had her hand up at the front. Uh, it seemed that these kids knew the answers, and I think, maybe subconsciously, she, maybe for us, was trying to get the right answer. As opposed to when she did ask Tony Parker, at the other end, who had trouble. You know, she didn't have that wait time, and she went on." (1336-1341)

The teacher's recall data is contradictory in nature, indicating that perhaps the principal should have pursued this point in the conference dialogue.

"I think, when he said I was directing my questions to the back of the grade 4 group, it's nice to know I'm doing it, and I think I'm doing it for a reason, but it's nice to have that sort of verbalized. I wasn't aware that I was doing it. Um, and I don't actually think in that case, that there was anything wrong with it. I was doing it for a reason, but it's nice to know that you're doing these things, and it's also nice if you can justify why you're doing it." (671-678)

Instead, the principal moves on to another point about questioning. Again, he tentatively informs the teacher.

"Um, I'm thinking of Tony Parker, where you asked a question and ah, he, he wasn't, he immediately didn't answer, and you allowed another student to answer. Research says that sometimes kids get used to this, and know they can buy out of it, if they keep mum for a minute. And the teacher will ask automatically someone else, without putting them on the spot and student accountability sort of comes down." (310-317)

The teacher picks up on and agrees with this point.

T: "I know, and that's a fault that I do have; that I don't wait long enough. I don't give kids long enough sometimes to marshall their thoughts." (318-321)

Her use of the word "fault" indicates she perhaps views the feedback as criticism. The principal is quick to suggest he is not providing feedback as criticism.

"Well, I'm not thinking in terms of faults. But..." (333)

The teacher responds, laughingly,

T: "I can call them faults even if you can't." (334)

The teacher's recall data indicates she accepts the feedback positively.

"It's really good for me to sit in this situation and be reminded of that, because I know it's a fault, that I do do it, and you know, it's difficult for me not to. But it's nice to have a reminder occasionally. So, from that point of view, this is really valuable. Just as a reminder. I know it, but it's good to be told again." (324-327; 329-331)

The principal's fourth and fifth questions are related. Both are open-ended, designed to elicit questions or further information or ideas from the teacher. They also appear to signal closure on the conference discussion. For example,

the principal asks,

"Do you have any questions of me?" (420)

The ensuing discussion revolves around the supervision experience. The teacher says,

"So, I didn't find it an uncomfortable situation. Except at the end, when I was running out of time. I thought, uh oh, I'm not going to be able to get all this done. But I thought, well, that's the way it goes. And the grade fives anyway, I wasn't expecting to complete the concepts. I'll be reviewing it again in the next couple of days." (436-441)

The principal picks up on this and goes on to pursue it. While it might be proposed that the principal was holding his point in abeyance, waiting for an opportune time to introduce it, the question that arises is why he did not pursue it at the time the grade five work was being discussed (lines 157-162), rather than here, after having stated earlier,

"Well I have one final point and this is for your consideration." (397-399)

and asked a question (line 420) that could be viewed as a signal of closure.

This sixth question leads into the seventh question. Again, the principal is tentative. He apprises the teacher of her actions, and seems to be seeking her acknowledgement before moving on to the next question.

"You know perhaps I missed it. You know, you had them cutting out the circles and then dividing them into thirds?" (443-444)

The principal moves tentatively into the next question,

"...and this is maybe a suggestion I had. Now I may have missed this ... you had the example four times three times one-half equals six, and the kids had made six two-thirds, right? Now did you, did you point that out? That it works out mathematically, and it worked out manually? They got the same answer? Do you see what I mean?" (458, 461-463, 465-467)

Question number seven is a leading question. It generates a single statement response, but the discussion continues.

"Yes, and I probably didn't." (468)

The principal goes on to say, for the third time,

"Now I may have missed this." (469)

In the recall data, the principal indicates this tentativeness is partly due to lack of confidence,

"You know, I wasn't very happy with all my questioning. I was too, well, unsure of myself, I guess." (1358-1359)

"I, I did not want...I had in the back of my mind, again, I wanted to be a facilitator. I didn't want to offend her, which I may or may not have done, before I'd taken some recent courses, though I would not purposely do it. I was trying to be low key and very informal." (1365-1369)

and partly due to conscious decision.

"...as facilitator, I kind of wanted to draw it out of her." (1379-1381)

"...so that was consciously done..." (1392)

The teacher responds, picking up on the point the principal is making.

"I think I did as I was going around to some of the kids, but I don't think I did with the class and that's a good point. That should definitely be shown up and I'll do that the next time we do it..." (470-472)

Her response further indicates a realization of the importance of this missing step to the teaching, and student understanding, of the math concept.

"Yeah, and that was an important step, see that's the whole point for doing this." (479-480)

The principal becomes more specific, in suggesting ways the teacher could have handled the instructional situation, and/or ways in which she could follow-up on it.

"Yeah, and maybe a way to do it is to, I don't know, an opaque projector, you'd have the working parts and could actually show them the relationship." (483-489)

He does not elicit the teacher's ideas at this point. The teacher, however, feels

free to offer a response. She goes on to suggest that those techniques had been used to introduce the concept, prior to the lesson observed, and that the decision not to use them in the observed lesson was a conscious one. She goes on in her response to ensure that the principal realizes that, although the step was missing in the lesson, the teaching of the concept is not yet complete.

"And I think...I do, I do feel that I missed that out, but I also think I probably would have picked it up. Like I don't feel that I've finished, that lesson. I don't like, want you to think, that I've finished the lesson." (505-508)

The principal concludes this part of the discussion with,

"No, I assumed you hadn't. No I just wanted to try to help."
(509)

Both participants comment on this part of the discussion in their recall data. Although it is conceivable that the conference could have ended following the two signals given by the principal, as cited earlier, the principal indicates that this point, dealt with almost as an afterthought in the conference, was really his major point.

"Ok, this is my major concern. Alright I, I may have missed it. I don't think I did. This is my major ah, ah, I guess thing, thing to be considered, because it dealt with the actual learning of a concept. I felt it was a real hard concept to get across. Alright I, I think she did an admirable job in the time, with it. But I think she could have maybe bounded it together with this, brought it all together."
(1177-1184)

The teacher's recall data indicates she is pleased that the principal picks up on this point, and that she did not realize her oversight during the lesson.

"This is really important. This was something Bill noticed that I had failed to do and it was a really important part of the math concept, so I was really glad he picked up on it. I had not related the answers back to the concrete circles they were using." (446-451)

In effect then, had the conference ended at the principal's cue for closure, this point would not have been discussed, and the teacher might not have reached the realization that she had omitted an essential component in her teaching of

the concept of equivalent fractions.

Feedback

The nature of much of the principal's feedback has been addressed in the section on questions. In the case of each of the major points to be discussed, the principal appeared to hold the issues in abeyance and retrieve them for probing at times he deemed appropriate. He did this with regard to the static positioning of the teacher in monitoring students, her questioning distribution, and the "missing link" in her teaching of the grade five math concept.

An examination of the principal's feedback suggests that it can be characterized as either appraising or apprising.

In seven specific incidents, the nature of the principal's feedback is an analysis and/or appraisal of the teacher's lesson.

"It seemed to me that your students were generally well on task."
(62-63)

"And I like the idea you use small steps..." (90)

"It was nice to see that you really tried a real hard concept." (133)

"Well that's good, that's, you're to be commended on that." (142)

"I liked your questioning techniques..." (168)

"I generally was quite impressed..." (306)

"But, generally, I was very pleased..." (390)

This type of feedback forfeits the opportunity to explore the lesson with the teacher and facilitate her analysis of it.

At other times during the conference dialogue, the principal elects to apprise the teacher of her actions by tentatively informing her of them. He uses this approach with issues such as her questioning distribution, wait time once a

question has been asked, and in approaching the discussion of her handling of the math concept in the grade five group.

The principal also uses this type of feedback in the discussion of another point, not yet addressed. In following up on a point the teacher makes regarding the organization required when teaching a split class, the principal pursues the issue of organization tentatively, using phrases such as "for your consideration", and quoting a research base.

"Yeah, very well organized. Well I have one final point and this is for your consideration. Research has stated that sometimes a lot of time is wasted shifting materials and books (teacher laughs loudly)." (397-401)

The teacher accepts the feedback with good humour.

"That was great. I was going to be so organized." (402)

She goes on to explain.

"The problem with that math book business is that their desks aren't big enough to keep both their books in their desks. And so we had to decide which one we don't use very often, and unfortunately it was the one I wanted today, so they all had the one we normally use ready, and they had to go and find the other one. But that's a physical problem as well." (408-413)

While a plausible explanation of the organization of the materials, the teacher does not address the issue of why she had not ensured the students did have the appropriate book for the lesson.

Although the principal does not pursue this in the conference discussion, he refers to his purpose in the recall data.

"Ok, that was an attempt to make sense of what had happened. Ok, I noted it, it was obvious, but I wanted to know why. She's answered. You know, I was fishing there." (1136-1138)

In the recall data, the principal again comments on the nature of his delivery of feedback to the teacher, suggesting that the analysis/appraisal approach is more natural to him and that the use of apprising feedback is something he was

working on consciously.

"I, to me, I'm not articulating very well, or not too competently. Now it started out, like, it's in the back of my mind, as facilitator, I have to behave in a certain way. And I sort of have to combat this, this thing I've got about me being...cut and dried. And I think I'm being a bit too laid back...Well, I'm sure of what I want to say, but I, I don't think I'm articulating it concisely and precisely. But I want to make...it informal, in a lot of ways." (1058-1066)

Teacher's Process Strategies

The teacher's process strategies revolve around the nature of her responses. Those responses can be characterized as expressing agreement with a point made, providing information to contribute to an exploration of the lesson, and providing a purpose or rationale for her actions or events in the lesson.

Responses Expressing Agreement

Each response expressing specific teacher agreement acknowledges a point the principal makes regarding something she has failed to do during the lesson.

With respect to wait time after questioning, she responds,

"I know, and that's a fault that I do have. That I don't wait long enough." (318-319)

In response to the organization of the math books required for the lesson,

"That was great. I was going to be so organized." (402)

And, in response to the "missing link" in her teaching of the math concept, the teacher is brought to the realization that she did, in fact, fail to make the connection for the students in the lesson.

"Yes, and I probably didn't. I think I did as I was going around to some of the kids, but I don't think I did with the class, and that's a good point." (468, 470-471)

"Yeah, and that was an important step. See that's the whole point for doing this." (479-480)

In none of these responses does the teacher appear to react defensively, or begin rationalizing.

Responses Providing Information

In a number of instances, the teacher's response provides information and contributes to further exploration of the lesson.

When the principal suggests, in relation to her teaching of the grade five math lesson,

"You're trying to promote the understanding of it and that's encouraging." (146-147)

the teacher's response sets the stage for the principal to come back to this point further on in the conference discussion.

"Yes, I try and do that with math concepts, but I do end up with the odd one or two, and there will be some in that group too, who don't understand it any other way than being told at the end, 'okay, this is how to do it.'" (148-151)

In response to the principal's appraisal of her questioning techniques, the teacher elaborates.

"When you're teaching math concepts, at least with the group I've got, I have to do that. I've got some kids, like Kate, and somebody else did it too, in that lesson, who see what they're doing right away. And they give you a quick answer and you realize that, if you accept that answer, half the class will have no idea what's going on. And that's why I do try and make those kids explain what they're doing. They're skipping a step and doing it in their heads, but I want them to verbalize that step for the sake of other people. So that's why, I was asking the why question." (173-183)

The teacher's response again sets the stage for the principal to hold further discussion of questioning in abeyance.

In response to the principal's appraisal of her management of a split class, the teacher responds,

"It's organization. It's basically organization. Once the kids understand that you have a limited amount of time to give to them, then they learn to use that time fairly wisely, and it is organization skills you know." (393-396)

This response facilitates the principal's exploration of the organization of the math books required for the lesson.

Responses Providing a Rationale

In several instances the teacher's response provides a rationale for her actions or events in the lesson. For example, she provides a rationale for her static positioning in teaching math and a rationale for the location of the math books required for the lesson.

When the principal suggests specific ways in which she could have handled the teaching of the concept of equivalent fractions in the grade five math lesson, the teacher acknowledges this and provides a rationale in her response.

"And I did have the overhead set up. And I used the overhead for the preceding lesson, and I was wondering about using it this time, but I thought, since they had their own circles in front of them, I wouldn't bother with getting it all set up. And I probably will use it, on Monday. I think it might be useful." (488-493)

As in this case, each of the teacher's responses providing a rationale is articulated in a non-defensive way. That is to say, although she is providing a rationale, she does not appear to be attempting to neutralize the points under discussion.

Reactions to the Principal's Feedback

The teacher's recall data to the principal's feedback is positive. Specific examples have been cited previously in lines 324-331 and lines 446-451. The teacher also comments on the principal's references to research in the feedback he provides.

"This kind of thing is really valuable. When you hear, when someone else is seeing what you're doing, that you're not always aware that you're doing it. It really makes me, gives me a little pat on the back, to know that not only does it seem to work for me, but it seems to be the thing you should be doing as well. It's I came out of this whole interview feeling very positive about things,

and I think it was because, not that there were no faults, but just because what I was doing seemed to be the accepted and the effective way of doing it. Which is a nice feeling..." (94-104)

While suggesting she finds this interesting and valuable, the teacher is also indicating that she does not have the labels with which to discuss her teaching.

"That was, I was, I was really interested in a lot of the things he was telling me. They were things that I'm not aware of, and it was nice to hear a bit about them...He certainly seems to be fairly well informed about current issues and I know I'm not...And so this, I felt, was quite valuable, yes." (350-353; 356-357; 360)

In the recall data, the teacher comments further on the nature of the principal's feedback. She appears to come close to suggesting that the principal does point out some "faults" with the lesson, then checks herself. (line 709)

"I thought he was actually bending over backwards to be nice, (chuckles) to be positive, which is super. Um, well I think what he said was something very constructive. Everything he pointed out that, well he didn't point out anything bad, I don't, that's not because there wasn't anything bad there. He was just not going to say. He wasn't, as he said at one point, he wasn't pointing out faults. Well, I think he should. I mean I'm fairly thick skinned, as long as he's got some sort of constructive way of dealing with that. I certainly don't want to sit down and hear somebody say, "You're doing this all wrong," and then not telling me what else I can do." (706-716)

She goes on to suggest she is open to constructive critical feedback.

"I don't mind people telling me I've done things wrong if they've got some ideas of how I can improve it." (729-730)

She also suggests that she recognizes critical feedback, even when it is provided tentatively.

"The point got through anyway. But he certainly didn't have to pussyfoot around the subject as much as he did." (735-737)

Reactions to the Supervisory Experience

The teacher provides considerable feedback on the supervisory experience in the conference dialogue and recall data. Much of what she says is contradictory in nature. For example, in the conference dialogue she tells the principal,

"I didn't really feel pressured at all. But if there was a little bit of pressure, it was coming from you being there..." (425-427)

then goes on, in the same dialogue, to indicate,

"So, I didn't find it an uncomfortable situation. Except at the end, when I was running out of time." (436-437)

Towards the end of the conference, the principal asks the teacher if she has any comments to make about the supervisory process.

"Well, I guess the obvious one, that I don't think much can be done. I mean in one period. It must be terribly difficult to watch somebody in one session like that and really come up with any (pause)" (515-518)

Although the teacher does not specifically discount the significant insights gained in this conference session, she does suggest that she questions the efficacy of a single observation, which may be to suggest that, even given those insights, she does not expect much change to occur in her classroom. When the principal responds,

"...my understanding, or my belief, is that I should be a facilitator or helper." (522-523)

the teacher picks up on this, further contradicting herself regarding her response to being supervised.

"I, I find, I must admit in the past when I've been supervised, I think probably to make myself feel better about it, and feel less under pressure, I tend to make the supervisor help. (laughs). But that's just a coping strategy for me I think..." (555-557, 562)

"From that point of view, too, it's nice, I think, to have the people in the room all involved, rather than just observing, although there is a place for that." (635-638)

She comments on this "coping strategy" again in the recall data.

"And I didn't feel at all threatened with that situation this morning. Um, as I said before I think, it doesn't, it's not a terribly high pressure situation for me anyway, from that point of view. But that is a strategy I use, quite often." (568-571)

Although the principal has suggested his role is as facilitator or helper, he goes

on to state here,

"Well, we have to be evaluated once every three years, and it's nice to know there's improvement by Christmas." (639-641)

The teacher responds by suggesting improvement should be the purpose of supervision.

"Well, that certainly should be the point of it. I mean there's no point in just going in and saying, 'You're doing a good job, or you're not doing a good job,' if there's no change or results from that." (642-645)

In the recall data the teacher comments further on the supervisory experience and the need for it to be ongoing.

"I think the most uncomfortable thing for me of the whole business was that I knew it was a one shot deal..." (31-33)

"I found, from that point of view, it was rather an artificial set up." (36-37)

"And, actually, I think I teach even better when there are people watching. I tend to perform. I find it a really helpful tool myself. I'm not under any pressure." (113-116)

"I really think, I really feel that supervision should be an ongoing type of deal. I think one shot, or even two or three visits, into a classroom doesn't give you an idea of what's going on." (541-544)

In the recall data, the teacher attempts to clarify the feelings of pressure surrounding the supervision experience.

"I would hate to have it going on all the time. While I say that I didn't feel that I was under pressure, well you obviously are aware that it's happening. But I would like to have it happen more often. And I think one of the reasons people are pressured by supervision, in my experience, is because it doesn't happen very often. You're not used to having people in your classroom." (692-698)

Summary

This conference is perhaps best characterized by a high degree of interaction and open communication. The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and feedback. The teacher's process strategies revolve around

the nature of her responses to the principal's questions and feedback.

Because of the open, interactive nature of the conference, a number of significant insights into the lesson appear to be gained through the exploration and analysis that takes place. However, given the nature of the teacher's feedback on the efficacy of this type of supervisory process, it is not possible to speculate what connection will be made between the content of the conference discussion and future action in the classroom.

CASE STUDY A: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF CONFERENCE DISCUSSION (ROUND 2)

The lesson under discussion in this twenty-eight minute conference is a grade four/five math lesson. The grade fours are to complete their journals and do a page in their math books. The grade fives are working on graphing. As with the lesson in Round 1, the teacher spends some direct instructional time with each grade level while the other grade level works independently on their assigned task.

The content of the conference discussion again revolves around the classroom management theme of managing instruction. The principal opens the conference with reference to the pre-conference discussion and purposes for the observation. The principal agreed to note student on- and off-task behaviour. The position of the teacher during instruction and monitoring, as it related to this on- and off-task behaviour, also becomes a part of the conference discussion. The principal also agreed to note and comment on the teacher's questioning distribution and techniques.

Management of Instruction

Student On-Task and Off-Task Behaviour

The discussion of student on-task and off-task behaviour involves the identification of patterns in this behaviour. The principal appears to be attempting to bring the teacher to a discussion of the reasons for the behaviour. Little of the discussion focuses on the teacher's handling of off-task behaviour.

The principal initiates the discussion by identifying a pattern in the grade four group and commenting on specific students.

"... it seemed that when you were discussing with the grade fives a lot of the grade fours were off-task." (57-58)

"... and the pattern I noticed is that some grade fours automatically went off-task." (71-73)

The teacher corroborates this observation.

"As a group they do though. They really have to be watched closely." (75-76)

P: "one that comes to mind is Sonya. Uh, she stood out like a sore thumb ... she seemed to be daydreaming, playing with things ... is she prone to do that?" (79-87)

The teacher suggests that the student has good weeks and bad weeks.

P: "See the thing I noticed, as soon as you came back to the grade fours, she came on-task again." (95-96)

The principal then focuses on another student who exhibited off-task behaviour.

"Douglas ... my guess is he had trouble and he disturbed Sam and they were talking." (105-106)

Again the teacher corroborates the principal's observation.

"... yes, he was having trouble with one section of it." (115)

In the recall data, the principal comments on this.

"it was obvious to me that Douglas didn't know what his assignment was, or he didn't understand it. He had his hand up and I wanted to see if she knew the reason ... Anyway, it's cleared up. But I wanted her to be aware that he did have some problem." (126-134)

The principal coins the phrase "on-task talking" and the teacher picks up on that term by explaining her expectations. The principal then comments,

"If there is such a thing as on-task talking, the kids were showing each other their work a bit ... " (136-137)

The teacher again explains her expectations.

"I don't object if it's not bothering me and I can't hear it, and it doesn't appear to be bothering the other group. I don't enforce strict silence. They know that if I can't hear them. Again, obviously they're supposed to be on-task." (143-148)

The principal goes on to identify a pattern in the grade five group. He again

suggests that the student interaction noted is as a result of difficulty with the work they were doing.

"Now. To get to the grade fives ... There was the big three ... They were talking a lot and showing each other their work and it became clear to me perhaps why. They were both keying, Carol and Don were both keying on Jim." (164-169)

"It seemed that Carol made a mistake. She may have been concerned. But, she seemed to be initiating most of it." (175-176)

The teacher again corroborates the principal's observations and goes on to suggest a reason for their difficulty.

"Yes, she had. She'd read some of the coordinates wrong." (178)

"... they were having quite a bit of difficulty with that, and I think you have to remember that that was a lesson in isolation. We've started graphing and we left it, then came back to it ..." (192-196)

The principal comes back to his point about on-task talking.

"I want to stress that these kids were on-task in a sense; that they were talking about their work. They weren't fooling around." (214-216)

And the teacher responds.

"Which I don't actually discourage ..." (218)

The principal refers to the professional literature which supports this approach.

"So the kids know they can seek help from their peers ... I read an article, or I have read articles, on that. Depending on the students and depending on the setting, that could be quite helpful." (225, 251-252)

The teacher agrees and refers again to her expectations for student on-task behaviour. In this instance she refers to rules

"I find it helpful. I think in a split it's helpful, as long as the kids follow a few rules, and I think they probably were. These kids, they were doing it very quietly." (254-256)

The principal follows up on this.

"You mentioned rules. What types of rules do they follow, when, say, if they are talking about their work and helping each other?" (261-263)

The teacher elaborates on the expectations in the classroom.

"As long as they're whispering, and as long as they're not disturbing other people, I don't object to it. They, we've talked a lot about cooperation and uh, not distracting other people. Just simple rules of courtesy, and they're fairly well aware of it." (265-269)

The principal goes on to pursue the reasons for Sonya's off-task behaviour, asking the teacher if the student's attention is usually short. In the recall data, the principal comments.

"The crux of the matter here is, I want to know if she's aware of Sonya. She obviously is. Sonya has caused some problems before in terms of classroom management, and I just wanted to know if she knew the background ... and she obviously does. She's aware of it. She's not surprised." (290-296)

The principal concludes the discussion with,

"... your class generally was well on-task, and if kids are on-task, in my opinion, the chances of learning are greater, eh." (309-311)

The teacher refers to the need to clarify terms such as on-task in the preconference.

"Yeah, and I may have been remiss in the pre-conference. Probably I should have mentioned, or you should have asked, what the rules were. I mean, that was on-task talking actually. They were talking about what they were doing, and I didn't, I normally don't object to that." (313-317)

The principal responds,

"Your point is well-taken. We didn't discuss what is meant by on-task and that is a very crucial point." (354-355)

In the recall data, the teacher makes a further comment about this,

"I think both of us had realized, and it comes later on the video tape, that we had not got the same definition of on-task which made the whole thing that he'd done not really as useful as it might have been." (958-961)

The principal comments at length on this point in his recall data.

"It's probably obvious, it's obvious in the tape that, here comes the glowing weakness of something I neglected to do. And that was to sit down with her and define, in the pre-conference, what is meant by on-task." (320-323)

" ... I wasn't aware that this was acceptable, first of all, until she mentioned it. The kids weren't really disturbing anyone else, but I was curious to know. One or two of those three perhaps didn't understand, or were having trouble with this. ... and I guess I wanted to know her rules, and if this was standard practice, and if it was acceptable, and if there were any guidelines. And the kids knew the guidelines and they knew her expectations. She satisfied me there. But during the lesson, it wasn't clear to me. ... she didn't monitor them. She didn't have to, because they were, in a sense, on-task, but talking." (332-347)

In the conference setting, the principal again attempts to bring this part of the discussion to a close. He asks the teacher if she has any further comments. Her response takes him on to another discussion point, rather than the focus on questioning, which he had intended to adopt. In response to the principal's question, the teacher says,

"Again, they're the outer perimeter kids aren't they? All those." (392-393)

P: "Yes, good observation. It seemed to be Sonya who is off-task the most." (395-396)

The teacher reiterates her point that Sonya has good weeks and bad weeks.

The principal takes the opportunity to comment on the positioning of the teacher for both instruction and monitoring purposes and how this relates to student on and off-task behaviour. Though not specifically identified as part of the purpose for the second round observation, this point was discussed in the first round conference.

"I see. I was going to mention that actually, when I came to the questioning. Because, you see. Because she (Sonya) seemed to go right on-task when you were close to her, or giving her attention. Um. You tended, quite rightly, you had to teach somewhere, and you chose teaching at the front, ok, and you were wandering around and you were checking and monitoring the students' work, which is commendable. I've read other things, and in your vision, you can't hope to see all the kids at the same time. This is for your future consideration and recommendation. If she were to continue to be off task, you might ..." (402-412)

Here the teacher picks up on the point the principal is coming to and interjects,

"Want to move her, or move me to the side." (412-413)

The principal continues,

"Perhaps it might be easier to move her towards the middle, because that's where you focus most of your attention." (413-419)

In the recall data, the principal indicates,

"As far as I'm concerned I was leading up to that all the time with Sonya. The theory that kids who are off-task the most with behaviour problems should be moved in to the centre more, as opposed to the extremities, and she picked that up, which is great." (423-427)

The teacher pursues the discussion.

"It's funny. I've been thinking about that. When you were saying, at the pre-conference, where the children on the periphery are the ones that tend to get missed, and they're usually the ones that are disruptive anyway. That's why they're out there. They've been moved away from other students. Sonya isn't a case in question. But, there are children there on that end row, and they're there because they've only got one person to disturb instead of four, if they were in the middle." (444-452)

"... you tend to push them to the sides to get them away from everybody else if they're disruptive and yet, perhaps, at the same time, you push them right out of vision and give them even more chance to be even more disruptive." (461-465)

Student Behaviour and Teacher Positioning and Questioning

The principal pursues the point about student on-task/off-task behaviour by referring to the teacher's positioning during instruction.

"Ah, pertaining to that, at the beginning of the lesson, you had the grade fives take out their materials ... and you were standing about here, ... between Tommy and Ross, and it seemed to me, although you didn't do it for a great length of time, when you were giving directions, you were speaking to these kids over here, more than these and, uh, these kids over here, weren't in your sight. But you did come around and you did monitor them all." (467-472, 478-482)

The teacher indicates that she was aware of this positioning during the lesson, and suggests some of the problems it caused.

"... actually I realized that, at that point, that I'd forgotten to give them out paper. That I was missing those two out. And I think it's because Bobby's away. ... Yes, I was aware, in fact I was aware of having done that, and it was brought home when I, in fact, even forgot to give out the paper to them. (484-487, 490-492)

The principal then moves the discussion on to questioning distribution. He identifies the pattern noted in each of the grade level groups, comments favourably on the types of questions the teacher asked, and goes on to make a specific suggestion involving her questioning technique.

"Yeah. And it seemed that your questions were directed to this side too. And, similarly with the grade fours. Now that's interesting. You seemed to, on this side, concentrate your questions this way, to the other boundaries. You know. I'll leave that with you, you know, so that you're aware of it. The only other, you did ask questions that were directly related to what they were supposed to be doing, and that is most favourable. One thing I have learned, however, is, if you ask, if you identify the student before you ask the question, sometimes that triggers kids to turn off. Like they know. It just happened. You said, Lewis, and then you paused, and then you asked the question, and that's just a little tidbit that I'm throwing in for you to consider. Perhaps state the question and then name the student, so that way they're all (pause)" (494-508)

Gaining Student Attention

The principal focuses on one last point in the conference discussion.

"I just have one more comment, and just, an observation I made. When you went back to the grade fives at the end. You, before you spoke, you sought their attention. You said, 'May I have your attention, please?' And Jane was not paying attention and you said Jane. Now you keyed on her, but you did not key on Mr. Smith and Mr. Black, who were also off-task and perhaps, for your consideration, uh. It's stated somewhere that you wait and scan to make sure they are all on-task or paying attention and you could have, perhaps, picked up those two." (542-549, 565-567)

In the recall data, the principal comments,

"I don't want to offend her, you know, and that's why I think I'm being tentative. She may now be thinking that I'm really unsure of myself. I don't want to offend her, but I have a point, and I'm beating around the bush, and I don't know if that's right or wrong." (552-556)

"I try to come to that point that she has to wait, have more wait time, and scan the classroom before she gives directions, and I'm going to make that point, but it's very long in coming out of my mouth." (560-563)

The principal concludes the conference discussion with positive comments about the lesson and students' on-task behaviour.

Summary

Management of instruction is again the theme which constitutes the main focus of this round two conference discussion. Considerable discussion revolves around the theme of student off-task behaviour. The need for a definition, and clarity, in discussing such terms at the pre-conference stage, prior to observation, becomes evident to supervisor and teacher in the conference. The positioning of the teacher for instruction and monitoring as it relates to student on- and off-task behaviour is also brought into the discussion. Though not specifically part of the pre-conference agreement, it is a theme that was discussed in the round one conference. Finally, the teacher's questioning distribution (a round one conference theme) and the need to gain student attention are discussed.

CASE STUDY A: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE (ROUND 2)

This conference also takes place over the lunch hour in a separate, closed area. The participants are seated in chairs placed side-by-side, on an angle, making eye contact possible. The teacher appears relaxed. The principal again holds his conference notes in his lap.

The principal's opening remarks are content-related. He states the purposes of the observation and begins providing feedback.

This second round conference discussion is also characterized by the theme of open communication, although the conference participants come to realize that they have not communicated clearly their understanding of the term on-task behaviour. A line count of the conference dialogue indicates that this conference is not as interactive in nature as the previous one. Principal talk accounts for 170 lines and teacher talk accounts for 131 lines of the conference dialogue. The teacher does considerably less talking in this conference situation. In the recall data the teacher gives some indications as to why this is the case.

"The first thing I was really aware of this time, and I didn't, I wasn't aware of last time was that he seemed much more ill at ease this time, about the experience. Like I felt quite comfortable but he seemed to be really ill at ease. I don't know why, he just did. Which made me just, it was a little harder this time to talk about it. Um, I personally didn't feel the lesson went very well and so I was expecting ... I don't know whether he saw a lot of things that he thought could have been improved and was ill at ease about the idea of approaching me with it. I don't think that was it, because it didn't come out at the conference anyway. He certainly seemed ill at ease and it made me wonder what he was getting at. We also, I think, both of us, realized ... that we had not got the same definition of on-task, which made the whole thing that he'd done not really as useful as it might have been." (945-961)

Principal's Process Strategies

As before, the principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback.

Questions

An examination of the conference dialogue indicates he asks six questions. All are seeking information or input from the teacher. Of these, only two are of consequence in terms of the conference discussion and the strategy revealed by the principal.

The principal's fourth question probes a point he has held in abeyance until the teacher provides an appropriate opportunity. Earlier in the conference, in his recall data, the principal indicates he is curious about the teacher's reaction to student talking. (lines 152-160). The conference discussion of on-task behaviour and student talking continues. With reference to the students helping one another, the teacher provides the following rationale.

"I find it helpful. I think in a split it's helpful, as long as the kids follow a few rules, and I think they probably were. These kids, they were doing it very quietly." (254-256)

The principal follows-up on the teacher's mention of rules.

"You mentioned rules. What types of rules do they follow, when, say, if they are talking about their work and helping each other?" (262-263)

In response to the question, the teacher provides the following information.

"As long as they're whispering, and as long as they're not disturbing other people, I don't object to it. They, we've talked a lot about cooperation and uh, not distracting other people. Just simple rules of courtesy, and they're fairly well aware of it." (265-269)

The principal's recall data indicates that his purpose was to probe for clarification of the teacher's approach to student talking during the lesson.

"I wanted to know her rules, and if this was standard practice, and if it was acceptable, and if there were any guidelines. And the kids knew the guidelines and they knew her expectations. She satisfied me there. But during the lesson, it wasn't clear to me ... it makes sense now. She didn't monitor them. She didn't have to, because they were, in a sense, on task, but talking." (340-347)

The principal's fifth question seeks information regarding a specific student.

"Is her attention span usually short?" (280-281)

In his recall data, the principal reveals that he is probing the extent of the teacher's knowledge of the student.

"The crux of the matter here is, I want to know if she's aware of Sonya. She obviously is. Sonya has caused some problems before, in terms of classroom management, and I just wanted to know if she knew the background and she obviously does. She's not surprised." (290-296)

Feedback

An examination of the principal's feedback suggests that it can be characterized as either appraising or apprising. In several instances the feedback provides the principal's analysis. For example,

"Douglas, ... my guess is he had trouble and he disturbed Sam and they were talking." (105-106)

"There was the big three. ... They were talking a lot and showing each other their work and it became clear to me perhaps why ..." (165-168)

"I want to stress that these kids were on task in a sense; that they were talking about their work. They weren't fooling around." (214-216)

In other instances he provides an appraisal of the lesson.

"Your class generally was well on task, and if kids are on task, in my opinion, the chances of learning are greater, eh." (309-311)

"You did ask questions that were directly related to what they were supposed to be doing, and that is most favourable." (500-501)

"But on the whole, I thought you did very well and the kids, again, appeared to be on task." (573-574)

In many more instances throughout the conference dialogue, the principal apprises the teacher of his observations by tentatively informing her of them. For example, in providing feedback on the student's on-task behaviour, the principal is tentative.

"It seemed that when you were discussing with the grade fives, a lot of the grade fours were off task." (57-58)

"Okay, I had noted some students names down and they seem to follow a pattern, and the pattern I noticed is that some grade fours, while you were with the grade fives, automatically went off task. Some. It's very few." (70-73)

"Okay, generally there was minor talking, but it seemed to be ... if there is such a thing as on-task talking, the kids were showing each other their work a bit." (117-118, 136-137)

The principal is also using feedback to inform the teacher about her positioning for instruction and monitoring, as it relates to student on- and off-task behaviour, particularly with regard to Sonya.

"I was going to mention that actually, when I came to the questioning. Because, you see. Because she seemed to go right on task when you were close to her, or giving her attention. Um, you tended, quite rightly, you had to teach somewhere, and you chose teaching at the front, okay. ... This is for your future consideration and recommendation. If she were to continue to be off task, you might ..." (402-406, 410-412)

Here the teacher interjects, indicating she understands the point the principal is making.

"Want to move her, or move me to the side." (412-413)

The principal clarifies,

"Perhaps it might be easier to move her towards the middle, because that's where you focus most of your attention." (413, 419)

The principal's recall data indicates he was holding this point in abeyance as well, waiting for the opportunity to introduce it in the discussion.

"As far as I'm concerned I was leading up to that all the time with Sonya. The theory that kids who are off-task the most with behaviour problems should be moved in to the centre more, as opposed to the extremities, and she picked that up, which is great."

(423-427)

When apprising the teacher of her questioning distribution, the principal appears to think out loud.

"And it seemed that your questions were directed to this side too. And, similarly with the grade fours. Now that's interesting. You seemed to, on this side, concentrate your questions this way, to the other boundaries. You know, I'll leave that with you, you know, so that you're aware of it." (494-499)

This he appears to do so as to get the point across without offending the teacher as a professional colleague.

Teacher's Process Strategies

The teacher's process strategies again revolve around the nature of her responses to the principal's feedback. These responses are characterized as expressing agreement with the feedback, providing information, and providing a rationale for events in the lesson.

Responses Expressing Agreement

Those teacher responses expressing agreement corroborate the principal's observations. For example, when the principal comments on a pattern in the grade four group's off-task behaviour, the teacher agrees.

"As a group they do though. They really have to be watched closely." (75-76)

In those instances, identified by the principal, where students appeared to be having difficulty, the teacher again verifies his analysis of the situations.

"Yes, he was having trouble with one section of it." (115)

"Yes, she had. She'd read some of the coordinates wrong." (178)

When the principal apprises the teacher of her positioning for instruction and monitoring in the grade five group, he suggests that some students did not appear to be in her line of vision. The teacher agrees, admitting to overlooking

those students.

"And I think part of that may have been, I, actually I realized that, at that point, that I'd forgotten to give them out paper. That I was missing those two out." (484-486)

Responses Providing Information

In response to a question regarding Sonya's on- and off-task behaviour, the teacher indicates,

"She has good weeks and bad weeks. I think this has been a bad week for her." (89-90)

To the principal's question regarding rules for talking about work and helping each other, the teacher responds,

"As long as they're whispering, and as long as they're not disturbing other people ..." (265-266)

To a further question regarding Sonya's attention span, the teacher replies,

"But Sonya has had a very bad week. There's something going on and I don't know what. I assume it's something at home." (285-287)

In each instance the teacher's response is in answer to a specific question posed by the principal in which he is seeking information.

Responses Providing a Rationale

In several instances the teacher's response provides a rationale for her actions or events in the lesson. For example, she provides a rationale for her tolerance, or acceptance, of student talking. This rationale is necessary to clarify that the students were viewed by the teacher as being on-task. The principal's method of coding student behaviour during the observation, however, was such that all talking was labelled as off-task.

"I don't object if it's not bothering me and I can't hear it, and it doesn't appear to be bothering the other group. I don't enforce strict silence. They know that if I can't hear them. Again, obviously they're supposed to be on task." (143-148)

Later in the conference dialogue the teacher refers to the need to clarify terms such as on-task prior to the observation.

"... and I may have been remiss in the pre-conference. Probably, I should have mentioned, or you should have asked, what the rules were. I mean, that was on-task talking actually. They were talking about what they were doing, and I didn't, I normally don't, object to that." (313-317)

The principal suggests, in his feedback, that some students' off-task behaviour is possibly due to the fact that they are having difficulty with the task. The teacher agrees and provides a rationale.

"... they were having quite a bit of difficulty with that and I think you have to remember that that was a lesson in isolation. We've started graphing and we left it, then came back to it ..." (192-196)

The principal also suggests, in his feedback, that some students' off-task behaviour is possibly a result of their seating position in the classroom. In providing a rationale for the positioning of students in the classroom, the teacher also undertakes some analysis of the situation.

"It's funny. I've been thinking about that. When you were saying, at the pre-conference, where the children on the periphery are the ones that tend to get missed, and they're usually the ones that are disruptive anyway. That's why they're out there. They've been moved away from other students. Sonya isn't a case in question. But, there are children there on that end row, and they're there because they've only got one person to disturb instead of four, if they were in the middle." (444-452)

"You tend to push them to the sides to get them away from everybody else if they're disruptive and yet, perhaps, at the same time, you push them right out of vision and give them even more chance to be even more disruptive." (461-465)

Comparative Recall Data

Both conference participants draw comparisons between the first and second round lessons observed, and the first and second round conferences. In addition, the teacher reacts to the principal's process strategies and the nature of his feedback, particularly in this second round conference.

Reactions to the Two Lessons

In comparing the first and second lessons the teacher comments,

"I knew the lesson wasn't as well prepared. I knew that I wasn't as aware of where the kids were. So, there were a lot of things that I knew that probably weren't going to run very smoothly and didn't." (626-630)

"I don't think my teaching strategies and things changed much. And probably, hopefully to the observer, I don't know whether there was any, I mean I don't think it was a bad lesson. I think I made mistakes in this lesson, just as I made mistakes in the last lesson ..." (1169-1173)

The principal compares the lessons as follows,

"I think this lesson was better. One serious question I had about the previous lesson was she didn't tie things together. ... I thought she monitored better. I really didn't think either of them. Well, the first one definitely wasn't a bad lesson." (810-812, 816-817)

"She tied loose ends up better this time. She monitored the class better. She was wandering around. She was trying to keep an eye on everyone ..." (842- 844)

In comparing the first and second round conferences, the teacher comments,

"Well, that's a much better idea, of zeroing in on one or two things, rather than ... last time. At least, I knew basically what you were looking for. You knew what you were looking for." (745-748)

The principal compares the conferences as follows,

"The major difference between this, or one of the differences, between this exercise and the last one, when I supervised her in the winter months, is that I felt the last time I had set the purpose of that particular observation. I have since concluded that she had more input in what we were doing in this task analysis. I'm also trying to ask my questions in response to what she's saying. I'm trying to take my cues from her and I'm trying to get her to lead it, and as a result I'm asking questions to verify." (201-209)

The principal continues to provide reaction to his process strategies and the nature of his feedback in this conference. He indicates that his conscious efforts to be tentative, rather than didactic, slow the conference pace and make him appear unsure of what he's saying.

"She's a very experienced teacher, and I think I've been intimidated by that. I'm afraid to insult her, and I'm really wishy-washy, and I'm very indirect. I'm trying to be very tentative, and very conscious ... and I'm very slow moving." (33-38)

"I don't want to be too direct. That's why I'm trying to be very tentative and it's perhaps coming across to her that maybe I'm unsure." (48-50)

Although the teacher responded favourably to the principal's use of educational research in the first conference, he indicates he is attempting to change his approach in this conference.

"The last time I was quoting according to educational research. I'm trying to desperately alter that ploy ... and I'm trying to think of another phrase ... I've read this and it says you've got to do this." (230-249)

Reactions to the Supervisory Experience

The teacher again provides considerable feedback regarding the supervisory experience in the conference dialogue and recall data.

In a discussion of the value of this type of supervisory process, she states more succinctly what she alludes to in her round one recall data.

"... it's interesting, and the things pointed out will be useful, but to a very limited degree. I think it has to be an on-going process." (691-693)

"I've always felt that supervision should be on-going and I think that, perhaps principals who are going to do it, if they're going to be facilitators, should be in the classroom once or twice a week and should know what's going on on a daily basis. I don't think they do, through no fault of their own. It's just not set up that way." (704-715)

"I think if people supervising you are going to be facilitators, I think they have to be there often enough to identify the problems properly, if there are any, and to see whether there is any improvement. And you can only do that on a long term, continuing basis." (730-734)

"For somebody just coming in and watching you for one or two lessons, and writing a report, or having a conference with you

afterwards, is not that much use, really. I wish there was some kind of on-going kind of thing, and I think that could take away some of the threat of it all too, if it was on going. You know, when somebody waltzes into your classroom to, and in my case it's always been to write a report on me, and I see them twice, and everything depends on those two lessons they've observed, of course there's pressure." (1229-1238)

"... when you know a principal's coming in to do one of their quicky supervision things on you, you plan a wonderful lesson. You don't do a lesson in something you're not particularly strong in. You choose your strongest subject and you do all the things that will make the lesson terrific, obviously. The principals don't see if you are having difficulties. They don't see those difficulties, unless they become apparent outside of the classroom, because you don't show them off." (1342-1351)

Summary

This conference is less interactive in nature than the first conference. Perhaps this factor contributes to communication which also appears less open, or at least less fluid, than in the previous conference. The process strategies employed by each of the conference participants are the same as in the first round.

Because the focus of the observation was far more specific in this instance, fewer insights into the lesson appear to be gained through this conference process.

The nature of the teacher's feedback on the efficacy of this type of supervisory process is more succinct in the recall data recorded following this second round observation and conference. She indicates quite specifically that little connection will be made between the content of the conference discussion and future action in the classroom.

CASE STUDY A: OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE

The data collected for the observed performances of each teacher are organized in three ways. The mean scores for all categories (1-9) are reported for round one observation prior to the workshop intervention, and for round two observation after the workshop intervention. Pre-workshop means, then, are calculated on the basis of round one observation data, prior to the workshop intervention. Post workshop means are calculated on the basis of round two observation data, following the workshop intervention. Within each case the mean scores represent the "flavour" of each lesson as observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a mean score of 3.50000 or greater represents a high rating, a mean score of 2.50000 or lower represents a low rating, and a mean score between 2.50000 and 3.50000 represents an average rating, based on a five point component rating scale.

Change scores are also reported. These are computed by subtracting the preworkshop mean from the post workshop mean. The change score provides some indication of both the direction (positive or negative) and the degree (minimal or substantial) of change. Within each case, then, the change scores represent a comparative measure of the differences between the lessons observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a change score of 0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change and a score of less than 0.50000 represents a minimal change.

Ratings, based on the mean scores for each category, are also reported for prior to and after the workshop intervention.

The organization of the data in each of these ways contributes to an overall profile of the observed performance(s) of each teacher.

Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher A's Observed Performance Across All Categories

Table 4.1 reports the category mean and change scores for teacher A's observed performance across all categories and across observers.

Mean Scores

An examination of the pre and post workshop mean scores and their relative ratings provides an observed performance rating profile for teacher A in Table 4.2.

Overall ratings remain constant in all categories but category 8, where the change is positive and substantial enough to cause an overall rating change from an average to a high rating. In terms of an overall, cross-category performance profile, teacher A would be rated as average or above average (or high) in seven out of nine categories, and the direction of change indicated is positive.

Change Scores

An examination of change scores by category (Table 4.1) supports this overall performance profile for teacher A. No change is evident in three categories and positive change is evident in the remaining six categories. There is no evidence of negative change.

No Change Categories

No change is evident in category 2, room arrangement. A mean of 5.00000, both pre and post workshop, indicates this category was given a high rating in

Table 4.1 Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher A's Observed Performance: An Overview of All Categories

| Category | Pre-Workshop Mean | Post-Workshop Mean | Change Score |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2.72727 | 2.95455 | 0.22728 |
| 2 | 5.00000 | 5.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 3 | 2.50000 | 3.33333 | 0.83333 |
| 4 | 3.25000 | 3.37500 | 0.12500 |
| 5 | 2.25000 | 2.50000 | 0.25000 |
| 6 | 5.00000 | 5.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 7 | 1.37500 | 2.25000 | 0.87500 |
| 8 | 2.75000 | 4.00000 | 1.25000 |
| 9 | 3.60000 | 3.60000 | 0.00000 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Change Score = Post minus Pre

0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change

0.50000 or lower represents a minimal change

Category Means and change scores are based on a five point scale.

Table 4.2 Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher A

| Rating | Categories | |
|---------|--------------|---------------|
| | Pre-Workshop | Post-Workshop |
| Low | 5,7 | 5,7 |
| Average | 1,3,4,8 | 1,3,4 |
| High | 2,6,9 | 2,6,8,9 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Ratings

| | |
|---------|----------------------|
| Low | = 2.50000 or lower |
| Average | = 2.50000 to 3.50000 |
| High | = 3.50000 or higher |

Ratings are based on a five point scale.

both observations.

No change is evident in category 6, disruptive student behaviour. A mean of 5.00000 in this instance indicates no evidence of disruptive behaviour was observed in either observation.

No change is also evident in category 9, miscellaneous. A mean of 3.60000 indicates this category was also given a consistent high rating in both observations.

Positive Change Categories

The remaining six categories all indicate positive change. Of those six categories, three have a change score above 0.50000, representing a substantial change (category 3, rules and procedures; category 7, inappropriate student behaviour; category 8, classroom climate). The remaining three categories have change scores below 0.50000, representing a minimal change.

(i) **Substantial Positive Change Categories**

Category 3, rules and procedures, has a change score of 0.83333, representing a substantial positive change. This change score indicates that the efficiency or appropriateness of the routines and/or procedures observed in the classroom are rated higher in round two observation.

Category 7, inappropriate student behaviour, has a change score of 0.87500, also representing a substantial positive change. This change score indicates a decrease in the occurrences of inappropriate behaviour observed in round two and/or a rating increase in the teacher's method of handling inappropriate behaviour.

Category 8, classroom climate, has a change score of 1.25000, representing a substantial positive change in the pleasantness of the classroom atmosphere or the teacher's feeling tone, and/or in the task-oriented focus (on-task behaviour) of the students from round one observation to round two.

(ii) Minimal Positive Change Categories

Category 1, instructional management, has a change score of 0.22728, representing a minimal positive change in the teacher's instructional management techniques in round two observation.

Category 4, meeting student concerns, has a change score of 0.12500, representing a minimal positive change in the teacher's efforts to take student concerns into account in instructional activities in the second observation.

Category 5, managing student behaviour, has a change score of 0.25000, representing a minimal positive change in the teacher's signaling, monitoring, and rewarding of appropriate behaviour, and/or in the consistency with which the teacher responds to appropriate and inappropriate behaviour in the second round of observation.

A profile of change score ratings for all nine categories indicates no change in three categories, substantial positive change in three categories, and minimal positive change in three categories.

Chapter 5

CASE STUDY B: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF CONFERENCE DISCUSSION (ROUND 1)

The lesson under discussion in this twenty-two minute conference is a grade one music lesson. The teacher is working on rhythm and pitch with the students through the use of voice, large body movements, and instruments.

In opening this February conference, the principal refers the teacher back to an instrument, comprised of twenty-seven teacher behaviours, that was used in a fall observation and follow-up conference.

In the recall session the teacher says, "oh nothing was discussed, nothing was discussed,"(282) referring to the fact that a pre-conference was not held prior to the observation currently under discussion.

The content of the conference discussion focuses on two general themes pertaining to classroom management: management of student behaviour and management of instruction.

Management of Student Behaviour

This focus includes discussion revolving around feeling tone and the handling of inappropriate behaviour.

Feeling Tone

The principal begins and ends the conference by commending the teacher for his caring feeling tone:

"And that, to me, shows that you're a caring, accepting, valuing sort of teacher ..." (55)

"... and I think the tone is really good in the class." (758)

In at least four other instances the principal also comments on the teacher's use of positive feeling tone during the lesson:

"You were again showing praise." (240)

"You use a lot of the courtesy words." (378)

"... you use lots of encouragement, encouraging statements." (389)

"... it was more positive reinforcement." (533)

During the recall session the teacher reports.

"I really do like the fact that he notices the atmosphere in the classroom, of caring, of respect, of responsibility, 'cause those are three things that I really try to do for the kids ..." (343-346)

Handling Inappropriate Student Behaviour

This focus is pursued consistently throughout the conference by the principal. Initially, he comments favorably on how the teacher handles a potential problem at the beginning of the lesson.

"And then there was a little problem with Jackie, and I didn't exactly see what transpired before, because I was looking at some other kids, but you noticed a problem, and then all of a sudden Jackie came over and sat with you. You didn't make any big deal about it, it was just sort of a natural thing, and it shows that you look after that inappropriate behaviour right away, and the intervention was immediate and, um, it supports the general rule that kids aren't going to fool around with others during the lesson." (102-110)

Later, however, the principal attempts to focus on other problems of a similar nature. Reference is made to several specific incidents involving one student's inappropriate behaviour:

P: "I noticed that, at that point in time, you brought back the bean bag, which was your system for getting kids back into the circle, and it just sort of, just sort of evolved naturally. They all sat down and that was great. I think the one thing I might have done there was to sit beside Francis, but we'll talk about that in a minute." (413-418)

P: "Um, at this point in time, you were now sitting with the group, and uh, you were sitting opposite Francis. Now Francis sat down with a little guy named Bob. And those two maybe shouldn't be sitting beside each other, and I think maybe that's one of the things I might have done was either sat between them, or moved them, or whatever. But I noticed you were watching Francis and he was trying to get your attention, but you chose to ignore most of his ..." (444-452)

The teacher responds, indicating his rationale.

"Well, I think at the time I was thinking more along the lines of Francis needs to be taught what's appropriate. So it's important to let him go and find that out and then see if he can correct himself. And I do, sometimes, isolate Francis at the door when he is disturbing others. But I allow him to make mistakes, so that he can correct them. And he can possibly establish those appropriate behaviours for himself." (457-474)

The principal goes on to question the motives for the student's behaviour.

"Do you find that his goal is attention?" (475)

T: "At different times. Sometimes it's just his inability to stay on task, and sometimes it's just he's not used to sitting up. You know, we've gone along too long sitting up. We're too long for him; maybe not too long for other people in the class. So it's a matter of building up his stamina to sit there and do what's appropriate for as long as everybody else." (476-484)

P: "Yeh, well, he does find it difficult. And, you know, I think one of the things that we have to be sensitive to is that. And, you know, if you have the rule that says, as long as he's not interfering with the learning of others, then you know you did the right thing. But I really think it's attention that he's looking for." (485-489)

T: "I think it varies myself." (527/Response is to the above quote but interrupted in the transcript by stimulated recall.)

The principal and teacher appear to disagree on the student's motives. However, the principal continues to pursue the teacher's handling of the behaviour.

P "... then you said, the kids were all clapping, but Francis was still leaning out like this, and then you said, 'that means you'll have to sit up Francis', and that was kind of a good way." (592-596).

"Right, you know, in other words you're telling him, 'Hey, come on, you've got to clap with the rest of the kids,' but you did it in a nice way." (622-625)

T: "I was just getting him on task. I don't really think what I said was important." (626-627)

The principal refers to two more incidents where the teacher singles out Francis.

P: "At that point I guess Francis was looking for some more attention, and you said, 'Come on Francis, we're waiting for you.' I guess he managed to get what he wanted because he got it." (635-639)

P: "You said to him, 'Francis please stop bothering the person next to you.' I guess he was poking or something. That was great. I think maybe, had he been sitting somewhere else, that wouldn't have happened." (665-668)

The principal appears to be focusing on these incidents so that he and the teacher can discuss them. Both the teacher's responses to the principal and the teacher's recall data suggest that this intent was neither shared nor completely understood. In the recall data the teacher says:

"He seemed to be trying to bring it back to his point again and my point was in opposition to his point, that Francis needs to be taught how to sit ..." (492-494)

"I was really amazed at how many times I talked to Francis, that he picked up on ... I felt like I was more shaping him over the course of the lesson, without having to come down hard on him. And yet, here, with so much dwelling on Francis, I, I was sort of wondering if, you know, mention it once, twice, three times, that's okay. But the lesson revolved around more than Francis. And I could have done with less talk about Francis. I didn't think I focused on him that much ... I wasn't sure whether his perception was right or my perception was. I didn't feel comfortable." (599-616)

The principal's recall data corroborates the lack of shared understanding and confirms the intent behind his persistence in the conference discussion:

"... we also disagreed on the motives for the little guy's behaviour." (1312)

"Sitting here watching it, you'd think that many, many disruptive things occurred during that lesson, but really they weren't all that bad. I mean like, it was pretty good, you know, the behaviour of the kid. But there were a few minor occurrences, and Francis was one of the perpetrators and, you know, I think that, maybe managed a little differently, you might not end up with those occurrences." (1321-1328)

Management of Instruction

This focus revolves around a discussion of the teacher's standard procedures for keeping students on-task and lesson pacing.

Standard Procedures

The principal makes the following favorable references to the teacher's standard procedures during the conference:

"To me that's just an excellent way of getting the kids' attention."
(235-236)

"... that focuses the kids' attention on listening to directions."
(339-340)

"... they were really focusing on what the drum was saying." (410)

"... at that point, you brought back the bean bag, which was your system for getting kids back into the circle." (414)

These procedures seem to be related to time-on-task and transition time, but no direct reference is made to these terms by the principal in the conference and the transcript of the conference discussion does not indicate whether or not a shared understanding of those terms exists. The teacher's recall data, however, suggests not.

"He was concerned with the fact that the end result was not the learning, but the fact that I had the focus of the kids." (224-226)

Lesson Pacing

The principal refers the teacher back to their previous conference, in the fall, when discussing pacing from three points of view. He refers to pacing the lesson to the time allotted,

"And by ending exactly on time, which is what you did, that was really good." (725-726)

and to changing the pace for students within the lesson,

"... seven minutes. That was the time the kids were sitting in the circle. And you recall last fall when we talked about a lesson you did, and the kids were sitting about twenty minutes. And obviously

you learned something there, because at the end of seven minutes they got up, they did something else, and that change of pace, that change of activity, is a good thing." (368-374)

and to the need for the teacher to pace himself so as to avoid burnout.

"... very fast pace. And I think I've talked to you about this before, and that is, how long are you going to be able to keep it up like that?" (534-536)

The teacher's recall data again suggests a lack of shared understanding, or differing perceptions regarding pacing.

"I had made a deliberate attempt to try and slow it down this time, and it seemed to me like it was half the speed of my normal lesson. So, um, while he was saying that, I was thinking that he didn't notice that it was slower, or he was still hooked on his initial perception that it was a fast-paced lesson." (543-548)

Summary

Two themes, management of student behaviour and management of instruction, constitute the main focus of this conference discussion, based on observation of a grade one music lesson. Student behaviour management involves discussion of feeling tone and the handling of inappropriate behaviour, with emphasis on the latter. The management of instruction involves discussion of the teacher's standard procedures for keeping students on-task and lesson pacing.

**CASE STUDY B: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE
(ROUND 1)**

The setting for this conference is in the music room, where the observed lesson took place. The principal is seated in a comfortable, highback chair with papers for the conference spread across the desk. The teacher is seated at the side of the desk in a hard chair with one arm on the desk. The conference takes place after school.

The principal's opening remarks are content related. Little attention appears to be given to the interpersonal dynamics necessary for setting the teacher at ease and establishing rapport.

The teacher's recall data suggests some discomfort with the physical arrangement of the conference and with the lack of rapport.

"I felt that I was sitting too close to him, and it made me think about other things than what he was saying. I felt that he was talking to the camera and he wasn't really talking to me." (10-13)

The process strategies in this conference revolve around the general theme of communication blocking. This blocking arises not only out of the interpersonal dynamics of the conference situation, but also out of the fact that both participants appear to be lacking either a clear understanding of the purpose(s) of the conference or clear objectives for the conference, or both. The recall data contains evidence of confusion and/or contradiction surrounding these points.

For example, early in the recall data the teacher indicates his expectation for little "criticism" of the lesson in the conference. He also indicates that he is interested in focusing on something other than what the principal appears to have selected for the focus of the conference.

"I don't know what, why I'm dwelling on his presentation, but it seems to me that I expected that he wasn't going to find too much wrong with the lesson. I was curious about his perception of the music objectives and he was watching classroom management."
(112-116)

He goes on to react to the principal's presentation.

"But he's telling me. He's not interested in my perception of the lesson. He's interested in telling me what happened, and I believe there's many ways of looking at it ..." (125-128)

Similarly, in the recall data, the teacher comments on the principal's presentation strategy during the conference.

"I was asked for approval of his perception of the lesson." (774)

"What he was doing was telling me what he'd written down on the paper. It wasn't interactive" (833-834)

The principal, on the other hand, has a different impression of the conference process. He comments in his recall data

"I don't think I would change anything. I think I was perfectly honest with what I saw." (1296-1297)

"... we did this last fall. Much the same thing. And I suggested one or two things, you know, and that's why I felt it was fair game to mention those things. Because I think that's what it's about, isn't it." (1373-1376)

Eventually, the teacher's recall data indicates that he views supervision as evaluative.

"I feel comfortable with him observing. I feel like I sort of know what he's doing. But I still think that the supervision process is evaluative rather than, okay, he's trying to figure out whether I'm a good teacher or not, or whether I'm a competent teacher or not. Perhaps he's not concerned about good, he's concerned about competency. And I still feel that I'm on display for him to measure me; not as a helping person. That's still how I feel." (152-160)

In the principal's recall data he comments on report writing, suggesting a similar view of supervision.

"He is flexible and I think that's another thing that, you know, when you sit down to write a report, that needs to be mentioned."
(989-991)

Both conference participants appear to block communication through the process strategies they employ in the conference. A line count indicates that principal talk accounts for 279 lines of the conference dialogue, and teacher talk accounts for 81 lines. The principal's process strategies then, are largely drawn from the conference dialogue, while much of the teacher's process strategies are unpacked by him in the recall data.

Principal's Process Strategies

The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback.

Questions

An examination of the conference dialogue indicates the principal asks eight questions. Of these, four are seeking information, but may be viewed as inconsequential, as they deal with information regarding the specifics of such things as musical procedure, the name of an instrument, and a student's request. Each of these questions requires, and elicits, a one word or one sentence answer.

The other four are "leading" questions, requiring a yes or no answer, and/or seek agreement with what the principal is saying. For example, the principal commends the teacher's handling of one student's inappropriate behaviour and asks,

"I think that's basically one of your main rules in the classroom is it not? (T: Yes) Inappropriate. (T: Yes) Inappropriate behaviour, so long as it does not interfere with others." (166-169)

Later, the principal makes reference to several specific incidents involving another student's inappropriate behaviour. At one point he comments,

"... he was trying to get your attention, but you chose to ignore most of his ..." (451-452)

Instead of following up on what the teacher says about allowing the student to

establish appropriate behaviours for himself, the principal asks,

"Do you find that his goal is attention?" (475)

The teacher's response suggests he disagrees that the goal is attention-seeking at all times. The principal then states his opinion.

"But I really think it's attention that he's looking for." (525)

In turn, the teacher states his opinion.

"I think it varies, myself." (527)

In the recall data the teacher acknowledges the disagreement.

"He seemed to be trying to bring it back to his point again and my point was in opposition to his point ..." (492-493)

The principal also acknowledges the disagreement in the recall data.

"Oh I think that, yes, we also disagreed on the motives for the little guy's behaviour." (1312-1313)

The principal goes on to suggest he does not feel there was anything to be gained by pursuing a discussion of the student's behaviour, or the teacher's handling of that behaviour. His rationale is that the teacher is already aware of other possible techniques for managing inappropriate behaviour:

"... like, it was pretty good, you know, the behaviour of the kid. But there were a few minor occurrences, and he was one of the perpetrators and, you know, I think that, maybe managed a little differently, you might not end up with those occurrences." (1324-1328)

"That's what we're here for, is to try and show him ways of dealing, I think he already knows this way. But he chose a different avenue." (1330-1332)

"... I think he knows those other avenues. I'm quite sure he does, because I've seen him use them, other techniques." (1335-1336)

The contradiction in these recall data is that the principal also suggests the behaviour should have been handled differently and that part of the purpose of the supervisory conference is to provide teachers with alternatives.

However, the principal's leading question focuses on the student's behaviour,

rather than the teacher's handling of that behaviour. The possibility of communication about the latter appears to be blocked when the teacher's response is one of disagreement about the reason for the student's behaviour.

Later in the conference dialogue the principal asks another leading question, in relation to the same student.

"... and you kind of, I don't know whether you did it deliberately or not, you kind of saved that last one for him to give him a little bit of success, I would suspect. Is that right?" (564-566)

Initially the teacher agrees, then changes his mind, suggesting his actions were deliberate, but not designed to give the student success.

"I did not choose people to do it right. Because I think by doing it wrong we learn by our mistakes. And he needed to, he was getting the idea, but needed to be focusing just a bit better. So I made him, again, make that mistake. (P: Good) But people helped him correct it, and I don't think he was humiliated." (570-575)

The principal's recall data suggests that he feels the teacher did set out to give the student a successful experience. He also indicates that his decision not to pursue this is a conscious one, because it would not be "fair". Rather, he accepts the teacher's explanation and moves on, thereby forfeiting the opportunity to probe the teacher's actions:

"He didn't really give, see I thought he had that all, now, okay... I didn't pursue that."(1343, 1346)

"I'm sure he had that all figured out, but I wasn't going to, no, I wasn't going to mess with that. I don't think that would have been fair." (1350-1352)

"Ya, that was a good way out, if you like. But, myself, I thought it was a set-up for him, to give him a little success." (1358-1359)

Feedback

The nature of the principal's feedback appears to be more of an appraisal of the lesson rather than an exploration to facilitate the teacher's analysis. A

minimum of twenty appraising statements appear in the feedback of the conference dialogue. Statements such as,

"As far as I'm concerned, that's really important." (58-59) "And I thought that was very good." (173)

"To me, that's just an excellent way of getting the kids' attention." (235)

"And I think, you know, that's a very good technique." (285-286)

"And as far as I'm concerned, that was really well done." (307-308)

"I think with kids this age that's the way you have to go." (393-394)

"I would just say that, in general, I thought it was excellent." (756)

while perhaps intended to be positive feedback, are laden with the principal's opinion, rather than probing for the teacher's opinion or analysis.

In some instances, the principal uses statements that suggest the teacher's perception of the supervisory process is reasonably accurate. (lines 774, 833-834, 152-160)

"... so obviously you listened and take criticism or suggestions. I think that's super." (67-68)

"... and obviously you learned something there." (371)

In other instances, rather than eliciting a response from the teacher, the principal tells the teacher what he would have done in the situation, thereby taking on the role of expert rather than facilitator.

"I think the one thing I might have done there was to sit beside him, but we'll talk about that in a minute." (417-418)

"And those two maybe shouldn't be sitting beside each other, and I think maybe that's one of the things I might have done was either sat between them, or moved them, or whatever." (447-450)

"I think maybe, had he been sitting somewhere else, that wouldn't have happened." (667-668)

The didactic nature of this type of feedback and the principal's failure to elicit

responses from the teacher serve as serious communication blocks during the conference. While the teacher does far less talking in the conference situation, he discloses much more than the principal about his strategies in the recall data.

Teacher's Process Strategies

The teacher's recall data suggests a high degree of confusion and contradiction surrounding both his expectations for the conference proceedings and what he expects to gain from the conference. He admits early in the recall data to attempting to control the conference. His confused expectations and his desire to control the conference result in his blocking of communication through neutralizing the principal's feedback. He neutralizes this feedback either by focusing on his music objectives, as opposed to the management of instruction and student behaviour, or using denial and rationalization.

Confused Expectations

The teacher initially indicates that he does not expect much criticism of the lesson to arise in the conference,

"... it seems to me that I expected that he wasn't going to find too much wrong with the lesson." (113-115)

and then goes on to indicate that he feels the principal's perception is that he's looking for criticism.

"... his perception that I wasn't interested in what he had to say unless it was a criticism. Maybe I can't accept the strokes ..." (130-132)

While suggesting he can't accept positive feedback, he goes on, further in the recall data to contradict this:

"I really do like the fact that he notices the atmosphere in the classroom, of caring, of respect, of responsibility, cause those are three things that I really try to do for the kids." (343-346)

"And he allows me to feel comfortable when he's in the room and here, really, really comfortable. A good feeling for him to ... give

the strokes." (585-587)

While the teacher suggests the principal delivers a lot of positive strokes, and that he feels comfortable with him observing, he also suggests he views the supervision process as evaluative rather than helpful.

"I feel comfortable with him observing. I feel like I sort of know what he's doing. But I still think that the supervision process is evaluative rather than, okay, he's trying to figure out whether I'm a good teacher or not, or whether I'm a competent teacher or not. Perhaps he's not concerned about good, he's concerned about competency. And I still feel that I'm on display for him to measure me; not as a helping person. That's still how I feel. But I feel very comfortable. I feel, he makes me feel comfortable." (152-161)

The teacher goes on in the recall data to suggest that the reason he feels comfortable is because he can control the conference process, given the way the principal conducts it.

"I can't go wrong. I can play it. I can fill in the right answer in the blank because of the context." (178-179)

"He wasn't asking me. He wasn't putting me on the spot. But, then again, I felt I could answer the right things at the right time. You know, sort of like I was almost in control of it, of the interview. In terms of the resulting effect that he would have, the next time he comes into my classroom." (185-190)

"I can make him feel comfortable. I can make him feel that he's right by 'yes, you're right'. You know it's just the way it's set up. Somebody else could have handled the situation differently and said, 'What were you thinking?', and then said, and then sort of, sort of evaluated, you know postconference evaluation, based on, you know, what I thought I was doing." (193-199)

The teacher goes on to make further reference to the conference format and how it could be controlled.

"He told me what I said, and what I did, and he told me what the objectives were, and then he asked me if he was right. You know anybody with any, it's sort of almost politically, um, obvious, to make him feel good, even though I don't feel threatened by him. It's, you know, sure you stroke me, I'll stroke you. But it wasn't really, I felt that by the end of the observation I didn't have anything to go away to work on. Because everything was rosy, but there were things in the lesson that I might change next time." (775-783)

The teacher continues to express a sense of dissatisfaction with the conference

feedback.

"Ok, and then the purpose of the observation comes in as well. That's the bottom of the line, satisfactory or not satisfactory. So I see it as an evaluative tool rather than something to help me out. So I don't know, I feel sort of like I don't know what I should change and what I shouldn't change, you know. Maybe the things that I thought I wasn't doing right, actually are right, so I don't really know. I know what he thought were the good points, but I don't know what he thought were the bad points. And I can't believe that in first year teaching that there isn't something else I could work on ..." (788-797)

"I'm flying by the seat of my pants, and strokes are nice, but I really need something to work on, and he's one of the only people that I have that comes in and might be able to help me with things. When I have a problem I could go to him, but maybe he can see problems that I can't see, okay? And that's what I was sort of hoping for. I, I think, without being all that conscious of it." (806-812)

Although the teacher suggests he's looking for identification of "problems", or things to work on improving, he also expresses discomfort over the principal's repeated referral to the management of student behaviour.

"And I could have done with less talk about Francis. I didn't think I focused on him that much. I may have, um, but I think it was so incidental to what was going on in the lesson. So I was sort of a little, it wasn't, what's the word. I wasn't sure whether, I, their perception was right or his perception was, or my perception was. I didn't feel comfortable. I felt that there was a little bit of ... I can't think of an appropriate word. It just didn't match, okay." (610-620)

The teacher rationalizes the discussion of behaviour management as unimportant, and appears to reject it because of the principal's approach.

"... I think he wasn't concerned about what I thought about it. He was telling me. And I felt sort of like, 'well wait a minute, this is my lesson, not yours', you know. And do you want the inside story, you know. You know I just felt that that wasn't really important." (824-826, 829-832)

He then goes on to reiterate that he is looking for help through conference feedback, and, contradictory to recall data provided initially, indicates he was expecting criticism.

"Ya, I'm looking for help. Maybe it stems from my insecurities as a first year teacher and not knowing what, what's offered, but my expectation was one of um criticism, but with possible solutions. Not that it was a bad lesson. No, I felt good about it, but I want something to work on too." (840-845)

The teacher indicates confused expectations for the conference and the recall data is full of contradictions. While expressing dissatisfaction over not receiving desired feedback, the teacher, like the principal, appears to convolute communication in the recall data, as well as in the conference dialogue.

An examination of the teacher's conference dialogue indicates six responses which focus on music objectives, seven which focus on the teacher's philosophy, particularly as it pertains to student behaviour management, and two responses which are in direct disagreement with the principals's stated point-of-view. Each of these responding strategies, whether deliberate, conscious efforts or not, serve effectively to block communication through neutralizing the principal's feedback.

Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Music

Early in the recall data the teacher acknowledges the difference in the content focus of the conference dialogue, and suggests a rationale for the principal's selected focus.

"I was curious about his perception of the music objectives and he was watching classroom management." (115-116)

"I think that's probably what most people who are observing a specialist, where they don't have the expertise, do." (118-119)

Although the teacher acknowledges his recognition of the principal's purpose and focus in the observation and conference, he tends to talk at cross-purposes with the principal. For example, in response to the principal's comments on the teacher's procedures as good management techniques, the teacher focuses on his music objectives.

T: "It's a process rather than a signal. The echo is the thing I use, but this was related to the lesson." (214-217)

P: "But the end result is that the kids are all sitting there quietly and you're ready to go, you see." (216-217)

T: "As well as the concepts, that was warming up the voice, in preparation for singing." (309-310)

In the recall data, the teacher acknowledges the interdependency of the objectives, then goes on to suggest that he wants to educate the principal.

"This objective, regardless of how I tried to tell him, that the echo was, um, something that I use as a format, but the material in the echo was also geared to the learning objectives, so my warm up and my attention getting was also a learning type. He was again concerned with the fact that the end result was not the learning that was going on, but the fact that I had the focus of the kids. Which is another objective, you know, that I thought was of primary importance to him, and he brought the conversation back around to that objective that he wanted it to be. I wanted to educate him into the fact that it was more than that, that there were two, two goals, one was learning and one was behavioural or management." (220-234)

He continues this focus on his music objectives and his desire to educate the principal elsewhere in the recall data:

"That's something that I've worked up myself, and I wanted to share that with him, but he didn't give me the opportunity ... But I felt like I wanted to share my perceptions so much and that, after a while, I realized that, that wasn't, just wasn't the place, or this wasn't the time, or this wasn't the, you know ..." (258-260, 263-266)

"And I feel that in a specialists position it's my job to educate the people that are watching me too, the parents or, and this is an opportunity for me to do it at this conference. But after a while, like I sort of shut down. You get in what you can and don't overdo it." (301-305)

Again, even when the principal comments more specifically on student behaviour management, the teacher elects to pursue his focus on music objectives.

"I think that the development of the section with the drum was important. Establishing, again, a focus on the drum, with the starting and stopping, and the simple walk to the beat, and then establishing the ostinato that I was going to use later in the piece on the instruments, through large body muscles. That really helped

to get them into it. And then we sat back down again and clapped that. It was in their whole bodies ..." (419-427)

In the recall data the teacher elaborates on his response to the principal's comment, and gives some indication of the reason for his focus on music objectives. The data also provides evidence of rambling, disjointed thoughts which reinforce a sense of confusion and contradiction on the part of the teacher.

"I just wanted to jump in and tell him all the popular theories about, you know that speech and music and movement are all one for the young child and all this theory was running through my head. And I was, 'You got to know this, you got to know this', and just, holding on, and saying, 'we got to get through this'. So I thought it was really, I was not threatened at all by him, I feel very comfortable, really nice atmosphere. (434-442)

Throughout the conference dialogue the teacher maintains his focus on music, in spite of the fact that he recognizes, and acknowledges, the principal's focus on management. The comment in the above recall data suggests that the teacher may have consciously chosen his course of action, in order to neutralize the principal's feedback.

Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Teacher's Philosophy of Student Behaviour Management

The teacher espouses a positive, pleasant classroom atmosphere, and suggests each individual has some responsibility towards the group.

"The concepts are important too, from a professional sense, but the end result is attitude, as far as I'm concerned. Music's a safe place, and a nice place, to go to ... And it takes one person to take away from the silence, so it's responsibility on the part of every individual for the conduct of the group." (359-361, 364-366)

When the principal makes a specific suggestion for how he would have handled one incident of inappropriate behaviour, the teacher provides his rationale for ignoring the behaviour.

"Well I think at the time I was thinking more along the lines of Francis needs to be taught what's appropriate ...

So it's important to let him go and find that out, and then see if he can correct himself. And I do , sometimes, isolate him at the door when he is disturbing others. But I allow him to make mistakes, so that he can correct them. And he can possibly establish those appropriate behaviours for himself." (457-458, 468-474)

In the recall data, the teacher comments on his dialogue with the principal.

"Now I'm starting not to let, um, just be a yes man, and I'm not answering his questions, but saying, 'Wait a minute, maybe you've got this wrong, or maybe there's something else', and I'm sort of feeling a little bit, you know, um, like not being a yes man. I have some integrity too." (461-466)

In response to the principal's question regarding the student's motives for the behaviour, the teacher disagrees at two different times during the discussion. Through this disagreement he deflects, or neutralizes, the feedback, and blocks further communication of the handling of this particular incident.

P: "Do you find that his goal is attention?"

T: "At different times. Sometimes it's just his inability to stay on task, and sometimes it's just he's not used to sitting up. So it's a matter of building up his stamina to sit there and do what's appropriate for as long as everybody else." (475-484)

Further in the discussion, both participants restate their opposing points of view, before the principal proceeds on with his review of the lesson as he observed it.

P: "But I really think it's attention that he's looking for." (525)

T: "I think it varies myself." (527)

Later in the conference dialogue, the teacher again rationalizes his actions, suggesting that his actions were deliberate, but not intended to provide success for the student.

"I did not choose people to do it right, because I think by doing it wrong we learn by our mistakes, and Francis needed to, he was getting the idea, but needed to be focusing a bit better. So I made him, again, make that mistake. But people helped him correct it, and I don't think he was humiliated." (570-575)

In the recall data, the teacher continues this rationalization, suggesting the approach is a standard technique he uses.

"I often set kids up to make the mistake, so I know what stage of, of internalizing the concept they're at. but I have other kids in that class help them, I mean that's standard technique." (579-582)

The principal provides some positive feedback on the teacher's handling of the student's inappropriate behaviour but the teacher also neutralizes this feedback through his response.

P "Right, you know, in other words you're telling him, 'Hey come on, you've got to clap with the rest of the kids,' but you did it in a nice way." (622-625)

T: "I was just getting him on task. I don't really think what I said was important." (626-627)

P: "Well it was a good way of saying it. I like the way you say these things." (628-629)

In the principal's recall data, he indicates that this too was a point of disagreement which he chose not to pursue.

"I think you know, it's how you say it, more than anything else, that's so important, if you're trying to get a child on task." (1160-1163)

At only one point in the teacher's recall data, does he appear to come close to recognition of the points under discussion in the conference. However, he moves again into rationalization and denial, and although expressing some uncertainty and discomfort, he remains at those operational levels throughout the conference dialogue and in the recall data.

"I was really amazed at how many times I talked to Francis, that he picked up on, and that twigged that Francis, Francis's not a bad kid, but Francis needs that little statement to know that he's part of the class and he doesn't have different rights. I felt like I was more shaping him over the course of the lesson, without having to come down hard on him, and yet, here, with so much dwelling on Francis, I, I was sort of wondering if, you know, mention it once, twice, three times, that's okay, but the lesson revolved around more than Francis. And I could have done with less talk about Francis. I didn't think I focused on him that much. I may have, um, but I think it was so incidental to what was going on in the lesson. So I was sort of a little ... I wasn't sure whether ... his perception was right, or my perception was. I didn't feel comfortable. I felt there was a little bit of, I can't think of an appropriate word. It just

didn't match." (599-620)

Summary

The communication blocking in this conference is so all-encompassing that the conference participants appear to be talking at cross-purposes throughout. The blocking that occurs may be seen to arise out of the interpersonal dynamics of the conference situation, as well as out of the lack of a clear understanding of the purpose(s) of the conference, or clear objectives for the conference, on the part of both participants. The principal's process strategies revolve around the number and types of questions he poses and the nature of the feedback he provides. The teacher's process strategies stem from his confusion about what he wants from the conference and revolve around his efforts to neutralize the feedback being delivered by focusing on his music objectives, rationalization, or denial. Each of these strategies appears to be an attempt to maintain some control over the conference process.

Because of the communication block, the extent to which the conference content themes might constitute the basis for future change in the classroom setting is not clear. It is possible to speculate, however, that little connection was made between the content of the conference discussion and future action in the classroom.

**CASE STUDY B: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF
CONFERENCE DISCUSSION (ROUND 2)**

The lesson under discussion in this twenty minute conference is a grade two music lesson. The format of the lesson is similar to the grade one music lesson in round 1. The teacher is working on rhythm patterns with the students. The emphasis is on counting the number of beats in a phrase using voices and echoing, body movements and instruments.

The principal opens the conference by stating what he was looking for in the observation.

"today we sort of took a look at student management and the little things that make things go right." (13-14)

The principal also makes reference to the fact that a pre-conference did not take place prior to the observation.

"... I didn't get a chance to check with the daybook in the morning before you did the lesson. We talked about it briefly in the equipment room while we were setting up the gym ..." (20-23)

In his reaction data the teacher comments on the principal's focus in the conference.

"I think that ... I know where he's coming from now ... based on the last time when we were doing this, he's saying much the same thing as he was saying last time, so I understand where he's coming from, and I don't feel quite as unsure of what his conception of the class was. Also, this time, he started by saying we were looking at management, and throughout this interview, whatever, conversation, I felt that that's what we were focusing on. And sometimes, I would try and tell him what my musical objectives were, and again, that wasn't where he was going, and he kept pulling back to the management part." (73-85)

The content of this second round conference discussion focuses on the same two themes pertaining to classroom management as in the first round: management of student behaviour and management of instruction.

Management of Student Behaviour

The focus of the discussion related to this theme revolves around classroom routines, the handling of inappropriate behaviour and feeling tone.

Classroom Routines

The principal comments positively on several of the teachers classroom procedures for group management:

"... as the kids came in, you developed a good routine for having them come in through one door and they leave the other door ..."
(46-48)

"I noticed ... you had the bean bag on the floor, like you always do"
(49-51)

"The routines, they were the same routines coming in and leaving that you had in the lesson that we observed back in February and the kids know exactly what to do and it really works out well."
(54-57)

"Very seldom in that lesson did you ask a question and have them blurting out answers. So, obviously, what you have done is, you have good control and the kids have been taught the routines."
(212-215)

"I've noticed, from other lessons, that that seems to be one of your traits. You like that circle and it seems to work well for you."
(546-548)

Handling Inappropriate Student Behaviour

Inappropriate behaviour on the part of two different students is discussed. In the first instance the principal condones the teacher's handling of the situation and the teacher comments on his actions.

P: "... at that point, poor old Fred came to the door. And you obviously knew that he had a problem. So you recognized right away that he wasn't really with us and acted accordingly. I think what you did there was perfectly right, in not insisting that he follow the same things, because he just isn't capable." (265-267, 305-308)

T: "Sometimes he's fantastic and I do insist on it, but today when he practically falls in the door, I don't know." (310-311)

P: "... after they got going on that movement activity, poor old Fred. I guess he was still sort of sitting in the corner and you chose to ignore him at that point in time. And I think that was probably the best thing to do." (372-376)

T: "I think he probably got something out of it just sitting there watching."

P: "Fred, yeah, and you pulled him into the group at that point in time. Uh, it seemed to me he was sitting there, facing the blackboard with his feet up on the board. Just sitting there like old King Tut himself. But really, you know the other kids; it didn't really make that much difference to them, because I think they understand what the situation is." (498-504)

T: "My concern was that he would feel separated from the group when he woke up. So I put him in the group before he woke up, ha ha." (506-508)

In the second instance the principal is not specific in his comments, but he does not condone the teacher's handling of the situation.

P: "And then, I just noticed at that point, that Bill was doing a little bit of pushing, and I don't know whether you saw it, or whether you ignored it, or what, but, I guess he's one of the ones that you've got to watch a little bit." (551-554)

T: "Bill, I'm usually quite hard on Bill and Jason I usually separate, but they usually manage to find themselves again, especially when we go back to the circle." (556-558)

P: "They're just like magnets towards each other, eh?" (560)

In the teacher's recall data, he indicates,

"I took that to mean, keep an eye on Bill, keep watching for Bill, cause he's getting worse. I don't know if that's what was meant, but ..." (564-566)

Further discussion of the handling of this student's inappropriate behaviour revolves around the procedure for lining students up to leave the lesson. The teacher comments,

"Was Bill not at the front? Did you notice that I'd separated Bill? I remember at the end of the lesson thinking, 'Well, the front of the line is like a reward for the children and, I mean, if that works for them that's fine. I'll go along with it.' But he was rewarded for being at the door. But, if I hadn't, he was already at the door. He had been removed from the circle because of a misbehaviour, and I felt that I had rewarded him somehow for his misbehaviour and

didn't like that." (576, 584-590)

Feeling Tone

The discussion of feeling tone centres around the teacher's phrasing and the creation of a positive attitude on the part of the students. The principal comments positively,

"...and you said, 'show me the circle please,' and it's kind of nice to see teachers using courtesy words." (51-53)

Further on in the discussion, the principal is more specific about the importance of the teacher's phrasing in the establishment of both a positive feeling tone in the classroom and a positive attitude on the part of students. Because the teacher is focusing on the music objectives for the lesson, he appears to miss the point the principal is trying to make and the principal pulls the teacher back to his focus on management of student behaviour.

P: "That's just basically a non-judgmental way of saying let's get on with it." (195-196)

T: "Um, I was also giving them rhythmic clues. I didn't just say, 'your turn'. It was always within the rhythm..." (198-199)

P: "Well, what I was referring to was the way you phrased that. You know, it was sort of a nonjudgmental way of saying it." (204-206)

The principal reinforces his point later in the conference discussion.

"And then again, the little courtesy words, ... 'would you be my echo', and there you were inviting them. You were asking them to do something in sort of an indirect approach, rather than telling them to do it." (254-258)

Again, rather than picking up on the point the principal is making, the teacher replies,

"Sometimes I get kids saying no. Then I say, 'I was asking you before; now I'm telling you.' The expectation is the same." (260-262)

In the teacher's recall data he indicates,

"He has helped me recognize my main objective for the music is attitude. You know, we enjoy music. It is a safe, happy place to go to." (157-159)

He goes on to refer to his use of praise, saying that it,

"Sets the right attitude...I respect them and I hope they respect me, and I can see you smiling sort of tells me that you do. It is a two-way street. We have a good rapport." (190-193)

Later in the conference discussion, the principal also comments on the objective of attitude and student enjoyment in music.

"...and the kids were just having a great time. Everybody had a smile on their face, and that's part of what you're trying to teach them in music. That's fine." (514-516)

Management of Instruction

The focus of the discussion related to this theme revolves around time-on-task and pacing.

Time-on-Task

In referring to time-on-task, the principal comments favourably on the fact that there is no wasting of time.

"The lesson began right away. There was absolutely no wasting of time." (57-58)

He also comments favourably on student participation and attention:

"I just mentioned here, good participation and, again, the participation stops all the fooling around that might take place." (151-153)

"Somewhere along the line, their attention wandered a little bit and then all of a sudden, you said, 'do this, do that'. Those are real good activities. Rather than this nagging that so often goes on in the classroom." (493-498)

However, when the principal comments on a transition problem, involving breaking the students into three groups, and makes a specific suggestion for handling such a situation, the teacher is not receptive and considerable discussion

ensues.

P: "The system of numbering, where you divide them into groups 1, 2, and 3. That has a few little quirks in it that could fairly easily be ironed out..." (381-384)

T: "That's the first time. I mean, I often number kids." (388)

P: "It was a bit confusing." (389)

Further in the discussion the teacher asks,

"So what were your suggestions?" (447-448)

He goes on to say, "That's the first time I've done that with them", and then concedes, "Well, that part of the lesson didn't go as smoothly as I had hoped." (452, 458-459)

When the principal suggests "it went pretty well," the teacher says, "No, no, I meant when I remember what happened there. It stopped the lesson. They weren't prepped for that routine." (461-463)

Lesson Pacing

The principal's comments on the pacing of the lesson focus on the varying of activities and are positive in nature.

"You had them clapping on their toes, on their ears, on their nose, and everything else. If you have good variety like that, it minimizes the problems you may end up with." (208-210)

"So that took up about ten minutes of the lesson, and then, at that point, you changed the activity." (315-316)

In the recall data, the principal comments,

"Basically, that's his pattern, and he's done it all year. Like, even in September, his lessons went much the same way. I don't know where he learned that pattern from, but basically they're always the same; divided into ten minute intervals..." (1217-1221)

Later in the conference discussion, the principal makes further reference to the importance of pacing in classroom management.

"Again, by varying the activities that they do tends to cut down on any problems you are going to have." (324-325)

In the conference dialogue, the teacher indicates, at this point, that his purpose

was not management, and goes on to explain his music objectives.

In the recall data the teacher refers, again, to differing perceptions or "agendas".

"I was sort of thinking while I was talking that this is going in one ear, and he has a different agenda than...I just sort of had to keep holding myself back." (344-347)

Summary

The themes discussed in this second round conference are the same as in the first. The theme of student behaviour management includes discussion of classroom routines as well as feeling tone and the handling of inappropriate behaviour. The emphasis in this discussion is again the latter. The theme of management of instruction involves discussion of time-on-task, with a focus on the handling of transitions, and lesson pacing, with an emphasis on varying student activities to minimize potential behaviour problems.

**CASE STUDY B: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE
(ROUND 2)**

The setting for this after-school conference is again in the music room, where the observed lesson took place. The physical arrangement is similar to that of the round one conference, although both conference participants are seated in hard chairs.

The principal's opening remarks are content-related, as before. There is also no change apparent in the attention given to the interpersonal dynamics in this second round conference.

In the teacher's recall data, he comments on these things.

"... based on the last time when we were doing this, he's saying much the same things as he was saying last time, so I understand where he's coming from, and I don't feel quite as unsure of what his conception of the class was. Also this time, he started by saying that we were looking at management. And throughout this interview, whatever, conversation, I felt that that's what we were focusing on. And sometimes I would try and tell him what my musical objectives were, and again, that wasn't where he was going, and he kept pulling back to the management part." (75-85)

"I did feel terribly uncomfortable. I remember being very aware of my body, and it's just sitting sideways, trying to talk over your shoulder to someone. ... I felt like I wanted to turn the chair around. Em, again, you know, look how spread out he is. I remember at one time moving my arm around and being conscious of that as opposed to what was going on." (86-93)

"One other thing, I still got the sense he's reading, he's trying to stay on track. I felt that he spent a lot of time looking at his paper, to remind him where he was going, rather than remembering what was going on in the lesson. It's also the end of the day, and it (the lesson) was the beginning of the day, but I didn't have any paper to look at. I was looking at the side of his head." (111-118)

The process strategies in this conference again revolve around the general theme of communication blocking. Similarly, this blocking appears to arise, though not as significantly, out of the interpersonal dynamics of the conference situation, as

well as the fact that the participants do not have a shared purpose or objectives for the conference.

Both conference participants continue to block communication through process strategies similar to ones they employed in the first conference. However, a line count indicates that this conference is more interactive than the first. Principal talk here accounts for 209 lines while teacher talk accounts for 108 lines. While more interactive than the first conference, there appears to be fewer examples of communication blocking in this conference.

In their recall data, each of the conference participants draws some comparison between the first and second round conferences. Each also comments on their view of the effects of the supervisory process. Some of these comments may provide insight into the similarities and differences between the two conferences.

Principal's Process Strategies

As before, the principal's process strategies are analyzed around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback.

Questions

An analysis of the conference dialogue indicates the principal asks four questions. All are leading or yes/no type questions. They call for information that proves to be inconsequential in relation to the substantive content of the conference discussion. For example,

"Did you use that lesson for the other grade two classes and the grade one's as well?" (26-27)

"Would it be about 400 kids?" (67-68)

"Does she ever say anything to you?" (219)

Each question elicits a single phrase answer from the teacher.

Feedback

There is no appreciable difference in the nature of the principal's feedback from the first round to the second round conference. He continues to tell the teacher what was happening and provide an appraisal, rather than facilitating the teacher's exploration and analysis of the lesson. A minimum of fourteen appraising statements appear in the feedback of the conference dialogue.

Statements such as,

"Things went really well as far as I could see ..." (47)

"I think that's really important." (53)

"This kind of phrasing forces kids to listen. That's the kind of thing that I like to see in the lesson." (128-129)

"Okay, I just mentioned here, good participation ..." (151-152)

"And then, the other thing that impressed me was the clapping on different parts of the body." (206-207)

"I think what you did there was perfectly right." (306-307)

are "I" statements that express the principal's opinion, rather than probing for the teacher's opinion or analysis.

In some instances the principal simply tells rather than probing.

"... that sort of prevented any problems that might have been seen as a result of changing from the circle to moving around." (319-321)

"Again, by varying the activities that they do tends to cut down on any problems you are going to have." (324-325)

In other instances he suggests what he would do in the situation.

"The system of numbering, where you divide them into groups 1, 2 and 3. That has a few little quirks in it that could fairly easily be ironed out. What I do when I divide kids up that way in a classroom situation is ... ones go there, twos go there, threes go there. Just a minor thing." (381-386)

In response to this type of feedback, the teacher begins to rationalize.

T: "That's the first time, I mean, I often number kids." (388)

P: "It was a bit confusing." (389)

:T "It's where I get the balance." (389)

Although the principal suggests it's a minor thing, he chooses to pursue it.

"But, if the kids aren't with you, you know, if they are trying to get your goat, or whatever, then they are going to forget right away and they are not going to go to the right group." (394-397)

The teacher continues his effort to rationalize.

T: "But did you notice that after I numbered them ..." (399)

P: "They helped each other." (400)

T: "No, but after ... well, maybe they did." (400-401)

And the principal continues to pursue his point.

"They did, yes, in the end. But, two of the kids didn't make it, or chose to ignore, or whatever." (403-404)

The discussion continues in this vein until the principal withdraws and prepares to go on, saying,

"Okay, and that really worked well." (447)

The teacher then asks,

"So what were your suggestions?" (447-448)

The principal offers,

"Oh, I just suggested that I put a number up, or make it a little more different, or do it a little slower. Because there was a little bit of confusion." (448-450)

And the teacher begins to rationalize again,

"That's the first time I've done that with them. Usually, I have them in a circle, and then I say this group is one, this is two, this is three." (451-454)

"But we were already standing up." (458)

before he finally concedes,

"Well, that part of the lesson didn't go as smoothly as I had hoped."
(458-459)

Having succeeded in bringing the teacher to this stage, the principal again withdraws.

"Oh, I thought it went pretty well." (461)

Although the teacher concedes, again, that the situation was problematic, this is not followed by any clear indication of possible solutions.

"No, no, I meant when I remember what happened there. It stopped the lesson. They weren't prepped for that routine." (462-463)

In the teacher's recall data, he makes use of the word "justify" and suggests his discomfort with what he perceives to be critical feedback is evident in his body language.

"I was talking about myself. The fact that I tried to justify what I was doing. It looks as if I was trying to justify my perception of what had happened, why I was doing it. It just wasn't a simple something that I had done on the spur of the moment and hadn't thought about. So, it looks to me as though this is the first negative thing he said, and all of a sudden I am squirming in my chair and hiding behind my hand and ... I had anticipated problems in breaking them up into three ... I mean what he said is true. I could have numbered the corners." (429-436, 444-445)

In his recall data, the teacher again comments on his reactions to the principal's feedback in the conference, and his defensiveness as evidenced in his body language and his dialogue.

"I can comment on his performance as easily as he can comment on mine. There's a good open rapport, and he accepts my suggestions, and I try to accept his. It didn't look like it there. I was really sort of taken aback at how that looked, like I was trying to justify, really his only suggestion, for the whole thing." (618-623)

"... I mean, my body. It's the first time I moved from having my head on my hands and my shoulder or jaw clenched or, I mean I got up and practically danced around the room as much as I could in the chair." (628-631)

"And then I sort of felt that, in myself, at the time ... and I sort of calmed down and went, 'Well, okay, so, maybe I am being rather defensive, and what were you're suggestions', and then I sort of

settled down and thought, 'Okay, well let's take this as a suggestion and ...'" (636-640)

The principal indicates, in his recall data, that he feels his feedback will have an impact on the teacher. He also comments on how the teacher accepts criticism.

"I think the next time he does that, he'll either do it a little smoother, or he'll be aware of it. I think he takes criticism fairly hard. Like he likes to be perfect, and I think in most instances, he is a very good teacher, for a first year teacher." (1142-1146)

This is one of the two instances of considerable animated dialogue in the conference discussion. In this case, the discussion is about management of a transition and the principal's didactic feedback provokes a defensive response in the teacher. Further in the conference dialogue the principal provides feedback on the management of student behaviour. In this instance he reports what he observes, rather than appraising the situation, and is more tentative in his suggestion to the teacher.

"And then, I just noticed at that point, that Bill was doing a little bit of pushing and I don't know whether you saw it or whether you ignored it, or what, but, I guess he's one of the ones that you've got to watch a little bit." (551-554)

Rather than addressing the incident directly, the teacher indicates how he usually manages the student's behaviour.

"Bill, I'm usually quite hard on. Bill and Jason I usually separate, but they usually manage to find themselves again, especially when we go back to the circle." (556-558)

In the recall data, the teacher goes on to interpret the principal's feedback.

"I took that to mean, keep an eye on Bill, keep watching for Bill, 'cause he's getting worse. I don't know if that's what was meant but ..." (564-566)

The continued didactic, appraising nature of the principal's feedback neither elicits, nor allows for, responses from the teacher. Feedback interpreted as criticism elicits a defensive response from the teacher. Each of the principal's process

strategies then, appear to block communication rather than facilitate it.

Recall Data

The principal makes a statement regarding his role as a supervisor, which, compared with how he carries out that role in both conference situations, appears contradictory.

"I'm the type of person that doesn't say you have to do it my way - there are lots of ways of doing things, and I've been at this long enough to know that there are many, many teaching styles, and if it works for one person, it might not necessarily work for another, and I don't think that we have to mold teachers into models of ourselves, but if they're having trouble, we can suggest ways of changing, and if they take the suggestions, then they're going to become better teachers." (1194-1202)

He goes on to suggest ways in which he has worked with the teacher in his supervisory role. He acknowledges the teacher's expertise in his subject area and indicates that the pattern or style of his teaching was set when he started his teaching career in the fall. The principal suggests that the area in which he has worked most with the teacher is "management", but he is very vague about what he has done with the teacher in this area.

"... when he came, we sat down and we talked about, you know, how I would like to see things go, and he's the expert in music, that's not my field at all. And in terms of management, we sat down with the teachers and we decided that the teachers would bring the kids right to the room to this door. They come in and go out that door, so that helps a lot. And in terms of his lessons and that, a lot of the ideas were his own. Basically that's his pattern, and he's done it all year. Like, even in September, his lessons went very much the same way. I don't know where he learned that pattern from, but basically they're always the same; divided into ten minute intervals, a lot of activities, lots of participation. He has the instruments out all the time. The room is, I don't think there's an awful lot you can criticize, I really don't. I mean you can get really knipicky at times and that just turns people off. So, that, I feel, too, is the mystery of it you know. If I make a suggestion, it's going to be on something that's very important." (1210-1229)

The principal comments further on the development of the teacher's teaching.

"Well, as I said before, he had the patterns before he came and he hasn't changed his patterns very much. The kids respond well to it, and I think basically all he's done is sort of refined, and got better at the management things." (1270-1273)

The principal essentially characterizes the teacher's teaching as static, with little change or development evident during the major portion of the first year (September to April). It is possible to speculate that his view of the efficacy of the supervisory process may account for the negligible effect supervision appears to have had on the teacher.

"... one of the things that I really feel strongly about is the supervision process itself isn't the be-all and the end-all of improving teacher performance. In fact, I think it's one of the least effective ways of supervision, I guess you would call it. I think there are an awful lot of other ways of dealing with, or helping people." (1304-1348)

Although he goes on to indicate that in-service and observing other teachers are two of the alternatives he would advocate, he does not provide any specific indication that these alternatives were provided for this teacher.

It is possible to speculate, given the amount and nature of the principal's recall data, that communication blocking occurred at this time, as well as during the conference dialogue.

Teacher's Process Strategies

As in the previous conference, the teacher continues to block communication by neutralizing the principal's feedback in two ways. In most instances he chooses to focus on his music objectives, and continues his efforts to "educate" the principal, even though he indicates he understands that the focus of the conference is on student behaviour management. In other instances his response strategy is to neutralize feedback through rationalization or focusing on details and elaborating on what the principal is saying. Many of these instances

involve a discussion of student behaviour management.

Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Music

The number of times the teacher elects to focus on music in his responses to the principal's feedback during this conference does not differ considerably from the first conference. What does differ is the length of the teacher's responses. He does more talking during this conference. Examples of teacher responses which focus on his music objectives include:

"... I've been working on that for two weeks now, to try to get them to sort of take the role of the conductor. So really what it is, is just lead the rest of the class, you know, as well as self-image and the other social things." (142-146)

And in response to the principal's appraising comment about his phrasing of instructions to the students, the teacher again emphasizes his music objectives.

"That's just, basically, a non-judgmental way of saying let's get on with it." (195-196)

"Um, I was also giving them rhythmic cues. I didn't just say, 'your turn'. It was always within the rhythm, so they wouldn't drop the beat. It is one thing to be able to do it, to give the pattern, but to be able to keep up the beat and not lose it was what I was stressing with that." (198-202)

While the teacher appears to recognize the duality of purpose, or interdependency, of the management and music objectives, his responses to the principal's feedback do not appear to facilitate the achievement of his objective of "educating" the principal, or bringing him to this recognition. Because the lack of, and need for, this understanding is never directly addressed in the conference dialogue, the participants continue to talk at cross-purposes, each intent on pursuing his point, and thereby tending to block any effective communication.

In the second instance of considerable animated dialogue in the conference discussion, this point is illustrated.

P: "But, remember you had them separating their fingers. (T: Oh, finger phrases) Again, by varying the activities that they do tends to cut down on any problems you are going to have." (323-325)

The principal's feedback tells rather than probes. In response the teacher elects to focus on his music objectives.

"Yeh, that also helped ... I mean I wasn't doing it for management. I was doing it to focus on ..." (327-328)

The principal persists with his point about management.

"No, but it helps, though." (330)

The teacher persists with his point as well.

"For sure, but I was getting them to focus on the number of phrases and that there are a number of beats that make up each phrase, and giving them some kind of visual aid to when they were supposed to come in, and for how long it was going. Because I kept changing the length of the phrase that I expected them to echo and it also prepared them for the movement phrase. Where I had them going back and forth against me. The phrase that we had already done with our fingers. We were going somewhere with that phrase idea, right from the very beginning." (332-339, 368-370)

In the recall data, the teacher indicates that he is aware of the differences in agenda, and of the fact that the principal is not attending to the information about music he is providing.

"He likely wasn't listening there when he was moving his paper. I mean he has his head turned towards me but his eyes just on the paper. I was sort of thinking while I was talking that this is going in one ear, and he has a different agenda than I do, and I just sort of had to keep holding myself back." (342-347)

"... his focus is strictly management. And also, he was getting off on making me feel happy about how positive the management thing was, and I sort of felt that I shouldn't take away from his happiness. I keep holding back and folding my arms across .. see it now, and sort of pulling a little smile, as if to say, 'okay, you go on, this is your show'" (361-367)

The teacher also identifies his closed body language as a signal of his "holding back" from communication with the principal and identifies his "little smile" as a signal of his tolerance of the principal's feedback. In other words, he seems to

suggest that little communication is taking place that will have any effect on his Future actions in the classroom.

Neutralizing of Feedback: Focus on Teacher's Philosophy of Student Behaviour Management

Perhaps because the principal uses the same didactic approach whether commending or criticizing the teacher's actions in terms of student behaviour management, the teacher appears to feel compelled to neutralize either type of feedback through his response. For example,

P: "... and there you were, inviting them. You were asking them to do something, in sort of an indirect approach, rather than telling them to do it." (256-258)

T: "Sometimes I get kids saying no; then I say, I was asking you before, now I'm telling you. The expectation is the same." (260-261)

Because they talk at cross-purposes, the teacher appears to miss the point the principal is trying to make in his feedback.

At other times, the teacher's strategy appears to be to focus on details, perhaps in an effort to take the conference discussion away from points about which he feels criticism might be rendered. For example,

P: "Okay, uh, then, at that point, poor old Fred came to the door. And you obviously knew that he had a problem." (266-27)

T: "He was coming in the door behind me, too." (270)

P: "Yeh, that's right. It was the wrong door." (272)

T: "No, he was coming in the right door. But I was sitting in front of the door. It was one of the children that told me someone was at the door." (274-276)

P: "Ok, where were we at?" (278)

In the recall data, the teacher reveals the possible reason for this strategy of focusing on details.

"I was curious to know if he was going to tell me that Fred had been there for five minutes, and that I hadn't noticed. Because I had no idea how long he had been there." (281-283)

The other major instance of teacher rationalization is dealt with in the section on the principal's feedback where, in a discussion of student management, the teacher becomes defensive when he perceives the feedback to be in the form of criticism. Perhaps because the principal's feedback in this second conference contains fewer criticisms couched in 'what I would do' phrases, the number of the teacher's rationalization responses are also considerably fewer.

Recall Data

The teacher's recall data indicates he feels much more relaxed in the second round observation and conference than in the first. He suggests this more relaxed feeling comes from growth in confidence.

"But it also comes out of, I'm at three schools, I've been observed by three principals, and a music supervisor, and I've been getting, like they're building me up a lot, and so now, I don't feel like I'm an impostor anymore, and that someone's going to find out. I have the confidence that that's what I look like to people. I know I can improve, and I've got to work on this by myself, but that the road for improvement is my own, but I have to go after that, nobody's going to come and volunteer to help me." (689-697)

While acknowledging that there is room for improvement he indicates professional growth is up to him. Further on in the recall data, he makes reference, again, to not getting any help or assistance with his professional growth from the principal.

"I don't feel, it's that the whole professional development thing comes from me, not from him. But he can make comments. I don't know. It's my program, not his, and I know that now." (716-719)

In commenting on the efficacy of the supervisory process, the teacher indicates that it has had limited impact on his teaching ability.

"It's useful. I don't know, it gives me an opportunity to find out where he's coming from, and what he's looking for, 'cause I know he has to write reports. It's useful because it clarifies what his expectations for me are, as a teacher, and what his perception of my teaching capabilities are, and my abilities as a teacher. It's built up my confidence." (724-729)

The teacher goes on to indicate the confidence level he feels he has attained.

"It hasn't been, in all of the supervision, I really haven't had many suggestions to improve. I don't know, I don't feel typical. I've had a fairly deep background in this and I have more qualifications than they do, and I have a more well-rounded experience than even the music supervisor, and so I guess, all I'm looking for is their confidence in me now. Whereas before, I wasn't sure what they would really say." (737-744)

He does suggest, however, that he expects he will change, as a music teacher, over time.

"I expect to change, I expect my goals for myself to change drastically from what they were this year, and I'm gong to become more program, I think, oriented. I have the teaching skills. People have told me I have the teaching skills. I think I have the teaching behaviours, for teaching music anyway, down pretty well, and I'm going to look for new ones, and I'm going to look to make my program more exciting. So that, those are my professional goals." (751-759)

When invited to comment on any other aspects of the supervisory process, the teacher appears to contradict himself again, and goes on to allude to his "problems".

"I would rather be supervised by, or have the opportunity to watch other teachers teach, because I know what my problems are, and I'm looking for solutions to specific problems." (790-792)

When asked to clarify his suggestion that he'd like to be supervised by other teachers, and have the opportunity to observe others teaching, he focuses on criticism as a part of the supervisory process, and, again, on the specialist nature of his role, rather than the generic skills of teaching.

"Oh, I'd like to ask them, you know, to share with them what I saw going wrong in their lesson too, I think that's the nature of the specialist thing. I'd still like the opportunity to observe other teachers. I think that would benefit me more. Maybe I'd have to

go outside of the district to teachers that I respect, or I know that I could learn something from. Not like a fledgling music program."
(806-812)

The teacher still appears to be experiencing some of the confusion evident in the first round data regarding the supervisory process and what he hopes to gain, or feels he can gain from it. An air of pretentiousness or, perhaps, arrogance may be discernible in some of the teacher's recall data. At the same time he indicates discomfort and uncertainty. It is not possible to determine whether the former feelings are held as a protection from, or as the result of, the latter feelings. However, the presence of either, or both, of these feelings does have some impact on the nature of the teacher's responses during both conference situations.

Summary

While the conference dialogue is more interactive here, the communication blocking in this conference appears to be less pronounced than in the first conference. However, the participants continue to talk at cross-purposes throughout, and effectively block communication in doing so. Both conference participants continue to block communication through process strategies similar to ones they employed in the first conference. The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback. The teacher's process strategies revolve around his efforts to neutralize the feedback by focusing on his music objectives, or rationalization.

The recall data provided by both participants suggest neither found the supervisory process to have much efficacy in terms of constituting the basis for future change in the classroom setting.

CASE STUDY B: OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE

The data collected for the observed performances of each teacher are organized in three ways. The mean scores for all categories (1-9) are reported for round one observation prior to the workshop intervention, and for round two observation after the workshop intervention. Pre-workshop means, then, are calculated on the basis of round one observation data, prior to the workshop intervention. Post workshop means are calculated on the basis of round two observation data, following the workshop intervention. Within each case the mean scores represent the "flavour" of each lesson as observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a mean score of 3.50000 or greater represents a high rating, a mean score of 2.50000 or lower represents a low rating, and a mean score between 2.50000 and 3.50000 represents an average rating, based on a five point component rating scale

Change scores are also reported. These are computed by subtracting the preworkshop mean from the post workshop mean. The change score provides some indication of both the direction (positive or negative) and the degree (minimal or substantial) of change. Within each case, then, the change scores represent a comparative measure of the differences between the lessons observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a change score of 0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change and a change score of less than 0.50000 represents a minimal change.

Ratings, based on the mean scores for each category, are also reported for prior to and after the workshop intervention.

The organization of the data in each of these ways contributes to an overall profile of the observed performance(s) of each teacher.

Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher B's Observed Performance Across All Categories

Table 5.1 reports the category mean and change scores for teacher B's observed performance across all categories and across observers.

Mean Scores

An examination of the pre and post workshop mean scores and their relative ratings provides an observed performance rating profile for teacher B in Table 5.2.

While the overall rating remains constant, several categories show positive or negative change. In each instance, the change is substantial enough to move the category from one rating to another.

Category 7 indicates a positive change from a low rating prior to the workshop intervention in round one observation to an average rating following the workshop intervention in round two observation. Category 1 changes positions with category 7, moving in a negative direction from an average rating to a low rating.

Category 9 indicates a positive change from an average rating prior to the workshop intervention in round one observation to a high rating following the workshop intervention in round two observation. Category 8 changes positions with category 9, moving in a negative direction from a high rating to an average rating. The other five category ratings remain constant.

In terms of an overall, cross-category performance profile, teacher B would be

Table 5.1 Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher B's Observed Performance: An Overview of All Categories

| Category | Pre-Workshop Mean | Post-Workshop Mean | Change Score |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | 2.95000 | 1.95455 | -0.99545 |
| 2 | 4.00000 | 5.00000 | 1.00000 |
| 3 | 4.00000 | 4.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 4 | 3.25000 | 2.75000 | -0.50000 |
| 5 | 3.12500 | 3.00000 | -0.12500 |
| 6 | 5.00000 | 5.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 7 | 2.31250 | 3.46667 | 1.15417 |
| 8 | 4.00000 | 3.25000 | -0.75000 |
| 9 | 2.87500 | 4.30000 | 1.42500 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Change Score = Post minus Pre

0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change

0.50000 or lower represents a minimal change

Category Means and change scores are based on a five point scale.

Table 5.2 Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher B

| Rating | Categories | |
|---------|--------------|---------------|
| | Pre-Workshop | Post-Workshop |
| Low | 7 | 1 |
| Average | 1,4,5,9 | 4,5,7,8 |
| High | 2,3,6,8 | 2,3,6,9 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Ratings

| | |
|---------|----------------------|
| Low | = 2.50000 or lower |
| Average | = 2.50000 to 3.50000 |
| High | = 3.50000 or higher |

Ratings are based on a five point scale.

rated as average or above average (high) in eight out of nine categories. The profile is not a stable one, however, with four out of nine categories fluctuating widely enough to alter ratings, and change occurring in both directions (positive and negative).

Change Scores

An examination of change scores by category (Table 5.1) supports this fluctuating performance profile for teacher B. No change is evident in two categories, positive change is evident in three categories, and negative change in four categories.

No Change Categories

No change is evident in category 3, rules and procedures. A mean of 4.00000 both pre and post workshop, indicates this category was given a high rating in both observations.

No change is also evident in category 6, disruptive student behaviour. A mean of 5.00000 in this instance indicates no evidence of disruptive behaviour was observed in either the first or second observation.

Positive Change Categories

In all three categories indicating positive change, the change scores are above 0.50000, representing a substantial change.

Category 2, room arrangement, has a change score of 1.00000, from a mean of 4.00000 to a mean of 5.00000. This change score indicates that although this category was rated highly in the first round observation, a substantial positive change was noted in the second observation.

Category 7, inappropriate behaviour, has a change score of 1.15417. In this

instance, the change is substantial enough to change the rating of category 7 from low to average. This change score indicates a decrease in the occurrences of inappropriate behaviour observed in round two and/or a rating increase in the teacher's method of handling inappropriate behaviour.

Category 9, miscellaneous, has a change score of 1.42500. Again, the change is substantial enough to change the rating of category 9 from average to high. This change score indicates either a decrease in the teacher's distracting mannerisms and/or an increase in the occurrences of listening and attending to students, or in the teacher's expression of feelings in round two observation.

Negative Change Categories

The remaining four categories indicate negative change. Three of those four categories have a change score of 0.50000 or greater, representing a substantial negative change.

i) Substantial Negative Change Categories

Category 1, instructional management, has a change score of -0.99545, representing a substantial negative change. In this instance, the change is substantial enough to change the rating of category 1 from average to low. This change score indicates that the teacher's instructional management techniques were rated considerably lower in the second observation than in the first observation.

Category 4, meeting student concerns, has a change score of -0.50000, also representing a substantial negative change. In this instance, the rating of category 4 remains constant at an average rating. This change score indicates that the teacher's efforts to take student

concerns into account in instructional activities were rated lower in round two observation than in round one.

Category 8, classroom climate, has a change score of -0.75000, again representing a substantial negative change. This change also affects a rating change for category 8, from high to average. This change score indicates that fewer examples of positive teacher feeling tone and/or fewer examples of student task-orientation were evident to the observers in the second observation.

ii) Minimal Negative Change Categories

Category 5, managing student behaviour, has a change score of -0.12500, representing a minimal negative change in the teacher's signaling, monitoring, and rewarding of appropriate behaviour, and/or in the consistency with which the teacher responds to appropriate and inappropriate behaviour in round two observation.

A profile of change score ratings for all nine categories indicates no change in two categories and substantial positive or negative change in six out of the seven categories where change is evident.

Chapter 6

CASE STUDY C: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF CONFERENCE DISCUSSION (ROUND 1)

The lesson under discussion in this fourteen minute conference is a grade four/five language arts lesson. The grade fours have a choice of activities, including work at a listening centre, which they have not used for some time. The grade fives have independent board work and reading, followed by a group lesson on designing a travel brochure.

The content of the conference discussion revolves around the classroom management theme of managing instruction. The principal opens the conference with reference to the pre-conference discussion and purposes for the observation. The principal agreed to provide feedback on the "transitions between the fours and fives in class" (12-13) and the teacher's questioning techniques.

Management of Instruction

The focus on this theme involves discussion of the teacher's movements between grade level groups, lesson pacing and questioning distribution.

Transitions/Monitoring

The principal moves into a discussion of transitions early in the conference. His focus is on the teacher's movement from grade level to grade level. The teacher uses the term monitoring to describe her actions. It becomes clear to the conference participants that they do not have a shared understanding of the term transition, and the recall data supports this.

The principal's approach is to provide feedback and then question the teacher

about the purpose of her actions, in order to draw a response from her.

P: "... in focusing on the transitions from one to another I did notice that you took time, two or three times in the initial part of the lesson, to check to see that the grade fives were working okay, came back and checked with the grade fours and then went back to the grade fives, and so on. Did that, was that your intention to, to do it that way? Or, did you feel there was a need?" (64-70)

T: "Well I just tend to do that, I think, because of the two grades. Um, well sometimes I feel that they can work independently and then other times, maybe my instructions weren't clear, and so then I have to, on my own, stop in the other lesson." (71-74)

In the teacher's recall data, she comments on this exchange.

"I wasn't quite sure about that when we were talking about it in our conference. The transition. To me, I wasn't aware that the transitions we were talking about really meant my movement from one grade to another. To me, I interpret transitions as a change of what the kids are actually doing ... So, that I wondered if he was worried about me moving from one group to the other and calling that a transition. I don't know of the, call it monitor, ya, or you know, just to, observing what the others are doing." (76-80, 83-86)

In the conference discussion, the principal goes on to make a specific suggestion about the teacher's movement between the two grade levels.

"Okay, the reason I asked you this was in terms of trying to give you some feedback from the transition. It would seem to me that if you have more transitions from one to another, then that increases the frequency, and it might ... if it seems to be a problem for you, maybe reducing those transitions would be a suggestion I could make. I don't know, it depends on how you felt about that." (108-115)

The teacher's response to this in the recall data is,

"... when he gave me that comment I understood what he was saying so, I mean that's fair." (117-118)

However, what she says in the conference dialogue suggests she does not understand the principal's point.

"Um, teaching math to two grades in the same lesson?" (122)

The principal goes on to describe more specifically what he observed in the first ten minutes of the lesson, to illustrate his meaning. He then questions the teacher again, to probe for the reasons behind the frequency of her movements.

"... and I felt that the directions were clear. Did you see then, for instance, when you went back to the grade fives the second time, that they had, were having difficulty, or was it necessary to be there?" (131-133)

The teacher explains her purpose.

"Um, actually ... I came back to check on their assignment, on the seatwork." (134-135)

In the principal's recall data, he comments,

"At this point I think the, ah, my focus was to try to get some recognition on her part that there were at least monitoring transitions back and forward. And the other thing that I did talk to her briefly about, later in the conference, was whether or not those things were distractions rather than helps. But I, in a sense I was just trying to um, to get some sort of reaction from her as to how she felt, or what she thought she was doing." (554-559, 565-567)

The principal repeats his observation of the teacher's movements in the first few moments of the lesson, and the teacher responds,

"I was just, just monitoring at that point, like to see if they were really on." (148-149)

The principal reassures the teacher, but his reassurance is met with a silence.

"No I'm not saying you, I'm not trying to make any notice about that, I didn't mean anything particularly wrong with that, it's just that if we were focusing on the transition problem, um, I thought maybe you could reflect on that ..." (150-153)

Both conference participants comment at this juncture in their recall data.

T: "You can understand why we had that interruption there. Like he kept talking, cause I didn't quite understand if we were talking about the same thing ... Well, I understood what he meant anyway." (158-160, 163-164)

P: "Here I'd just like to make a comment that obviously there was a communication problem in terms of what she thought I was talking about in terms of transition. It's a little clearer later when she ... In her view, transition would have meant from one major subject to another. And I think that sort of threw her a little bit in terms of what I was talking about. And that's why I took the extra time to go back over that, which was to try to clarify what I was talking about. Because there seemed to be some confusion on her part, basically." (596-604)

Later in the conference discussion, the principal gets to the point he wants to

make; that the frequency of the teacher's movements are perhaps more distracting than helpful for the students.

"The other thing that crossed my mind in observing that is that if, in fact, they were doing that ... okay, to go back and interrupt them might have perhaps put something in the way of them carrying on with their work." (173-176)

The principal's recall data indicates he did feel the teacher's movements were distracting for the students.

"... I thought maybe she had interrupted them two or three times. When, in fact, if they really knew what was going on, that might be a major suggestion I'd make to her, ..." (503-506)

Pacing

The principal moves on to relate the frequency of these movements (which he defines as transitions and the teacher defines as monitoring) to the pacing of the lesson. While this was not part of the pre-conference discussion, it is identified as a "problem" by both conference participants. The principal states,

"... it became obvious that, as we got closer to lunch time, that there was a little bit of a pacing problem. You know in terms of what you had tried to accomplish. And I was just trying to think back. Pacing is a very difficult thing to know about, and if some of the transitions within those two groups had been cut down, maybe you would have had five minutes or so at the end of the lesson for the grade fives to get into the activity which probably would have made it better for them in terms of designing their brochure." (207-215)

In the recall data, the principal comments,

"Okay, obviously you know I think that the key point, what I was trying to bring out, was the connection between the pacing and the transition ..." (702-704)

Further in the conference discussion the principal talks about the importance of closure in a lesson, with specific reference to the grade five group having the opportunity to begin and work on their travel brochures. His reference to this point in the recall data is,

"What I could have said here, and maybe should have, was maybe next time it will be too late." (976-977)

In the conference discussion the teacher refers to the problem she has in bringing closure to a lesson.

"You see I have a problem with pacing. Ten to three, you know, I should be getting them ready to go ..." (311-312)

In the recall data, the teacher admits to awareness of a pacing problem during the lesson.

"Oh, I mean I knew, I knew it was a problem when I was into it, into my lesson, that we wouldn't get finished." (356-357)

She also talks about going overtime with the class as a regular occurrence.

The principal concludes the conference by suggesting that pacing provide the focus for the next observation.

"The transition things were a particular problem only in relation to the pacing and maybe possibly the next time we do an observation we can look at pacing and see how the lesson's going." (321-325)

Questioning Strategies

The principal also relates the teacher's questioning strategies to the pacing of the lesson.

"Um, I just wanted to, you know, comment on the questioning techniques. It seemed to me that there were a fair number of what kind of questions. You seemed to have a little bit, I wouldn't say difficulty, but it took a little bit of time and effort to draw out from the students what your intention was in terms of where they might want to go in connecting the two brochures, in connecting the two up. What seemed to be the object of the lesson would be to write one. I, I felt that particularly with the pacing kind of situation that you ran into, that it might have been better if you actually got into telling the children what it was they were going to do." (215-225)

In the recall data, he comments further.

"I felt really quite uneasy, if you like, about the preliminary kinds of questioning. The children seemed to be in a great deal of difficulty making that connection as to what she was doing. The lesson

seemed to drift, ah, they looked to me, many of the students, very interested and keen but couldn't quite figure out what was happening." (733-738)

"... what I was doing, I was trying to indicate to her ways that she could view that and say, 'Right, probably a lot of this thing was over the kids' heads' and I could have got into it." (773-775)

The teacher talks about her questioning technique with the grade five group, suggesting that she understands how it may have been handled, then rationalizes,

"But I really was trying to expand ... see if I could, without preparing to do it. Or looking in my daybook, and I purposely didn't do that." (256-258)

She then admits to digressing and struggling with the resulting situation.

"Well I was struggling, I was really struggling to get to where I wanted to go after having digressed." (261-262)

The principal follows up on this.

"I think that, it seemed to me, there was a little space there where, where it seemed a bit abstract for the children to make the connection between where they might want to go in the world, and that it would be a travel brochure which would tell them that." (263-267)

The teacher also comments on the digression that occurred as a result of her questions, at the start of the conference,

"Well, the particular part I wanted to focus on, I found it difficult to get to, where I wanted to, because I got myself sidetracked in the grade fives." (20-22)

and in the recall data,

"Oh, I felt that he was dead-on. Because while I was in the process of having made a mistake by asking the first question incorrectly, and not having ... I should have actually focused on where I wanted to be, right, not ... But by asking, I forget what the question was, I asked them a question that got them going on the country and so then you couldn't just chop them off that. And so I was forced into a little bit of discussion there. So I mean, I was glad that he picked it up. I mean I would expect him to." (400-408)

In the recall data, the teacher suggests areas she should or would like to work on, and indicates it's a matter of more planning.

"Well, I think I should possibly write down a few more questions, like actually write them down. I've been doing that ... last year. I'm finding this year though, with the two grades and having more prep, ... That the time frame, you know, you need too much time to write down these questions ... More planning." (414-417, 419-420, 425)

Planning

The teacher makes a number of references to her planning and preparation. At the beginning of the conference discussion, when the principal asks her to comment on how the lesson went, she says,

"I felt that I should have been more prepared for the situation, but then my objective was really not to be prepared for the questioning, you know." (42-45)

Early in the conference recall data, the teacher speaks of the deliberate nature of her lack of planning for the lesson.

"Oh ya, I feel very confident. Not confident but relaxed ... I mean we've had conferences before. And maybe that's why too, I sort of thought, well, let's just wing it. And in a normal situation, if you knew you were being supervised, you would just do that extra bit." (89-93)

And in the discussion of her questioning techniques, the teacher again refers to her lack of preparation (257). In the principal's recall data, he comments on this.

"I was going to say here, this is the second time she made reference to the fact that lack of preparation, or unease about the situation, was there." (833-835)

At one point in the conference discussion, the teacher suggests that the lesson observed was really what takes place in the classroom, rather than one designed for show.

"... I thought, well, is this, are you doing this for show, or are you doing it for real?" (288-289)

The principal ties the teacher's remarks together in his recall data.

"Okay, I think when she said that, I think that she really felt that, like throughout the whole lesson. In terms of what she said about, ah, lack of preparation, and all the rest of it. It's that I think she was really conscious of the fact that, that she didn't want it to be a show." (911-915)

Summary

The theme which constitutes the main focus of this conference discussion is management of instruction. The teacher's movement between the grade level groups is a major focus. This movement is referred to by the principal as transition and by the teacher as monitoring. The frequency of those movements is related to the pacing of the lesson, as are the teacher's questioning strategies. Planning is also referred to a number of times in the discussion of the lesson. The principal concludes the conference by suggesting that pacing provide the focus for the next observation.

**CASE STUDY C: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE
(ROUND 1)**

This conference takes place after school in a small office which is used for meetings and conferences. The participants are seated at a small table, with the teacher at the side of the table. The principal has his conference notes in front of him, on the table, and sits at an angle, facing the teacher.

The principal's opening remarks are content related. He makes reference to the pre-conference and states the purposes of the lesson observation. He elicits the teacher's reactions to the lesson and begins providing feedback.

The process strategies employed in this conference can perhaps best be characterized as communication blocking. This blocking appears to arise out of the interpersonal dynamics of the conference situation. A line count of the conference dialogue indicates 184 lines of principal talk and 60 lines of teacher talk. In other words, the conference session is not interactive in nature.

A lack of shared understanding of the purposes of the observation also appears to contribute to the communication blocking. While it was apparently agreed in the preconference that the principal would observe, and provide feedback on, the teacher's questioning techniques and the transitions between the grade four and five groups in the class, some confusion surrounds the discussion of both of these points in the conference dialogue and is referred to by both participants in the recall data. The principal comments.

"...although in the preconference we had agreed that questioning techniques was one of the things that she wanted me to give her feedback on, it seemed to me, pretty early in the lesson, that there wasn't a lot of questioning going on." (526-530)

The teacher comments on her lack of preparation and the deliberateness of it,

with specific reference to questioning techniques, in her recall data.

"...I feel very confident, not confident but relaxed. And maybe that's why too I sort of thought, well, let's just wing it. And in a normal situation, if you knew you were being supervised, you would just do that extra bit. I purposely left my day book, my plan for the lesson, till the very end yesterday...So that...I didn't have time, well I didn't want to take time, to write specific questions, and think about it." (89-99)

Further in the recall data, the teacher interjects during the principal's feedback on her questioning techniques, to suggest that a preconference establishes an artificial situation for lesson observation because, based on the preconference agreement, a teacher can "pad" and make those things to be observed "perfect".

"I was just thinking here; I'm listening to that; if you would not have a preconference before the lesson...You know, so like the preconference sets such a, I don't want to, well not an artificial, but it, it seems like you do sort of pad everything to make it perfect." (233-234; 241-243)

This comment appears to be a direct contradiction of her previous comment, in which she indicates she deliberately did not prepare her questions for the lesson to be observed. She also refers to her lack of preparation, as a rationalization for the problems encountered with questioning, during the conference dialogue. In response to the principal's question regarding her reaction to the lesson, the teacher indicates,

"...I got myself sidetracked in the grade fives." (21-22)

"I felt that I should have been more prepared for the situation, but then my objective was really not to be prepared, for the questioning, you know..." (42-45)

Further on in the conference dialogue, she rationalizes,

"Well, this is the thing that I felt, had I, normally I would, if I was using my head, I would say, 'Okay, I'm going to start out with this question and have the lead-in question right into where I wanted to be'. But I really was trying to expand...to see if I could, without preparing to do it, or looking in my daybook, and I purposely didn't do that." (252-258)

The principal makes a positive comment, and the teacher adds,

"Well, I was struggling, I was really struggling to get to where I wanted to go after having digressed." (261-262)

In his recall data, the principal also comments on the miscommunication surrounding the transitions to be observed.

"Here I'd just like to make a comment that obviously there was a communication problem in terms of what she thought I was talking about in terms of transition. It's a little clearer later, when she...In her view, transition would have meant from one major subject to another. And I think that sort of threw her a little bit in terms of what I was talking about. And that's why I took the extra time to go back over that which was to try to clarify what I was talking about. Because there seemed to be some confusion on her part, basically." (596-604)

The teacher, in her recall data, acknowledges the miscommunication on this point, but also indicates she understands what is meant by the term transition, as the principal uses it.

"You can understand why we had that interruption there. Like he kept talking cause I didn't quite understand if we were talking about the same thing...Well, I understood what he meant anyway." (158-160; 163-164)

Principal's Process Strategies

The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of the questions he asks and the nature of the feedback he provides.

Questions

An examination of the conference dialogue indicates the principal asks seven questions. Of these, only two are of some consequence in terms of the substantive content of the conference discussion. Both are information-seeking questions, designed to elicit information from the teacher and to probe for a rationale for her actions.

In providing initial feedback to the teacher on her transitions, or movements

between the grade level groups in the classroom, the principal apprises her of her movements, then asks,

"Did that, was that your intention to, to do it that way, or did you feel there was a need?" (69-70)

In the principal's recall data, he indicates his strategy.

"At this point I think the, ah, my focus was to try to get some recognition on her part that there were at least monitoring transitions back and forth. And the other thing that I did talk to her briefly about, later in the conference, was whether or not those things were distractions rather than helps." (554-559)

The teacher's response indicates the rationale for her actions is based on habit rather than on intention or need.

"Well, I just tend to do that, I think, because of the two grades." (71)

The principal pursues the discussion of transitions, making suggestions and repeating his feedback regarding the teacher's movements between the two groups. He again questions the reason for her actions, and appears to be probing, to bring her to the point of analysis and insight:

"Did you see then, for instance, when you went back to the grade fives the second time, that they had, were having difficulty, or was it necessary to be there?" (131-133)

The other questioning strategies employed by the principal either seek information which is not pursued in the conference dialogue,

"How did you feel, then, the lesson went this morning?" (16)

"Did you feel that having visitors in like that made it an unnatural situation, or did you feel alright?" (27-28)

or are leading questions.

"Is that what you thought we were doing?" (14)

"Was that correct?" (55)

"Do you have any questions, or things I haven't thought of?" (327)

This latter question, while appearing open-ended, occurs at the end of the

conference and serves to signal closure on the part of the principal.

Feedback

The nature of the principal's feedback can be characterized as either appraising or apprising. In most instances, the principal offers appraisal statements that are general in nature.

"I felt that the class did seem a little bit nervous, in the very beginning, to get started, it took them a minute or so, but that wasn't so bad. I thought that was quite good really." (47-50)

"...the routines seemed quite well established." (59-60)

"...obviously the classroom control is good. The class noise level was very good." (281)

"Basically, their attention was good." (296)

"So basically, you know, I think that the lesson went fairly well." (304-305)

"I thought that you handled that well." (321)

Comments such as these appear to be designed to enhance the conference tone.

In other instances, the principal's feedback is a combination of appraisal and analysis:

"...and this obviously was, to me it seemed, like a preparation to enable you to go and set up the grade four lesson." (53-54)

"...it became obvious that, as we got closer to lunch time, that there was a little bit of a pacing problem." (207-208)

"I, I felt that, particularly with the pacing kind of situation that you ran into, that it might have been better if you actually got into telling the children what it was they were going to do." (222-225)

The principal comments on his strategy for dealing with the problem the teacher encountered with her questioning techniques.

"I felt really quite uneasy, if you like, about the preliminary kinds of questioning. The children seemed to be in a great deal of difficulty making that connection as to what she was doing. Now, um, in a sense I don't like to just say to someone directly, 'Well, that was particularly bad if you like, or particularly a problem', in that sense,

and I guess in a way during my observation I was thinking that, and making notes, and so on. About trying to find some sort of positive way to be able to indicate that..." (733-744)

He goes on to suggest that the decision not to pursue some points, such as this one, in depth is related to the time factor involved in the conference situation and the necessity, or desire, to reduce or ameliorate the teacher's stress level and/or defensiveness.

"...I'm trying to condense, if you like, into this conference so that it wasn't really, really long...I was trying to indicate to her ways that she could view that and say, 'Right, probably a lot of this thing was over the kids' heads,' and I could have got into it. I think I do talk to her directly about that towards the end of the conference and she recognizes it, so, and I still don't have a sense of her being stressful or defensive in terms of accepting the suggestions or advice that I have given, so I think that's good." (771-780)

Although still addressing the problem encountered with the teacher's questioning techniques, the principal goes on to generalize his comments regarding the observation process.

"I didn't feel uneasy in the conference particularly. My objective was to try to make it an easy relaxed session. When I say uneasy, like if you go into observe a lesson, um, I don't know, I feel a little nervous and tense myself, if I see difficulty going on, and you sort of hope that people will pull it off, or get things together..." (786-792)

He appears to be suggesting that, in this instance, and in general, he hopes the teacher being observed will resolve the difficulty during the lesson, perhaps so it won't have to be dealt with during the conference session.

The principal comments further on his process strategies during conference sessions, and particularly in his interaction with this teacher.

"With this particular teacher, and others, my experience tells me that it's better to have self-recognition in a, in a positive setting, as being an objective. With other teachers as well, I think sometimes it's, you don't want them to lose confidence. And in many senses, this teacher is a very experienced teacher, and does lots of really, really good lessons. Sometimes even a hint of suggestion or criticism are hard to take..." (804-812)

Further in the conference discussion, the teacher admits she was struggling in the grade five group.

"Well I was struggling, I was really struggling to get to where I wanted to go after having digressed." (854-855)

The principal pursues the point that the teacher's questioning left the students struggling.

"I think that, it seemed to me, there was a little space there where, where it seemed a bit abstract for the children to make the connection between where they might want to go in the world, and that it would be a travel brochure which would tell them that." (854-860)

In the recall data, the principal indicates he was holding this issue in abeyance, waiting for the opportunity to discuss it. He also suggests that if the opportunity had not presented itself, the issue would most likely not have been raised.

"...you notice that I take the opportunity when she initiates it. Okay, it seems like there was a little, a little gap there, and I feel comfortable in talking to her about that, and, in fact, I waited, if you like, for that. If it didn't happen, I probably wouldn't have raised it. But at the same time, when the opportunity is there, go ahead and take it, and say, well we can talk about that, things are okay." (862-868)

In the discussion of transitions in the lesson, the principal appears to move back and forth between apprising the teacher of his observation and providing suggestions for more effective movement between the grade level groups.

"...in focusing on the transitions from one to another, I did notice that you took time, two or three times in the initial part of the lesson, to check to see that the grade fives were working ok, come back and check with the grade fours, and then went back to the grade fives, and so on. Did that, was that your intention to, to do it that way or, did you feel there was a need?" (64-70)

When the teacher indicates her actions were based on "habit", the principal goes on to provide a specific suggestion regarding transitions.

"Okay, the reason I asked you this, was in terms of trying to give you some feedback from the transition. It would seem to me that, if you have more transition from one to another, then that increases the

frequency and it might, if it seems to be a problem for you, maybe reducing those transitions would be a suggestion I could make. I don't know, it depends on how you felt about that." (108-115)

When the teacher asks, "Um, teaching math to two grades in the same lesson?", the principal once again apprises her of his observation.

"No, I just meant that, if for instance, I thought I observed that um, in the first say ten minutes of the lesson, you would have gone initially to the grade fives to get them started, then to the grade fours, and back to the grade fives to see that they were doing okay, which is okay, now back to the grade fours, and then..." (123-129)

In response to another direct question, the teacher again suggests her actions are based on "habit" and that she returns to the grade five group to check on their assigned seatwork. For a third time, the principal apprises her of what he observed her movements to be. At this point, the teacher indicates that she "was just monitoring". The principal's next comment suggests he will withdraw from the point he is trying to make if the teacher is expressing discomfort.

"I'm not trying to make any notice about that, I didn't mean anything particularly wrong with that. It's just that if we were focusing on the transition problem, um, I thought maybe you could reflect on that...I didn't see anything wrong, or have suggestions." (150-155)

The teacher then appears to recognize, or concede, that other approaches might be feasible, and the principal goes on, finally, to the point he appeared to be trying to make.

"Well, we weren't necessarily looking for problems, we were focusing on this as something we thought you might want to have some feedback on. The other thing that crossed my mind, in observing that, is that if, in fact, they were doing that okay, to go back and interrupt them might have, perhaps, put something in the way of them carrying on with their work." (170-176)

Having made this point, the principal then attempts to soften it, again, by withdrawing and suggesting that it is not a problem.

"...but basically that wasn't, I didn't see it as a particular problem, but that's one of the things we wanted to focus on." (192-194)

Further on in the conference discussion, the principal goes on to suggest,

"...and if some of the transitions within those two groups had been cut down, maybe you would have had five minutes or so at the end of the lesson for the grade fives to get into the activity..." (210-213)

Teacher's Process Strategies

The teacher's process strategies revolve around the nature of her responses to the principal's feedback. The nature of those responses can be characterized as either providing a rationale or providing a rationalization.

Responses Providing a Rationale

In each response where the teacher provides a rationale, she is providing a rationale for her movement between the two grade level groups during the discussion of transitions in the conference session.

In each of the first two instances, her rationale is based on habit rather than intention or necessity because students are having difficulty.

"Well, I just tend to do that, I think, because of the two grades."
(71)

"Um, actually, I came back to check on their assignment, on the seatwork." (134-135)

In the third instance, the teacher appears to recognize that an alternative exists, but then continues to provide support for her rationale by suggesting that the alternative would still allow for students to pull her back and forth between the grade level groups.

"I think the fives are a little bit more independent, and if I didn't do that, and told them that, 'Okay, now I'm with the grade fours for the next ten minutes, or I'm now with the grade fives...', but, they can pull me out anytime." (165-168)

The principal's recall data suggests he forfeits an opportunity here to "push" for teacher insight.

"...probably I could have taken that opportunity to say to her, 'Yes, that's what I'm talking about. You could, in fact, have a longer time span, and say I don't want to be interrupted now and I'll work with these people.' She's recognized it, I think, in terms of thinking through that process, so let's just see what happens. But I, I have a sense here that maybe I missed a point there. That I could have said to her more emphatically, yes..." (643-650)

Further in the recall data, the principal goes on to comment on the reasons for having missed this opportunity.

"What I was trying to bring out was the connection between the pacing and the transition...and I must have been preoccupied if you like with thinking ahead to, to getting on to that aspect of it. It could be that I'm not too perceptive of the fact that she couldn't recognize what I'd been talking about in transitions, but basically, I think it could be that I just want to get on with it." (702-709)

Responses Providing a Rationalization

In addressing the problem the grade fives experienced with her questioning, the teacher appears to make excuses, or rationalize.

"Well this is the thing that I felt, had I, normally I would, if I was using my head, I would say, 'Okay, I'm going to start out with this question and have the lead-in question right into where I wanted to be. But I really was trying to expand...to see if I could, without preparing to do it, or looking in my daybook, and I purposely didn't do that." (252-258)

In general, the limited dialogue the teacher engages in during the conference and the nature of her responses suggest that she either misses the point of, or misunderstands, the principal's feedback almost entirely. However, the teacher's recall data indicates quite the opposite.

Recall Data

In her recall data, the teacher indicates she does understand the feedback being provided in the conference and what the principal is trying to say. Based on this data, it is possible to speculate that the teacher's responses in the conference were designed to block communication.

"I wasn't quite sure about that when we were talking about it in our conference, the transition. To me, I wasn't aware that the transitions we were talking about really meant my movement from one grade to another. To me, I interpret transitions as a change of what the kids are actually doing. So, that I wondered if he was worried about me moving from one group to the other and calling that a transition. I don't know of the, call it monitoring, yeah, or, you know, just observing what they're doing." (76-80; 83-86)

Although the teacher indicates there is some confusion, she also indicates she understands the difference between transitions and monitoring, what the principal means by his use of the term transition, and the point he is making. This recall data follows the principal's first feedback on transitions.

When the principal suggests that the teacher could consider reducing the frequency of her transitions, or movements between the groups, she says in the recall data,

"Like when he gave that comment I understood what he was saying, so, I mean, that's fair." (117-118)

Although she indicates, again, that she understands what's being said in the feedback, what she says in the conference dialogue does not corroborate this. She asks,

"Um, teaching math to two grades in the same lesson?" (122)

Further in the discussion of transitions, when the principal has apprised the teacher of his observation three times and she has suggested an alternative approach, he goes on to say,

"Well, we weren't necessarily looking for problems. We were focusing on this as something we thought you might want to have some feedback on." (170-172)

In her recall data, the teacher indicates she recognized the "problem", but she gives no evidence of this in her responses to the principal in the conference dialogue. She also comments on the principal's process strategies.

"That was sort of interesting, in that he wouldn't comment about the problem. Like I didn't mind that he used the word problem, because it was a problem. So I just thought that maybe he thought he was, um, being a little tough by using the word problem. But I mean, that was fair game as far as I was concerned." (177-182)

Summary

This conference is perhaps best characterized by a low degree of interaction and a high degree of communication blocking. The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and feedback. The nature of his feedback can be characterized as appraising or apprising. The teacher's process strategies revolve around the nature of her responses to the principal's questions and feedback. The nature of her responses can best be characterized as providing a rationale or providing a rationalization.

Because of the communication blocking, it is not clear the extent to which the conference content themes might constitute the basis for future change in the classroom setting. It is possible to speculate, however, that little connection was made between the content of the conference discussion and future action in the classroom, although the principal does conclude this conference by suggesting that pacing provide the focus for the next observation.

**CASE C: PROFILE OF SUBSTANTIVE CONTENT OF CONFERENCE
DISCUSSION (ROUND 2)**

The lesson under discussion in this twenty minute conference is a one hour grade four/five math lesson. The hour included the following activities: attendance, current events, a math team quiz, a ten question math review drill. The grade fives then go on to independent work while the grade fours receive instructions on a worksheet assignment. The grade fives then have a lesson on equivalent fractions.

The content of the conference discussion revolves around the classroom management theme of managing instruction. The principal opens the conference with reference to the first round observation and the agreed upon focus for this second observation and conference.

"... after our conference the last time, we sort of agreed that the next time I came for an observation, that we'd look at pacing, and try and see how the transition from one grade to the other in the classroom went." (17-21)

Although not part of the agreement, the appropriateness of student activities also becomes part of the conference discussion.

Management of Instruction

Pacing

The principal opens the conference with an explanation of how he kept track of the teacher's pacing during the lesson.

"... I wrote down a whole series of notes which I can just make available to you as we look at the pacing, okay? Cause I kept a timelog for you." (12-14)

In the recall data the principal indicates,

"To be honest with you, I didn't know what her response to me even keeping a timelog would be and when she said that it would be interesting and valuable to her ..." (708-710)

Pacing was not part of the agreed upon focus in the first observation, but was identified as a "problem" in that lesson. The principal makes reference to the first and second lessons observed before providing feedback on the pacing of the second lesson.

"... this morning the lesson was a math lesson and the one previous to that was not a math lesson." 22-23)

The principal's recall data suggests why.

"... I just wanted to say, so if we got into some kind of difficulty when we were looking at it, that we could even say, 'Well, maybe we need to look at pacing in another math lesson, to see if it is applicable to that, or whatever' ..." (742-746)

Specific feedback on pacing is provided with reference to the timelog, although the principal also comments on, and questions the teacher about, the activities involved in the attendance, current events, math team quiz and math review drill.

"... basically, that part of your lesson then, took, up to that point, about twenty minutes. And, if you feel, in terms of pacing, that twenty minutes was about what you had in mind then you were probably on target. It looked to me that the math lesson would probably conclude about 10:00. So we'll see how we got there, okay." (156-161)

While this comment is not pursued at this point in the conference discussion, the teacher recall data, interjected following this comment, is fairly specific. She refers to the general nature of the preconference and suggests how it might be handled in the future, to build in more success in the observed lesson. She appears to be suggesting that observations of this nature would perhaps be more beneficial if the lesson involved specific practice of an identified teaching skill or technique.

"I was just going to say that, if we had taken a little bit more time in our pre-conference, and sat down and looked at it and said, 'Okay, pacing - what does it entail; transitions - what does it entail?' and maybe planned what I was going to do - this in this time spot, and this much in this time spot, that might have been a good way to go too. ... I think if I was doing it again, I would suggest, 'Okay, let's look at the lesson that we are going to do and divide it out and see if I am in fact keeping to my time line'" (164-169, 171-174)

The teacher goes on in the recall data to indicate that she had not planned the pacing of the lesson, even though that was to be a major focus of the observation.

"I knew that I had until 10 o'clock for math, so that was my overall objective. But as far as ten minutes for this and five minutes for instructions, I didn't really plan anything." (187-190)

At the conclusion of the conference discussion the participants do come back to this point about pacing. The principal pursues the discussion of pacing through reference to the timelog.

"... and then spent, oh, seven minutes or so giving instructions to the grade fours." (220-221)

The teacher expresses surprise at the amount of time spent on giving instructions. The principal pursues this.

"... Well, you have to realize, I think the instructions to do that worksheet probably was seven minutes well spent, if in fact the kids learned how to do it, because it did seem fairly complex to me, and I'll make some comments about that. Um, then basically, I think, at about 9:30 you introduced your lesson on equivalent fractions to the grade fives, so you went back." (226-232)

The teacher again expresses surprise.

"That's a lot of time, isn't it? (234)

The principal responds with a non-evaluative comment.

"Well, I don't know, you know, in terms of how you planned it and what you thought? As I said, I'll give you the log and you could check yourself." (241-243)

In the recall data, the principal comments further on the teacher's surprised response.

"When she says to me that it's a long time, what I'm saying is ... sort of like a cue. That is a long time. That's a half an hour into the lesson. Half of the time. And so, if I say to her a negative comment, or something like, 'that other half hour isn't worth it,' then we have to know what the objective is. If it's really to teach equivalent fractions, or if it's to make the kids feel welcome, or if it's maybe to make them feel at ease to discuss international affairs, or whatever." (1094-1102)

In the conference dialogue, the teacher goes on to express her interest in the timelog approach.

"You see, I find that valuable to know that. Because when you're teaching, you are not really aware of that, of how long it is." (262-264)

The principal again refers to the purpose for the observation.

"I think that that's one of the reasons that I came to do the observation. Was to give you some feedback. And particularly in light of what we talked about last time, and seeing if you were able to pace and get the entire lesson done ... which, in fact turned out to be the case." (266-270)

Further on in the conference dialogue the principal points out that, in fact, the lesson pacing was not within the time allotted.

"Your lesson ended about six minutes overtime, which I think is reasonable" (379-380). The teacher comments that, "That's about normal." (381)

In the recall data, the principal comments on this.

"Basically what the purpose of this would be, like in comparison to the last one, is to give positive reinforcement to the fact that transitions were less and the pacing was better. I said early in the tape, let's see whether you make it, and most of the kids in fact got the session done ..." (1137-1141)

He elaborates further.

"... and I think, even by telling her that, sure, you went six minutes over. Maybe she didn't accomplish everything that she wanted to, but she did go the six minutes over to make the closure, to be able to satisfy herself, I think, that at least the lesson had a beginning and had an end, and that the kids had accomplished something, which I think is good. ... In the first one, I didn't think so. I felt it was particularly poor that it got to the end and there was so much left undone, and so, in other words, the task had obviously been too much." (1715-1720, 1722-1725)

At the conclusion of the conference discussion the participants come back to pacing. The teacher suggests a follow-up observation on pacing, with specific times being noted.

"I like the idea of the timing. Maybe we should do this another time. Just on the spur of the moment kind of thing. And just come in and do the business of, what were you doing for three minutes, and the next three minutes ..." (468-471)

The principal comments on the possibility of specifically planning for such an observation, which constituted a part of the teacher's recall data about the nature of the pre-conference, cited earlier in this profile.

"Yeah. Because I didn't ask you, you know, in advance, to tell me what you thought you might spend on those certain things, and maybe that is something we can look at at another time, if you wanted to know." (478-481)

The principal then refers back to the first specific feedback he provided about pacing at the start of the conference (See line 157).

"Like I didn't know, we could talk about, I suppose, whether even seventeen minutes or eighteen minutes to get started in your lesson is worth it. But I think, as I said, you were setting the tone for the children, and trying to get them in a position where having visitors in the classroom wasn't that awkward." (482-486)

Since the principal's recall data, cited earlier, suggests that he did not feel it was appropriate (see lines 1094-1102), and since the teacher is suggesting a follow-up observation, concluding in this way could be seen as setting the stage for pursuing this point in the next conference. The teacher's recall data suggests this may be possible. In commenting on her overall impression of the observations and conferences, she concludes.

"Well, I have found them useful for myself to just review that I do need to focus on perhaps the pacing, and be aware of the time, especially with having two grades. That it is really valuable to have things well planned, and be able to move from one class to the other and still focus on what is going on with the other class, but then I think that comes with experience, too." (636-642)

"I hope I have learned something. But after you have taught for so many years, you wonder. But I'm sure you do learn more." (656-658)

The principal's recall data also suggests this possibility may exist, but he does not make reference to whether or not his conclusion was designed for this purpose, nor does he indicate any specific follow-up plans.

"... I think she has shown three or four times in this particular postconference that she is beginning to question in her own mind how much time it should take. And what I have tried to do is make sure that she doesn't look at it only from one point of view. ... I think it's encouraging to note that she accepts that kind of data gathering, and may find it useful, and is interested in it, and probably will, I expect, take a look at her lessons a little more carefully with that in mind, and has given me an invitation to come back and give her more feedback, and I think that's very positive." (1537-1541, 1545-1551)

Further in his recall data, the principal makes specific reference to the appropriateness of the pacing in the lesson.

"I think in this case, it (i.e. the problem) was how much time was appropriate. And we didn't really get into that, other than to say that it could be too much or it could be too little, but the lesson ended, reasonably on time. Whether everything, you know, the concepts were taught and the kids understood, it's hard to know in one particular session..." (1652-1657)

Here the principal is making reference to the appropriateness of student activities within the context of the teacher's pacing of the lesson.

Appropriateness of Student Activities

In commenting on how she felt about the lesson, at the beginning of the conference, the teacher indicates some dissatisfaction with the activity the grade fives were involved in.

"... but I felt frustrated in that I think, had there not been the crowd there, I would have perhaps changed my plans in the grade fives. Um, in that I would have had them working as a group over on the side." (30-33)

The principal questions how the change might have benefitted the lesson. In the recall data, the teacher comments on this.

"... he's leading me to identify the problem and I think that's good. You appreciate that. Rather than telling you where you went wrong, he lets you tell, and identify the problem. ... he's leading me into a point that he wanted to make probably, with the pacing of that particular lesson. Once the kids got going, like the more able students could have maybe done three or four envelopes in the time that the slower ones did. What it means is that the way I used it, it slowed them down and it did get to be a problem in a couple of places." (49-52, 53-59)

The teacher goes on to say,

"I knew these things could happen before I got started, but I just left it as it was, because it was maybe more controlled." (67-69)

"I mean, had I been in there alone, I probably would have changed." (77-78)

The principal also comments on the teacher's expressed dissatisfaction with the grade five activity in the recall data.

"... I think it is reasonable to expect that what she said is true, that teachers probably do make those decisions and say, 'Hey, well I better stop this and try to do it in another way.' And, I think in that sense, I agree with her, in that having observers in would tend to make her want to carry on and not try to make changes." (781-787)

In the recall data the teacher comments again on the grade five activity. She makes reference to the conscious decisions made during the teaching of a lesson. She also suggests that her decision was based on her desire to get on with the work and to cover as much material as possible.

"... and took extra time, but I also wanted to get on with the work, and so those are the kinds of things you weigh. Whether it is worth it, and, of course, it would have been worth it too, and maybe I should have just done a few, but I always like to do more." (523-528)

In the same recall data the teacher goes on to make reference to the pre-teaching decisions made and the fact that those decisions are influenced by the time required for lesson planning. She also appears to suggest that what "really" happens is limited planning of lessons that can be executed in the easiest way for the teacher.

"But you see I either want to do it easier for myself or make it right, which could be artificial in a way, or just do it like sometimes you do. You don't have time to do all this thinking. You plan a lesson and off it goes, ... and so if I wanted to make it just topnotch, so everything went tickety-boo, I would probably have re-arranged and had things over there, and things over there, and it takes so much time to do that. You can't do that." (537-546)

When referring to the timelog in the conference discussion, the principal questions the teacher about the current events session.

"On the international news, I wasn't really quite sure what a normal sort of situation was, for the kids, whether that was typical or ..." (92-94)

In the recall data, the principal elaborates.

"Actually, I think that is a diplomatic way of saying I didn't really think there was much there in terms of that news feedback from the children." (816-818)

"And, maybe, I think if the situation had been different I might have given her more feedback about how to look at other ways of doing that, if there are other ways." (821-824)

"For the process that we are going through, I didn't want to spend the time in this particular post-conference covering that, it seemed insignificant ..." (828-830)

He suggests that, like the classroom teacher in the instructional setting, the principal also makes some decisions during the conference discussion about what to focus on, in addition to those decisions made prior to the conference.

The principal goes on in the conference discussion to question the teacher about the math team quiz.

"I was quite surprised to see them, you know, jump up and rush to get on the teams. But you might want to comment about how you see that section of your lesson. What purpose it had." (107-110)

In the recall data, the principal elaborates on this point too, relating it to his comment on the current events section of the lesson.

"And once again, almost the same comment that I would say about the news. I'm just sort of information gathering for myself... I'm just trying to take in information which I don't particularly want to,

in this conference, talk to her about." (881-887)

He goes on to suggest why he makes this decision.

"... in this case I don't want to, once again, use that as a focus. But, in fact, I do want to keep the situation going and everybody comfortable..." (900-902)

The appropriateness of the activity set for the grade fours, in the form of a worksheet, is introduced by the principal as follows:

"I did notice that you picked up, or seemed to be aware of, the fact that you thought the grade fours were noisy. In terms of what you expected. I just note to you that that's probably your level of acceptance. It didn't seem excessively noisy to me, but I wasn't teaching them and under those pressures." (279-284)

The teacher comments in the recall data.

"He makes you feel a little more at ease. Because I can handle fairly high levels of noise, but I felt it might be noisy for what people might expect. So anyway, he handles that very well. I felt good about it." (287-290)

The principal then goes on to relate this noise level to the difficulty of the task.

"But, I thought about it as I sort of reviewed my notes. If you give a complex worksheet and the kids understand it, then they will probably be content to work on that for a longer period of time, which is good. If they didn't really understand it, then they might be frustrated or distracted, and that might be one of the reasons. And if you picked that up halfway through, you might have been able to do something about it. Um, basically, I think there was a little bit of both. Some kids really were challenged and hung in there, and others probably didn't quite know what you meant." (193-194, 300-308)

The teacher expresses some discomfort with what the principal has to say in her recall data.

"At that point I wasn't sure about what he was thinking about the lesson in relation to whether the kids were frustrated or not. I didn't feel that they were frustrated in the assignment itself. I think they were frustrated in knowing that there was a way in getting the answer but they hadn't discovered it yet. So, I mean, I don't know if he felt that it was too difficult for them. I didn't feel it was. But just in that interaction there, I thought well, maybe he thought it was too difficult, but I didn't feel it was." (311-319)

She goes on in the recall data to comment.

"It made me feel that he thought there was a problem, and I didn't feel it. But that was the only interaction I thought where we weren't on the same plain." (332-335)

The teacher's reaction continues, providing her rationale for the worksheet as "buying time" with the grade five group. She also suggests that, perhaps it was not clear, but the grade four group did have a choice of activities.

"You see I wanted to give them a fairly hard assignment so that they would stick with it, because I needed the time over there, but one that they could do, and they would feel that they could do it. And then, of course, if they were finished at some point, they could go ahead and do the other assignment that was reviews on multiplication. I don't know if you picked that one up, you know, if they were frustrated, that they could actually stop and wait and go ahead and do the other assignment. Maybe that wasn't clear in my communication." (347-361)

The principal makes several references to the difficulty of the grade four task in his recall data.

"I observed the children in grade four having difficulty with the complexity of the tasks that they had to do, so I don't know, that's something that I might try to pursue, or follow up, some other time .." (1030-1034)

"I don't think that the teacher really realized how difficult it was for some of the kids to be doing three different processes at the same time." (1069-1070)

"What I'm trying to say here is that those children that do have difficulty with it, they needed the feedback and the instruction in order to even handle it. And that possibly is an indication that that task might not even have been appropriate for those kids because, as I mentioned earlier, in the de-briefing, there were two or three different processes going on at one time, and that's difficult for the grade fours." (1235-1242)

As he indicates in his recall data, the principal decides not to pursue a discussion of the grade four activity in the conference. Instead he moves on to a discussion of the grade five lesson, relating the format of the activity to the implications for pacing the work of the various students in the group.

"In the grade five lesson, I just noted that you'd mentioned before about how you might have done it a little differently. The particular format you chose meant that your whole group would be paced to the

slowest child, or until everybody had it." (363-367)

The principal also comments on this in the recall data.

"Now, I'm not sure what I say after this, but one of the things that I wanted to talk to her about, or did, certainly after at least, was the fact that there is a problem with that particular format, in the organization that she used, and I did mention that it's the pace of the slowest kid, and when those kids pick up, that makes the slowest kid's problem that much greater, because he's under pressure ..."
(1182-1188)

The ensuing conference discussion revolves around specific suggestions for how the activity could be changed. The teacher acknowledges her awareness of the potential problems that did arise, and her pre-teaching decision to take that risk.

"Although I knew that there would be difficulty with it. Like, I figured the envelope idea would cause problems. But, I don't know, I think you sort of need to take those chances." (402-405)

Further into the discussion the teacher again refers to her decision to carry out that particular activity and indicates expediency is the reason.

"And, then, you could have, I could have put them into ability groups, because I know three kids who have trouble and they could have worked by themselves. But, I mean, that was something I thought of before I even got started, but I just thought, I'll leave it, because it would have been a more difficult thing to do, right?"
(424-429)

The teacher then changes the subject back to pacing and the use of the timelog.

"I did like, I do like that idea though, of knowing exactly the times. I've really not had that done before." (430-431)

"Like spending seven minutes on that instruction sheet. How could I have cut down? You know, if you're really pressed for time. Because I find that with two grades, you're always pressed."
(438-441)

The principal comments at this point, since earlier in the conference discussion he suggested that they were "seven minutes well spent." (line 228)

"Well, I don't know. You know, the other thing I could say to you, is that it's awkward, sometimes, for somebody coming from outside the class to know how to judge how well instructions are being received. See, I might have said to you that, in a couple of the other transitions, that the directions, to me, seemed to be pretty fast, and maybe not as done in detail enough so that I would know

exactly what is going on, but the kids did, so I think you'll have to try to judge that." (443-451)

The principal continues on, rather than pursuing this line of discussion. However, in the recall data the teacher indicates that, although she understood the point the principal was making, she didn't agree.

"... he might have been trying to tell me that my directions should have slowed down, but I didn't really think it was necessary on what I did." (519-521)

Transitions

The discussion of transitions includes both the teacher's movement from one grade level to the other and changes in student activities within the lesson. This represents an expansion in the focus on this particular theme from round one, where the principal viewed transitions as the former and the teacher viewed them as the latter.

The teacher indicates that she used the various activities such as current events, the math team quiz and the math review drill to create more transitions within the lesson to be observed.

"So, I thought I'd use it today just because I wanted to have more transitions, I guess, in your observation ..." (115-117)

The principal comments positively on a method used by the teacher to facilitate her instructions prior to moving from one group to the other.

"I think that the other business about transitions, a comment that I might make is that I noticed that you had written agendas on the board. And you gave instructions to the children and you referred them to those specific agendas, and I think that that is quite positive. So that if people aren't paying attention, at least they can refer back." (196-202)

T: "Well, I find that I have to do that with two grades. That's something that I didn't always do at the beginning of the year." (204-206)

P: "How do you feel about it?" (208)

T: "Well, it certainly serves a purpose and it helps me 'cause I can

say, 'Well, look up there and I'll be with you in a minute.'" (210-212)

The principal indicates in his recall data.

"I think what I should have done, you know, if I was going into it more deeply, and that might have been to tell her that I think those written agendas are good whether you're in a split class or not, in terms of helping students keep on track." (995-999)

The principal pursues his focus on the teacher's movement between the groups, making comparison with the previous lesson.

"Okay. One of the things that we talked about in the last post-conference was the fact that in the lesson previously, you went, several times, back and forth to the grade levels to make sure, maybe an excessive amount. I'm not sure. But in this case, the lesson started. You just gave instructions to the grade fives to have them check their work ..." (214-219)

"I guess, so we don't go on at length, basically you went and checked sort of halfway through the time that was left, to when the grade fours, some of them started to finish their sheet. You went to give them some feedback. Some of the children that had had difficulty with the instructions, you gave them individual attention. That was good, in terms of the transition." (271-277)

Further on in the conference discussion the principal summarizes his points about pacing and transitions.

"Your lesson ended about six minutes overtime, which I think is reasonable ... And, I think, from the previous lesson to this one, the number of transitions were cut down, and I think that that reflected the planning that you put into it, that you had set it up that way, and that was good." (379-385)

In the recall data the principal says,

"... I think that she was in a way trapped by the fact that she created so many transitions that it did cause a little bit of a problem with the pacing, ..." (1736-1739)

Elsewhere in the recall data the principal refers to the content of the conference discussion and his objectives for the conference.

"... I wanted to give feedback on the two particular aspects of the lesson we'd agreed upon, which I think is important to do. They were also the things that had been previously identified as something that we wanted to look at, to see if they would improve. Now, in that sense, I think I did cover that, but I think that, also, the other

objective was to encourage the teacher to be more aware of those aspects of her lesson, and to give her some actual data, if you like, to refer to, which was the timeline, the amount of time and so on, and I think that the response to that had been achieved. As to whether we did a careful analysis of how much time was needed, and how many transitions, and so on, that I don't think we got to. I think the stage is set to do that." (1571-1589)

Summary

The theme which constitutes the main focus of this second round conference discussion is also management of instruction. As agreed to in the previous conference, pacing receives considerable emphasis in this conference discussion. A timelog is used to track the pacing of the lesson. Within the context of pacing there is also some discussion of the appropriateness of student activities, both with regard to length of time allowed for giving instructions for the activities, for the activities in relation to the lesson as a whole, and complexity or organization of the activities. The transitions in the lesson are discussed in terms of the teacher's movement between grade levels and changes in student activities within the lesson. However, the relationship between the number of transitions and lesson pacing is not specifically discussed. The conference concludes with a suggested follow-up observation that would again focus on pacing.

**CASE STUDY C: PROFILE OF PROCESS STRATEGIES OF CONFERENCE
(ROUND 2)**

This conference also takes place after school in a small office which is used for meetings and conferences. The participants are seated at a small table, with the teacher at the side of it. The principal has his conference notes in front of him, on the table.

As before, the principal's opening remarks are content-related. He makes reference to the last conference and the agreed upon purposes for this observation, elicits the teacher's reactions to the lesson, and begins providing feedback.

An examination of the conference dialogue indicates 210 lines of principal talk and 75 lines of teacher talk. This second round conference session, then, is slightly less interactive in nature than the first. However, there appear to be fewer examples of communication blocking in this conference. Both the interactive nature of the conference and the process strategies employed to block communication appear to be as a result of the interpersonal dynamics of the conference situation.

In the recall data the conference participants, particularly the principal, provide feedback on the interpersonal dynamics and on their view of the supervisory process.

Principal's Process Strategies

The principal's process strategies again revolve around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback.

Questions

An analysis of the conference dialogue indicates the principal asks four questions.

All are open-ended and information seeking questions. For example,

"... and have you give me some impression of how you felt the lesson went. And how did you feel?" (26-27)

"How do you feel that change would have been beneficial in terms of how you felt the lesson went?" (36-37)

"and then you made the transition fairly easily to the drill questions. Can you maybe tell me a little bit about that?" (134-136)

In each case the questions elicit an opinion and/or information from the teacher.

The second question is posed following the teacher's response to the first, in which she provides her reactions to the lesson and suggests she might have changed the nature of the activity in the grade five group, if the lesson had not been under observation. The principal appears to probe for the teacher's analysis of the situation. While this is not forthcoming in the teacher's conference dialogue, she comments on his process strategy in her recall data.

"He's questioning ... his questioning skills there are ... he's leading me to identify the problem and I think that's good. You appreciate that. Rather than telling you where you went wrong, he let's you tell, and identify the problem ... he's leading me into a point that he wanted to make probably, with the pacing of that particular lesson." (48-55)

Feedback

Much of the feedback provided by the principal can be characterized as reporting to, or telling, the teacher his observations of the lesson according to the timelog he used during the observation. While the use of an analysis instrument such as a timelog for observation purposes facilitates the provision of this type of feedback, it does not appear, in this instance, to foster a high degree of interaction between participants.

In the conference dialogue the principal alludes to a rationale for this type of

feedback and the pace at which it is delivered. He also delivers an example of it.

"Um, I guess, so we don't go on at length, basically you went and checked sort of halfway through the time that was left, to when the grade fours, some of them started to finish their sheet. You went to give them some feedback." (270-274)

Further on in the conference dialogue the principal comments on his approach to observations.

"... and basically, when I do make an observation, I try to write it down, try to summarize the lesson." (434-436)

In the recall data, he again refers to the amount of feedback data available and the time constraints surrounding the conference.

"... I wanted her to know that I had a more detailed analysis of the time breakdown than I was prepared to discuss in this particular feedback. I might have, if we weren't on videotape, just gone through the whole thing." (684-687)

Basically, the principal seems to suggest that the rationale for the type of feedback he provides to a great extent in the conference session is to cover as much ground as possible within a certain time period.

The principal goes on in the reaction data to corroborate this point, state his objectives for this conference session, and provide insight into his view of the interpersonal dynamics of the situation.

"I was trying to keep the discussion within the context of what we had started to look at and refer back to the other particular lesson." (1371-1373)

"... there are lots of thoughts going on in my mind but, basically this part of the post-conference was to try and, once again, encourage her and reinforce the effort she had made to focus on the concerns raised in the previous one, and if you're making some progress on that I think that you have to be a little bit careful that you don't give somebody, or leave somebody, with a negative impression, when in fact you are getting somewhere, so I think that the dialogue between myself and the teacher is really, really important because if this is successful then the next one will be more successful, and she will feel easier. Those kinds of thoughts go through my mind, and basically, as I said to you, I didn't want this particular

post-conference to go too long ..." (1384-1397)

"... in this particular case, many of these things, the teacher herself, will realize and pick up on and work on, because that's the kind of person she is." (1402-1404)

In the teacher's recall data she also comments on the nature of the principal's feedback.

"I like the way he does the leading. When we have another conference some time, he'll do most of the talking, and do the leading, which helps a person that is on the other end. So I appreciate that kind of feedback." (501-504)

The nature of the remainder of the principal's feedback can generally be characterized as either offering an analysis and/or appraisal of the lesson, or as withholding judgment altogether.

In the principal's opening remarks he includes an appraisal of the classroom atmosphere, possibly to help establish a positive tone for the conference and set the teacher at ease.

I thought that the classroom, as usual, was very nice and pleasant. I thought the atmosphere ...I thought that was good." (84-89)

He provides an appraisal of the teacher's handling of the math drill,

"Okay, well, I thought that you handled that very smoothly and the routine seemed good. Students know how to mark and they gave the question and the answer. And, I thought it was particularly good that you gave them feedback about the questions that might be trouble for them ..." (147-151)

and of her use of written agendas on the board.

"and I think that is quite positive." (200)

In introducing the discussion of transitions, the principal makes reference to the previous lesson.

"One of the things that we talked about in the last pre-conference was the fact that in the lesson previously, you went, several times, back and forth to the grade levels to make sure, maybe an excessive

amount, I'm not sure." (214-217)

Here the principal makes an appraising comment about the previous lesson, but couches it in tentative language. In his recall data, the principal indicates his strategy.

"I did know that within the last lesson observed there were too many transitions. I say I'm not sure. It's just that I didn't want to hammer her over the head with it, okay. It's a nervous way, or a manner, if you like." (1073-1077)

When the teacher expresses surprise at the time she spent giving instructions to the grade fours, the principal's appraisal is based on his analysis of the situation.

"Well, you have to realize, I think the instructions to do that worksheet probably was seven minutes well spent, if in fact the kids learned how to do it, because it did seem fairly complex to me, and I'll make some comments about that." (226-230)

The principal offers his positive appraisal of the student noise level.

"I just note to you that that's probably your level of acceptance. It didn't seem excessively noisy to me, but I wasn't teaching them and under those pressures." (281-284)

He then goes on to provide an analysis of the situation, suggesting that student difficulty with their task may have been the reason for the noise level.

"... if they didn't really understand it, then they might be frustrated or distracted, and that might be one of the reasons, and if you picked that up halfway through, you might have been able to do something about it. Um, basically, I think there was a little bit of both. Some kids really were challenged and hung in there and others probably didn't quite know what you meant." (301-308)

In this instance, the principal uses tentative language to deliver his analysis of the grade four activity. In delivering his analysis of the grade five activity, however, he is very direct.

"The particular format you chose meant that your whole group would be paced to the slowest child, or until everybody had it." (365-367)

He makes reference to the teacher's initial comment, possibly to give her ownership of the analysis.

"... so probably your intuition would have been correct, to break it up and set them up, or have them have an opportunity to choose."
(371-373)

The teacher agrees that a choice would have been better, and the principal makes a "withdrawal" or nullifying statement, which he appears prone to do once he has provided feedback in a direct manner, even where he has received teacher agreement.

"Mind you, I don't sense that it was an error, in any sense, to continue under the circumstances, as you did." (374-376)

In referring to this discussion with the teacher in the recall data, the principal indicates he withheld some of his feedback at the time.

"... she's pretty perceptive in that sense, and really, under the conditions, couldn't have done much other than she did. Except on the negative side, and then I didn't mention it to her at all, is that she did, occasionally, pick out a child who was having difficulty and try to hold him to task for something that was part of the system and was not his problem, as well as the fact that he didn't know what was going on." (1193-1200)

In an initial attempt to summarize the principal again uses positive, appraising statements.

"Your lesson ended about six minutes over time, which I think is reasonable ... And, I think from the previous lesson to this one, the number of transitions were cut down, and I think that that reflected the planning that you put into it, that you had set it up that way, and that was good ... I thought it was a good lesson to the grade fives." (379-390)

In pursuing a discussion of the grade five activity the principal offers an analysis or appraisal of the situation. In this case, he "checks" his use of terms during the feedback and appears to be attempting to validate the teacher's awareness of the situation.

"I think that the problems, the potential problems, that I noticed. I think you picked them up about the pacing, the mixing up the envelopes, or losing the pieces, or having to wait." (407-410)

The principal provides a similar combination of analysis and appraisal of the

lesson overall.

"Anyway, I think the two things we've looked at, I've tried to give you some feedback on, I'm quite sure from talking to you, and watching you in your lesson, that you are aware of those things. Um, and I thought that things went okay." (462-465)

Again, the principal appears to be attempting to validate the teacher's awareness of the situation, as well as, perhaps, her experience and expertise.

In a number of instances the principal is tentative in his feedback or generalizes it, rather than directing it at the specific situation. In these instances, he withholds judgment and, in many cases, suggests that the teacher will have to judge.

For example, in commenting on the math game he says.

"I was quite surprised to see them, you know, jump up and rush to get on the teams. But you might want to comment about how you see that section of your lesson. What purpose it had." (107-110)

The teacher responds, providing information about the activity, and her rationale for including it. In apprising the teacher of the pacing of the lesson, the principal comments.

"Um, so basically, that part of your lesson then took, up to that point, about twenty minutes. And, if you feel, in terms of pacing, that twenty minutes was about what you had in mind, then you were probably on target." (155-159)

Although the principal appears to be probing for insight into what the teacher did have in mind in terms of the pacing of the lesson, he does not facilitate discussion at this point. At the end of the conference discussion, the teacher comments.

"I like the idea of the timing. Maybe we should do this another time. Just on the spur of the moment kind of thing." (468-469)

At this point the principal comes back to the point he did not probe earlier.

"Yeah. Because I didn't ask you, you know, in advance, to tell me what you thought you might spend on those certain things, and maybe that is something we can look at another time if you wanted to know. Like I didn't know, we could talk about, I suppose, whether even seventeen minutes or eighteen minutes to get started in your lesson is worth it, but I think, as I said, you were setting the tone for the children, and trying to get them in a position where having visitors in the classroom wasn't that awkward." (478-486)

He again makes no value judgment, but he does provide an analysis of what the teacher was doing in that initial period of time. Again, however, he does not facilitate further discussion, nor probe the issue, to verify his analysis.

Further in the discussion of pacing, the principal indicates that the teacher introduced the grade five lesson at 9:30. The teacher responds in surprise,

"That's a lot of time, isn't it?" (234)

The principal withholds judgment, suggesting that the teacher will have to judge.

"Well, I don't know, you know, in terms of how you planned it and what you thought. As I said, I'll give you the log and you could check yourself. I didn't necessarily feel it was an excessively long period of time. That's really only ten minutes from the time the introduction started. Maybe you have other feelings on that, I don't know." (241-247)

Again, the principal does not elicit a reaction from the teacher. Rather, he delivers a statement of appraisal which suggests that is not necessarily a lot of time.

In the recall data the principal provides his judgment, and his rationale for this feedback, but not his rationale for the lack of probing in this instance.

"When she says to me that it's a long time, what I'm saying is sort of like a cue. That is a long time. That's half an hour into the lesson, half the time. And so, if I say to her a negative comment, something like that other half hour isn't worth it, then we have to know what the objective is, if it's really to teach equivalent fractions, or if it's to make the kids feel welcome, or if it's maybe to make them feel at ease to discuss international affairs, or whatever. I didn't want to say that that was inappropriate at that point, you know I don't necessarily think it is." (1094-1104)

"I'm trying to let her, once again, use her value judgment, rather than me, as to whether that's too late into the lesson." (1112-1115)

In initially discussing the grade five group activity, and the use of concrete aids, the principal withholds judgment, commenting.

"I don't know how you felt about that; or whether it was worth it or not." (394-395)

The teacher does provide some input at this point, suggesting she feels the use of concrete aids is a good idea, and that, although she anticipated some difficulty with the activity, she decided to take that chance.

It is at this point that the principal speaks of the "potential problems" (408) he noticed, and validates the teacher's awareness of them. The discussion of the grade five activity continues until the teacher changes the subject back to the use of the timelog and pacing.

"Like spending seven minutes on that instruction sheet. How could I have cut down? You know, if you're really pressed for time, because I find that, with two grades, you're always pressed." (438-441)

The principal is tentative in his response, generalizing his feedback, rather than addressing the time spent on the instruction sheet in question.

"Well, I don't know. You know, the other thing I could say to you, is that it's awkward, sometimes, for somebody coming from outside the class to know how to judge how well instructions are being received. See, I might have said to you that, in a couple of the other transitions, that the directions, to me, seemed to be pretty fast, and maybe not done in detail enough so that I would know exactly what is going on, but the kids did, so I think you'll have to try to judge that." (443-451)

Once more he suggests the teacher should be the judge, but he does not probe for her judgment.

Recall Data

The principal suggests that one of the conference objectives is teacher "awareness". While he does not indicate what he means by that term, this

approach could account for his lack of probing for teacher analysis, insight, or judgment throughout the conference.

"Well, I said that I wanted to give feedback on the two particular aspects of the lesson we'd agreed upon, which I think is important to do. They were also the things that had been previously identified as something that we wanted to look at to see if they would improve. Now, in that sense, I think I did cover that. But I think that also, the other objective was to encourage the teacher to be more aware of those aspects of her lesson." (1571-1578)

He goes on to provide his view of the supervisory process.

"So, I mean if you're looking at improving instruction, or giving feedback to teachers, it's got to be an ongoing sort of thing, and not one time only. So obviously, I think the teacher in this case had been able to see the connection from the first one to the second one and that there might be an actual follow up of things to look at." (1590-1595)

"... in fact, the objective really is to get at something, to improve the situation." (1604-1605)

"... if you're looking to improve the situation, I think you probably have to isolate and work at one or two things at a time." (1632-1634)

He does not, however, indicate how teacher "awareness" will bring about improvement.

The principal goes on to unpack his strategy, as it relates to his objectives for the supervisory process.

"Well, as I said, you know, in the first place, I think that any time you're seeking to improve a situation, you start with recognition, okay. The data is recognition. The teacher can see it and if you try to present it in a positive manner, that's what I'm trying to do, then you encourage the person to look at an area, and not feel inhibited or threatened, by the fact that I'm going to make a heavy value judgment, that that was right, or that was wrong. Um, and maybe that's waffling sometimes, maybe it isn't. I think, from my experience, at least, I found that to be more successful than if you put a person in a position of being insecure, or worrying about whether you're going to use power on them, or whatever." (1665-1677)

With reference to his approach to withholding judgment, he goes on.

"I did it in a sneaky kind of way. I would say, 'That part of the lesson took twenty minutes.' And I didn't say, 'Twenty minutes is too much, or whatever.' But I think that if you say it like that, the person would have to make the judgment, 'Oh did I mean to take twenty minutes, and if I did take twenty minutes, was it worth it?'" (1683-1688)

However, the principal still does not address the issue of whether or not he feels he has a role in helping bring the teacher from the awareness stage to the judgment stage.

Finally, he comments on the objectives for, the amount to cover in, and the time factor involved in, the observation session, as it relates to the efficacy of the supervisory process.

"Now the only other thing I can say is that maybe even having two variables, or two focuses is not the correct way to go. But in this case, she put in more transitions so I could see more transitions. Whereas if I had said to her, 'Well, let's only work on the pacing,' then we could have observed it in one wack, and I think it might have been different, probably better." (1725-1731)

Teacher's Process Strategies

While the amount of teacher interaction in this second round conference is similar to the first round conference, the nature of her responses appears to differ. The teacher's responses can be characterized as providing information or an opinion on request, providing a rationale, or as an expression of agreement, surprise and/or interest in response to the principal's feedback.

Responses Providing Information

In each response where the teacher is providing information or her opinion, she is doing so in response to either a question or a leading statement from the principal.

For example, the principal asks the teacher to tell him about the math drill.

"Okay, we just started that; where we're going to have a short little drill that I make up; with ten questions. And, it's just stuff they can do, and I mark it. It serves as a little review." (138-141)

He also asks her how she feels about the use of written agendas on the board.

"Well, it certainly serves a purpose and it helps me, 'cause I can say, 'Well, look up there and I'll be with you in a minute.'" (210-212)

When he withholds judgment and makes one of his leading statements about the grade five activity and whether she felt it was worth it or not, the teacher responds.

"Yes, I think it is. Because I know where I am going the next day for sure. It's going to be just a review basically of what we did today. And, I think, maybe two or three minutes will do it and they'll catch on. Like I feel that that was a good thing to do. Although I knew that there would be difficulty with it. Like, I figured the envelope idea would cause problems. But, I don't know. I think you sort of need to take those chances." (397-405)

In this instance, the teacher also goes on to provide a rationale for why she went ahead with the activity, even though she anticipated difficulty with it.

Responses Providing a Rationale

The teacher continues this particular rationale in a later response.

"And, then, you could have, I could have put them into ability groups, because I know three kids who have trouble and they could have worked by themselves. But, I mean, that was something I thought of before I even got started, but I just thought, I'll leave it, because it would have been a more difficult thing to do, right? I did like, I do like that idea though of knowing exactly the times. I've really not had that done before." (424-431)

In this case the teacher goes on to change the subject, expressing interest in the principal's use of a timelog to track the pacing of the lesson.

Other examples of responses providing a rationale include:

The teacher's rationale for not changing the nature of the grade five activity during the lesson,

"... but I felt frustrated in that, I think had there not been the crowd there, I would have perhaps changed my plans in the grade fives. Um, in that I would have had them working as a group, over on the side. I think, basically, everything else would have been the same." (30-34)

and her rationale for the purpose of the math challenge activity.

"Well, they like the challenge because those four boys can't be beat. They have been beaten twice. And they often ask when they can have it again. So, I thought I'd use it today just because I wanted to have more transitions, I guess, in your observation." (113-117)

Responses Expressing Agreement, Surprise and/or Interest

In response to the principal's use of a timelog to provide feedback on the pacing of the lesson, the teacher expresses considerable surprise at some points. For example, when she learns that her instructions to the grade fours took seven minutes she responds,

"Seven minutes? That's all?" (223)

The interest she expresses in this information later, in the conference discussion indicates she feels this is a lengthy period of time.

"Like spending seven minutes on that instruction sheet. How could I have cut down?" (438-439)

When she learns that the grade five math lesson did not start until 9:30 she responds,

"That's a lot of time, isn't it?" (234)

She goes on to express interest in this information.

"You see, I find that valuable to know that. Because when you're teaching, you are not really aware of that, of how long it is.." (262-264)

While discussing the grade five math activity the principal refers to the teacher's initial reaction to the lesson, where she indicates she would have changed the activity if the lesson were not being observed, and comments that her "intuition"

was probably correct. The teacher interjects, expressing agreement.

"Well, yes, a choice would have been better." (373-374)

At one point the principal apprises the teacher of her actions during the math drill activity and she comments,

"Yes, I definitely recall that." (454)

When the principal suggests that it may have been better not to have interrupted the students at that point, the teacher responds,

"Yeah, right. That is called ... gee, I forget the name now. Ha, ha." (459-460)

At the close of the conference the teacher concludes by again expressing interest in the use of a timelog to observe the pacing of a lesson, and by suggesting a follow-up observation.

"I like the idea of the timing. Maybe we should do this another time. Just on the spur of the moment kind of thing, and just come in and do the business of, what were you doing for three minutes, and the next three minutes ..." (468-471)

Recall Data

In the recall data the teacher comments on the efficacy of the supervisory process she has experienced.

"Well, I have found them useful for myself to just review that I do need to focus on, perhaps, the pacing, and be aware of the time, especially with having two grades, that it is really valuable to have things well planned, and be able to move from one class to the other and still focus on what is going on with the other class, but then I think that comes with experience, too. I wasn't sort of slated for a supervision in terms of a report, and this is just sort of gravy. I like being supervised, or having help, I guess, in that capacity. I don't feel it is a trauma or anything, I feel comfortable with it. You always learn from it, and although it is pressure or stress, I know in the long run it will help." (636-648)

"I hope I have learned something. But after you have taught for so many years you wonder, but I'm sure you do learn more." (656-658)

Summary

The communication blocking in this conference appears to be less pronounced than in the first conference. However, both conference participants continue to block communication through their process strategies.

The principal's process strategies revolve around the nature of his questions and the nature of his feedback. The principal employs few questioning strategies in either conference. The types of questions he does ask generally seek information from the teacher. The nature of the principal's feedback is largely a reporting of his observation of the lesson from beginning to end. In some instances he apprises the teacher, tentatively, of his observation, and in other instances he offers an appraisal of some aspect of the lesson. In the second round conference in particular, the principal employs the strategy of withholding judgment, but in each case where this is evident in the conference dialogue he does not pursue the issue, to probe for teacher analysis and insight. Through these process strategies the principal blocks effective communication with the teacher.

The teacher's process strategies revolve around the nature of her responses to the principal's feedback. Those responses can generally be characterized as either providing information or providing a rationale. The teacher also provides some rationalization in her responses. In the second round conference her responses to feedback also provide evidence of either agreement, surprise, or interest. It is perhaps evidence of these responses and the principal's strategy of withholding judgment, while appearing to probe for teacher analysis and insight, that give the impression that communication blocking is less pronounced in this conference than in the first.

Because of the limited number and nature of the teacher's responses in both conference situations, it is difficult to speculate whether the communication blocking on the part of this conference participant is intentional or as a result of the participant's limited ability to grasp and pursue the issues raised in each conference.

The teacher's recall data are also limited and provide little, if any, insight into the process strategies she employs. However, whether intentional or not, the teacher also blocks effective communication with the principal, just by virtue of the fact that she either does not respond in many instances, or provides responses which are very limited in nature in others.

The recall data provided by both participants make it possible to speculate that the supervisory process may have limited, if any, effect in terms of constituting the basis for future change in the classroom setting.

CASE C: OBSERVED PERFORMANCE PROFILE

The data collected for the observed performances of each teacher are organized in three ways. The mean scores for all categories (1-9) are reported for round one observation prior to the workshop intervention, and for round two observation after the workshop intervention. Pre-workshop means, then, are calculated on the basis of round one observation data, prior to the workshop intervention. Post workshop means are calculated on the basis of round two observation data, following the workshop intervention. Within each case the mean scores represent the "flavour" of each lesson as observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a mean score of 3.50000 or greater represents a high rating, a mean score of 2.50000 or lower represents a low rating, and a mean score between 2.50000 and 3.50000 represents an average rating, based on a five point component rating scale.

Change scores are also reported. These are computed by subtracting the preworkshop mean from the post workshop mean. The change score provides some indication of both the direction (positive or negative) and the degree (minimal or substantial) of change. Within each case, then, the change scores as represent a comparative measure of the differences between the lessons observed by two independent observers.

For the purposes of this study a change score of 0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change and a change score of less than 0.50000 represents a minimal change.

Ratings, based on the mean scores for each category, are also reported for prior to and after the workshop intervention.

The organization of the data in each of these ways contributes to an overall profile of the observed performance(s) of each teacher.

Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher C's Observed

Performance Across All Categories

Table 6.1 reports the category mean and change scores for teacher C's observed performance across all categories and across observers.

Mean Scores

An examination of the pre and post workshop mean scores and their relative ratings provides an observed performance rating profile for teacher C in Table 6.2. Several categories show positive or negative change. In each instance the change is substantial enough to move the category from one rating to another.

Category 2 indicates a substantial negative change from a high rating prior to the workshop intervention in round one observation to an average rating following the workshop intervention in round two observation. Categories 7 and 9 indicate a substantial positive change from a low rating prior to the workshop intervention in round one observation, to an average rating following the workshop intervention in round two observation.

In terms of an overall, cross-category performance profile, teacher C's profile changes considerably. Prior to the workshop intervention in round one observation, teacher C would be rated as low in seven out of nine categories. Following the workshop intervention in round two observation, teacher C would be rated as average to low, with five categories rated low, three categories rated average and one category remaining at a constant high rating. The direction of change for teacher, C then, is positive overall.

Table 6.1 Category Means and Change Scores for Teacher
C's Observed Performance: An Overview of
All Categories

| Category | Pre-Workshop Mean | Post-Workshop Mean | Change Score |
|----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1 | 1.68182 | 1.77273 | 0.09091 |
| 2 | 5.00000 | 3.00000 | -2.00000 |
| 3 | 2.12500 | 2.50000 | 0.37500 |
| 4 | 2.28571 | 2.37500 | 0.08929 |
| 5 | 1.25000 | 1.75000 | 0.50000 |
| 6 | 5.00000 | 5.00000 | 0.00000 |
| 7 | 2.06250 | 2.56250 | 0.50000 |
| 8 | 2.50000 | 2.50000 | 0.00000 |
| 9 | 1.00000 | 2.80000 | 1.80000 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Change Score = Post minus Pre

0.50000 or greater represents a substantial change

0.50000 or lower represents a minimal change

Category Means and change scores are based on a five point scale.

Table 6.2 Observed Performance Rating Profile for Teacher C

| Rating | Categories | |
|---------|---------------|---------------|
| | Pre-Workshop | Post-Workshop |
| Low | 1,3,4,5,7,8,9 | 1,3,4,5,8 |
| Average | | 2,7,9 |
| High | 2,6 | 6 |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

Ratings

| | |
|---------|----------------------|
| Low | = 2.50000 or lower |
| Average | = 2.50000 to 3.50000 |
| High | = 3.50000 or higher |

Ratings are based on a five point scale.

Change Scores

An examination of change scores by category (Table 5.1) supports this overall performance profile for teacher C. No change is evident in two categories, positive change is evident in six categories, and negative change in one category.

a) No Change Categories

No change is evident in category 6, disruptive student behaviour. A mean of 5.00000 in this instance indicates no evidence of disruptive behaviour was observed in either the first or second round observation.

No change is also evident in category 8, classroom climate. A mean of 2.50000 indicates classroom climate (teacher feeling tone and student task-orientation) was rated low in both observations.

b) Positive Change Categories

Of the six categories in which positive change is indicated, three categories have a change score above 0.50000, representing a substantial change, and three categories have a change score below 0.50000, representing a minimal change.

(i) Substantial Positive Change Categories

Category 5, managing student behaviour, has a change score of 0.50000. Although this represents a substantial positive change, the rating of category 5 remains constant. This change score represents a substantial positive change in the teacher's signaling, monitoring, and rewarding of appropriate behaviour, and/or in the consistency with which the teacher responds to appropriate and inappropriate behaviour

in the second observation.

Category 7, inappropriate student behaviour, also has a change score of 0.50000, representing a substantial positive change. In this instance the rating of category 7 changes from low to average. This change score indicates a decrease in the occurrences of inappropriate behaviour observed in round two and/or a rating increase in the teacher's method of handling inappropriate behaviour.

Category 9, miscellaneous, has a change score of 1.80000, representing a substantial positive change. Again, the change is substantial enough to change the rating of category 9 from low to average. This change score indicates either a decrease in the teacher's distracting mannerisms, and/or an increase in the occurrences of listening and attending to students or in the teacher's expression of feelings in the round two observation.

(ii) Minimal Positive Change Categories

Category 1, instructional management, has a change score of 0.09091, representing a minimal positive change in the teacher's instructional management techniques in the second observation.

Category 3, rules and procedures, has a change score of 0.37500, representing a minimal positive change in the efficiency or appropriateness of the routines and/or procedures observed in round two.

Category 4, meeting student concerns, has a change score of 0.08929, also representing a minimal positive change. This change score

indicates that the teacher's efforts to take student concerns into account in instructional activities were rated slightly higher in the round two observation than in round one.

c) Negative Change Categories

Category 2, room arrangement, is the only category in which negative change is evident. Category 2 has a change score of -2.00000, representing a substantial negative change that changes the category rating from high to average. This change score indicates that some change in room arrangement in the second observation was rated as less effective than the room arrangement observed for the first lesson.

A profile of change score ratings for all nine categories indicates no change in two categories, substantial positive change in three categories, minimal positive change in three categories, and negative change in one category.

Chapter 7

CASE STUDY A: INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS

The relationship among the substantive content of the conference discussions, the supervisor's process strategies, and the differential treatment (workshops) received are examined here for evidence of the possible effects these variables have on the teacher's observed classroom performance in terms of classroom management practices.

Substantive Content of Conference Discussions

The classroom management practice identified by the principal in the supervisory conference settings is management of instruction. While many of the variables of instructional management are included in the conference discussions, the substantive focus is on the patterns that are identified in the positioning of the teacher during instruction and monitoring, her questioning distribution, and student on and off task behaviour.

Observed Classroom Performance

In teacher A's case, with this substantive focus on managing instruction, one might expect some change in classroom management practices in this area. The change score for category 1, instructional management, is 0.22728, representing a minimal positive change (see Table 4.1). This evidence of a minimal improvement in practice on the part of teacher A supports the expectation created through analysis of the substantive focus of the supervisory conference discussions.

This expectation is also supported in terms of an overall improvement in the

observed classroom practices of teacher A. Table 7.1 reports the direction of change within category and across all categories by teacher. Teacher A shows no change in three categories (category 2, room arrangement, category 6, disruptive student behaviour, and category 9, miscellaneous) and positive change in the remaining six categories. The overall direction of change for teacher A across all categories, then, is positive. This finding leads one to examine the supervisory experience in this case for evidence of factors influencing this positive change.

Supervisor's Process Strategies

An examination of supervisor A's process strategies in the conference settings provides some insight into the identified change, and overall direction of change, in teacher A's observed classroom performance. However, to gain greater insight into why the impact is as it is, it is also necessary to examine the process strategies employed by teacher A in the conference settings.

Supervisor A provides no evidence of a low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process. He does, however, provide evidence of a low sense of confidence in his supervisory role. He suggests that the process strategies he employs in the conference settings are not operationally natural for him, and that he finds the supervisory experience stressful and laborious as a result. This supervisor refers to his role as facilitating teacher awareness. In that regard he makes a conscious effort to be tentative rather than direct, partially to avoid offending the teacher and partially because of a lack of confidence.

Even given these intentions, the appraising and/or apprising nature of supervisor A's feedback often precludes teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice. While he successfully holds several issues in abeyance, they are not necessarily

Table 7.1 Direction of Change Within Category and Across All Categories by Teacher

| Teacher | Category and Direction of Change | | | | | | | | | Total | | | All Categories 1-9 |
|---------|----------------------------------|-----|-----|---|---|-----|---|-----|-----|-------|---|-----|-----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | + | - | N/C | |
| A | + | N/C | + | + | + | N/C | + | + | N/C | 6 | 0 | 3 | + |
| B | - | + | N/C | - | - | N/C | + | - | + | 3 | 4 | 2 | - |
| C | + | - | | + | + | N/C | + | N/C | + | 6 | 1 | 2 | + |

Categories of Variables

| | |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| C1: Instructional Management | (V1-11) |
| C2: Room Arrangement | (V12-13) |
| C3: Rules and Procedures | (V14-18) |
| C4: Meeting Student Concerns | (V19-22) |
| C5: Managing Student Behaviour | (V23-26) |
| C6: Disruptive Student Behaviour | (V27-34) |
| C7: Inappropriate Student Behaviour | (V35-42) |
| C8: Classroom Climate | (V43-44) |
| C9: Miscellaneous | (V45-49) |

N/C = No change (same score on pre and post)
 + = Post mean higher than pre mean (positive change)
 - = Post mean lower than pre mean (negative change)

probed when he does introduce them in the conference discussion. The supervisor acknowledges that he forfeits these opportunities. In some instances, in the face of such opportunity he elects to withdraw from discussion of the issue rather than probe and push for teacher analysis and insight.

Supervisor A appears to have a limited grasp of some of the process strategies of supervision, but there is no evidence of the conscious application of a thoughtout supervisory strategy.

Teacher A's expressed low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process does not appear to be reflected in the process strategies she employs. The nature of her responses can be characterized as either expressing agreement, providing information, or providing a rationale. There is little evidence of defensiveness or rationalization on her part in the conference settings and no evidence of either subtle or deliberate efforts to block communication with the supervisor.

All of these factors serve as the basis for conference settings which are characterized by a certain openness and a high degree of interaction, rendering the supervisory experience potentially effective, at least to a limited degree. This is reflected in the overall positive change in teacher A's observed classroom performance. The supervisory process in this case, then, appears to have had some positive impact on classroom practice overall.

This point notwithstanding, the extent of the supervisory experiences' effectiveness is somewhat limited. This is particularly reflected in the minimal positive change in category 1, instructional management. In this case, it is possible that the change can be attributed to the supervisory experience. There is continuity in the substantive focus of the conference discussions, and evidence to suggest that the teacher had considerable input into the purposes of the second round

observation. She also expresses genuine interest in the feedback provided by the supervisor. Not only does she acknowledge a lack of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning, but a lack of awareness of many of the instructional practices she employs. Her realization of the patterns identified in these practices leads her to suggest pursuing their generalizability through other observations, thus establishing the basis for further continuity, and perhaps increased effectiveness, in the supervisory experience.

Differential Treatment

Supervisor A received workshops on both the content of classroom management (room arrangement, management of student behaviour, and management of instruction) and workshops on supervisory process strategies (questioning techniques and exploratory procedures).

The supervisor appears to have a pervasive, if somewhat vague, knowledge of the content area, as evidenced in his focus on a number of the variables of instructional management in the supervisory conference. The supervisor also provides evidence of knowledge of some of the process strategies to employ in the conference setting. However, he provides no indication of a thought-out supervisory strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into the variables of instructional management.

In this case, the effects of the treatment on the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task appear to be limited at best. Although the principal transfers both the content knowledge and the process strategies gained from the workshop interventions to the supervisory task, there is no evidence of improved practice on the part of the principal in the supervisory conference setting. Rather the evidence appears to indicate a negative effect on the supervisor's performance.

This may be to suggest that while the effects of the treatment on the supervisor could be considerable, his initial efforts to apply new knowledge and skills could serve to inhibit the effectiveness of his performance of the supervisory task. If this is the case, then continued application of both knowledge and skills could potentially lead to improved practice over time.

However, given the nature of the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task in this case, it could be argued that operating at a level of gaining teacher awareness, rather than employing a thought-out supervisory strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into classroom practice, renders the supervisory experience limited in its effectiveness. This is evidenced in the minimal improved practice on the part of the teacher in her classroom performance. In this case, the relationship between the supervisory experience and teacher developmental growth, while positive, is limited.

Evidence of the principal's content knowledge and his efforts to employ certain process strategies in the first as well as the second conference settings suggests that both content knowledge and process strategies may impact on teacher practice and developmental growth.

The evidence provided in case A of this study, then, appears to demonstrate that effective supervision may, in fact, require supervisors who do consciously employ a thought-out supervisory strategy (consisting of a combination of effective questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) in the conference setting, to facilitate teacher analysis and insight into their teaching practice, in terms of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning.

CASE STUDY B: INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS

The relationship among the substantive content of the conference discussions, the supervisor's process strategies, and the differential treatment (workshops) received are examined here for evidence of the possible effects these variables have on the teacher's observed classroom performance in terms of classroom management practices.

Substantive Content of Conference Discussions

Those classroom management practices identified by the principal in the supervisory conference settings include managing student behaviour, with an emphasis on the handling of inappropriate behaviour in both conferences, and managing instruction. Managing instruction includes some reference to procedures and lesson pacing in the first conference. In the second conference, the principal refers to transitions and is more specific in his references to the importance of pacing in minimizing potential behaviour problems. Instructional management, then, is incidental to the substantive focus on handling inappropriate student behaviour in the supervisory conferences.

Observed Classroom Performance

In teacher B's case, with this substantive focus on managing inappropriate student behaviour, one might expect some change in classroom management practices in this area. The change score for category 7, inappropriate student behaviour, is 1.15417, representing a substantial positive change (see Table 5.1). This evidence of improved practice on the part of teacher B supports the expectation created through analysis of the substantive focus of the supervisory conference discussions.

However, this expectation is not supported in terms of an overall improvement in the observed classroom practices of teacher B. Table 7.1 reports the direction of change within category and across all categories by teacher. Teacher B shows no change in two categories (category 3, rules and procedures; and category 6, disruptive student behaviour), positive change in three categories (category 2, room arrangement; category 7, inappropriate student behaviour; and category 9, miscellaneous), and negative change in the remaining four categories. The overall direction of change for teacher B across all categories, then, is negative. This finding leads one to question the impact of the supervisory experience in this case.

Supervisor's Process Strategies

An examination of supervisor B's process strategies in the conference settings provides some insight into the identified changes and overall direction of change in teacher B's observed classroom performance. However, to gain fuller insight into why the impact is as it is, it is also necessary to examine the process strategies employed by teacher B in the conference settings.

Supervisor B's low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process is reflected in the process strategies he employs. His less than effective questioning techniques and the didactic, appraising nature of his feedback neither elicits, nor allows for, teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice. Not only does this supervisor fail to probe or push for such analysis and insight, he forfeits many opportunities to do so.

In both supervisory conferences the supervisor couches direct suggestions to the teacher in tentative language. He withdraws from discussions when the teacher's response is defensive and indicates that teacher awareness will suffice in those,

as well as other, instances.

Teacher B's low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process is also reflected in the process strategies he employs. His reaction to the supervisor's process strategies is to neutralize all feedback, whether positive or negative, by either focusing on his subject specialization or rationalizing his classroom practices. Feedback interpreted as criticism is countered with a strong defensive response.

All of these factors serve as the basis of an impasse, rendering the supervisory experience less than effective. This is reflected in the overall negative change in teacher B's observed classroom performance. The supervisory process in this case, then, appears to have had a negative impact on classroom practice overall.

There is no evidence in the conference data to suggest the positive change in category 7, inappropriate student behaviour, is a direct result of the supervisory experience. Given the nature of the supervisory process in this case, it is possible to speculate that this change occurs either in spite of the supervisory experience, or that the message gets through to the teacher, even though the nature of the feedback prohibits the teacher from acknowledging receipt of it.

Differential Treatment

Supervisor B received workshops on the content of classroom management only. The topics covered in those workshops included room arrangement, management of student behaviour, and management of instruction.

The supervisor in this case would appear to have some knowledge of the content area, as evidenced in his focus on inappropriate student behaviour in the supervisory conference. However, in the reaction data, in contrast to the conference setting, the principal says little to indicate a thought out supervisory

strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into methods of handling inappropriate student behaviour.

In this case, the effects of the treatment on the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task appear to be negligible. In other words, although the principal transfers the content knowledge gained from the workshop intervention to the supervisory task, there is no evidence of improved practice on the part of the principal in the supervisory conference setting.

While the treatment had no impact on the supervisor's performance, there is some evidence to suggest a possible impact on the classroom teacher's observed performance, as reflected in the positive change score for category 7, inappropriate student behaviour. As has already been speculated, it is possible that the content knowledge gained through the treatment did impact on the teacher, regardless of how that knowledge was conveyed by the supervisor in the conference setting. If this is the case, it would suggest there is a relationship between supervisor content knowledge and supervisee practice and developmental growth. And, given the nature of this supervisor's performance of the supervisory task, it would also suggest that, at least in some cases, the lack of a thought out supervisory strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice is not that consequential.

However, the overall negative change in teacher B's observed classroom practice provides a stronger indication of the possible relationship between teacher developmental growth and the supervisory experience than a positive change in one out of nine categories, in which the rating is low to average. This overall negative change suggests that the process strategies employed in the supervisory conference do impact on teacher practice and growth, in this case, negatively.

The evidence provided in case B of this study, then, appears to demonstrate that effective supervision may, in fact, require supervisors who do consciously employ a thought out supervisory strategy (consisting of a combination of effective questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) in the conference setting to facilitate teacher analysis and insight into their teaching practice, in terms of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning. The evidence provided in case B also appears to demonstrate that content knowledge alone is not associated with positive effects on supervisee teaching practice or overall developmental growth.

CASE STUDY C: INTERPRETIVE FINDINGS

The relationship among the substantive content of the conference discussions, the supervisor's process strategies, and the differential treatment (workshops) received are examined here for evidence of the possible effects these variables have on the teacher's observed classroom performance in terms of classroom management practices.

Substantive Content of Conference Discussions

The classroom management practice identified by the principal in the supervisory conference settings is management of instruction. While many of the variables of instructional management are included in the conference discussions, the substantive focus is on the teacher's transitions, or movements, between grade level groups in the classroom, and on lesson pacing.

Observed Classroom Performance

In teacher C's case, with this substantive focus on managing instruction, one might expect some change in classroom management practices in this area. The change score for category 1, instructional management, is 0.09091, representing a minimal positive change. (See Table 6.1). This evidence of a minimal improvement in practice on the part of teacher C supports the expectation created through analysis of the substantive focus on the supervisory conference discussions.

This expectation is also supported in terms of an overall improvement in the observed classroom practices of teacher C. Table 7.1 reports the direction of change within category and across all categories by teacher. Teacher C shows no change in two categories (category 6, disruptive student behaviour; and

category 8, classroom climate), negative change in one category (category 2, room arrangement), and positive change in the remaining six categories. The overall direction of change for teacher C across all categories, then, is positive. This finding leads one to examine the supervisory experience in this case for evidence of factors influencing this positive change.

Supervisor's Process Strategies

An examination of supervisor C's process strategies in the conference settings provides some insight into the identified change, and overall direction of change, in teacher C's observed classroom performance. However, to gain greater insight into why the impact is as it is, it is also necessary to examine the process strategies employed by teacher C in the conference settings.

Supervisor C's low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process is reflected in the process strategies he employs. His ineffective questioning techniques and the didactic, appraising nature of his feedback neither elicits, nor allows for, teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice.

In the round one supervisory conference there appears to be some probing for a rationale in teacher C's actions, but there is no evidence of pushing for teacher analysis and insight and, in fact, the supervisor acknowledges that he forfeits these opportunities. The supervisor also acknowledges that while he holds some issues in abeyance, if the opportunity to discuss them is not presented in the conference, he forfeits any discussion of those issues. In both supervisory conferences the supervisor withdraws from discussions where the teacher appears to express either discomfort or defensiveness, and/or the nature of his feedback has been particularly direct, thereby nullifying the impact of the conference discussion.

In the round two supervisory conference the supervisor uses more tentative language and, in several instances, he withholds judgment, suggesting that the teacher should be the judge, then fails to probe for that judgment. He indicates that one of his supervisory conference objectives is teacher awareness, and that his tentativeness is a nervous mannerism, rather than part of a thought-out, conscious strategy.

Teacher C's low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process is also reflected in the process strategies she employs. The nature of her responses can be characterized as either providing a rationale for her classroom practices, or rationalizing those practices. The nature of teacher C's limited responses in the supervisory conference suggests that she misunderstands, or misses the point of, the supervisor's feedback almost entirely. However, her reaction data suggests she does understand, leading to the speculation that her responses were designed to block any in-depth discussion of issues during the supervisory conferences.

If this is the case, it suggests that both conference participants in Case C prefer to operate at a "comfort level" of awareness, rather than analysis and insight, rendering the supervisory experience minimally effective, at best. Despite the overall positive change in teacher C's observed classroom performance, the supervisory process in this case appears to have had a minimal but positive effect on classroom practice overall.

The minimal effectiveness of the supervisory experience is also reflected in the minimal positive change in category 1, instructional management. In this case it is possible that the change can be attributed to the supervisory experience. The identification of a pacing problem by the supervisor in the round one observation leads to the establishment of that as a specific focus for the round two

observation, thereby ensuring some continuity in the supervisory experience. The teacher expresses genuine interest in the substantive focus (her lesson pacing) of the round two conference discussion. Although her knowledge of the content appears limited, there is evidence of some growth in knowledge and awareness on the part of teacher C in the supervisory conference setting, provided largely through the reaction data. Within the conference setting, teacher C indicates interest in pursuing the substantive focus of the discussion in other observations, thus establishing the basis for further continuity, and perhaps increased effectiveness, in the supervisory experience.

Differential Treatment

Supervisor C received no treatment. In this case, then, the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task cannot be attributed to the effects of the treatment received.

The supervisor appears to have a reasonable knowledge of the content area, as evidenced in his focus on instructional management in the supervisory conference. And in the reaction data the principal provides evidence of knowledge of some of the process strategies to employ in providing feedback (holding issues in abeyance, withholding judgment). However, he provides no indication of a thoughtout supervisory strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into the variables of instructional management. Given the nature of the supervisor's performance of the supervisory task in this case, it would suggest that, at least in some cases, operating at a level of gaining teacher awareness, rather than employing a thought-out supervisory strategy for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into teacher practice, renders the supervisory experience low in efficacy.

In this case there is evidence of minimal improved practice on the part of the

principal in the supervisory conference setting, and evidence of minimal improved practice on the part of the teacher in her classroom performance, indicating a relationship between teacher developmental growth and the supervisory experience. The principal's knowledge of content and his improved practice in the conference setting suggests that both content knowledge and process strategies impact on teacher practice and developmental growth.

The evidence provided in Case C of this study, then, appears to demonstrate that effective supervision may in fact require supervisors who do consciously employ a thought out supervisory strategy (consisting of a combination of effective questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) in the conference setting to facilitate teacher analysis and insight into their teaching practice, in terms of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning.

COMPARATIVE FINDINGS

A comparison of each of the supervisory cases reported in this study in terms of supervisor and supervisee backgrounds and roles as well as treatments received may provide the basis for some generalizations about the relationship between the supervisory experience and supervisee developmental growth.

Supervisors' Experience and Confidence Levels

Supervisor A is young and has little experience as a principal. Although he does not express a low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process, he does express discomfort with his performance of the supervisory task. This appears to be compounded by the fact that he is supervising an experienced generalist teacher with a reputation for good performance. While lacking confidence, supervisor A appears genuine in his efforts to apply both content knowledge and process strategies to the supervisory experience.

Supervisor B is a senior principal, with approximately twenty years of experience. Although he expresses a low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process, he does not express discomfort with his performance of the supervisory task. This principal is supervising an inexperienced specialist teacher. Supervisor B is confident in his approach and does not appear open to change.

Supervisor C is also a senior principal, with approximately twenty years of experience. He too expresses a low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory process. Although generally confident, he does express some discomfort with aspects of his performance of the supervisory task. However, he acknowledges that this discomfort may be due to the fact that he is supervising a very experienced generalist teacher in whom he observes a number of weaknesses.

Supervisor C appears content to function at a "comfort level" of teacher awareness.

Supervisors' Roles

Each of the supervisors in this study operates at the level of teacher awareness in the supervisory conference setting. Each refers to the evaluative nature of the supervisory process and makes use of terms such as "fair game" to allude to this comfort level they strive to maintain. There is no indication provided of how teacher awareness will bring about improvement. All acknowledge forfeiting opportunities to probe and push for teacher analysis and insight. There would seem to be, then, a lack of recognition, or acceptance, of the role of the supervisor in helping bring teachers from the awareness stage through to the stage of analysis and insight into teaching practice.

While generally recognizing the low efficacy of the supervisory process as they are currently engaged in practicing it, none of the supervisors in this study has a thought out supervisory strategy to consciously employ. In each case there is a distinct lack of clarity of the purposes(s) for the classroom observations, particularly with respect to the definition and understanding of terms used to guide those observations and subsequent discussions of substantive content. The didactic approach to providing feedback common to these supervisors appears to be more natural to them than their conscious efforts to be tentative and apprising. All of these are factors which contribute in these cases, to subtly blocking communication among participants that would perhaps take teachers beyond the "comfort level" of awareness to a level of analysis and insight into teaching practice.

Supervisors' Roles and Treatments Received

Supervisor A appears to be the most tentative and apprising in his feedback. The highly interactive nature of the conference settings in Case A suggests that the facilitating role he attempts to employ allows greater opportunity for teacher response than in Cases B and C. This supervisor's application of both content knowledge and supervisory process strategies appears to be more pervasive in the conference settings than either Case B or C. The supervisor's role in this case has a minimal positive impact on the teacher's classroom practices. Although minimal, the change in Case A is greater than that in Case B or C.

Supervisor A received workshops on both the content of classroom management practice and supervisory process strategies. The effects of this treatment on the supervisor's performance appear to be negative, indicating that his initial efforts to apply new knowledge and skills may have served to inhibit his overall effectiveness. In this case, the continued application of such knowledge and skills could lead to this supervisor's improved performance of the supervisory task over time.

Supervisor B appears to be the most pedantic and didactic in his feedback. The starkly low interactive nature of the conference settings in Case B suggests that the role played by this supervisor neither elicits, nor allows for, teacher response. Indeed teacher B expresses a strong negative reaction to this supervisory role.

In contrast to Cases A and C, this supervisor exhibits limited content knowledge and an almost complete absence of supervisory process strategies. The supervisor's role in this case has a negative impact on the teacher's classroom practices.

Supervisor B received the workshop on the content of classroom management practice only. The effects of this treatment on the supervisor's performance appear to be negligible. While he transfers this knowledge to the supervisory task, there is no evidence of improved practice on the part of this supervisor.

Supervisor C appears to soften didacticism with a reporting style of feedback. While the low interactive nature of the conference settings in Case C suggests that this supervisory role does not elicit, nor allow for, teacher response, at least it does not evoke a strong negative reaction on the part of the teacher, as in Case B. Supervisor C received no treatment. However, he exhibits a reasonable grasp of content knowledge and employs some supervisory process strategies in the conference settings. The supervisor's role in this case has a minimal positive impact on the teacher's classroom practices. The positive change in Case C is less than the positive change in Case A.

From these superficial findings it would appear that exposing supervisors to both content knowledge and supervisory process strategies is more beneficial than exposing them to content alone, in terms of their performance of the supervisory task. It would also appear that combining both content knowledge and supervisory process strategies in dialoguing with teachers in the conference setting is more effective than exposing teachers to content alone, in terms of their performance in the classroom.

Teachers' Experience and Confidence Levels

Teacher A appears professionally secure and confident. While an experienced generalist teacher she exhibits a willingness to learn and an openness to change.

Teacher B may best be characterized by professional insecurity. Given that he has little experience it might be expected that he would be willing to learn and

be open to change. However, he adopts a "specialist attitude", thereby blocking much of the feedback he is provided regarding generic teaching practices.

Teacher C may also be characterized by professional insecurity. While a very experienced generalist teacher, she does not exhibit a willingness to learn nor an openness to change.

Both teacher B and C appear to carry this professional insecurity into the postconference reaction sessions, where there is some evidence of efforts to block the observers' understanding of the events of the supervisory experience, or at least to influence that understanding.

Teachers' Roles

While exhibiting various levels of confidence professionally, each of the teachers in this study refer to the pressure or stress involved in the supervisory experience. Each also contradicts this by insisting s/he feels comfortable with the process and/or the supervisor. All refer to the artificiality of the observed lessons, as opposed to what really happens in regular practice. All indicate that they recognize critical feedback, regardless of how it is delivered, and that they recognize instances of the supervisor's employment of process strategies. All also indicate a low sense of the efficacy of the supervisory experience, indicating they view it as an evaluative process, rather than assisting in the improvement of their teaching practice.

While generally recognizing the low efficacy of the supervisory process they are currently involved in, it is obvious that none of the teachers in this study has the content knowledge or "labels" to facilitate discussion of their teaching practices. These teachers' common approach is to engage feedback in a reactive rather than a proactive sense. Two out of three of the cases in this study

could be characterized by "the principal does the talking and the teacher does the blocking", given the marked lack of interaction in the conference settings. The prevalent teacher attitude would appear to be, "the less said, the better". All of these are factors which also contribute, in these cases, to subtly blocking communication among participants that would perhaps take teachers beyond the "comfort level" of awareness to a level of analysis and insight into teaching practice.

Teacher A takes a highly interactive, though not a proactive role in the conference settings. She is interested in and open to the feedback provided. She responds by expressing agreement (i.e. acknowledging error), providing information about, and/or providing a rationale for, her teaching practices. While there is no evidence of communication blocking on the part of the teacher, she appears content to operate at the awareness level. If this is the case, it may also help account for the minimal positive change in teacher A's classroom practices.

Teacher B does not take an interactive role in the conference settings. His strong negative response to the principal's performance of the supervisory task is reflected in the reactive role he takes. He acknowledges the use of communication blocks, neutralizing all feedback (both positive and negative) through his focus on his subject specialization and countering perceived criticism with a strong defensive response. Teacher B exhibits a negative change in his classroom practices.

Teacher C also does not take an interactive role in the conference settings. While she does not acknowledge the use of communication blocks, the nature of her limited responses can best be characterized as rationalizing the state of her

teaching practices. Teacher C exhibits a minimal positive change in her teaching practices.

Overall Effects of the Supervisory Experience

With respect to the research questions posed in this study, the impact of research-verified content knowledge about classroom management and process strategies combined on the supervisory conference (research question 1) appears to be greater than the impact of research-verified content alone (research question 2). In those cases where some improvement in supervisee classroom management practices is indicated, the supervisors apply their knowledge about classroom management practices combined with some process strategies to the supervisory conference setting. In the case where the most positive change takes place, the supervisor provides evidence of possessing and applying a broader range of both content knowledge and process strategies than the other supervisors. Correspondingly, in the case where negative change takes place the supervisor applies a limited knowledge about classroom management practices and none of the process strategies to the supervisory conference setting.

It would appear, then, that supervisory process strategies do facilitate, in some way, the internalization (and application) of content knowledge by supervisees. While the content of conference discussions is of some import, it seems that the impact of the conference discussion is heightened through the employment of supervisory process strategies.

In two out of three cases in this study, there are principals acting as supervisors who perceive themselves to be very experienced and highly confident, but who, in fact, have little conception of supervisory process strategies. Such supervisors, whether dealing with experienced or inexperienced teachers, tend not to foster interaction, thereby allowing for teacher exploration of their teaching

practices.

In the case where the most positive change takes place, the supervisor perceives himself as lacking in experience and confidence. Correspondingly, he is dealing with a very confident and highly experienced teacher. Success seems to associate, in this study, with a high level of experience (and a high level of openness) on the part of the teacher, and a low level of experience, (and a high level of openness) on the part of the supervisor. Perhaps the efficacy of the supervisory process, then, is more closely related to the experience and professional confidence level of the teacher, and the role s/he chooses to play in that process, than has heretofore been recognized.

A pervasive sense of low efficacy exists in this study. All participants appear to expect to, and appear content to, operate at a low level of teacher awareness. With this ethos surrounding the supervisory experience, it is likely that it will continue to have limited effect as it is currently practiced.

Chapter 8

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS**Summary**

This study examined the effects of the supervisory process on classroom teaching. It sought to determine if the supervisory experience contributed to teacher's developmental growth, as evidenced by improved classroom management practices (room arrangement, student behaviour management, instructional management).

Specifically, this study examined the relationship between research-verified content knowledge about teaching and learning and supervisory process strategies (questioning techniques and exploratory procedures), and the observable classroom performance of supervisees. It sought to determine whether content knowledge alone was sufficient to impact on teaching performance, or to what extent process strategies were necessary to facilitate the internalization of content knowledge by teachers.

Through analysis of the supervisory conference setting, this study examined whether effective supervision required supervisors who practiced certain strategies as they dialogued with teachers in the conference, or whether discussion of research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning alone, regardless of how this information was conveyed, was sufficient to bring about an improvement in classroom teaching practice.

This study also examined the effects of an intervention on school principals in their performance of the supervisory task. That is, the study sought to determine if supervisors transferred the research-verified knowledge and/or process

strategies presented in workshop program(s) to the supervisory task, and, if so, what effect, if any, this had on teacher's classroom teaching performance (classroom management practices).

Given an understanding of the role currently played by supervision in affecting teacher classroom performance, it may be possible to gain greater understanding of how such supervisory practice can be made more effective.

The findings of this study suggest that current supervisory practice, along traditional as opposed to clinical lines, appears to be characterized by an evaluative rather than a facilitative process, a pervasive sense of artificiality, feelings of stress and pressure, and a low sense of efficacy. Supervisees lack content knowledge, or the language with which to discuss their teaching practices. Supervisors lack a thought-out supervisory strategy to consciously employ in the supervisory conference. The expectation and acceptance of teacher awareness as the operational level of the supervisory conference leads procedurally to supervisors reviewing the events of the lesson and supervisees taking a reactive role, resulting in little, or low levels, of interaction. With this ethos in place, it is likely that current supervisory practice, along traditional lines, will continue to be low in efficacy. Such practice does not correspond to clinical supervision as espoused by Goldhammer and Cogan, although supervisors speak of the clinical supervision model.

The supervisory experience appears to be affected by the experience and/or professional confidence levels of both supervisors and supervisees, the openness of both supervisors and supervisees (as evidenced in the interactive nature of the conference), the level of content knowledge and supervisory process strategies employed by the supervisor in the conference setting, and the facilitating role

played by the supervisor.

The role played by the teacher appears to impact on the effect of the supervisory experience. Where teachers are experienced and professionally confident, they appear to find the supervisory process less threatening, and are more open and interactive in the conference setting. Under these conditions, the supervisory experience is potentially more effective.

The role played by the principal also impacts on the effect of the supervisory experience. Where supervisors are perceived as less threatening (low in experience and/or level of confidence), more knowledgeable, and sincere in their facilitating efforts (process strategies), the supervisory experience appears more effective.

It is possible to speculate, on the basis of this study, that the role played by the teacher in the supervisory experience has considerable impact on the efficacy of the process as it is currently practiced.

The effects of the treatments (workshops on the content knowledge of classroom management and/or supervisory process strategies) on supervisors may also be related to their level of experience and/or confidence, as well as their degree of openness. While the supervisors in this study do transfer the knowledge and/or strategies learned to their performance of the supervisory task, the levels of application differ considerably. The latter appears to be related to level of experience or confidence and degree of openness. Principals having limited experience with the supervisory task are correspondingly low in confidence but exhibit a high degree of openness to learning both content and strategies to apply to the task. The treatments have a greater impact on these supervisors' performance of the supervisory task than on those supervisors who are highly

experienced and confident in their performance of the supervisory task, and apparently lower in their degree of openness.

Where knowledge alone is transferred, there is no appreciable change in how the supervisory task is performed. Where both knowledge and process strategies are transferred, the performance of the supervisory task may be negatively affected initially. That is, the effort to apply new knowledge and skills may lead to increased nervousness or discomfort with the task, and other such negative effects. However, continued practice could lead to improved performance over time.

It is not possible to determine the impact of the treatments on classroom teaching performance in this study, as none of the supervisors involved carried out the supervisory function between the administration of the treatments and the second round supervisory experience.

Conclusions

Confirmation of Previous Research Findings

Participants' perceptions. This study supports previous findings in this area which indicate that the assumptions of clinical supervision are more acceptable to participants than the actual procedures at a practical level. Clinical supervision was not being practiced in this study, even though supervisors spoke of the clinical supervision model in their recall data. Participants' perceptions of supervision along traditional lines, as it was practiced in this study, were that it was low in efficacy.

Factors contributing to successful clinical supervision. Many of the factors found to contribute to effective clinical supervision also appear to contribute to the effectiveness of supervision along traditional lines. Both Squires (1978) and

Kilbourn (1982) identified teacher autonomy (the ability to analyze and control their own teaching) as a factor contributing to increased collegiality in, and effectiveness of, clinical supervision. Kilbourn also identified evidence, based on observation and analysis, and continuity in the supervisory process as factors contributing to supervisory effectiveness. Kerr (1976) found that more open-minded teachers displayed a greater willingness to enter into a dialogue with supervisees in the conference setting and Champagne and David (1985) identified teacher trust in the supervisor and perceptions of the supervisor as competent as factors contributing to the effectiveness of the supervisory experience.

This study reflects these findings, contributing further to an understanding of the supervisory relationship in the conference setting, whether as a part of clinical or traditional supervision. In the case where supervisory practice appears to have the most impact, the teacher's autonomy, the supervisor's use of evidence, and a collegial relationship are more evident than in the other cases. In two out of three cases those factors which would serve as the focus for follow-up observation and conferences were identified and agreed to in the initial conference session, thereby providing some continuity to the supervisory process.

The terms open and openness are used synonymously in this study to reflect an open-minded attitude which manifests itself in a willingness on the part of both teachers and supervisors to interact and to learn.

In this study, teacher trust in the supervisor appears to parallel each of these identified factors, as well as the perceived competence of the supervisor. This trust is reflected in teachers feeling more or less threatened by the supervisory experience.

The efficacy of clinical supervision. Studies of the efficacy of clinical supervision

suggest this instructional supervision process can effect positive changes in teacher classroom behaviour. While clinical supervision was not being practiced in this study, the traditional supervision process appears to have a limited impact on teacher classroom behaviour, and further it appears that this impact may be either positive or negative. None of the supervisors in this study had a conscious supervisory process or strategy that was employed. The findings of this study also suggest, then, that a supervisory process or strategy, such as clinical supervision, may be necessary for increased efficacy in the supervision experience.

Interpersonal relationships in clinical supervision. While this study examined interpersonal relationships in traditional supervision, the findings reflect some of those found by other researchers in the context of clinical supervision. Both Squires (1978) and this study found that teacher concern about evaluation had an inverse relationship to their level of trust and classroom performance.

Studies by Sahling (1981), O'Neal and Edwards (1983), and this study, found that supervisors tend to dominate conference verbal interactions by procedurally reviewing and/or commenting on events of the lesson. In this way supervisors tend to determine what is and is not discussed and teachers tend to play a reactive role. The principle of collegiality is not evident to any appreciable degree in such supervisory relationships. Each of these studies also found that the content of conference discussions was most often related to teacher activities rather than student involvement in the lesson.

Grimmett's study (1982), on which this study is based, found differences in supervisory conference performance to be related to the process strategies (questioning techniques and exploratory procedures) employed by supervisors. This

study reflects this finding. Supervisors in this study, however, employed only some of the process strategies identified by Grimmert. The questioning techniques most commonly employed were leading questions, requiring a yes or no answer and/or agreement with the supervisor, and requests for specific information, which Grimmert (1982) found to be associated with less effective conferencing practices. The exploratory procedures most commonly employed were holding questions or points for discussion in abeyance and retrieving them at the appropriate time.

While in some instances the supervisors withheld analysis, the nature of the feedback provided tended to be either appraising, involving a review of the lesson along with evaluation or advice, or apprising, involving merely informing the teacher of the supervisor's observations. None of the supervisors in this study probed for teacher clarification or analysis, nor pushed for teacher insight into teaching practice. In each case the supervisor acknowledged forfeiting such opportunities based on the rationale that teacher awareness, in and of itself, was, for them, an acceptable level of progress in supervision conferences. Teacher commitment to action for improvement did not emerge as one of the supervisors' concerns.

Collegiality in these cases appeared to be equated with the maintenance of this "comfort zone" of teacher awareness. In Grimmert's study, however, supervisors having the greatest impact on supervisee developmental growth used the process strategies to push teachers beyond this "comfort zone" to a focus on instructional issues. This deeper sense of collegiality, intended by such process strategies, was not present in the cases in this study; rather, collegiality appeared to be characterized by superficial pleasantries.

Contributions to Knowledge

This study contributes to an understanding of the supervisory relationship in the conference process, a knowledge of the practical operation of the supervisory process, and to a knowledge of those factors which appear to have an impact on the efficacy of that process.

The combination of process strategies and content. It would appear that where supervisors employ a combination of process strategies and content knowledge in the conference setting the impact of the supervisory process is greatest. Supervisory process strategies, then, appear to facilitate the internalization and application of content knowledge by supervisees.

The need for content knowledge in teachers. Teachers appear to lack a language to facilitate discussion of their teaching practices. Provided with research-verified knowledge about teaching and learning, teachers may be able to adopt a more proactive role in the supervisory conference, or, at the very least, be more interactive in that setting. Increased interaction on the part of the teacher could contribute to the increased efficacy of the supervisory process.

The experience and professional confidence levels. The experience and professional confidence levels of both participants appear to have an impact on the efficacy of the supervisory process. Supervisors with low levels of experience and professional confidence in performance of the supervisory task tend to be perceived as less threatening and may be more effective in the supervisory process as a result. Teachers with high levels of experience and professional confidence tend to perceive the supervisory experience as less threatening and tend to be more interactive in the conference setting, rendering the supervisory process more effective.

The impact of the teacher's role. The role the teacher plays in the supervisory process appears to be related to their experience and professional confidence level. The role the teacher chooses to play in the conference setting appears to have considerable impact on the efficacy of the supervisory process.

The need for a conscious supervisory strategy. The need for a conscious supervisory strategy as distinct from the random application of some supervisory process strategies is evident in each of the cases examined in this study. A supervisory strategy, such as clinical supervision, would provide supervisors with a necessary framework for facilitating teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice, based on classroom observation data, rather than merely functioning at a "comfort zone" level of teacher awareness.

The need to move beyond teacher awareness. In each of the cases studied, teacher awareness served as an acceptable operational level for the supervisory conference. Given the limited impact of the supervisory intervention in these cases, it would appear necessary for supervisors to move beyond this "comfort zone" level and probe and push for teacher analysis and insight into teaching practice to increase the efficacy of the supervisory experience.

The teaching of process strategies and content to supervisors. The findings of this study suggest that it may be possible to teach supervisors the content knowledge and supervisory process strategies which appear necessary to increase the efficacy of the supervision experience. Where instruction was provided in either content knowledge, or in content knowledge and process strategies combined, supervisors did transfer the learning to their performance of the supervisory task, although their skill in application of the content knowledge and/or process strategies varied.

Implications

Implications for Further Research

The results of this study suggest several areas which might be investigated through further research.

1. Investigate the experience and confidence levels of both supervisors and supervisees to determine more specifically what effect these variables have on the supervisory experience.
2. Investigate the differential effects on the supervisory experience of a thought-out consciously employed supervisory strategy versus the random application of some supervisory process strategies.
3. Investigate the effects of teacher content knowledge (a language with which to discuss teaching practices) on the supervisory experience.
4. Investigate the impact of a treatment or treatments (in-service training) on supervisor's performance of the supervisory task over a longer period of time, encompassing more observation/conference rounds than the current study.
5. Investigate the impact of a treatment or treatments (in-service training for supervisors) on classroom teaching practice over a longer period of time, encompassing more observation/conference rounds than the current study.

Implications for Practice

The implications for practice suggested here focus on the in-service level of training. Based on the limited findings of this study, it would appear that the improvement of current supervisory practice may require a combination of several

staff development programs designed to provide both partners involved in the supervisory process with opportunities to develop and/or enhance their knowledge and/or skills. Such staff development programs might provide the following:

1. Opportunities for content knowledge training for both teachers and administrators. Such training would provide participants with a common language with which to discuss teaching practices, facilitating a substantive focus on observable data collected, rather than the current focus on impressionistic value judgements.
2. Opportunities for administrators to learn and/or develop and apply a planned, conscious supervisory strategy. Such in-service training could be designed around current research on teaching and learning, to facilitate supervisors' observation and analysis of the teaching/learning situation, and around the process strategy(ies) which will enable them to elicit a considered analysis of teaching practice from supervisees, in a situationally meaningful way.
3. Opportunities for all new principals, with little or no experience as supervisors, to undertake such in-service training. Low levels of experience and/or confidence on the part of supervisors in this study appear to be equated with a willingness to learn and an openness to change.
4. Opportunities for on-site peer or supervisory support, through observation and coaching, for those candidates undertaking such a training program and attempting to implement the subsequent supervisory role.

Given the ethos of current supervisory practice evident in this sample, and the

role the teacher plays in this experience, further implications for practice may also be suggested. An investigation of the differential effects of supervision for the improvement of teaching practice and supervision for the purposes of evaluation is perhaps warranted. This separation of purpose in supervisory practice might take the form of peer supervision to focus on improvement in teaching practice, and principal supervision to focus on evaluation of that practice. In such instances, there would be an obvious need for parallel "supervisory tracks".

The implementation of a peer supervision track would also have implications for the in-service training of teachers in both substantive content and process strategies, much along the lines of the in-service training programs for new administrators. For while the removal of the threat of evaluation may potentially enhance the supervisory experience, the findings of this study suggest that both content knowledge and a process strategy are necessary for effective supervisory practice. It would appear that both are required to facilitate the objective analysis of teaching/learning situations and the gathering of data to employ in conference discussions which are designed to elicit and/or allow for supervisees' considered analysis of teaching practices.

REFERENCES

- Arbucci, R.P. A study of the relationship between a clinical supervision innovation and the attitudes of a professional staff toward instructional supervision in a suburban school district. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia, 1978. Dissertation Abstracts' International, 39, 2714-2715A.
- Arlin, M. Teacher transitions can disrupt time flow in classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 16, 42-56. 1979.
- Bents, R.H. A study of the effects of environmental structure on students of differing conceptual levels. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, ED 780 286.
- Bernier, J. A psychological education intervention for teacher development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, ED 776 932.
- Bisbee, S.E. The effects of clinical supervision and a staff development program in one school on teachers' attitudes, stages of concern, and success in achieving individually established objectives. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45. 2756. 1983.
- Blumberg, A. Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1974.
- Boulet, F.X. Clinical supervision: Alternative for principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1981.
- Champagne, D.W. & David, R.J. One Supervisory Relationship. Paper presented at A.E.R.A. Annual Meeting, Chicago, Illinois. 1985, March.
- Coffey, W.C. Change in Teachers' verbal classroom behaviour resulting from an in-service program in science education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1967. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1968, 27 4506-A.
- Cogan, M.L. Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 1973
- Cook, G.E. Supervisors for the classroom: A study of the professional growth of educational supervisors in a program of clinical training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 735A.

- Desrochers, C.G. Relationships between supervisory directness and justification in the teacher-supervisor conference and teachers' perceptions of supervisor credibility. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1763. 1982.
- Eaker, R.E. An analysis of the clinical supervision process as perceived by selected teachers and administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 3997A-3998A.
- Emmer, E.T. & Evertson, C.M. Synthesis of research on classroom management. Educational Leadership, 38 (4), 342-347. 1981, January.
- Emmer, E.T., Evertson, C.M., Sanford, J.P., Clements, B.S., & Worsham, M.E. Organizing and Managing the Junior High School Classroom. Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project. The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. The University of Texas at Austin. 1984.
- Evertson, C.M. & Emmer, E.T. Effective management at the beginning of the school year in Junior high classes. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, (4), 485-498. 1982a.
- Evertson, E.M., Emmer, E.T., Clements, B.S., Sanford, J.P., Worsham, M.E., & Williams, E.L. Organizing and Managing the Elementary Classroom. Classroom Organization and Effective Teaching Project, the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas at Austin. 1984.
- Garman, N.B. A study of clinical supervision as a resource of college teachers of English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 6835A.
- Grimmett, P.P. The clinical supervision conference: An exploratory study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1982.
- Grimmett, P.P. The supervision conference: An investigation of supervisory effectiveness through analysis of participants' conceptual functioning. In P.P. Grimmett (ed.) Research in teacher education: Current problems and future prospects in Canada. Vancouver, CSTE/CSCI, 1984, pp. 131-166. Grimmett, P.P. and Housego I.E. Interpersonal relationships in the clinical supervision conference. Canadian Administrator, 1983, 22, (5), Feature Issue.
- Goldhammer, R. Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., & Krajewski, R.J. Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980.
- Harvey, O.J., Hunt, D.E., & Schroder, H.M. Conceptual systems and personality development. New York: Wiley, 1961.

- Hills, R.J. Preparation for the principalship: Some recommendations from the field. Administrator's Notebook, 1975, 23 (9).
- Jacobson, P.L. Student teachers' use of evaluation information. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 2841. 1984.
- Kerr, B.J. An investigation of the process of using feedback data within the clinical supervision cycle to facilitate teachers' individualization of instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 1374A.
- Kerr, T.G. The relationship among attitude scores, dogmatism scores, and change in a classroom teaching pattern of teachers who have experienced clinical supervision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1976. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 2132A.
- Kilbourn, B. Linda. A case study in clinical supervision. Canadian Journal of Education, 7 (3), 1-24. 1982.
- Kounin, J.S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1970.
- Krajewski, R.J. Clinical supervision: To facilitate teacher self-improvement. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1976, 9 (2), 58-66.
- Mattalino, A.P. Clinical supervision: The key competencies required for effective practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1977. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 2060A.
- McNergney, R., Francis, P., Hinson, S., & Stimpfle, P. Translating a metatheory of teacher development into practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (5), 53-57. 1983, Sept./Oct.
- Mears, R.A. Student teacher/cooperating teacher relationship, perceptions of conferences, and student morale. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 3115. 1981.
- Mershon, J.B. A critical analysis of selected experiences that demonstrate analytic skill in clinical supervision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 6793-6794A.
- Myers, O.W. The effects of two supervisory approaches on teacher attitude toward supervision, evaluation, and self. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1975.
- O'Neal, S. & Edwards, S. The supervision of student teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of A.E.R.A., Montreal, 1983, April.

- Pierce, L.R. Supervisors' managerial talent and their verbal behaviour with teachers during the supervisory conference in clinical supervision: An exploratory analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1978. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 6410A.
- Reavis, C.A. A test of the clinical supervision model. Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 70, 311-315.
- Sahling, N.J. An observational study of clinical supervision in selected elementary, junior and senior high schools. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 4965. 1981.
- Scime, J. The conflict between evaluation and supervision: A study of a clinical supervision program designed to link instruction, supervision, and evaluation to staff development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1603. 1984.
- Shuma, K.Y. Changes effectuated by a clinical supervisory relationship which emphasize a helping relationship and a conference format made congruent with the establishment and maintenance of this helping relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 729A.
- Skarak, N.D. The application of immediate secondary reinforcement to classroom teaching observations in clinical supervision. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1973. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 1140A.
- Smyth, W.J. & Strachan, J. Helping teachers through clinical supervision. Practicing Administrator, 3, (1) 1243,23. 1981
- Squires, P.A. A phenomenological study of supervisors' perceptions of a positive supervisory experience. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 4605. 1978.
- Story, V.J. Work-related learning efforts of school principals: An exploratory study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1978.
- Witt, G. Relationship between leadership style and supervisory behaviour in the conference cycle of clinical supervision as perceived by teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1977.
- Zonca, P.H. A case study exploring the effects on an intern teacher of the condition of openness in a clinical supervisory relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972. Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 658A.

APPENDIX**Classroom Observation Record and
Component Rating Scale**

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD

Teacher # _____ School # _____ Observer # _____ Date _____ AM PM

of Students _____ Grade _____

TRANSITIONS and GROUP MANAGEMENT

1. Does the teacher do things that students could do for themselves?

2. Are there delays caused because everyone must line up or wait his or her turn? Can these be reduced with a more efficient procedure?

3. Does the teacher give clear instructions about what to do next before breaking a group and entering a transition?

4. Does the teacher circulate during transitions, to handle individual needs? Does she/he take care of these before attempting to begin a new activity?

5. Does the teacher signal the end of a transition and the beginning of a structured activity properly, and quickly gain everyone's attention?

- _____ 1. Transitions come too abruptly for students because teacher fails to give advance warning or finish up reminders when needed
- _____ 2. The teacher insists on unnecessary rituals or formalisms that cause delays or disruptions (describe)
- _____ 3. Teacher is often interrupted by individuals with the same problem or request; this could be handled by establishing a general rule or procedure
- _____ 4. Delays occur because frequently used materials are stored in hard to reach places.

- ___ 5. Poor traffic patterns result in pushing, bumping, or needless noise
- ___ 6. Poor seating patterns screen some students from teacher's view or cause students needless distraction
- ___ 7. Delays occur while teacher prepares equipment or illustrations that should have been prepared earlier

PUPIL ATTENTIVENESS

- ___ 1. Activity has gone on too long
- ___ 2. Activity is below students' level or is needless review
- ___ 3. Teacher is continually lecturing, not getting enough student participation
- ___ 4. Teacher fails to monitor attention - poor eye contact
- ___ 5. Teacher overdwells, needlessly repeating and rephrasing
- ___ 6. Teacher calls on students in an easily predictable pattern
- ___ 7. Teacher always names student before asking question
- ___ 8. Activity lacks continuity because teacher keeps interrupting (specify cause for interruption)
- ___ 9. Activity lacks variety, has settled into an overly predictable or boring routine
- ___ 10. Other (indicate)

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION RECORD

PAGE 3

TEACHER REACTION TO PUPIL BEHAVIOUR**A. TYPE OF SITUATION**

| | A | B | C |
|--|----------|-------|-------|
| 1. Total class, lesson or discussion | 1. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Small group activity - problem in group | 2. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Small group activity - problem out of group | 3. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Seatwork checking or study period | 4. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Other | 5. _____ | _____ | _____ |

B. TYPE OF MISBEHAVIOR

| | | | |
|--|-----------|-------|-------|
| 1. Brief, nondisruptive, should be ignored | 6. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Minor, but extended or repeated. Should be stopped non-disruptively | 7. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Disruptive, should be stopped quickly. No questions needed. | 8. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Disruptive, questions needed or advisable | 9. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Other (specify) | 10. _____ | _____ | _____ |

C. TEACHER'S RESPONSE(S)

| | | | |
|---|-----------|-------|-------|
| 1. Ignores (deliberately) | 11. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Nonverbal; uses eye contact, gestures or touch, | 12. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Praises someone else's good behavior | 13. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Calls offender's name; calls for attention or work; gives rule reminder. No overdwelling | 14. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Overdwells on misbehavior, nags | 15. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Asks rhetorical or meaningless questions | 16. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Asks appropriate questions - investigates publicly | 17. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Investigates privately, now or later | 18. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Threatens punishment if behavior is repeated | 19. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Punishes (note type) | 20. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 11. Other (specify) | 21. _____ | _____ | _____ |
| | 22. _____ | _____ | _____ |

- ____ 1. Teacher delays too long before acting, so problems escalate
- ____ 2. Teacher identifies wrong students or fails to include all involved.
- ____ 3. Teacher fails to specify appropriate behavior (when this is not clear)
- ____ 4. Teacher fails to specify rationale behind demands (when this is not clear)
- ____ 5. Teacher attributes misbehavior to ill will, evil motives
- ____ 6. Teacher describes misbehavior as a typical or unchangeable trait; labels student

continued - PAGE 4 . . .

MANAGEMENT DIMENSIONS

1. Instructional Management:

2. Room Arrangement:

3. Rules and Procedures:

4. Meeting Pupil Concerns:

5. Managing Pupil Behavior:

6. Disruptive Pupil Behavior:

7. Inappropriate Pupil Behavior:

8. Classroom Climate:

9. Miscellaneous:

Teacher # _____ School # _____ Observer # _____ Date _____ AM PM
 # of Students _____ Grade _____

1. INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Describes objectives clearly
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Variety of materials
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Materials are ready
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Clear directions
- 5 4 3 2 1 e. Waits for attention
- 5 4 3 2 1 f. Encourages analysis, builds reasoning skills
- 5 4 3 2 1 g. Assignments or activities for different students
- 5 4 3 2 1 h. Appropriate pacing of lesson
- 5 4 3 2 1 i. Clear explanations and presentations
- 5 4 3 2 1 j. Monitors student understanding
- 5 4 3 2 1 k. Consistently enforces work standards

2. ROOM ARRANGEMENT

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Suitable traffic patterns
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Degree of visibility

3. RULES AND PROCEDURES

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Efficient administrative routines
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Appropriate general procedures
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Efficient small group procedures
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Suitable routines for assigning checking, and collecting work
- 5 4 3 2 1 *e. Uses warm-up or wind-down activities

4. MEETING STUDENT CONCERNS

- 5 4 3 2 1 *a. Student aggression
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Attention spans considered in lesson
- 5 4 3 2 1 *c. Student success
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Activities related to student interests or backgrounds

5. MANAGING PUPIL BEHAVIOR

- 5 4 3 2 1 *a. Rewards appropriate performance
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Signals appropriate behavior
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Consistency in managing behavior
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Effective monitoring

6. DISRUPTIVE PUPIL BEHAVIOR

- 5 4 3 2 1 *a. Amount of disruption
- 5 4 3 2 1 *b. Source of disruption
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Stops quickly
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Cites rules of procedures.
- 5 4 3 2 1 e. Non-verbal contact
- 5 4 3 2 1 f. Desist statement
- 5 4 3 2 1 g. Punishment, criticism
- 5 4 3 2 1 h. Ignores

7. INAPPROPRIATE STUDENT BEHAVIOR

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Amount
- 5 4 3 2 1 *b. Source
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Stops quickly
- 5 4 3 2 1 d. Cites rules or procedures
- 5 4 3 2 1 e. Non-verbal contact
- 5 4 3 2 1 f. Desist statement
- 5 4 3 2 1 g. Punishment, criticism
- 5 4 3 2 1 h. Ignores

8. CLASSROOM CLIMATE

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Task-oriented focus
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Relaxed, pleasant atmosphere

9. MISCELLANEOUS

- 5 4 3 2 1 a. Distracting mannerisms
- 5 4 3 2 1 b. Listening skills
- 5 4 3 2 1 c. Expresses feelings
- 5 4 3 2 1 *d. Externally imposed interruptions
- 5 4 3 2 1 e. Manages interruptions