

A CASE STUDY OF A POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE
IN A SECOND LANGUAGE SETTING

by

LOUISE ANNE GUEVREMONT

B.ED., The University of Montreal, 1977

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

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction)

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

July 1994

© Louise Anne Guèvremont, 1994

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.

CENTRE FOR:
~~Department of~~ THE STUDY OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date OCT. 28 1994

ABSTRACT

This case study examined the nature of the exchange between two French-as-a-second language teachers involved in a worthwhile post-observation conference, identified the conditions that facilitated their exchange, and investigated how this supervision experience contributed to the development of the teacher's practice. Since clinical supervision involves the analysis and interpretation of classroom data, it seemed important to inquire whether knowledge of the content, approach, and issues related to the teaching of a second language appeared to be a condition that facilitated a worthwhile outcome.

Transcripts of the post-observation conference videotape and stimulated recall interview audiotape provided two of the three sources of data. A preliminary content analysis was conducted to examine the characteristics of the exchange between the participants and to ascertain whether the four conditions identified from previous studies, teacher-supervisor relationship, Glickman's (1990) developmental approach, peer supervision, and reflective transformation of experience, were present in this case. Results were used to frame questions for a subsequent interview with the teacher in order to explore further themes and issues that emerged from the preliminary analysis.

Findings indicate that the exchange between the teacher and supervisor was non-judgmental, honest, supportive, cooperative, and close to Cogan's (1973) collegueship. The teacher-supervisor relationship and peer supervision by a second language teacher were found to be two conditions that facilitated a worthwhile outcome. However, the Glickman's developmental model was not found totally appropriate in peer supervision because the supervisor does not have the choice of a full range of approaches since s/he

cannot enact decisions. Even though the conditions were present, reflective transformation of experience was not completed during the post-observation conference and it was therefore suggested that it may not be an appropriate indicator of teacher development. Finally, supervision was found to be useful in three different ways. It increased the teacher's awareness of her teaching, enabled her to take appropriate action, and provided useful feedback on her experimentation with new material. Based on these findings, it was concluded that the role of the post-observation conference may need to be reviewed, particularly in the case of experienced teachers using supervision for professional development. It was also recommended that further study be conducted to verify this case study's findings on a larger scale and find out whether they apply to teachers from different areas, and to investigate how teachers conduct their reflection outside the post-observation conference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SIGNIFICANCE	1
BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
Research Questions	3
Definition of Terms	4
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	5
LIMITATIONS	6
OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS	7
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
CLINICAL SUPERVISION	8
Cogan and Goldhammer Models	9
Further Developments In Clinical Supervision	13
Problems of practice	16
CONDITIONS	18
Teacher-Supervisor Relationship	18
Glickman's Developmental Approach	19
Peer Supervision	20
Reflection	23
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	25
CHAPTER 3: METHOD AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS	27
OVERVIEW OF THE GRIMMETT AND CREHAN STUDY	27
CASE STUDY OF A POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION	30
DATA COLLECTION	33
Dyad Selection	34
Post-Observation Conference and Stimulated Recall Interview Data Collection	35
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS	37
DATA COLLECTION FROM THE SECOND INTERVIEW	38
FINAL DATA ANALYSIS	39
SUMMARY	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS, Continued:

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	41
THE NATURE OF THE EXCHANGE	41
Post-Observation Conference	42
Observations on the Nature of the Exchange	47
Summary and Conclusion	49
CONDITIONS THAT FACILITATE A WORTHWHILE EXCHANGE	51
Teacher-Supervisor Relationship	51
Glickman's Developmental Approach	53
Peer Supervision	55
Reflective Transformation of Experience	59
Summary and Conclusion	61
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHER'S PRACTICE	61
Summary and Conclusion	65
SUMMARY	66
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS ..	69
CONCLUSIONS	69
Conditions That Facilitate A Worthwhile Exchange	70
Glickman's Developmental Approach in Peer Supervision	72
The Limitations of Reflective Transformation of Experience	73
Peer Supervision Short and Long Term Effects on Development of Practice	75
Summary of Conclusions	76
RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH, THEORY, AND PRACTICE	77
Recommendations and Implications for Research	77
Recommendations and Implications for Theory	78
Recommendations and Implications for Practice	79
REFERENCES	81
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE	85
APPENDIX 2: POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE TRANSCRIBED DIALOGUE	88

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Peter Grimmett and Dr. Patricia Crehan for giving me the opportunity to work on their study and give me access to their data. They provided me with the initial inspiration and encouragement to begin this study.

I have pleasure to express my deepest thanks to Dr. Patricia Crehan, my research advisor, for her inestimable patience and persistent support throughout this long process. Her invaluable comments and thorough reviews of each chapter, in addition to her helpful advice with numerous interventions on my behalf while I was in Montreal contributed greatly to the successful completion of my thesis.

I express my gratitude to Dr. Peter Grimmett who provided astute comments on my research. I also acknowledged gratefully Dr. Hillel Goelman for his kind support and meaningful questions; and Dr. John Willinsky for his participation as an external examiner. I also owe thanks to Dr. Claudia Mitchell of McGill university whose keen interest and enthusiastic reception kept me on track.

Deep thanks are going to Gene, my husband, for his consistent support and relentless encouragement throughout my studies. Finally, I am also grateful to my family for their support and particularly to my father, who valued education highly and who always encouraged us to fulfill our educational pursuits.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

Supervision of teaching is a topic of major interest in education because it is deemed as an effective means of teacher development both in terms of preservice and ongoing inservice professional development. Although many educators agree that supervision of teaching can contribute to improving teachers' performance and fostering teachers' growth, there remains a great deal of controversy over some crucial issues. For instance, some researchers such as Hunter (1984) argue that in order to be efficient, supervision must take place in a hierarchical setting, i.e., principal supervising teacher, while others such as Little (1987) and Smyth (1988) claim that teachers develop more through collegial interaction. In a research study of a training program in peer supervision, Cook (1985) found that collegiality was not sufficient unless conditions such as administrative support and adequate training were fulfilled. Yet, Schon (1988) suggests that the development of teachers occurs only when they engage in the reflective transformation of their own practice. However, we know little about the point of view of teachers engaged in a successful supervision experience, how this process is useful to them, and what conditions foster a worthwhile outcome.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

During my experience as a French-as-a-second language teacher, I had been observed many times for evaluation purposes but I seldom found the outcome useful to changing my practice. However, I never had the opportunity to get involved in a peer supervision experience. Since little research was found in the literature about

instructional supervision in second language settings, I wondered whether peer supervision would be an effective means of professional development in such a setting and if so, whether particular conditions had to be applied to fulfill the needs of the second language teacher. For instance, since supervision of instruction involves the analysis and interpretation of data collected in the classroom, was the supervisor's knowledge of the second language an important condition in order to provide the teacher with meaningful feedback? Furthermore, would a colleague unfamiliar with the approach and issues related to second language teaching be as useful as another second language practitioner? It seemed to me that an appropriate way to address these questions would be to investigate the case of a second language teacher engaged in a worthwhile supervision experience.

The opportunity to do so was given to me through a larger study (Grimmett and Crehan, ongoing) looking at teacher development through instructional supervision. This study examined the effects of supervision on teacher development, classroom instruction, and student learning. Many practitioners, including teachers and administrators, volunteered to participate in the study and an enormous amount of data were collected in the field. Grimmett and Crehan hired and trained a team of research assistants to ensure the liaison between them and the participating schools, and to gather the data needed for the study. As a research assistant on that team, my role consisted mainly of taking field notes during classroom observations and interviewing the participants following their post-observation conference.

I noticed that the post-observation conferences generated insightful data about the supervision process experienced by the participants. Furthermore, the subsequent

stimulated recall interviews allowed them to express their views on what had happened during the post-observation conference, and to elaborate further on particular issues.

One of these dyads drew my attention since it included a French-as-a-second language teacher being observed by a colleague, also a second language teacher. The teacher being observed was very positive about this supervision experience and expressed a high level of satisfaction during the stimulated recall interview. I believed that both the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview transcripts constituted excellent data sources for developing a case study.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the case of a French-as-a-second language teacher engaged in a worthwhile post-observation conference. More specifically, the purpose was to: (1) describe the nature of the exchange between the supervisor and the teacher observed, namely the supervisee, during the post-observation conference, (2) identify the conditions that facilitate a worthwhile exchange, and (3) find out from the teacher's point of view how this experience was useful to her teaching practice.

Research Questions

In order to address the purpose of this study, three research questions were formulated.

Question 1. What is the nature of the exchange between two practitioners engaged in a worthwhile post-observation conference in a second-language setting?

Question 2. What are the conditions prior to and within the post-observation conference that facilitate this worthwhile exchange?

Question 3. How does this supervision experience contribute to the development of the teacher's practice?

Definition of Terms

Terms that will be consistently used through this study are defined below. In addition, terms stated in the three research questions are clarified in order to demonstrate the operationalization of these questions.

Supervisor and supervisee. These terms are used to designate respectively the practitioner conducting the observation and the teacher being observed. In the literature, the terms "supervisor" and "supervisee" usually imply a hierarchical relationship between the participants, such as a principal observing a teacher. In this case, both subjects are teachers and supervision was not conducted for evaluation purposes. However, one practitioner observed the other while the reciprocal did not occur. Therefore, since supervision was conducted in one way only, the terms "supervisor" and "supervisee" are being used.

Post-observation conference. This term refers to the meeting held by the supervisor and supervisee following the classroom observation.

Nature of the exchange. The first question on the nature of the exchange between the supervisor and the teacher refers to the interaction between the participants during the post-observation conference, and to the way in which they fulfill their roles with respect to the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data.

Worthwhile. In this study, "worthwhile" means being useful to the development of the supervisee's practice from her point of view. It is based on the assumption that teachers are in the best position to determine what is useful to them, and how supervision contributes to their practice.

Conditions. This term refers to the factors deemed to facilitate a successful post-observation conference which are identified from the literature on clinical supervision. They are described in the second chapter.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The main goal of teachers is to provide pupils with excellent education. Therefore, it is essential to examine the best ways to improve teaching. Since this is precisely the purpose of clinical supervision, it is important that we understand how this process works to foster teachers' development.

Although there is a great deal of literature on supervision, few researchers have examined the subject from the teacher's point of view. What really happens in a worthwhile post- observation conference between the supervisor and the supervisee? What type of exchange takes place? What is useful to the supervisee and how is it useful to her/his practice? What conditions facilitate a worthwhile outcome? If we have a greater understanding of these issues, we may be able to help practitioners create more appropriate conditions of supervision. Furthermore, there is little in the literature on supervision in second language settings. In a paper on supervision in special language programs, Florez-Tighe (1985) reported that many supervisors lacked adequate training and "were out of touch with classroom needs" (p. 2). This raises the question about

whether knowledge of content, approaches, and issues related to second language teaching is needed in order to provide helpful supervision to practitioners.

This study's findings should contribute to existing insights on the conditions that foster a worthwhile supervision experience in a second language setting. If indeed conditions such as "content" appear important to the teacher, we may want to investigate whether it appears true for other subjects and verify these findings on a larger scale. It would have an impact on staff development programs that are planning to implement clinical supervision. Furthermore, the results may have implications for teacher education programs in universities as well as for practitioners who receive student teachers in their classrooms.

LIMITATIONS

Results of this study are not generalizable. They apply only to the case investigated because of the particular factors pertaining to this setting, such as the relationship between the participants, and their background and experience. However, there is no reason to believe that these two participants are different from other second-language teachers practising in the same type of environment. If this assumption is accepted, then results from this study could provide some indication as to the conditions that contribute to a successful supervision experience.

OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

This thesis is organized in five chapters. The first one described the background, purpose, significance, and limitations of the study. The second chapter reviews the literature on the clinical model of supervision and examines four conditions that facilitate

a worthwhile experience for teachers. These conditions are: (1) teacher-supervisor relationship, (2) Glickman's developmental approach, (3) peer supervision, and (4) reflection. The third chapter details the methods used to conduct this study and describes the different stages of data collection and data analysis. This chapter contains the following sections: (1) an overview of the Grimmer and Crehan study, (2) a rationale for the case study of a post-observation conference, (3) data collection including the dyad and data selected from the Grimmer and Crehan study, (4) the preliminary analysis, (5) an overview of the second interview, and (6) the final data analysis. The fourth chapter reports findings in terms of the study's three main research questions. Finally, the fifth chapter presents the conclusions, recommendations, and implications of this case study's major findings for research, theory, and practice.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The main purpose of this chapter is to review the literature on the clinical model of supervision. It contains three main sections. The first section presents an overview of clinical supervision and is organized in three sub-sections. The first one describes the concept of clinical supervision developed by Cogan and Goldhammer and the supervision cycle of both models; the second one explains how this concept evolved since its origin; and the third one summarizes the problems encountered in the practice of clinical supervision. The second section examines the conditions that contribute to making clinical supervision a successful experience for teachers. It includes the four following sub-sections: teacher-supervisor relationship, Glickman's developmental approach, peer supervision, and reflection. The third section presents a summary and conclusion.

CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Supervision of instruction, which generally refers to the process of overseeing teachers' work, has existed for centuries in North America (Karier, 1982). Initially, supervision was conducted through inspection of schools, teachers, and students by committees of laypersons who were later replaced by professional supervisors. The twentieth century saw quite important changes in the nature of the supervisory process. Indeed, supervision was based successively on the theory of scientific management, human relations, and neoscientific management. Although these approaches differed, supervision remained a form of control over teachers' work and was concerned with

such aspects as curriculum, materials, and standardized testing of students (Gordon, 1992; Smyth, 1984).

Cogan and Goldhammer Models

In an effort to shift the focus to classroom instruction, Cogan (1973) developed the concept of clinical supervision in the 1950s, while working with student teachers in Harvard's M.A.T. program. By clinical, Cogan meant supervision based on the observation and analysis of classroom events with the goal of improving teaching. He made a distinction between general supervision which he referred to as out-of-class supervision, and clinical supervision which he associated with in-class supervision (1973, pp. 8-9). Cogan defines clinical supervision as:

The rationale and practice designed to improve the teacher's classroom performance. It takes its principal data from the events of the classroom. The analysis of these data and the relationship between teacher and supervisor form the basis of the program, procedures, and strategies designed to improve the student's learning by improving the teacher's classroom behavior. (p. 9)

Cogan (1973) proposed that teachers and supervisors go through the following eight stages in order to complete a full cycle of supervision: (1) establishing the teacher-supervision relationship, (2) planning with the teacher, (3) planning the strategy of observation, (4) observing instruction, (5) analyzing the teaching-learning processes, (6)

planning the strategy of the conference, (7) the conference, and (8) renewed planning (pp. 10-11-12).

Goldhammer (1969), who worked with Cogan, also developed a model of clinical supervision which he characterized as "close observation, detailed observational data, face-to-face interaction between the supervisor and teacher, and an intensity of focus that binds the two together in an intimate professional relationship" (p. 54). His model comprised five stages: (1) preobservation conference, (2) observation, (3) analysis and strategy, (4) supervision conference, and (5) post-conference analysis (p. 57).

The Cogan and Goldhammer models are described below. Since clinical supervision focuses on the observation of instruction, the stages have been organized in three main sections: preobservation, observation, and postobservation.

Preobservation. Preobservation refers to all the stages that occur prior to the classroom observation. The first stage of Cogan's (1973) model consists of establishing a relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. He reports that a supervisor's visit into a teacher's classroom generally suffuses a great deal of anxiety and "may be perceived by the teacher as a source of threat" (p. 78). He therefore suggests that supervisors begin by taking the time to initiate teachers to clinical supervision and prepare them for their new role and functions. The second phase of the Cogan's model involves planning a lesson or a series of lessons with the teacher. This process serves the following purposes:

- (1) It engages the dyad in work on a professional problem that has significance and utility for the teacher: planning his teaching,
- (2) it provides opportunities for the teacher to

learn about his new role in supervision, and (3) it enables the supervisor to gain valuable information about the teacher's views on the objectives of teaching, his teaching strategies, his perceptions about the students, his choice of the content and experiences to be embodied in his instruction, and the history of his instruction. (pp. 108-109)

The third phase of the Cogan's model consists of the joint planning of the classroom observation with respect to the objectives, focus, and technical arrangements.

Goldhammer's (1969) model begins with the preobservation conference. Its purpose is to prepare and "provide a mental framework" (p.57) for the supervisory sequence to follow. Like Cogan, Goldhammer stresses that an important goal of this conference is to establish communication between the teacher and supervisor.

Stages of preobservation in both models are mostly concerned with, on the one hand, establishing communication and trust between the teacher and supervisor, and, on the other hand, planning the observation itself by defining its goals, focus, time, duration, and instruments of data collection. However, Cogan (1973) does suggest spending more time prior to the preconference to familiarize the teacher with the concept of clinical supervision.

Observation. The observation refers to the supervisor's actual visit to the teacher's classroom during which data based on classroom events are collected. Goldhammer (1969) states that "the principal purpose of Observation is to capture realities of the lesson objectively enough and comprehensively enough to enable Supervisor and Teacher to reconstruct the lesson as validly as possible afterwards, in order to analyze

it" (p.83). Cogan (1973) suggests that the observation focus on three aspects: (1) teacher behavior, (2) students' behavior, and (3) other events occurring in the classroom (p.145). He also advises that the supervisor remain neutral and avoid participating through the observation. Both Cogan and Goldhammer emphasize the importance of collecting objective non-judgmental data carefully selected in function of the needs required for the observation.

Postobservation. Postobservation refers to the stages that follow the classroom observation and involves mainly the following: analysis and interpretation of data, and planning of future teaching strategies and further supervision cycles.

Cogan's (1973) model includes four stages: analyzing the teaching-learning processes, planning the strategy of the conference, conference, and renewed planning. These stages can be combined depending on the teacher's competence and experience in clinical supervision. He suggests that initially, teacher and supervisor analyze data separately. However, he indicates that this task could be performed jointly as the teacher develops competence in clinical supervision. He proposes the same gradual approach for the planning of the strategy of the conference. Hence, this stage could also be incorporated into the conference (pp. 11-12).

Cogan characterizes the conference as a "shared exploration: a search for the meaning of instruction, for choices among alternative diagnoses, and for alternative strategies of improvement" (p. 197). He recommends that the interaction be "participatory, responsive, and formative" (p. 197) and he stresses that there is no best strategy or standard format because the course of the conference is unpredictable. The last stage of Cogan's model, that is renewed planning, occurs during the conference.

Following the analysis and discussion of the lesson observed, teacher and supervisor begin planning the next lesson and decide the changes the teacher will make in his or her instruction.

Goldhammer's (1969) model includes three stages: analysis and strategy, supervision conference, and post-conference analysis. The first stage is performed by the supervisor and consists of the analysis of data and the planning of the strategy for the conference. The supervisor, at this point, selects specific teaching patterns to discuss in the conference and makes decisions about "what should occur in supervision, what outcomes should result from supervision, and other decisions about how to bring about the events and achieve the results he [sic] is after" (pp. 104-105, emphasis in the original). The second postobservation stage of Goldhammer's model refers to the conference itself while the last stage involves the supervisor's self-analysis of the supervisory conference.

Despite some variation in these models, the salient goals of postobservation are the analysis of the data recorded during the classroom observation and the planning of future teaching strategies. Both Cogan and Goldhammer emphasize the importance of carefully planning the conference. They also agree that clinical supervision should aim at developing teachers skills in self-analysis in order to enable them to gain a better understanding of their teaching and hence improve their practice.

Further Developments In Clinical Supervision

Cogan and Goldhammer's work triggered a renewed interest in supervision and many authors discussed further the concept of clinical supervision. Anderson and

Krajewski took on the task of updating Goldhammer's work and published a second edition of his original book (Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski, 1980). They viewed clinical supervision as a subset of instructional supervision and defined it as "that phase of instructional supervision which draws its data from first-hand observation of actual teaching events, and involves face to face (and other associated) interaction between the supervisor and teacher in the analysis of teaching behaviors and activities for instructional improvement" (p.19-20). They viewed the supervisor as an expert teaching analyst whose goal was to help the teacher perform better. They recognized that implementing clinical supervision was not an easy task and emphasized the method aspect. However, they stated that it was also important to have a good understanding of the concept.

Acheson and Gall (1992) offered a variant model of clinical supervision based on Cogan and Goldhammer's work. They reduced the supervision cycle to four phases: goal setting conference, planning conference, classroom observation, and feedback conference. The first phase consists of defining with practitioners areas of their teaching that need improvement. The second phase is very similar to Goldhammer's preobservation conference. Its purpose is to "set the stage for effective clinical supervision" (1992, p. 99) by identifying teacher concerns and selecting appropriate observation techniques. The third phase refers to the observation of instruction. Acheson and Gall (1992) present a list of 21 effective teaching practices drawn from a review of the literature and indicate which methods from selective verbatim to video recording is the most convenient and appropriate for collecting data on each of these practices (p. 108). For instance, if the purpose of the observation is to provide data on whether

students are engaged in a particular task assigned by the teacher such as seatwork, the supervisor can use a seating chart and systematically at regular intervals examine the behavior of each student for a few seconds to determine whether the student is at task or not.

The fourth phase, the feedback conference, consists of presenting observational data to the teacher, conducting analysis, eliciting teacher reactions, considering alternative strategies, and reaching decisions about future planning (p. 185). Acheson and Gall, like Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969), state that the emphasis is "on direct teacher-supervisor interaction and on the teacher's professional development" (p. 11).

Hunter (1984) presented a model of supervision based on the premise that teaching is "an applied science derived from research in human learning and human behavior" (p. 171). She claims that supervisory conferences must be diagnostic and prescriptive and "promote a teacher's professional growth in effective instruction, provide objective evidence rather than subjective impressions, and encourage teachers to seek continuing professional growth" (1990, p. 25). Hunter (1980) defined six types of supervisory conferences, five of which are instructional and one evaluative. She stated, "No instructional conference will be successful unless the observer utilizes and models those cause-effect teaching and learning relationships that promote both teachers' and students' achievements" (p. 408). Hunter (1984) proposed the use of the script tape to record observational data in the classroom. This consists of "capturing with anecdotal notes the temporal sequence of teacher and learner behaviors as they emerge" (p. 185). She believes they have many advantages: they require little material, the observer can shift focus rapidly, and an audiovisual record can easily be recreated.

Hunter (1986) argued for the elimination of the preobservation conference stating that "it can create bias in both observer and teacher which interferes with objective observation of teacher performance and results in a less productive postobservation conference" (p. 69). She considers that conferencing takes too much time which could be better spent in the postobservation conference and that trust and support depend on what happens after the observation rather than before.

Clinical supervision today is not only used in reference to specific models such as Cogan's and Goldhammer's, but it also generally refers to "face to face encounters with teachers about teaching, usually in classrooms, with the intent of enhancing professional development and improving teaching and learning" (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988, p. 350). It is distinct from general supervision in that the latter is concerned with such aspects as school climate, relationships, and educational programs. Both general and clinical supervision, however, are interdependent. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) state that "though general supervision is an important and necessary component of effective supervision, without clinical supervision it is not sufficient" (p. 304).

Problems of practice

Many school districts, particularly in the United States, implemented clinical supervision as part of their regular instructional supervision program (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988; Smyth, 1991). Garman (1986a) reports that administrators liked the system because it involved principals and supervisors in "face-to-face evaluation of teaching" (p. 23). However, problems emerged in the practice. For instance, teachers and supervisors

experienced frustration in conferencing because neither of them had a common agreement about the use of the preobservation conference. Supervisors lacked the proper skills and training particularly in the analysis of teaching. Postconferencing was also problematic. Supervisors had trouble using an approach appropriate to teachers' needs. In some cases, teachers found supervisors too direct whereas, in other instances, they expected more advice. Furthermore, time was a major concern. Indeed, conferencing before and after the classroom observation in addition to data analysis were time-consuming tasks (Garman, 1986a; Goldsberry, 1986; Krajewski and Anderson, 1980). Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) also acknowledge these problems and affirm that "supervisors and teachers typically report a lack of confidence in present procedures, and frequently more damage than good seems to be the result" (p. 306).

These issues raised a fundamental question, that is: What conditions need to be met in order to achieve the purpose of clinical supervision, namely improvement of teaching? Researchers offered different explanations. Some (e.g., Alfonso and Goldsberry, 1982) suggested that the hierarchical relationship between teachers and supervisors hindered the supervision process while others (e.g., Retallik, 1986; Smyth, 1991) pointed out at problems in the conceptualization of clinical supervision itself. The next section will examine the following conditions: teacher-supervisor relationship, developmental approach, peer supervision, and reflection.

CONDITIONS

Teacher-Supervisor Relationship

Studies suggest that supervision conveys threat and produces anxiety and fear of being judged (Acheson and Gall, 1992; Blumberg, 1980; Cogan, 1973; McGee and Eaker, 1977; Mohlhan, Kierstead, and Gundlach, 1982; Withall and Wood, 1979). Many teachers report that they do not find the process helpful (Huddle, 1985). Cogan (1973) was aware of this issue when he developed his model of clinical supervision. He addressed it by stating that the relationship between the teacher and supervisor was "at the heart of clinical supervision" (p. 219). He defined that relationship as "colleagueship" (p. 68) by which he meant that teacher and supervisor worked together as equals toward a common goal. Consequently, he suggested beginning the supervision cycle by establishing the teacher-supervisor relationship. He asserted that if the supervisor assumed the role of a superior or was viewed by the teacher as such, colleagueship would no longer exist. However, working as equal partners did not mean they had to have the same competence. On the contrary, Cogan (1973) wrote: "In clinical supervision the interaction of similar competence at equal levels is generally less productive than the interaction of unequal levels of competence and dissimilar competence" (p. 68). The supervisor's area of competence would include observation and analysis whereas the teacher would be more knowledgeable in the areas of curriculum, students, and learning characteristics.

Goldhammer's (1969) view on the teacher-supervisor relationship was similar to Cogan's. He characterized it as "an intimate professional relationship" (p. 54) based on trust and openness in which both participants work collaboratively toward satisfying

results. This view was also supported by Krajewski and Anderson (1980) in addition to Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) who stated, "The heart of clinical supervision is an intense, continuous, mature relationship between supervisors and teachers with the intent being the improvement of professional practice" (p. 357). Furthermore, Acheson and Gall (1992) maintain that clinical supervision is based on the premise that "teachers might react positively to a supervisory style that is more responsive to their concerns and aspirations" (p. 11).

Glickman's Developmental Approach

Studies on clinical supervision indicated that several concerns appeared with respect to the approach used by the supervisor during conferences (Garman, 1986a). Glickman (1990) proposed a concept called developmental supervision based on the premise that teachers have different levels of experience and operate at different levels of thought and ability. He identified and described three approaches which supervisors can use in their interaction with teachers: the controlling, the collaborative, and the nondirective approach.

The controlling approach is characterized by the supervisor taking responsibility for the conference. Hence, a directive supervisor identifies problems, determines best solutions, and states expectations. The collaborative approach involves the sharing of the responsibility for the conference. The supervisor seeks teacher perceptions and understandings, provides points of view, accepts conflict, and negotiates a plan of action with the teacher. The nondirective approach consists of the teacher taking the responsibility for the conference. The supervisor listens, clarifies, probes, paraphrases, and asks the teacher for possible solutions.

Glickman and Gordon (1987) suggested that teachers at lower developmental require more structure and direction whereas teachers at higher levels demand less. Studies which indicate that novice teachers prefer directive conferencing support Glickman and Gordon's assertion (Holland, 1989).

Peer Supervision

The issue of unequal power between supervisors and teachers led the way to peer clinical supervision (Retallik, 1986). Indeed, some researchers such as Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) and Cook (1985) argue that the collegueship originally intended by Cogan in clinical supervision cannot be achieved as long as the relationship between teacher and supervisor takes place in a hierarchical setting. Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) postulated that the difference of status between teachers and supervisors hinders the development of collegueship particularly when the supervisor is also in charge of teacher evaluation. Sergiovanni (1986) confirmed that dominance and control are inherent problems in clinical supervision which "stem from the association of the supervisory role with hierarchical authority" (p. 52). Starratt (1992) also asserts that supervision creates "an unequal power relationship" (p. 79) between teacher and supervisor and argues that a teacher's work is so complex, that a supervisor is not in a position to come to a classroom and advise teachers on how to improve their teaching. Smyth (1986) posited that this issue was really about who exercises power stating that "it is not the teacher's agendas, issues and concerns that are being addressed but rather those of someone within the administrative or bureaucratic hierarchy" (p. 60). Furthermore, studies indicated that teachers were more receptive to clinical supervision

when they are actively involved in determining the purpose and procedures and when they engage in the process with their peers (Cook, 1985; Ellis, Smith, and Abbott 1979; Lesnik, 1987; McGee and Eaker, 1977).

Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) report the findings of a study involving 15 elementary teachers from four different schools, who participated in a semester-long course on collegueship and consultation. They conducted classroom observations and were also observed. The following semester, 13 of the 15 teachers paired with other teachers in their respective schools. All of them reported the process to be useful and mentioned "increased collegueship as benefit of their participation" (p. 102). Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) concluded that "when combined with postobservation conference, intervisitation offers a potentially powerful avenue for teacher collaboration directly pertaining to classroom practice" (p. 100). However, they dispute the concept of peer supervision stating it is a contradiction in terms. They argue that supervision "implies superordinate-subordinate relationship" (p. 94) and prefer the term collegueship.

Joyce and Showers (1988) developed a model of peer supervision which is called peer coaching. They summarize their model as follows:

A partnership in which two or more people work together to achieve a goal. Visiting as they practice, they learn from observing the other person and particularly by watching the students' responses to the cognition and social tasks that are presented to them. They discuss how to help the students

respond more powerfully and how and where to apply their
new skills. (p. 94)

Joyce and Showers (1988) separate peer coaching from supervision and evaluation, and state its main purposes are to: (1) implement innovation to the extent that determination of effects on students is possible; (2) build communities of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft; (3) develop a shared language and common understandings necessary for the collegial study of new knowledge and skills; and (4) provide a structure for the follow-up to training that is essential for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies (pp. 83-84). Studies conducted by Joyce and Showers (1988) revealed that peer coaching facilitates the transfer of training and contributes to the development of collegiality.

Raney and Robbins (1989) presented the results of a peer coaching program implemented in a California school district to set up a support system for beginning teachers. Participants involved found that the term "coaching" did not imply an equal relationship and renamed the program "peer sharing and caring" (p. 35). Results indicate that this program promoted collegiality and provided support needed by new teachers.

In summary, the research suggests that peer supervision contributes to a more successful outcome for teachers when the process is separate from evaluation and when teachers take charge of the program. Furthermore, it appears to foster collegiality. However, specific conditions such as appropriate ongoing training and administrative support are needed. Some studies even indicate that peer supervision programs should be voluntary otherwise the result might be what Hargreaves (1989) calls "contrived collegiality", that is "a set of formal specific bureaucratic procedures to increase the

attention being given to joint teacher planning and consultation" (p. 33). In other words, teachers would go through the steps of the process without deriving much benefit.

Reflection

One of the major topics in the literature on supervision is the issue of reflection. Researchers such as Nolan and Huber (1989) suggest that supervision is shaped by our view of teaching. Indeed, if teaching is regarded as a matter of applying theory and research, then supervision becomes a process of ensuring that teachers put these theories into practice. A contrasting perspective can be found in Schon's notion of professional practice. Schon (1983) claims that practices such as teaching are characterized by "uncertainty, disorder, and indeterminacy" (p. 16). Problems faced by practitioners are complex and messy. From this perspective, teaching is viewed as "a form of reflection-in-action: reflection on phenomena, and on one's spontaneous ways of thinking and acting, undertaken in the midst of action to guide further action" (Schon, 1988, p. 22). Hence, the role of supervisors is to encourage teachers to reflect on their own practice.

Authors such as Retallik (1986) and Smyth (1991) state that the first perspective, the technical view, has often characterized the practice of clinical supervision. The Hunter model of teaching and supervising, for instance, is a typical example and has been criticized for its "narrow recipe approach to both teaching and learning" (Smyth, 1991, p. 329). Smyth considers that such models are rigid, prescriptive, and regard teachers as "unthinking technicians" (p. 329). He posits that this form of clinical supervision has been used as a means of control of teachers' work.

The second perspective, namely the professional practice, reflects better the reality of teaching and recognizes that "no one best way of teaching is inherently better than another" (Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988, p. 344). This perspective also appears closer to the Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) original versions of clinical supervision (Garman, 1986b; Smyth, 1991). Furthermore, Smyth (1984) sees reflective supervision as a process enabling teachers to "gain insights, acquire understandings, and exercise a measure of empowerment over their own teaching" (p. 425).

Many researchers (Garman, 1986b; Nolan and Huber, 1989; Retallik, 1986; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1988; Smyth, 1991) agree that the view of supervision as a reflective process holds more potential for teachers. Nolan and Huber (1989) state, "Reflection is the driving force behind successful clinical supervision programs - the programs that make a difference in the lives and instruction of the teachers who participate in them, as well as in the lives of the students they teach" (p. 143). However, it is still not clear how reflection occurs in the process and how it can be fostered.

Schon (1988) suggested that teachers develop when they transform reflectively their experience, that is, when they name the problem with which they are dealing and frame the context in which they will attend to it. Grimmer and Crehan (1990) conducted a case study of teacher reflection in clinical supervision and described how development occurred through the post-observation conference. They found that the following four factors appeared to account for the occurrence of reflective transformation: (1) the teacher named the problem, (2) the principal accepted it and explored it with the teacher, (3) the teacher felt supported to take a risk by admitting his problem, and (4) the principal's empathy enabled the teacher to reconstruct and reframe

the lesson during which the problem occurred. Grimmer and Crehan (1990) suggest that development can occur in clinical supervision in a hierarchical setting providing that those conditions are met. However, they recognize and acknowledge that this rarely happens.

Although researchers agree that reflection is a necessary condition in clinical supervision, many questions remain unanswered. Nolan and Huber (1989) call for more research in this area and claim that case studies are the "most appropriate method for inquiry into the clinical supervision process" (p. 135).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Clinical supervision generally refers to the observation of classroom instruction with the intent of improving teachers' practice. However, it also refers to a supervision model widely used in schools. A supervision cycle usually includes three stages: preobservation conference, observation, and postobservation conference. The literature suggests that clinical supervision can be a useful means of professional development for teachers providing the following conditions are met: teachers are actively involved in the process and receive ongoing training, it is separate from evaluation, and the program receives administrative support. Furthermore, reflection appears to be an essential component of clinical supervision. Some studies indicate that the process works better when teachers observe each other rather than when they are observed by supervisors. However, researchers argue that reflection and development can also occur in a hierarchical setting.

Some aspects still remain unclear. For instance, what type of reflection, besides reflective transformation of experience, occurs in clinical supervision? How do teachers view the process? How do they find it useful with respect to their practice? How does this process work in different types of settings such as second language classrooms where the content and issues are different than those of a first language classroom for example? This study addresses these questions through the case study of a French-as-a-second-language teacher engaged in a post-observation conference with a colleague. The method used for this study is described in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the method used for this study. The first section describes the Grimmitt and Crehan research and my role as a research assistant in the study; it covers the following aspects: the main objectives of the study, the selection of subjects, and data collection. The second section discusses the use of a case study approach in clinical supervision and demonstrates how such an approach fulfills the purpose of this study. The third section deals with data collection and presents the dyad and data selected from the Grimmitt and Crehan study for this research. The fourth section consists of the preliminary analysis. The fifth section presents an overview of the second interview questionnaire based on the findings from the preliminary analysis. The sixth section provides details of final data analysis while the seventh section contains a summary of the chapter and offers an overview of the presentation of findings.

OVERVIEW OF THE GRIMMETT AND CREHAN STUDY

The data used for this research originate from a larger study conducted by Grimmitt and Crehan (ongoing) on teacher development through instructional supervision. Their study examines the effects of supervision on teacher development, classroom management, and student learning. Grimmitt and Crehan wanted to find out which type of supervision situation worked most efficaciously for teachers. For instance, did teachers working together with other teachers have a greater impact on classroom practice than did teachers in principal-led instructional supervision? Did teachers with knowledge of instructional supervision work more efficiently than those with little or no

knowledge? This study began in 1989 and data gathering took place over a two year period in order to find out what happens in teacher development over a long period of time.

I was part of a team of six research assistants working for the study. Grimmer and Crehan contacted two school boards in the Lower Mainland area in order to identify a sample for their study. Teachers and administrators from elementary and secondary schools were invited to participate. Research team members then visited schools in which the practitioners had expressed interest in the study to provide them with further information. All subjects were volunteers. They consisted of teachers from kindergarten through grade twelve, including various subject matter specialists, i.e., chemistry, art, music, drama, and French, in addition to administrators such as principals, vice-principals, and department heads. Four French immersion teachers from an elementary school also joined the study.

Each teacher was asked to work with a partner of his/her choice, either another teacher or an administrator in the same school. Hence, some dyads included an administrator observing a teacher while other dyads were made up of two teachers observing one another. Each of these dyads engaged in four supervision cycles spread out over two school years: winter 1990, spring 1990, fall 1990, and winter 1991. Each cycle included the following steps: one classroom observation, one post-observation conference, and one stimulated recall interview with each of the dyad's partners separately.

Our role as research assistants consisted mainly of gathering data for the study. We worked in pairs and each team was in charge of an equal number of dyads. We

planned a schedule with subjects from our assigned dyads for each supervision cycle. Participants decided in which classroom the supervision of instruction would take place, as well as the date, time, and duration of the observation. They also determined the focus of the observation but did not share this information with us prior to the observation.

For each of these cycles, the designated research team and the dyadic supervisor observed in the teacher's classroom. Each research assistant independently recorded extensive field notes which were not shared with one another afterwards. The dyadic supervisor signalled the end of the observation, at which time all three observers left the classroom. Each of these observations lasted approximately 15-60 minutes.

Shortly after the classroom observation, the supervisor met privately with the teacher for a post-conference. Conference data were collected by videotape. At the beginning of a conference, a research assistant set the camera on a tripod, turned it on, and left the room. The subjects switched it off at the end of their conference. These meetings varied in length from approximately 10 to 30 minutes.

An audiotaped stimulated recall interview conducted by one of the research assistants with each of the subjects separately followed immediately after the post-observation conference. During this interview, subjects reviewed the videotape of the conference and were invited to stop the tape anytime they wished to comment. These comments would focus either on how they felt and what they thought during the conference itself, or on what they observed and noticed now that they were watching the videotape. Research assistants used a non-directive approach (Glickman, 1990) because their role was to help subjects articulate their thoughts and expand on them.

The subjects initiated the conversation and pointed out what they deemed meaningful and valuable to them. Research assistants checked their understanding by paraphrasing what the subjects had said, asking for clarification and more information using open-ended questions. The interviewers probed the practitioners on their comments, reactions, and responses and explored further the nature of their experience and the meaning of their concerns with regard to supervision. These interviews varied in time from approximately 20 to 60 minutes since they included the review of the post-observation conference videotape in addition to the interview itself. The research assistant conducting the interview set the audiotape recorder at the beginning of interview, switched on the conference videotape, and recorded everything until the end of interview.

In summary, data collected for each observation cycle included two sets of classroom field notes recorded independently by the two research assistants, a post-observation conference videotape, and two audiotaped stimulated recall interviews conducted separately with each member of the dyad. The videotape and both audiotapes were subsequently transcribed for analysis purposes.

CASE STUDY OF A POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Data collected for the Grimmer and Crehan study constituted excellent base for developing a case study of a supervisory conference because of the nature of both the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview. Holland (1989) asserts that "the conference is an essential part of the supervisory process because it provides the context for the teacher and supervisor to review the teaching observed" (p. 363). She

further states that more research is needed and suggests that "the use of qualitative methods such as discourse analysis to explore the interpretive aspects of the supervisory conference promises a new understanding of a dimension of conferencing often cited in the theoretical literature but as yet not researched in any thorough, systematic way" (p. 378). Nolan and Huber (1989) also claim that:

the case study is the most appropriate method for inquiry into the clinical supervision process. The philosophical underpinnings of clinical supervision provide for a teacher-directed supervision process that focuses on expressed teacher concerns; therefore, experimental or quasi-experimental studies in which the researcher chooses the variables of interest before entry into the setting are not appropriate. The variables of interest cannot be specified before entry into the research situation; they are specified by the teacher and supervisor during the clinical supervision process. Therefore, accumulating evidence from individual case studies is the appropriate method for aggregating research findings on the effects of clinical supervision on teachers and supervisors. (p. 135)

In the Grimmer and Crehan study, participants themselves decided the time, place, and focus of the classroom observation as well as the data to be collected. They were also free to conduct the conference as they wished. They were given no specific instructions regarding a particular plan to follow, topics to discuss, or time limits.

Therefore, both teacher and supervisor were in control of the conference and addressed concerns and issues that suited their needs. Moreover, the stimulated recall interview provided additional data that would enhance understanding of what happened during the conference and permit further exploration of the teacher's concerns with regard to supervision.

From their previous research, Grimmer and Crehan (1990) presented the case study of Barry, an elementary school teacher engaged in clinical supervision with his principal. They investigated the extent to which Barry engaged in reflection in such a setting. Grimmer and Crehan reconstructed the post-observation conference of Barry and his principal from a videotape recording and stimulated recall interview transcript. They presented episodes from the conference interspersed with an interpretive analysis of each of these episodes to demonstrate which conditions constrained or permitted teacher development through reflection. Such an approach allowed Grimmer and Crehan to present findings on the topic of teacher reflection in supervision based on observable events that took place in a classroom supervision setting.

The case study selected for this thesis also takes place in a clinical supervision setting; its purpose is to seek the point of view of a second language teacher engaged in a worthwhile instructional supervision experience to find out how this process contributes to his/her practice and what conditions facilitate such an exchange. As noted in the first chapter, "worthwhile" is defined as being useful to the development of the supervisee's practice from his/her point of view. A case study appeared an appropriate approach to fulfill this purpose and answer the following research questions:

1. What is the nature of the exchange between two practitioners engaged in a worthwhile post-observation conference in a second-language setting?
2. What are the conditions prior to and within the post-observation conference that facilitate this worthwhile exchange?
3. How does this supervision experience contribute to the development of the teacher's practice?

Indeed, a case study approach allowed me to take an in-depth look at what characterized a worthwhile exchange between two practitioners engaged in a post-observation conference in a second-language setting and provided valuable insight into the teacher's perspective on this process.

Data collection and analysis occurred in four stages: (1) the selection of a dyad from the Grimmer and Crehan study, and the collection of post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview data; (2) the preliminary analysis of the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview data; (3) the collection of a third set of data namely, a second interview with the supervisee; and (4) the final analysis of those three sources of data. The exploratory nature of this research called for a sequence in which data collection and analysis were interwoven rather than linear. Therefore, the following sections describe these steps in the chronological order in which they occurred.

DATA COLLECTION

Data used for this research originate from the Grimmer and Crehan study on the topic of teacher development through instructional supervision. Both my co-research assistant and I had experience with French immersion and French-as-a-second-language

programs. Therefore, we visited the schools in which French immersion and French-as-a-second-language teachers participated in the study.

Dyad Selection

Since I wanted to investigate the nature of the exchange between two practitioners engaged in a worthwhile post-observation conference in a second-language setting and ascertain how this experience contributed to the development of the teacher's practice, the dyad to be selected had to fulfill two conditions. First, the practitioner observed had to be a French-as-a-second language teacher; second, the post-conference between this teacher and his/her supervisor had to be deemed worthwhile by the teacher observed.

Only one dyad from the Grimmer and Crehan study met these criteria. This dyad included a French-as-a-second-language teacher, Christine, being supervised by one of her colleagues, Jane (pseudonyms), also a second language teacher. Both these practitioners had 13 years of teaching experience and were working in a secondary school in one of the two Lower Mainland districts involved in the research project. Christine was teaching French-as-a-second language while Jane was mainly fulfilling the position of librarian in addition to teaching Spanish a few hours a week. However, Jane had taught French in previous years. Since Jane worked mostly in the library, the two teachers decided that Jane would observe one of Christine's French-as-a-second-language class but Christine would not observe Jane.

During the stimulated recall interview that occurred in the second cycle of supervision in May 1990, Christine expressed a high level of satisfaction with respect to

her conference with Jane and was very positive about this supervision experience. For instance, at the beginning of the interview, she stated: "It was interesting that some of the things that she (Jane) picks up to do in an observation are quite helpful" and "It was neat because some of it looked really interesting to me". Therefore, after a first review of Jane and Christine's post-observation conference and Christine's stimulated recall interview, this dyad was selected to develop the case study of a post-observation conference in a second language setting.

Post-Observation Conference and Stimulated Recall Interview Data Collection

Jane and Christine decided the observation would take place in Christine's grade eight classroom. They also agreed on the date and time it would take place. Jane and Christine previously discussed the focus of the observation. Christine asked Jane to observe how the lesson flowed and how it worked for the pupils, and Jane planned how she would collect classroom data. However, neither of them shared this information with us prior to the observation. Those details, which will be discussed further in the next chapter, were later revealed in the stimulated recall interview with Christine. During the observation, my partner and I sat at the back of the classroom as inconspicuously as possible and recorded field notes. This observation lasted an hour.

The two subjects, Jane and Christine, met shortly after the classroom observation. They held their conference in a small private room in the school library. I set the video camera on a tripod at the beginning of conference, left the room, and Christine and Jane switched it off at the end. They had complete control over this conference with regard to topics discussed, sequence, and time limits. The conference lasted 18 minutes.

Immediately after the post-observation conference, I conducted and audiotaped a stimulated recall interview with Christine. During this interview, she reviewed the videotape of the conference and I invited her to stop the videotape anytime she wished to express her thoughts on how she felt or on what she observed and noticed now that she was watching the videotape. Christine initiated the conversation and pointed out what she deemed meaningful and valuable to her. I was using a non-directive approach as my role was to help her articulate her thoughts and expand on them.

During the first part of the interview, which consisted of the review of the videotape, Christine led the interview: She decided when to stop the videotape, and selected concerns and issues about which she wished to talk. I simply nodded and acknowledged that I understood what she was saying. On a few occasions, I asked clarification questions such as: "Can you give me an example?" or "What do you mean by that?" or "Can you tell me more about that?" In some instances, I also paraphrased what Christine had said to verify my understanding.

In the second part of the interview, I prompted Christine to pursue further the concerns and issues she had raised. I based my questions upon her comments. For instance, in one episode in which Christine stated that principal-led supervision did not have as much of a long-term effect as her experience with Jane, I asked her the following question: "Why do you think it doesn't have as much effect?" I also asked questions about the focus of the observation and how she and Jane had agreed upon this focus. The stimulated recall interview lasted 36 minutes.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

A preliminary analysis of the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview data was conducted. The purpose of this analysis was to examine what characterized the exchange between the two participants during the post-observation conference and whether conditions deemed to facilitate a worthwhile exchange pertained in this situation.

First, the following questions were asked of the post-observation conference data: "What is the supervisor doing?" and "What is the supervisee doing?" with regard to the following aspects: presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data, type and frequency of questions, listening, suggestions, issues discussed, type of comments, reactions, responses, and planning. These aspects, drawn from the literature on clinical supervision, were examined in order to describe the interaction between the supervisor and supervisee. Second, conditions deemed to facilitate a worthwhile exchange between participants in a post-observation conference were identified from previous studies on supervision. They are organized into the following categories: teacher-supervisor relationship, Glickman's developmental approach, peer supervision, and reflection. Questions were asked of the post-observation data to ascertain whether these conditions pertained in the context of this study. For instance, Schon (1988) suggests that teachers develop when they engage in the reflective transformation of their practice. Therefore, the following question: "Are there any instances of reflective transformation of experience in the post-observation conference, i.e., does the teacher name a problem and reframe it?" was asked of the conference data.

A content analysis of the stimulated recall interview was completed to verify post-observation conference analysis findings and to identify themes and issues raised by

Christine about her supervision experience. Questions such as "Upon which aspects did Christine choose to comment?" "Does she confirm, refute or provide further insight on what happened during the post-observation conference?" and "How does she assess this experience?" were asked of the stimulated recall interview data. Themes that emerged from these preliminary findings were identified and classified into six categories which served as a guide for framing questions for a subsequent interview with Christine.

DATA COLLECTION FROM THE SECOND INTERVIEW

I conducted and audiotaped a second interview with Christine at the school where she worked in June 1990. I had previously contacted Christine and arranged an appointment with her at her convenience. The purpose of this interview was twofold: (1) verify preliminary findings from the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview, and (2) gain a deeper insight on themes that emerged from the preliminary analysis of these two sources of data.

The second interview was organized into six main sections: (1) supervision process, (2) shared subject specialty, (3) collegial supervision, (4) principal supervision, (5) definition of terms, and (6) future implications. Each section began with one major question followed by secondary questions (or rescue questions) which were used, if needed, to help Christine develop further her ideas. The interview questionnaire is contained in Appendix 1.

This second interview with Christine lasted 44 minutes. The audiotape recording was transcribed for analysis purposes.

FINAL DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis consisted of content analysis, in the tradition of Grimmer and Crehan (1990), of three sources of data: (1) the videotape of the post-observation conference between Jane and Christine; (2) the transcript of the stimulated recall interview with Christine; (3) and the transcript of the second interview with Christine. A preliminary analysis of the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview was completed and themes that emerged from this analysis were used for framing a second interview with Christine. The purpose of this second interview was twofold: First, to verify findings from the preliminary analysis, and second, to explore further themes and issues that emerged from both the supervisory conference and stimulated recall interview. Final analysis of the three data sources was completed after the second interview. The three main research questions provided the framework for constructing the analysis questions. Preliminary analysis questions were restated and findings from the post-observation conference videotape and stimulated recall interview transcript were compared to the results from the second interview transcript analysis. Triangulation (Wiersma, 1986) was conducted among these three sources of data to compare and assess the convergence of information and to cross-validate findings. These findings were then examined in relation to the study's large questions.

SUMMARY

This chapter has described the method used for this study. An overview of the Grimmer and Crehan study was presented since data for my research originate from their study. The use of a case study approach in clinical supervision was then discussed. The four following sections described the various stages of data collection and data

analysis: The first one dealt with the selection of a dyad and collection of the post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview; the second one provided details on the preliminary analysis; the third one presented an overview of the second interview and the fourth one discussed the final analysis.

Findings from both the preliminary and final analyses are integrated and presented in the next chapter. They are organized with respect to the study's research questions. Descriptive accounts of incidents pertaining to each question are produced interspersed with episode excerpts from the post-observation conference and both interviews transcripts.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings derived from the analysis of the following three sources of data collected for this case study: (1) the post-observation conference videotape, (2) the stimulated recall interview transcript, and (3) the subsequent interview transcript. It contains four major sections. The first three are organized around the three main research questions and the fourth offers a summary of the findings.

THE NATURE OF THE EXCHANGE

This first section deals with the first question on the nature of the exchange between the supervisor and the supervisee and provides the findings from the analysis of the post-observation conference. It contains three sub-sections. The first one includes a descriptive account of the post-observation conference; the second one presents the observations on the nature of the exchange between the supervisor and supervisee; and the third one consists of a summary and conclusion.

The first research question for this study asked:

What is the nature of the exchange between two practitioners engaged in a worthwhile post-observation conference in a second-language setting?

The purpose of this question was to inquire into the nature of the exchange between the supervisor, Jane, and the supervisee, Christine, during their post-observation conference in order to describe the role played by each participant.

The literature on clinical supervision suggests that the relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee is central to the supervision process (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969; Krajewski and Anderson, 1980). Cogan (1973) states it is "an

intimate professional relationship" (p. 54). This view is supported by others such as Anderson and Krajewski (1980) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993). During the post-observation conference, supervisor and teacher analyze and interpret data recorded during the classroom observation, and plan future strategies. Cogan (1973) envisioned this conference as a "shared exploration" and viewed the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee as "colleagueship" (p. 68). Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) agreed that the development of teachers' skills in self-analysis was one of the goals of clinical supervision. Therefore, the analysis of the post-observation conference focused on the interaction between the supervisor and supervisee, and examined what each one was doing with respect to the presentation, analysis, interpretation of data in addition to the planning of future teaching strategies.

Post-Observation Conference

The post-observation conference lasted 18 minutes (see Appendix 2). As was revealed later in the stimulated recall interview, Christine decided the focus of the observation and Jane planned how she would collect data. The conference took place in a relaxed atmosphere with both participants often laughing while sharing data, yet focused and on task.

The first part, representing 29% of the conference time, was characterized by supervisor talk and consisted of her presentation of observational data to the supervisee. Jane not only stated her findings, but also provided extensive details about the process of collecting data, including the problems with which she had to deal. For instance, on

one occasion, she related how she modified her method of collecting data on pupils who were off task during the observation, in order to be more efficient:

Then, I started down here, instead of putting in comments: "back corner, two wandering", I thought, no, that's not going to work, and I had already prepared this kind of seating plan, so from then on whatever the time is, there's a number beside it and those kids at that particular number were off task in one way or another.

While presenting her data, Jane placed her papers between her and Christine thus making it possible for the latter to follow her explanations. The supervisor did not ask questions of Christine and seldom checked for understanding. The supervisee mostly listened and constantly indicated she was following Jane's explanations by nodding, or simply saying one of the following: "Hum hum" (13 times) "Yeah" (7 times) and "Ok" (4 times).

The second part of the conference, which lasted 70% of the post-observation conference time, began with Jane's suggestion that Christine take some time to read the comments she had written on the data sheets. From then on, Jane withdrew and let Christine take over. The conversation between the supervisor and supervisee consisted mainly of a sharing of information. Christine provided additional data about her pupils and commented on the notes she was reading. Jane responded to Christine's questions or reactions and offered further explanation when needed. The conversation focused on the data collected and what happened during the observation itself. Topics of discussion were the following: (1) double standard, (2) oral participation, (3) pupils on/off task, (4) listening exercise, (5) teacher control, and (6) pupil behaviour. Each one is summarized below.

Double standard. After Jane had completed her presentation of observational data, Christine expressed her interest with respect to an inference she had made from the data. She noticed that she had ignored some pupils who were off task while she called others to attention. She provided background information on the pupils to illustrate what she meant and she named the problem:

This is interesting because I know that that happens and yet, he's getting a B, and he's getting a B, and he's getting C+, B, (Wow) so, I tend not to bug them too much (Hum hum) because they cope. (Yeah) Double standard.

Jane supported Christine's observation "Very interesting" and shared her hunches with her: "I figured this guy probably was running around 30%". Christine stated that she was aware of her different reaction towards her pupils but she expressed her surprise at seeing it so clearly. Towards the end of the conference, Christine reiterated her concern about "double standard" by giving an example of how differently she responds to her pupils' behaviour and Jane reaffirmed her support by agreeing with her:

CHRISTINE: I usually begin the year and attend at kids that do that an awful lot, but when I find out that their performance is fairly adequate, I back off.

JANE: If it's not bothering anybody else.

CHRISTINE: Yeah, I guess that's the main thing and they leave her alone usually, usually they don't, you know, and they're not too bad and they seem to stay on task ok, so. I guess I do have sort of a double standard, because if he's so much as looks sideways, I'm on his back. (Both laugh) It's true, I'm mean to him but as soon as I can keep him performing.

Oral participation. While Christine was reading Jane's notes, she indicated her agreement with one comment about oral participation. Jane had noticed that pupils were participating much more when Christine was recording their participation than when she

was questioning them at random. During the stimulated recall interview, Christine described further how she records oral participation:

I count the check marks for oral participation so when I pull out my seating plan, they all sit up and start, they know, they know it's counting... So, as they give any response, it's good, they get a check mark and at the end of the term, I count the check for what I call oral participation.

Jane stressed once more her finding about the difference in participation:

What a change that makes. You were having to pull answers out of that second one and in the first one, wow, they were there boy! they wanted their ticks. It was incredible.

Christine explained when she records oral participation and when she does not, and offered a possible explanation of pupils' reactions. Jane did not interpret the findings but reiterated them.

Pupils on/off task. At one point, Christine interrupted Jane to express her concern about the difficulty of keeping pupils on task while she attends to individuals. Jane responded by sharing her own experience with her Spanish class. She revealed how difficult it is for her too to keep pupils on task, and she further stated that she envied Christine for having so many students who worked independently during her class. Reciprocally, Christine supported Jane by responding that her situation is somewhat easier because she is dealing with grade 8 students. She suggested that when those same pupils begin a new language class later on in grade 11, they will not be as motivated.

Listening exercise. Christine initiated this topic by asking for Jane's feedback about a listening exercise she conducted during the classroom observation. Jane first stated what she liked from the exercise and then stated her opinion on one aspect that she said could be improved. She suggested that Christine play the cassette a second time

so the students could hear each segment of the conversation twice. Christine replied it was a good idea and that she would likely follow that suggestion in the future.

Teacher control. Jane presented additional data about an aspect that had also been requested by Christine, namely control. Jane acknowledged she had difficulty recording control statements and drew the following conclusion: "There's a very gentle control" which she supported with examples. She indicated that she did not know whether Christine used certain strategies such as oral participation as a form of control. Christine responded by providing further information on her purposes and intentions:

I wanted to do the choosing and I wanted them to know that I was going to call on them sometimes too because I don't always look for volunteers and usually that tends to make them sit up and pay a little bit more attention.

She then expressed her surprise at the findings because she had the impression she was doing a lot of controlling which did not appear in the findings. Jane recognized that she did not know Christine's definition of control and explained further her perception providing some examples:

JANE: I mean, I don't know what your definition of control is exactly, but a lot of these are just, I'm sure they're demands but...

CHRISTINE: To pull them back in, they're not necessarily control statements.

JANE: Yeah, and just to get things rolling. (Hum hum) So, I put in the commands as well and whether they were reiterated...

CHRISTINE: Hum hum, ok, that's interesting.

JANE: One "Shsh" in the whole hour.

CHRISTINE: Isn't that interesting?

JANE: And sometimes, I think one I didn't put in but I think sometimes you use it for control is "Ok".

CHRISTINE: Probably.

JANE: Yeah, and that tends to bring some back in, I think.

Pupil behaviour. Following the episode about control, Christine commented about individual pupils, providing additional background information on their abilities and actual results. As she was talking, she pointed at them on the seating plan to indicate precisely about whom she was talking. Jane shared with Christine her impressions about those students, which she had gathered from the observation. At one point, she interrupted Christine because she believed there was a misunderstanding. Christine had shown a pupil on the plan and Jane replied that there was nobody at that seat. However, Christine confirmed Jane was right by saying the pupil was away on the day of the observation.

Christine then expressed her surprise at another pupil she thought was off task which was not showing in the data. Jane responded that she might have not seen her:

CHRISTINE: Nadia, I'm surprised she was on task as much but I think she doesn't clue in very quickly at all.

JANE: It's possible that she wasn't but this is where I was so, I might have just stuck with these kids up here.

The conversation continued and Christine compared this class with another one she teaches. Jane supported her comments by restating how she perceived the students were reacting and participating, and she expressed her surprise at the successful results of some of the pupils who were off task. Finally, she related an anecdote about a pupil who had remained on task despite several distractions from his peers.

Observations on the Nature of the Exchange

The conference revealed that the supervisor and supervisee worked towards the same goal, namely developing the teacher's practice, but fulfilled different roles. The supervisee identified specific concerns and determined the aspects of her teaching she

wanted to be observed, and the supervisor decided which method of collecting classroom data would give the maximum information to the teacher.

The supervisor opened the conference and presented her findings to the supervisee in addition to her method of data gathering. Once this was completed, she assumed a less active role. Indeed, she let the supervisee lead the conference and respected fully Christine's choice of concerns and issues. Jane seldom became involved in data interpretation and made few judgments. One instance occurred during the control episode in the second part of the conference when she stated: "There is a very gentle control". A second instance also took place in the second part during the listening exercise episode. However, Christine had invited Jane to tell her what she thought about the exercise. Besides those two episodes, Jane's statements were usually softened by expressions such as "I'm not at all sure that...", or "I guess they were having a little bit of difficulty understanding". Jane offered support to Christine when the latter shared some concerns with her. She made one suggestion during the conference following her opinion on the listening exercise upon which Christine had asked her to comment.

At the beginning of the conference, the supervisee listened and then participated more actively after the presentation of data. She expressed her satisfaction with the way the observation was conducted and with its outcome. She asked questions, made comments, asked once for Jane's opinion, and volunteered additional data on individual pupils. She often agreed with Jane's comments or findings and expressed her surprise at some of the findings in the following instances: (1) When she realized she used a double standard with the pupils, having different expectations from them according to their performance; (2) when she noticed one student appeared to be on task while she

thought she was not; and (3) when she discovered she did not use many control statements even though she believed she did. She expressed two concerns: her different expectations with respect to pupils' behaviour which she labelled as a double standard, and pupils being off task while she worked with individuals. She decided when to end the conference and brought it to a close.

The topics of discussion included the aspects of observation requested by the supervisee and a great deal of the interaction between Jane and Christine revolved around the pupils. Only once did the conversation deviate for a brief moment when Jane shared her own experience with Christine. However, it was related to a concern that Christine had expressed. The discussion of issues did not go very far. Problems or concerns were raised by the teacher but they were not explored nor discussed further. There was hardly any planning except in the case of the listening exercise when Christine indicated she would follow Jane's suggestion of playing the cassette a second time.

Summary and Conclusion

Findings from the analysis of the post-observation conference revealed the following characteristics about the nature of the interaction between the supervisor and supervisee. Their exchange was: (1) non-judgmental, (2) based on trust and respect, (3) honest, (4) supportive, and (5) cooperative. Each aspect is described below.

Non-judgmental. Supervision in this case was neither evaluative nor hierarchical. The supervisor was one of the supervisee's colleagues and supervision was conducted for the purpose of developing Christine's teaching rather than evaluating it. Jane made

few judgments on what occurred during the observation and left to Christine the task of interpreting the data.

Trust and respect. The interaction between the supervisor and supervisee was based on trust and respect. Christine trusted Jane enough to seek her opinion on pedagogical matters and share her concerns with her, and Jane was comfortable enough to provide her opinion and give details on the process of data collection. The focus of the observation was determined by Christine and Jane respected it as well as Christine's choice of concerns. In turn, Christine respected the process Jane used to collect data as well as the comments she recorded.

Honest. Their interaction was honest. Jane acknowledged her difficulties, admitted incidents she had missed, and presented both sides of her point of view on the listening exercise. Christine accepted the findings whether they were positive or negative, and revealed there were incidents she had missed during the observation.

Supportive. There was evidence of support when the supervisor shared her experience with Christine stating that keeping pupils on task was very difficult. At the end also, during the brief discussion on double standard, Jane accepted Christine's rationalization about her different expectations from students.

Cooperative. Their exchange was cooperative in the sense that both supervisor and supervisee worked together towards the same goals, but each had a different responsibility. The role of the supervisor was to provide as much information as she could on aspects requested by her colleague, not to interpret the findings or try to improve the supervisee's teaching. The role of the supervisee was to listen and read the

data collected by Jane, interpret the findings, and make appropriate decisions with respect to future planning.

In summary, the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee can be characterized by what Cogan (1973) defined as "colleagueship" since they both worked together toward the same goal, namely developing the supervisee's teaching. Yet, Christine and Jane fulfilled specific roles and respected each other's responsibility.

CONDITIONS THAT FACILITATE A WORTHWHILE EXCHANGE

This section deals with the second research question on the conditions deemed to facilitate a worthwhile exchange in clinical supervision. It asked:

What are the conditions prior to and within the post-observation conference that facilitate this worthwhile exchange?

Four conditions were identified in the literature review: teacher-supervisor relationship, Glickman's developmental approach, peer supervision, and reflective transformation of experience. In the four following sub-sections, data are examined to ascertain whether each condition pertains in the context of this study while the fifth sub-section offers a summary and conclusion.

Teacher-Supervisor Relationship

The analysis of the post-observation conference revealed that the exchange between Jane and Christine was characterized as non-hierarchical, non-evaluative, trustworthy, comfortable, respectful, honest, supportive, cooperative, and collegial. These findings were confirmed in the stimulated recall interview with Christine. She stated:

I really like working with Jane because I think we really understand where each other is coming from and she's really honest and she's not threatened, you know what I mean? I can ask the question I asked and she can observe "Well, that's because of this" and it's not a problem you know. I feel very comfortable with her working that way because, I don't know, it's always positive, always cooperative, it's always, you know, we're looking at what's here and we have a view to improvement. It's not like you're being picked apart by somebody. You know what I mean? I like that. She's got a nice manner.

In the subsequent interview, Christine defined what she meant in the previous statement:

I guess there's a couple of things happening here. One is Jane's personality and my personality. We get along very well. Ok, so that's one basis of the honest, friendly, whatever.

She [Jane] was not afraid to tell me that some kid was fooling around in the back that I hadn't noticed, hum, very, very upfront. I mean, she told me what she saw and I trust her too, I trust her not to mask the good or the bad, you know, hum, I think she's an impartial observer, that would, that, that's my kind of meaning of honest too, hum, that what she sees is what she's going to tell me that she sees, hum also, I don't think she has any vested interest in doing anything different, you know what I mean? and it's not a judgmental observation whereas a principal does have to make a judgment.

In her second interview, Christine was asked why what characterized her relationship with Jane was important to her, and what impact it had on her as a participant in this supervision process. Christine answered that these characteristics were basic and essential in order to have a worthwhile outcome:

I figure that if somebody comes in and is not cooperative and it is not honest, you're not going to get a very good result, I mean, it's almost like a baseline, you have to have somebody that you can work with.

If I was not respectful and respecting of the person that was coming in and observing, hum, I know me, I'm stubborn and I would probably say: "Well thank you very much but wrong filing cabinet" you know, I think you have to have respect for the person who, from who you're getting that cooperative learning with, hum, otherwise you're going to doubt what you're hearing, you're going to not be convinced that they're really seeing right.

You have to believe that the person that's coming and watching you has the capacity to, to give something, otherwise I don't think it's a worthwhile exercise.

Christine confirmed that her relationship with Jane was a condition that facilitated a worthwhile exchange in this case and that it was essential to ensure a successful supervision outcome.

Glickman's Developmental Approach

The following questions, based on Glickman's (1990) developmental approach, were asked of the post-observation conference data:

Which approach, controlling, collaborative, or non-directive was used by the supervisor?

Is the supervisor taking responsibility for the conference; i.e., does she identify problems, determine solutions, state expectations?

Is the supervisor sharing the responsibility for the conference; i.e., does she seek the teacher's perceptions and understandings, does she provide points of view, does she accept conflict, does she negotiate a plan of action with the supervisee?

Is the supervisee taking responsibility for the conference; i.e., is the supervisor listening, clarifying, paraphrasing, probing, and asking the supervisee for possible solutions?

In the post-observation conference, the supervisor, Jane, did not identify problems, determine solutions nor state expectations. She did not play a controlling or directive role. She sought the supervisee's perception when she asked her about her definition of control or whether she was questioning pupils for control purposes, but she did not negotiate nor get involved in planning. In fact, she asked very few questions of the supervisee. Jane provided her point of view, but on topics selected by, and requested by Christine; for example, the listening exercise episode. Jane listened to Christine but did not probe, paraphrase or ask her for solutions. Both supervisor and supervisee shared the responsibility of the conference by assuming their respective roles. Jane's role consisted of observing and gathering data whereas Christine's role was to determine the focus of the observation, articulate her concerns, and make decisions with regard to the findings.

Therefore, the supervisor's approach in this case study did not correspond to one of the approaches described in the Glickman's model but involved characteristics of both the collaborative and non-directive approaches. However, one important element was missing namely, future planning or search for solutions. In Glickman's model, it is assumed that an important outcome of the supervision process is a plan of action or the search for solutions to a given problem. In Jane and Christine's post-observation conference, there was no evidence of future planning except in one instance and no discussion of solutions to the supervisee's concerns. The supervisor did not press nor ask the supervisee to come up with any plans; she did not get involved in that respect. It was the supervisee's responsibility to decide what she wanted to do with the findings and when she wanted to do something about them. There was only one instance of

planning in the conference. However, the stimulated recall interview and subsequent interview revealed that the supervisee is using the findings for her planning, but it did not appear during the conference itself. Furthermore, since both practitioners were experienced teachers, it was expected that a collaborative or non-directive approach would be preferred by the supervisee.

Peer Supervision

Some authors (e.g., Alfonso and Goldsberry, 1982; Cook, 1985) argue that true collegueship cannot be achieved in a hierarchical setting; that is, when the supervisor is an administrator. They suggest separating supervision and evaluation and involving the teachers in the process.

After watching the post-observation conference videotape during the stimulated recall interview, Christine initiated the following comment about her supervision experience with Jane:

I like much better having a colleague coming in because I think you address more the actual teaching things than when a principal comes in and evaluates. I think you're, you're basically worried about, you know, is it ok? or is it not ok? and I don't think that principals coming in and writing reports on me have had as much of a long-term effect as this sort of exchange does.

I think this is less threatening. It's a, because it's less threatening, I think you relax more in terms of what you would normally do in the classroom and, and the comments, they don't all have to be taken seriously and you can kind of focus on things that catch your attention.

Christine referred to the anxiety of having an administrator coming in, and finds it more relaxed to be observed by a colleague in a non-evaluative context. In the

subsequent interview, Christine related previous supervision experiences she had with principals:

Probably the first evaluations I ever had, a stranger came into the room and sat down and watched me and you get all uptight, your hands go all wet and you start getting really uptight. I mean, so often after a principal would observe me, he'd leave and the kids would say after to me: "Boy! were you ever nervous". And sometimes that, sometimes the whole nature of the class would change.

Christine explained the reason peer supervision has a longer term effect:

We address the teaching more with a colleague.

With Jane, I know I'm looking at the teaching and that's what is going to have the longest-term impact on my career.

Christine stressed that with a colleague, she can choose the aspects of her teaching that she wants to be observed, and focus on her concerns rather than those selected by an administrator. However, Christine goes further and affirms that it is not only the fact that she engaged in supervision with a colleague that facilitated a worthwhile exchange, but also that her colleague was a second language teacher.

In the stimulated recall interview, Christine stopped the conference videotape after watching the episode during which she expressed her concern about keeping pupils on task, and Jane responded by sharing her experience with her Spanish class. She said:

It's nice also having that kind of exchange between two language teachers because we share and we know what each other is dealing with.

Christine explained that another second language teacher may understand better teaching concerns and issues relevant to second language teaching. She stated:

[A teacher of science or math may not know] how hard oral participation may be to get and why it's hard to keep kids

on task during certain kinds of activities in language, whereas that kind of disruption may be fine in science and it's not in language and vice versa, so, it's easier, I think, when you have somebody that's in your own field to observe.

In the subsequent interview, Christine elaborated on the implications of engaging in supervision with another second language teacher:

I've tried a lot of new things since student teaching, a lot of things that are, that are, that I'm out in the left field on them. I don't know if I'm doing them right or wrong and I know I've done my own personal research [...] but unless you have feedback from somebody else who has done the same kind of research, I don't think that, well I just feel more confident with feedback from somebody who's also been doing the same kinds of things and may have found other solutions or it's a broader base of experience that can be brought to the same learning which I think is really valuable.

If you think about English, they think about mostly writing because they assume that the passive skills are there, the listening, and they assume that the speaking is there so, they don't bother to concentrate so much on teaching those things, whereas within second language, it takes a long time to get that to happen. The listening is very hard to achieve unless you address it specifically, and so is the speaking.

Christine revealed that prior to the observation, she and Jane had looked at a professional development package on the skill of listening. She said that Jane had spent four to five hours working through the information so that she could understand better Christine's teaching goals:

I was just looking at the oral interpretation I guess, you know, the skill of listening and being able to teach the kids what to listen for, and she read through the entire package and just as well as I had it, and she found it very interesting and it was basically from that, there was only little parts of each lesson that she observed that addressed that specific thing that I was particularly trying as a new thing, but she

knew what I was trying to do with those things, and she understood where I was kind of branching out into something that I hadn't done before.

Christine talked further about the implications of engaging in supervision with another second language teacher. She said:

If I had a principal, and that's basically who has been evaluating before, I don't think I would bother getting into the grammar. I don't think that, I don't think that I'd get a solution from them, so there's no point asking or stating. The point of discussion between me or Jane perhaps, as you know, having that base, you may, you may understand the problem because you may have experienced it before, I mean ok, how do you teach this? is often a conversation that I have with other language teachers, like how do you get the kids to do this? You know, it is a concern and you're always looking for good solutions, ways to make it easier for the kids.

I think that working with somebody who understands your, your subject area can give you more, well if that's what you're looking at, if you're, if you're looking at just kind of keeping your class in line, I'm sure a principal can do that quite nicely because that's something I think that can be transferred from area to area to area.

Christine claims that working with a colleague in her own field allows her to address issues with respect to her subject itself, namely second language teaching. For a principal or somebody from a different field, including language arts, it might be difficult to understand and be aware of such issues as oral participation or developing listening skills. Another second language teacher who has experienced the same difficulties and who is struggling with the same issues may appreciate better what she sees in a second language class. In summary, it is not only that she engages in supervision with a colleague that Christine deems valuable, but also that this colleague is a second language teacher.

Reflective Transformation of Experience

Many authors (e.g., Garman, 1986b; Nolan and Huber, 1989; Retallik, 1986; Sergiovanni and Starratt, 1993; Smyth, 1991) agree that reflection is an important condition for the success of clinical supervision. Schon (1988) suggests that teachers develop when they go through the process of transforming reflectively their experience; that is, when they name the problem with which they are dealing and frame the context in which they will attend to it. In a study of teacher reflection in clinical supervision, Grimmer and Crehan (1990) found that reflective transformation occurred providing these four factors were met: (1) the teacher named the problem; (2) the supervisor accepted it; (3) the teacher felt supported by the supervisor; and (4) the supervisor's empathy enabled the teacher to reconstruct and reframe the lesson during which the problem occurred.

Findings from the analysis of the post-observation conference revealed that the supervisee, Christine, named a problem on two occasions. On one occasion, she talked about a "double standard" when she realized that she had different expectations from her pupils depending on their performance. The supervisor accepted the problem. However, they did not explore nor reframe it. Christine simply acknowledged it.

On another occasion, Christine expressed her concern about pupils being off task while she worked individually with others. She named the problem. Jane supported her by stating she experienced the same problem in her Spanish class and that in fact, she was envious of Christine's class because she found that the pupils were much more on task than in her own Spanish class. Once again however, they did not pursue that topic and there was no further exploration or reframing.

Therefore, it appears that the first step of reflective transformation was present; that is, the teacher named the problem. Furthermore, the four factors identified by Grimmert and Crehan (1990) were also met: The supervisee named the problem, the supervisor accepted it and supported and showed empathy towards the teacher. Nonetheless, the second step of reflective transformation, reframing of the context in which the teacher will attend to the problem, did not occur during the conference although it may have occurred subsequently. In her stimulated recall interview, Christine revealed that supervision affected her thinking on a long-term basis. When asked to define what she meant by "thinking", she replied that she found "thinking" and "reflecting" synonymous. She mentioned that she conducted her reflection on a continuous basis, little bits at a time:

I put something in the back of my mind and I let it stay there, and it kind of just, every so often I think about it a little bit and I put it back and it stays there but it doesn't go away, I always pull it back out and (It's cooking?) Yes, that's right, "ça mijote" and that's, that's I think, the way I do my most effective reflection, is little bits like that and giving it lots of time in between.

It's not just the immediate feedback. I find too that I go away and a lot of it sort of comes through. It just affects your thinking on a long-term basis.

Hence, findings indicate that reflective transformation was not completed during the post-observation conference although the four factors identified by Grimmert and Crehan were present. This will be further discussed in the next chapter.

Summary and Conclusion

Four conditions, identified from the literature, were deemed to facilitate a worthwhile exchange in clinical supervision. They were: (1) teacher-supervisor relationship, (2) Glickman's developmental approach, (3) peer supervision, and (4) reflective transformation of experience. Post-observation conference and both sets of interview data were examined to ascertain whether these conditions pertained in the context of this study.

The findings revealed that the first condition, teacher-supervisor relationship, was important in facilitating a worthwhile exchange. With respect to the second condition, it was found that the supervisor used a combination of both the non-directive and collaborative approaches from the Glickman's model, although one important component, future planning, was left out. The third condition, peer supervision, appeared to be important, providing that the supervisee's colleague was also a second language teacher. Finally, even though the facilitating conditions were present, the fourth condition, reflective transformation of experience, was not completed during the post-observation conference.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHER'S PRACTICE

This section addresses the third research question and investigates how supervision was useful to Christines's practice. The question asked:

How does this supervision experience contribute to the development of the teacher's practice?

Interviews with Christine were reviewed to examine how she viewed her supervision experience in terms of the development of her own practice.

Jane and Christine's dyad was selected for my case study because Christine expressed a high level of satisfaction about her experience with Jane. She used the expression "It's interesting" on many occasions. She indicated the process was helpful to her and that she enjoyed working with Jane. Furthermore, she stated:

It's really nice to have somebody else there to give you that feedback because they just see things that you don't see and that's really good. That, I think, is a time saver in terms of your own development.

In the subsequent interview, Christine explained why the supervision process is useful to her practice and how she uses the results to understand better her teaching:

I tend to do what the kids need or say what the kids need to hear in order to get them to do the learning that they have to, and not always aware of what I've done afterwards.

When you have an observer there who is noting down the kinds of things that you're doing or saying, you know, it's nice to, after the conference, to look at that information because you're seeing it from a different point of view. When you're teaching, you're actively involved in creating it and afterwards it's nice to sort of look at what it was that you actually did to try to get to those results. Hum sometimes I guess, students need to hear something that's perhaps not what you would not expect them to have to hear in order to get the result that you want.

Results from the post-observation conference analysis indicate that the classroom observation findings increased Christine's awareness with respect to what she was doing in class. One instance occurred when she realized she was using a double standard with her pupils according to their performance.

That was interesting because I really, I realized that I'd really do have a double standard in terms of what I let the kids get away with in class. If they're performing well, I'll give them a little bit more freedom; if they're not passing or if they're not coping with the school material, well, then I

tend to get on their backs a lot more. So, I think I don't have, hum. That was an interesting perception again reminding me that I do have a double standard in class.

A second instance occurred while Christine was reading Jane's notes about the overhead transparencies she had used during the observation:

She [Jane] mentioned that the overheads were not clear, the third one was hard to read from the back of the room which as soon as I slipped on I realized: "I haven't done that again!" I didn't, so those are little details that are not perfect.

A third instance was revealed when Jane presented her findings about Christine's use of control statements.

The outcome was really surprising because I thought I used "attention" a lot. I thought I used a lot of things that I did not. It was interesting.

Later, Christine added: "That was quite an eye opener for me".

In the subsequent interview, Christine shared her conclusions from the findings about her use of control statements and the implications of these findings on her as a cooperating teacher:

My conclusion from that is a lot of the control that I exert is because I'm very attuned to where the kid is at, to what he's thinking, so I mean, I am controlling but I guess I don't have to use statements to do it.

I have to define what it is before I'm able to pass it on, I mean, before I teach something, I have to understand it first and when you understand it, then you can transmit it a lot better or break it down into the steps that you have to break it down so that the student teacher can pick up, what they can pick up, I mean you have to analyze not only the task but yourself and the student teacher as well.

Christine also discovered from the observation findings that she had missed some of her pupils' actions. In some cases, she did not see that a few pupils were off task in

the back of the room. In another instance, she did not notice one pupil who was on task.

Toward the end of the conference, Jane related an anecdote about that pupil who was distracted by others but remained on task. In the stimulated recall interview, Christine commented:

That's really neat. That's really neat. That kid was trying so hard and I didn't even notice.

In the subsequent interview, Christine revealed how she used that information to reward the pupil the following day:

I also rewarded the kid in front whom I had ignored the whole time... The next day I had the kid, we were in class and I called the young man up and said, I gave him a ?VIC? - they're a little reward thing - and he looked at me really surprised and I said that's for being so good when Martin was driving you crazy last day... Lots of little things come from it you know. I probably can't remember all the revelations that came because of that, but it was nice.

Christine also disclosed how she used this information to become stricter with another pupil who had been off task during the observation.

There was some activity going on that I wasn't aware of and that was quite interesting, really, because the particular student involved had been moved by the student teacher... It made me realize just how much this kid that I had decided at the beginning of the year would fool around (I see) actually was when he got back there, and that was kind of interesting, so that sort of let me put my thumb on that person a little bit more.

In addition to increasing her awareness of what she was actually doing in class and what the pupils were doing, Christine used supervision to help her reach her goal of professional development. As revealed in her second interview, the supervisee was working at better developing her pupils' listening skills. She was trying a new type of

exercise in class and she had requested Jane's feedback on the process. In the stimulated recall interview, Christine expressed her appreciation of Jane's opinion and explained how this information contributes to the development of her practice:

This is good because this is new kinds of materials, I haven't used these before and I get an impression as to how they're working. I get a feedback from the kids when I see their marks as to who has understood and who hasn't and if it's worked that way or not. But it's also great to have somebody in the back to sort of have an observer.

In the subsequent interview, Christine provided further insight on this aspect and clarified what she learned from the observation findings:

Because I speak the language very fluently, I don't necessarily know what to attend to, whereas these researcher's analyses of that portion of language skill, it's really well done, it's very clear. It made me realize how I rushed certain parts too fast for the kids (ok) and so I'm trying to break that down into slower steps. Now Jane hasn't given me a lot of feedback in our post conferences on that because basically I think I hit it, it wasn't too off.

Summary and Conclusion

Findings on how this supervision experience contributes to the development of the supervisee's practice indicate the following. First, it increased Christine's awareness of what she was doing in class. In some cases, she already suspected what she was doing, such as using a double standard of expectations with her pupils according to their performance. The data enabled her to see more clearly how she was behaving in class, and the post-observation conference gave her the opportunity to rationalize her behaviour. In other cases, Christine had a different perception of what she was doing in reality, such as in her use of control statements. These findings provided her with more

information to work with student teachers in the future. This information allowed her to understand better her teaching and, therefore, contributed to developing her practice. As Christine said, if she is aware of what she is doing while she teaches, she can gain a deeper understanding of what it is that she does in order to obtain the results she is working to achieve.

Second, Christine found out additional information on her pupils. This enabled her to take some concrete action. She rewarded the pupil who had remained on task despite his peers distractions and became stricter with the one who had been off task.

Third, other findings gave the supervisee an indication on where she stood in her experimentation with new materials. Since the outcome was positive, she was able to move on.

In addition to immediate impact on her teaching, Christine indicated supervision had a long-term effect on her teaching. Few decisions regarding future planning were made during the post-observation conference. However, the meeting triggered an on-going reflective process that continued after the conference by enabling the supervisee to explore ideas which she kept in the back of her mind.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented the findings from the data collected for this case study, namely the post-observation conference videotape, the stimulated recall interview, and subsequent interview transcripts. Results were organized around the main research questions.

The first section dealt with the first research question on the nature of the exchange between the supervisor and supervisee. It included a descriptive account of the post-observation conference and presented the findings on the nature of the interaction between the participants. The findings indicated that each participant had a definite role and assumed her responsibility for this role. The role of the supervisor was to select the data collection method and subsequently present these data to the supervisee, whereas the supervisee decided herself the focus of the observation and was in charge of the analysis and interpretation of data. Both supervisor and supervisee appeared comfortable. The exchange was non-judgmental, based on trust and respect, honest, supportive, cooperative, and reflected the type of relationship defined by Cogan (1973) as "colleagueship".

The second section addressed the second research question on the four conditions deemed to facilitate a worthwhile exchange between the supervisor and supervisee. These conditions were: (1) teacher-supervisor relationship, (2) Glickman's developmental approach, (3) peer supervision, and (4) reflective transformation of experience. Post-observation conference and stimulated recall interview data were analyzed to ascertain whether these conditions were present in the context of this study. Findings revealed that the first condition, namely teacher-supervisor relationship, was important in facilitating a worthwhile exchange in this case. The second condition, Glickman's developmental approach, appeared to be present. The supervisor used a combination of both the non-directive and collaborative approaches which had been expected since the supervisee was an experienced practitioner. However, the step of planning future teaching strategies, an important aspect of each of Glickman's approaches, did not occur during

the conference. The third condition, peer supervision, also appeared to be important, providing that the supervisee's colleague was a second language teacher. The fourth condition, reflective transformation of experience, did not occur during the conference although the factors to facilitate the process were present.

The last section presented the findings on the development of the teacher's practice through this supervision experience. Results indicate that Christine found supervision an effective means for improvement that had both short and long-term effects on her practice. First, it increased awareness of her teaching; second, it disclosed new information about her pupils which enabled her to take concrete action; third, it provided extra indicators with respect to her experimentation with new materials which might also result in further action. In summary, supervision helped the supervisee to gain a better understanding of her practice and consequently, enabled her to make appropriate teaching decisions based on this newly acquired knowledge. The next chapter will present the conclusions, recommendations, and implications of these findings for research, theory, and practice.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions, recommendations, and implications based on this case study's major findings. The chapter is divided into two main sections: conclusions, and recommendations and implications for research, theory, and practice. The conclusions include five sub-sections: (1) conditions that facilitate a worthwhile exchange, (2) Glickman's developmental approach in peer supervision, (3) the limitations of reflective transformation of experience, (4) peer supervision short and long term effects on development of practice, and (5) a summary of conclusions. The second main section deals respectively with the recommendations and implications of the findings for research, theory, and practice.

CONCLUSIONS

The main findings from this study are organized into four categories. The first section deals with the three conditions that were found to facilitate a worthwhile exchange; they include a pre-established teacher-supervisor relationship, peer supervision, and peer supervision by a second language teacher. The second and third sections discuss respectively the use of the Glickman's developmental approach in peer supervision and the limitations of reflective transformation of experience. The fourth section presents the short and long term effects on development of practice while the last and fifth section provides a summary of conclusions.

Conditions That Facilitate A Worthwhile Exchange

In this case study, the two participants appeared relaxed and comfortable. Their exchange was non-judgmental (based on trust and respect) honest, supportive, cooperative, and close to what Cogan (1973) defined as "colleagueship". Three conditions were found to facilitate this type of exchange. They are: (1) a pre-established supervisor-teacher relationship, (2) peer supervision, and (3) peer supervision by a second language teacher. Each condition is discussed below.

Pre-established relationship. As recommended by Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), Sergiovanni and Starratt (1993), and Acheson and Gall (1992), the supervisor/supervisee relationship was well established before the beginning of the supervision process; the rapport between Jane and Christine was based on trust and openness. They were both experienced teachers with 13 years of practice and they had worked together for several years. Christine mentioned in her interviews that she did not feel threatened by being observed by Jane.

Peer supervision. Christine and Jane took part in this supervision study on a voluntary basis and chose to form a dyad for the Grimmett and Crehan study (ongoing). They had complete control over the process and were in charge of deciding when, where, and how long the observation would occur, in addition to what the focus would be. Furthermore, their participation in the larger study was supported by the administration of their school. This is consistent with Cook (1985); Ellis, Smith, and Abbott (1979); Hargreaves (1989); Lesnik (1987); and McGee and Eaker (1977) all of whom found that supervision works better when it is not mandatory, when teachers are actively involved in determining the purpose and procedures, and when it is supported

by the administration. Christine revealed that she found supervision conducted by a colleague caused less anxiety, gave her more power over the issues she wanted to address, and allowed her to address teaching issues. These findings are confirmed by Smyth (1986) who claimed that in a hierarchical model of supervision, it is the administration, rather than the teacher, who really decides the agenda and that if teachers have power over the process, they will benefit more from it. These results are also supported by Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982) who found that teachers involved in peer supervision deemed the process useful, and that furthermore, it increased collegueship. The relationship between Christine and Jane was not hierarchical, even though Christine was not observing Jane. As recommended by Cogan (1973), who viewed the supervisor and teacher as equals working together toward the same goal, the supervisor in this case did not assume the role of a superior nor was she viewed by the supervisee as such. Furthermore, the purpose of supervision was not evaluative which is consistent with authors such as Alfonso and Goldsberry (1982), Cook (1985), and Joyce and Showers (1988) all of whom claim that collegueship cannot be achieved when the supervisor is also in charge of teacher evaluation.

Peer supervision by a second language teacher. This case study indicates that if supervision is conducted for developmental purposes rather than evaluative ones, and if the supervisee is an experienced teacher, another second language teacher might be in a better position to play the role of a supervisor because s/he would understand and appreciate better the implications of the curriculum, the goals of the program, the process used to reach these goals, and the difficulties and issues that pertain to second language teaching, in addition to the language used in class. The supervisor could also

provide valuable input and benefit from the findings since s/he would be dealing with the same issues.

In summary, the exchange between the supervisor and supervisee in this case was close to Cogan's (1973) colleagueship because three main conditions were met. Two of these three conditions are consistent with the literature. First, the teacher/supervisor relationship was well established prior to the supervision cycle. Second, supervision was conducted by a peer and its purpose was not evaluative. Participants entered supervision on a voluntary basis, they had support from their administration, and complete control over the process. The third condition, supervision by a second language teacher, arose from this study and was also found to facilitate the exchange between the supervisor and the teacher.

Glickman's Developmental Approach in Peer Supervision

The findings revealed that a combination of the collaborative and non-directive approaches was used by the supervisor. Although these findings are consistent with Glickman (1990) and Holland (1989) who suggest that more experienced teachers like Christine prefer a collaborative or non-directive approach, this might explain only partly the supervisor's decision. One aspect of each of Glickman's approaches is the elaboration of a plan of action. In Christine and Jane's case, problems were identified by the supervisee but there was no evidence of search for solutions nor future planning during the post-observation conference. Since supervision in this case was not hierarchical, the supervisee had control over the issues and concerns discussed. The supervisor did not press her to look for solutions nor did she offer any unless asked. She

respected and trusted the supervisee with regard to these aspects. It was the supervisee who lead the discussion. The supervisor did not try to present her agenda and left the supervisee entirely free to choose the issues she wished to discuss. She had no vested interest in this process since she was not an administrator conducting supervision for evaluative purposes. In a peer supervision context, supervisors do not really have the choice of using a directive or controlling approach since they do not have the power to operationalize it. They can be directive in the sense that they can decide which issues to discuss, identify what they perceive to be the problems, and propose solutions, but supervisees remain free to accept and implement the suggestions offered or to dismiss them. Supervisors do not have any means of imposing them on teachers. Therefore, Glickman's developmental model is not totally appropriate in a peer supervision context because supervisors have, for all practical purposes, only the collaborative and non-directive approach options unless requested otherwise by the teacher observed.

The Limitations of Reflective Transformation of Experience

Findings in this case study revealed that reflective transformation of experience (Schon, 1988) was not completed during the post-observation conference even though the four factors identified by Grimmer and Crehan (1990) were present. The first step of the process, naming a problem, occurred in two instances but the second step, reframing the problem into another context, did not happen in either instance.

In the first instance, the teacher named the problem but did not attempt to reframe it. She simply recognized what she already suspected: her behaviour was different with her students depending on their performance. The data collected in class

enabled her to analyze her behaviour. Instead of reframing the problem, Christine rationalized it explaining why she reacted differently with students. In other words, the results from the observation allowed her to understand better the motives underlying her behaviour. The supervisor accepted her explanations. Therefore, what appeared at first to be a problem turned out to be a rational behaviour motivated by the needs of the students. The fact that she was using a double standard with her pupils might have bothered the supervisee, since it is typically believed that a teacher has to be consistent and react the same way with her students. However, these findings provided her with an insight on her teaching that enabled her to understand it better. In this instance, the problem did not need reframing because it had been resolved.

In the second instance, the supervisee also identified and named the problem. She expressed her concern about keeping pupils on task while she was working individually with others. The supervisor accepted the problem and showed empathy. However, the problem did not get reframed although the Grimmer and Crehan (1990) factors were met. The type of problem faced by Christine was not a simple one for which a quick solution might have been devised right away. Indeed, it was a more complex issue which required more time to address. The supervisor stated that she faced the same problem to an even greater extent than what she had seen in the supervisee's class. In this instance, the limited time of the post-observation conference was not sufficient for these two practitioners to deal with and find an acceptable solution to this problem.

In summary, reflective transformation of experience did not occur for different reasons in each of the two instances. In the first one, what initially appeared to be the first step of reflective transformation of experience was in fact the teacher's discovery of

the rationale behind a behaviour that could have been perceived problematic. Consequently, the reframing of the problem was not necessary. In the second instance, reflective transformation of experience did not occur because of the complexity of the supervisee's problem and the limited time of the post-observation conference to deal with it. Nevertheless, the conference did provide feedback to the teacher which she claimed triggered a long-term reflective process. Therefore, reflective transformation of experience may not always be an appropriate indicator of teacher development because the time constraint combined with the complexity of issues hinder the full completion of the process. Furthermore, its lack of evidence during the post-observation conference may not mean that reflection does not occur at other times and in different ways. As Christine revealed in her second interview, her most effective reflection is not conducted in long sessions, but rather in short ones with "lots of time in between".

Peer Supervision Short and Long Term Effects on Development of Practice

Contrary to the recent literature eschewing the value of supervision (e.g., Starratt, 1992), the teacher in this study found the process to be useful in both the short and long term. In this case, supervision was associated with the development of practice in three important but different ways. First, supervision increased Christine's awareness of her teaching. This finding is consistent with Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969) and Smyth (1984) all of whom claim that supervision allows teachers to "gain insights, acquire understandings, and exercise a measure of empowerment" (Smyth, 1984, p. 425) over their practice. Second, the new information revealed enabled Christine to take concrete action. As Cogan (1973) and Goldhammer (1969) have stated, the goal of clinical

supervision is the improvement of the teacher's practice and one of its main components involves the planning of future teaching strategies. Although little planning occurred during the conference, the interviews revealed that Christine took some action as a result of the observation findings. Third, supervision helped Christine with her experimentation of new material. This finding is consistent with Joyce and Showers (1988) who suggest that supervision provides teachers with an opportunity to get feedback on new material with which they are experimenting.

Summary of Conclusions

In this study, three conditions were found to facilitate a worthwhile exchange between Christine and Jane. Two are consistent with the literature and one arises from this study. These conditions include a pre-established teacher-supervisor relationship, supervision conducted by a peer, and engaging in supervision with a peer who is also a second language teacher. Glickman's developmental model was not found totally appropriate in peer supervision because the supervisor does not have a full range of choice; s/he can only use a collaborative or non-directive approach since s/he does not have the power to enact decisions that would be made in a more controlling approach. Reflective transformation of experience was not completed during the post-observation conference because of the time constraint to deal with complex problems. It was therefore suggested that reflective transformation may not be an appropriate indicator of teacher development and that reflection may happen in various ways and on occasions outside the post-observation conference. Indeed, the conference may not always be the most appropriate setting for the supervisee to conduct her reflection about her teaching.

As Garman (1986a) has said: "Emphasis of formal conferencing perpetuates the illusion that a great deal more can be accomplished in a formal conference than is logically possible" (p. 28). It appears that in this case, the purpose of the conference was to present the results of the classroom observation rather than discuss the findings and search for solutions to problems raised. However, the teacher found supervision to have both short and long term effects on the development of her practice. It increased her awareness of her teaching, enabled her to take subsequent action, and provided useful feedback on her experimentation with new material.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH, THEORY, AND PRACTICE

This study generates implications for research, theory, and practice. They are presented in the three following sections.

Recommendations and Implications for Research

This study examined the case of one second language practitioner engaged in a post-observation conference and cannot be generalized. However, it points to directions for future research. First, findings about whether second language teachers benefit more from engaging in supervision with one another need to be verified on a larger scale. Second language teachers involved in peer supervision could be interviewed to find out whether they engage in supervision with other second language practitioners and if so, what benefits they may derive from it. Results could then be compared to those of this study. If it is found, as in this study, that engaging in supervision with a second language partner facilitates the exchange, the case of teachers in other areas such as fine arts or

science for instance, needs to be investigated to ascertain whether they might also benefit from participating in supervision with a colleague from their own field. This will have implications for teachers who are using or planning to use peer supervision for professional development purposes and will affect the organization of supervision itself.

Second, more research needs to be conducted in the area of reflection. Post-observation transcripts could be analyzed to examine what type of issues are dealt with during occurrences of reflective transformation of experience with beginning and experienced teachers. If it is found that the process deals mostly with technical types of problems rather than more complex ones, we may want to verify whether the complexity of the problems discussed and the post-observation conference time constraint are factors in preventing the process from being completed. Interviews could be conducted to examine how teachers conduct their reflection and deal with unresolved issues raised during post-observation conferences. These findings might affect the planning of supervision programs with respect to the time, frequency, and expectations of post-observation conferences.

Recommendations and Implications for Theory

Most findings from this case study are consistent with those from studies on peer supervision. They confirm that clinical supervision may be a useful means of professional development and that, for experienced teachers, a non-directive, non-judgmental approach may facilitate the exchange between the supervisor and supervisee. However, too much emphasis may be placed on the post-observation conference. In this case, the conference dealt mainly with the presentation of the results from the classroom

observation. Little planning, discussion or search for solutions occurred and reflective transformation of experience was not completed. This may indicate that the purpose of the post-observation conference may need to be reviewed, particularly in the case of experienced teachers using supervision for professional development. On the one hand, these practitioners may be addressing more complex teaching issues that require longer reflection than can occur during a conference. On the other hand, planning may not always be a necessary or appropriate component of the conference. Reflective transformation of experience as an indicator of teacher development might also need to be reconsidered. The fact it does not always happen during the conference may not mean that teachers neither develop nor reflect.

Recommendations and Implications for Practice

Findings support the studies indicating that teachers should participate in peer supervision on a voluntary basis, and be involved in determining its procedures. However, the Glickman's model of developmental approach was not found totally appropriate for teachers involved in peer supervision. In the case of second language teachers, it appears that supervision conducted by another second language colleague may facilitate a more worthwhile outcome. Indeed, a second language practitioner may understand better the difficulties pertaining to second language teaching, and may contribute a more meaningful and valuable insight. Therefore, opportunities for second language teachers to engage in peer supervision with their colleagues should be provided. This involves planning timetables that will allow teachers to visit one another's classrooms and providing release time for them to hold their pre and post-observation

conferences. This could benefit not only the practitioners, but also the subject area because teachers would be exchanging ideas and working together at solving issues pertaining to second language.

This study offered a new insight into clinical supervision by examining the nature of the exchange between two practitioners engaged in a post-observation conference in a second language setting, and providing the teacher's perspective on the process. Findings confirm that clinical supervision can contribute to the development of a teachers' practice when certain conditions are met. Furthermore, it appears that when teachers are in charge of the process, they derive greater benefit from it. It is therefore important that research be pursued in this area in order to understand better what is useful to practitioners and how it is useful to them. Thus, the outcome will be worthwhile not only for teachers but also for their pupils.

REFERENCES

- Acheson, K.A., & Gall, M.D. (1992). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications (3rd ed.). New York: Longmans.
- Alfonso, R., & Goldsberry, L. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching (pp. 90-107). Alexandria ASCD: VA.
- Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cook, G.E. (1985, February). Teachers helping teachers: A training program in peer supervision. Paper presented at the 65th annual conference of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, NV.
- Ellis, E., Smith, J., & Abbott, W. (1979). Peer observation: A means for supervisory acceptance. Educational Leadership, 36(6), 423-426.
- Florez-Tighe, V. (1985, March). Supervision in special language programs. Paper presented at the annual spring meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Houston.
- Garman, N.B. (1986a). Getting to the essence of practice in clinical supervision. In W.J. Smyth (Ed.), Learning about teaching through clinical supervision (pp. 19-36). London: Croom Helm.
- Garman, N.B. (1986b). Reflection, the heart of clinical supervision: A modern rationale for professional practice. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2, 1-24.
- Glickman, C.D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C.D., & Gordon, S.P. (1987). Clarifying developmental supervision. Educational Leadership, 44(8), 64-68.
- Goldsberry, L. (1986). Is clinical supervision practical? In W.J. Smyth (Ed.), Learning about teaching through clinical supervision (pp. 137-152). London: Croom Helm.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., & Krawjeski, R.C. (1980). Clinical Supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Gordon, S.P. (1992). Paradigms, transitions, and the new supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8(1), 62-76.
- Grimmett, P.P., & Crehan, E.P. (1990). Barry: A case study of teacher reflection in clinical supervision, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5(1), 214-235.
- Hargreaves, A. (1989, June). Contrived collegiality and the culture of teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Quebec City.
- Holland, P.E. (1989). Implicit assumptions about the supervisory conference: A review and analysis of literature. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4(4), 362-379.
- Huddle, G. (1985). Teacher Evaluation. How important for effective schools? Eight messages from research. NASSP Bulletin, 69(479), 58-63.
- Hunter, M. (1980). Six types of supervisory conferences. Educational Leadership, 37, 408-412.
- Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising. In Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Using what we know about teaching.
- Hunter, M. (1986). Let's eliminate the preobservation conference. Educational Leadership, 43(6), 69-70.
- Hunter, M., & Russell, D. (1990). Mastering coaching and supervision. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. New York: Longman.
- Karier, C. (1982). Supervision in historic perspective. In T. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of teaching (pp. 2-15). Alexandria ASCD: VA.
- Krajenski, R. & Anderson, R. (1980). Goldhammer's clinical supervision a decade later. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 420-423.
- Lesnik, M. (1987). Peer supervision and its positive administrative effects. The Canadian School Executive, 7(1), 8-9.

- Little, J.W. (1987). Teachers as colleagues. In V.R. Koehler (Ed.), Educator's handbook: A research perspective (pp. 491-518). New York: Longman.
- McGee, J.C. & Eaker, R. (1977). Clinical supervision and teacher anxiety: A collegial approach to the problem. Contemporary Education, 49(1), 24-28.
- Mohlman, G., Kierstead, J., & Gundlach, M. (1982). A research-based inservice model for secondary teachers. Educational Leadership, 40(1), 16-19.
- Nolan, J.F., & Huber, T. (1989). Nurturing the reflective practitioner through instructional supervision: A review of the literature. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 4(2), 126-145.
- Raney, P., & Robbins, P. (1989). Professional growth and support through peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 35-38.
- Retallik, J. (1986). Clinical supervision: Technical, collaborative & critical approaches. In W.J. Smyth (Ed.), Learning about teaching through clinical supervision (pp. 85-110). London: Croom Helm.
- Schon, D.A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D.A. (1988). Coaching reflective teaching. In P.P. Grimmett & G.L. Erickson (Eds.), Reflection in teacher education (pp. 19-29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1986). A theory of practice for clinical supervision. In W.J. Smyth (Ed.), Learning about teaching through clinical supervision (pp. 37-58). London: Croom Helm.
- Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R. (1988). Supervision: Human perspectives (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sergiovanni, T., & Starratt, R. (1993). Supervision: Human perspectives (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smyth, W.J. (1984). Toward a "critical consciousness" in the instructional supervision of experienced teachers. Curriculum Inquiry, 14(4), 425-436.
- Smyth, W.J. (Ed). (1986). Towards a collaborative, reflective and critical mode of clinical supervision. In W.J. Smyth (Ed.), Learning about teaching through clinical supervision (pp. 59-84). London: Croom Helm.

- Smyth, W.J. (1988). A "critical" perspective for clinical supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3(2), 136-156.
- Smyth, W.J. (1991). Problematizing teaching through a "critical" approach to clinical supervision. Curriculum Inquiry, 21(3), 321-351.
- Starratt, R. (1992). After supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8(1), 77-86.
- Wiersma, W. (1986). Research methods in education: An introduction. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Withall, J. & Wood, F. (1979). Taking the threat out of classroom observation and feedback. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(1), 55-58.

APPENDIX 1

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Section 1: Supervision Process

- 1.1 During your post-observation conference with Jane, I noticed that some of the information she reported to you seemed to catch your attention more particularly; for instance, in the episode of the control statements, you said: "The outcome was really surprising...That was quite an eye-opener for me" and "It's really nice to have somebody else there to give you that feedback because they just see things that you don't see".

Can you tell me why this is useful to you?

- 1.2 In this same episode, you mentioned that you wanted to know what you were doing in class, in terms of control, in order to get it across to your student teacher. Why is this knowledge valuable to you?
- 1.3 Can you recall other events from the conference that were "eye-openers"?

Section 2: Shared Subject Specialty

- 2.1 During the stimulated recall interview, you said: "It's nice having this kind of exchange between two language teachers because we share and we know what each other is dealing with and it's kind of nice. They're really recognizing what you have worked to get...how hard oral participation may be to get and why it's hard to keep kids on task during certain kinds of activities in language whereas that kind of disruption may be fine in sciences and it's not in language and vice-versa. It's easier I think when you have somebody that's in your own field to observe".

Could you tell me more about the implications of working with another language teacher?

- 2.2 At one point in the post-observation conference, you asked Jane: "What did you think of the listening activity?" Why did you feel Jane's point of view would be useful on this aspect of the lesson?
- 2.3 In the last part of the stimulated recall interview, in answer to my question on the focus of the observation, you told me about the objectives of the lesson, the difficulty you had teaching the concepts "au" and "à la", and you compared these two methods: LFI (Le Français International) and Passeport Français.

Can you recall what your purpose was in mentioning this to me?

- 2.4 How do you characterize the similarities and differences between these two methods?

Section 3: Collegial Supervision

- 3.1 During the stimulated recall interview, you said: "I enjoyed working with Jane. She's very honest, she's not threatened... I feel very comfortable because it's always positive, cooperative, we're looking at what's here and we have a view to improvement...She's got a nice manner".

I wonder if you can tell me what you mean by: "honest", "she's not threatened", "cooperative", "nice manner"?

- 3.2 Can you give me examples of things that Jane does or says that illustrate these qualities?
- 3.3 Why are these qualities important to you?
- 3.4 What impact do they have on you as a participant in this supervision process?
- 3.5 If you were paired with a partner who did not have these qualities, what implications would it have for you?

Section 4: Principal Supervision

- 4.1 How does your previous supervision experience compare with your experience in the UBC study (i.e., people involved, conditions, context, impact)?
- 4.2 What did you learn from this experience at this point?
- 4.3 You said: "I like much better having a colleague coming in because I think you address more the actual teaching things than when a principal comes in and evaluates...Comments don't all have to be taken seriously...You kind of focus on things that catch your attention".

How is that to be interpreted in the context of principal supervision?

- 4.4 You also said: "I don't think that principal's coming in and writing reports on me have had as much of a long-term effect...In terms of my own development, I don't think I really have changed nearly as much".

Could you tell me why you think that is?

Section 5: Definition of Terms

- 5.1 You used the word "think" in many occasions. For instance: "I'll think about that...I'll end up thinking a lot more too about it... It affects your thinking on a long-term basis...I'll go home and think about it later...I'll do my own thinking when I'm teaching a lesson".

Can you tell me what you mean by the word "think"? Can you give me an example?

- 5.2 You also used the word "development". For instance: "In terms of my own development, I don't think I have changed nearly as much...It is a time saver in terms of your own development".

Can you tell me what you mean by the word "development"?

Section 6: Future Implications

- 6.1 If the type of supervision in which you are involved through the UBC study were institutionalized, what do you think would be the implications for teachers?

APPENDIX 2

POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCE TRANSCRIBED DIALOGUE

Supervisor: Jane Teacher: Christine

The asterisk (*) indicates that Christine stopped the post-observation conference videotape at that point to comment during the stimulated recall interview.

JANE: Once again I emerged with writer's cramps.

CHRISTINE: I bet you.

JANE: No, it's fun. It's really fun to be there. When I come back into a class, I realize I'm missing a part of my life not teaching French. It was a real treat to be there.

CHRISTINE: Oh! That's nice. (Yeah). They're certainly different from the other group.

JANE: That they are. That they are (CHRISTINE nodding). But you can see by the different things that I've done here. You were concerned about them really being boisterous. There are a few pockets but that's basically it (yeah) in terms of being off task or (Good) having to adjust your pacing for particular people. You asked me about the pacing, so what I did was go through and just note down the time at which each activity started (Good, that's good) and then some comments where I could see something. (OK) In this first part, (Yeah) I noticed lots of chatter with that new exercise. I guess they were having a little bit of difficulty understanding. Rather than address you (Hum hum) they were addressing each other (yeah). Then I started down here, instead of putting * in comments: "back corner, two wandering", I thought, no, that's not going to work, and I had already prepared this kind of seating plan, (Hum hum), so, from then on, whatever the time is, there's a number beside it (Hum hum) and those kids at that particular number were off task in one way or another.

CHRISTINE: Ok. I understand.

JANE: Ok?

CHRISTINE: Hum hum.

JANE: Now, if * some of the chatter, I could tell that it was work related, (Hum hum) I made a comment so that you would know that it was not idle chatter. (CHRISTINE nodding). Now, it might well could have been that in some of these other places some conversation was directed towards their exercises (Hum hum) but I'm not at all sure that anything was directed towards the exercises (Both laugh) between these two guys. (JANE circling on paper) (Yeah) Yeah. It was interesting. This fellow in front of the great off task person...

CHRISTINE: That was Nadia. It's a girl.

JANE: No. No. (No?) This a boy, second one down.

CHRISTINE: Oh! So, this is the first one?

JANE: No. Ok. This is the front.

CHRISTINE: Oh! Sorry. Wrong way around.

JANE: I'm terribly sorry. (JANE writing on paper) Front and back. (Ok) Ok. Yes. Check, ok. Ok. Now, I was sitting here. (Hum hum). So, there's the odd one (CHRISTINE

nodding) because of you (Hum hum) that I may well have missed at times (Hum hum) but I was looking around for an alternate location for today and the old corner seems (hum hum) as good as any (yeah) because I didn't want to be turning around and facing the kids. * I wanted to be as much out of the way as possible.

CHRISTINE: Hum hum. They'd actually did very well because after I said that you were there, (Oh yeah) I mean, they just did forget.

JANE: I think they did. (Yeah) Now...

CHRISTINE: This is interesting because I know that that happens and yet, he's getting a B, and he's getting a B, and he's getting C+, B, (Wow) so, I tend not to bug them too much (Hum hum) because they cope. (Yeah) Double standard. *

JANE: Very interesting. I figured this guy probably was running around 30% the way he...

CHRISTINE: No, his work's ok. There's a girl here, she's not doing well, (Oh) and the girl in front is not. No. There's a boy and another girl, (name?), a quiet girl, she's not doing well.

JANE: I didn't notice her at all. (Hum hum). Now, this one seemed to be a day dreamer.

CHRISTINE: That would be (referring to notes)...

JANE: That was a large girl who had (Oh) a cast.

CHRISTINE: Yes, Sylvia. She was away most of the term too. She's really, I'm having really trouble, a lot of trouble getting her back (Hum hum) on task.

JANE: Yeah, but this one, She * she didn't seem to be trying.

CHRISTINE: She's not there.

JANE: No, no. As I put here: "lost in thought" (hum hum) ??? question mark. (Hum hum) I don't know whether she was asleep with her eyes opened or (yeah) just drifting off, and for the most part, the rest of the class looked like it was with you.

CHRISTINE: Ok, good.

JANE: Now, you might want to take a minute to go through since you did wonder what the pacing with the little comments, so...

CHRISTINE reads; **JANE** sits back and waits.

CHRISTINE: (reading) So, somebody asked me a question and they couldn't understand what it was.

JANE: Yes, that happened a couple of times (Hum hum) where a question was asked in this very quiet voice (**JANE** whispers) and then you would go on to give the answer and the rest of the class was lost because they hadn't heard the question.

CHRISTINE: Ok, (So) ok. (**CHRISTINE** carries on reading). Yeah these overheads seem to be every time. (**CHRISTINE** reads) Hum hum. * Yeah, (**CHRISTINE** laughs) you're right. They do tend when I pick up that thing, (Hum hum) they really do. (Hum hum) They don't...

JANE: What a change that makes. (Amazing, isn't it?) You were having to pull answers out of that second one and in the first one, wow, they were there boy! they wanted their ticks. (**CHRISTINE** laughs) It was incredible.

CHRISTINE: I generally try, I don't always use it. I tend to use it after things have been taught ?? too so, it could partially be psychological too that they just don't want to jump in because there isn't a reward.

JANE: I don't know but it was interesting to see the difference.*

CHRISTINE: It's neat (reading). This is the same back corner here?

JANE: Yeah (Yeah) yeah. That's when I decided to use the numbers to sort it through. What I had intended with these numbers, that's why there was one up here, was that I divide the lesson into quarters just make the comments according to the quarters. (Ok) There, I thought, he, this would probably work better and give you more information if the number works.

CHRISTINE: Hum hum. Ok, yeah. (CHRISTINE reads) Ok.

JANE: Yeah, and then for the rest...

CHRISTINE: This is a little harder to control because there is some of them that are not as good at getting on task as, I don't know what else I could give them to do. I could do, you know. I may as well take the time to do the individual thing after that.

JANE: On task, off task. I saw my Spanish class this morning in the last ten minutes when I give them some time to do things in class. I was incredibly envious (CHRISTINE laughs) seeing how many of your kids were on task. Oh!

CHRISTINE: It's a different crew though, I mean, you know.

JANE: Well, well, but (both laugh) oh! I'd give anything here to see my Spanish class during just one day, just one day before the end of June.

CHRISTINE: Yeah, these are sweet little grade eights though. I mean you know. Wait till they get to grade 11 and they're doing a beginner's course, they'll, a lot of them will be on the same boat. * Ok, good, good. What did you think of the listening exercise? Did you find it was good or appropriate?

JANE: The one from the cassette? (Hum hum) The only thing I thought... I loved it, I mean, and I loved the drawings and the humour in it and the tone of voice and so on. That was really good. (Hum hum) The only thing that I would have liked to occur and I think probably kids didn't feel like... It came so fast (Hum hum) that it would have been nice after the correction (to rehear it) to listen to it one more time (Hum hum) at least, so that the ones that just flew by without them having any clue what they were about...

CHRISTINE: Would get a chance to listen to it again. I might do that. When I've gone through them, when I've gone through them and check the marks and give it back to them, I may have them listen to it again.

JANE: It would be great.

CHRISTINE: Because they would get a reinforcement on another day.

JANE: For sure, for sure.

CHRISTINE: The "enrhumé" one was great but it's a little ??? and the tone of voice, I think, was quite appropriate because you could hardly hear what he was saying, he was so stuffed (Yeah, yeah) and... Ok, I'll do that next time. *

JANE: Now, the other thing that you were wondering about was control. (Hum hum) So, I went through on the times again and * whenever there was anything. Now, I had to fish really really hard I think, to find anything a lot of times that seemed like control at all, except there's a very gentle control. Yeah: "Regardez", "Is that clear?", "One at a time", hum, that kind of thing, "Fermez les yeux. Concentrez". That was really funny. I looked around to see how many eyes were shut. I couldn't find any. (Both laugh) So, I think they missed that one.

CHRISTINE: They may...

JANE: That was cute.

CHRISTINE: They know: "Fermez vos livres." (Hum hum) but they may not connect on: "Fermez vos yeux". (Both laugh) May be too new. Ok.

JANE: Yeah, and this was where the points were not being given for the oral part, and I didn't know whether you were choosing those as a kind of control (A little bit) or whether you were choosing those students at random.

CHRISTINE: A little bit at random and a little bit for control because I wanted to, I wanted to do the choosing and I wanted them to know that I was going to call on them sometimes too because I don't always look for volunteers and usually that tends to make them sit up and pay a little bit attention (Oh sure!) which is good. Ok. It's interesting because I got the impression with that group particularly, that I'm doing a lot of controlling which is interesting.

JANE: I mean, I don't know what your definition of control is exactly, but a lot of these are just, I'm sure they're demands but...

CHRISTINE: to pull them back in, they're not necessarily control statements.

JANE: Yeah, and just to get things rolling. (Hum hum) So, I put in the commands as well and whether they were reiterated. Hum. * There was only one time ?? each time paraphrase ??, a repetition.

CHRISTINE: Hum hum, ok, that's interesting.

JANE: One "Shsh" in the whole hour.

CHRISTINE: Isn't that interesting?

JANE: And sometimes, I think one I didn't put in but I think sometimes you use it for control is "Ok".

CHRISTINE: Probably.

JANE: Yeah, and that tends to bring some back in, I think.

CHRISTINE: Hum hum, ok. Interesting, interesting the different problems. This young man in the front, I found I was controlling. He was not on task nearly as much as I would like to see him, but he's very very bright but he's still ?? a lot in the last term. (Pointing at another pupil on the sheet) Very bright. (Yes) That's bright.

JANE: I got that. At first, I thought: "Oh! here are a couple of real goofs.

CHRISTINE: 97% out of ?? They're just thoughtful all the ?? They get ancy. One in front, the same thing, just amazing.

JANE: Now, just a sec. There was nobody there.

CHRISTINE: No, he was away. (Oh, ok.) But the three of them are just really bright. Nadia, I'm surprised she was on task as much but I think she doesn't clue in very quickly at all.

JANE: It's possible that she wasn't but this is where I was so, I might have just stuck with these kids up here. *

CHRISTINE: Ok, ok, yeah, yeah. And this is (name ??). This is Michael I guess the dark one? Ok, interesting.

JANE: Maybe this too, the reason there was interaction there was just that he had forgotten his book, I guess. He had pulled back to sit next to (Ok) this person.

CHRISTINE: Ok, that's why there was interaction going that way.

JANE: But very little as you can see. That was it. (Good) Now, I don't know what I've said up here. Maybe he was off task but there was no interaction. (Yeah) Ok, he tends to daydream once in while too for some reason.

CHRISTINE: They're pretty good, I'd say for a larger class. There's more of them passing that connect faster than the other group (Hum hum) and they're more reactive too, which I find much more enjoyable.

JANE: Oh, for sure.

CHRISTINE: Because this C class, it's like pulling teeth all the time, they're very cooperative and so quiet, it's like they're dead.

JANE: Yeah. This group, the enthusiasm that was there (That's right) and the participation, just "wham", I mean, there they all are with you just sipping their stuff. (T nodding) Yeah, yeah. (Interesting) That was neat. But that surprises me (I know) that these kids are doing as well as they're doing.

CHRISTINE: Hum hum. She's not but he's doing just fine.

JANE: He didn't get involved very much this one or when the other guy turned around, even sometimes when this fellow was turning around which he was doing regularly. I mean, he was trying to distract everybody around to make something to annoy this girl.

CHRISTINE: He's probably quite bright too.

JANE: Probably, but it was funny. It was interesting ?? He didn't finish. Han han! on the shoulder (CHRISTINE laughs) and the kid just sat there and this solid look (CHRISTINE laughs) on his face. He wouldn't turn around. (Both laughs)

CHRISTINE: That's priceless. I love it. I think I will do that. The kids will... *

JANE: As you can see eventually he succumbed. Yes, but considering the temptations that were put in front of him, (Hum hum) he did admirably.

CHRISTINE: That's fun. There are some really nice kids in that class, but I usually begin the year and attend at kids that do that an awful lot, but when I find out that their performance is fairly adequate, I back off.

JANE: If it's not bothering anybody else.

CHRISTINE: Yeah, I guess that's the main thing and they leave her alone usually, usually they don't, you know, and they're not too bad and they seem to stay on task ok, so. I guess I do have sort of a double standard, because if he's so much as looks sideways, I'm on his back. (Both laugh) It's true, I'm mean to him but as soon as I can keep him performing.

JANE: Yeah, you're Mr. (name ??).

CHRISTINE: Yeah. This kid, he's a smart kid, he's really bright but he's got all business he can possibly... His attention is everywhere. Well, thank you very much, that's interesting.

JANE: You're welcome.

CHRISTINE: Do we get to do this again this year or is it next year?

JANE: I don't know, I have no idea, but I guess we can turn this off.

CHRISTINE: Yeah. Merci beaucoup.