

Supervision and Mid-Career Teachers: A Study of the
Attitudes Toward Alternative Models of Supervision
Held by a Sampling of Mid-Career Teachers
at the Secondary Level in a Winnipeg
Area School Division

by

© Michael Bergsgaard

A Thesis Submitted to the Department
of Graduate Studies,
University of Manitoba

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Education

April, 1988

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-48110-2

SUPERVISION AND MID-CAREER TEACHERS:
A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES TOWARD ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF SUPERVISION
HELD BY A SAMPLING OF MID-CAREER TEACHERS AT THE SECONDARY
LEVEL IN A WINNIPEG AREA SCHOOL DIVISION

BY

MICHAEL BERGSGAARD

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1988

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	1
Conflicts in the Literature on Supervision	2
Statement of the Problem	9
Definitions	10
Statement of Limitations	11
Significance of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Historical Overview of the Literature	13
Points of Disagreement in the Literature	21
Points of Agreement in the Literature	34
Concerns in Need of Further Examination	35
III. METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION	37
The Interview Schedule	37
Selection of the Study Population	38
The Interview Process	40
IV. CONTEXT FOR THE STUDY	43
The Setting	43
Supervision of the Study Population	43
V. ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO SUPERVISION	49
Introduction	49
Perceptions Toward Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors	50
Strengths	52
Weaknesses	54
Conclusions	59
Perceptions Toward Clinical Supervision	60
Clinical supervision in the study context	62
Strengths	65
Weaknesses	65
Conclusions	71
Perceptions Toward Differentiated Supervision	72
Strengths	72
Weaknesses	80
Assigning teachers to clinical supervision	83
Conclusions	86

Table of Contents (continued)

Chapter

V. ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO SUPERVISION (continued)	
Perceptions Toward Reflective Supervision	87
Informal practice of reflective supervision	90
Strengths	93
Weaknesses	97
Conclusions	98
VI. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUPERVISOR AND THE TEACHER	102
Introduction	102
Characteristics Desired in the Supervisor-Teacher Relationship	103
Characteristics Undesirable in the Supervisor- Teacher Relationship	110
Preferred Relationship in Teacher-Colleague Supervision	113
VII. FACTORS IN SUPERVISION	120
Factors Which Should be Considered During Supervision	120
Conclusions	140
The Impact of Factors on Motivation of Mid-Career Teachers	141
Preparation time	142
Support from administration	143
Input into decision-making	146
Salary	148
Conclusions	151
VIII. CONCLUSIONS	
Implications for Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors	153
Implications for Clinical Supervision	155
Implications for Differentiated Supervision	158
Implications for Reflective Supervision	161
Inferences about the Teachers' Preferred Relationship with the Supervisor	163
Considerations to be Included in Supervision	169
Additional Factors to be Considered During Supervision	172
Conclusion	173
Implications for Further Research	176
REFERENCES	177
APPENDIX A	184
APPENDIX B	195
APPENDIX C	197
APPENDIX D	198

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to survey the attitudes of selected mid-career males teaching in a Winnipeg-area collegiate toward four distinct models of formal supervision: 1) supervision according to prescribed behaviors, 2) clinical supervision, 3) differentiated supervision and 4) reflective supervision.

The rationale for conducting the study was premised on persuasive evidence that, unless mid-career teachers perceive methods of supervision as appropriate and of value to them in performance improvement, they are not likely to commit themselves to improvement of their teaching through those methods. Because it also appears that mid-career males are inclined to hold views toward the effectiveness of various models which may differ from their female counterparts and teachers at other career stages and because an increasing number of male Manitoba teachers are entering mid-career, this study was conducted to determine those methods of supervision which a selected population of fourteen mid-career teachers perceived as being appropriate and having utility for the growing number of teachers in that career stage.

Based upon the data gathered from the study, it was evident that those interviewed perceived methods of supervision which call for teachers to practice behaviors identified by superordinates as being of least value and those models which allow the teacher to choose methods for performance improvement as having the most potential for promoting improvement of the mid-career teacher's performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish, firstly, to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Jon Young, my principal advisor, for his patience, guidance and wisdom. I am grateful, as well, to the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Lionel Orlikow, Dr. John Stapleton and Mr. John Wiens, for the time which they gave to the study and for their invaluable insights.

Acknowledgement is due, also, to the administrators and teachers in the study school for their cooperation and willingness to share the thoughts and sentiments which constitute the basis of this study.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my parents and to Janet Bergsgaard for their support, their encouragement and their abiding confidence that this study could be completed.

List of Tables

1. Characteristics of Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors_____	51
2. Teachers' Perceptions Toward Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors for Mid-Career Teachers_____	53
3. Characteristics of Clinical Supervision_____	61
4. Teachers' Perceptions Toward Clinical Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers_____	63
5. Characteristics of Differentiated Supervision_____	73
6. Teachers' Perceptions Toward Differentiated Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers_____	75
7. Characteristics of Reflective Supervision_____	88
8. Teachers' Perceptions Toward Reflective Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers_____	91
9. Characteristics of the Relationship Between the Teacher and Supervisor_____	104
10. Characteristics of the Relationship Between the Teacher and a Colleague_____	104
11. Factors Which may be Considered During Supervision_____	121
12. How Factors Impact on Motivation of Mid-Career Teachers_____	121

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Currently, demands that public schools across North America demonstrate the improved performance of classroom teachers in promoting student learning has made formal supervision of teachers a common practice in most school divisions. However, there exists amongst researchers and between educators considerable disagreement over which supervisory practices, if any, will be successful in improving the performance of teachers. The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes toward selected supervisory models held by mid-career males teaching full-time at the secondary level in a Winnipeg-area public school.

Corresponding with an increase in the average age of Canadians from 28.2 years in 1977 to 31.5 in 1986, and a decrease in teacher mobility (resulting from fewer available positions), the average age of teachers has increased dramatically in the last decade and a half. According to Statistics Canada (1986), the average age of male Canadian teachers rose from 35 years in 1975 to 41 in 1985. Consistent with this national trend, the present mean age of male Manitoba teachers is 40 with that figure advancing one year approximately every two years, in contrast with a one-year advancement every five years in the previous decade (Manitoba Teacher's Association, 1987).

Given evidence which suggests that mid-career teachers are more susceptible to "burnout," disillusionment and to declining commitment to their work (Krupp, 1987; Farber,

1984), at a time when large numbers of Manitoba teachers are entering that career stage, an increasingly important concern becomes the motivation of mid-career teachers to continue to make improvements in their teaching.

A review of the literature reveals that the most consistently identified means employed by public schools to improve the performance of teachers is the process of formal supervision or evaluation. However a literature review also discloses considerable disagreement over the exact meaning of the term supervision and over which supervisory methods are likely to be most effective in promoting performance improvement.

Conflicts in the Literature on Supervision of Teachers

What is supervision?

While some authors writing on the subject view evaluation and supervision as two distinct processes, others appear to use the terms synonymously. In making a distinction between evaluation and supervision, Goens and Lange (1976) describe evaluation as a summative process in which a supervisor makes a subjective value judgement or appraisal about the right or wrong in a teacher's classroom behavior. Burke and Kray (1985) would add that evaluation is a "determination of the worth or value of an individual to the organization" (p.3). In contrast, supervision refers, typically in the literature, to a formal process of interaction between the teacher and others in the school organization for the purpose of examining teacher practices to improve instructional performance (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Glatthorn, 1984).

Despite the disagreement within the literature over what constitutes the purpose of supervision or the most effective methods of carrying out the process of supervision, it is possible to suggest and identify a number of elements of supervision and the supervisory process that are consistent across most uses of the term and which provide the basis for the way in which the term is used in this study.

Firstly, supervision is a formalized process; teachers often engage in many activities with other people that may be directed toward, or have the effect of, improving their teaching but not all of these constitute supervision. Supervision is also a social process in that it involves teachers with other people. This may be a principal observing a teacher's class or two colleagues exploring particular teaching methods but it necessarily involves social interactions. Additionally, supervision has as its purpose the improvement of a teacher's performance (although the distinction between summative and formative purposes mentioned earlier is often made in the literature, the emphasis is ordinarily placed on the latter, and for supervision of teachers at mid-career this is even more likely to be so). Finally, whether stated explicitly or not, supervision involves a power relationship in that there is a superordinate responsible for structuring the interactions during supervision and for monitoring and assessing the outcomes. This is just as true for the superordinate actively attempting to initiate a process through which teachers design their own improvement plans as it is for the superordinate prescribing specific behaviors for teachers.

Methods of Supervision

In reviewing the literature on the supervision of teachers, it becomes evident that, currently, several distinct methods of supervision are advocated more consistently than others. Four approaches to supervision which have considerable support from opposing proponents are 1) supervision according to prescribed behaviors, 2) clinical supervision, 3) differentiated supervision and 4) reflective supervision. It is the attitudes of mid-career teachers toward each of these approaches that provides the major focus of this study and each approach is summarized briefly in the discussion which follows.

Supervision according to prescribed behaviors.

Many of those addressing the matter of supervisory practices argue that a teacher's effectiveness can, in essence, be universally assessed on the basis of observable, measurable behaviors identified from prior research and that evaluation should be a process of identifying the extent to which these behaviors are practiced as well as the cooperative formulation of an improvement plan to promote or eliminate specific behaviors (Russell and Hunter, 1980; Pfeiffer and Dunlap, 1982; Blome, 1985; C. Hunter, 1987).

Clinical supervision.

While a superordinate-subordinate relationship also exists in clinical supervision, there is a means through which teachers may provide input into the supervisory process. Unlike supervision according to prescribed behaviors, clinical supervision calls for a pre-observation conference between the

teacher and supervisor during which teachers are afforded the opportunity to provide the supervisor with background information on the lesson to be observed and to identify teaching behaviors to which they wish the supervisor to react. During this conference the supervisor will also indicate the behaviors he or she has targetted for assessment. Subsequent to the supervisor's observation of the teacher in the classroom, the two confer again to discuss the supervisor's observations and to design a plan for ameliorating any agreed upon deficiencies in the teacher's performance. After a pre-determined interval has elapsed, the supervisor will once again observe the teacher to assess the teacher's progress in performance improvement (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973).

Differentiating supervision for teachers.

A recent literature purports that to motivate teachers to improve their performances, improvement strategies must be formulated in relation to the varying ages and needs of teachers. When these factors are not taken into consideration, supervision, they argue, becomes an unreliable and unproductive undertaking.

On the basis of his own research and an abundance of studies on androgogy, or the education of adults, Knowles (1980) describes the differing traits which tend to characterize young (18-30), middle-aged (30-65) and older adults (65+) and stresses that in training or teaching adults, instructors must make adjustments according to the needs of individuals which will vary with age. A clear implication of Knowles' work is that the way in which teachers are evaluated or supervised should be dependent, in part, upon their ages and career stages.

Farber (1984) refers to several studies which indicate that mid-career teachers are most vulnerable to "burnout" characterized by disillusionment, lack of sympathy for students, little enthusiasm for their work, decreased dedication, poor planning and an assortment of emotional and physical symptoms (p.326). Since 64 per cent of the teachers surveyed in a study by Farber felt that they rarely or never received support from their supervisors, the author argues that, rather than accelerating teacher burnout through summative evaluation, supervisors should strive to treat and prevent burnout, particularly in mid-career teachers, through a variety of methods (detailed in Chapter Two).

In essence, this literature argues that to provide mid-career teachers with opportunities to improve their performance, supervisors must vary their methods of supervision according to the age, experience and special needs of teachers. Glatthorn and Holler (1987) contend that traditional supervision models, based in theories of scientific management or evaluation by objectives, do not allow for the differences between inexperienced and mid-career teachers. Sergiovanni (1985) maintains that supervision of teachers is an uncertain, complex activity, that a single concept of good teaching is impossible and that effective supervision involves selection of the model which will be of the most benefit to the teacher in making sense of what they do as teachers.

Reflective supervision.

A similar literature currently submits that, rather than theories developed out of research, teachers rely more upon

personal experience and knowledge, or what Sergiovanni (1985) terms "informed intuition," and that through reflecting upon their actions and practices, they may improve their performance in the classroom (Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1985; Shulman, 1986; Smyth, 1986; Goldsberry, 1986; Russell, 1987).

A fundamental tenet of reflective supervision is that teachers vary in the extent of their personal and professional development and should, with the assistance of a supervisor, examine their current practices, analyze what is or is not effective, then map out and test alternative strategies that will lead to both personal and professional growth (Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1985).

While there are elements of each model which overlap one another, each approach does have unique characteristics that justifies considering them as distinct and discrete methods of supervision.

Necessity for Further Research

Since the teacher's perception of whether supervisory models and strategies for improvement are accurate, reliable and appropriate is, according to the literature, a critical factor in determining the extent to which the teacher will actually attempt to change his practices in response to supervision, it is important to identify those models, strategies and variables in the school environment which teachers feel hold the most promise to help to improve their performances (Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease, 1983; Kauchek, Peterson and Driscoll, 1985; Duncan, 1984; Conley, 1987). Currently, however, little attention appears to have been given to this endeavor.

A review of the literature identified one American study (Kauchek, et al., 1985) which reported on the differing attitudes of sixty Utah teachers toward evaluation practices. However, no information was retrieved concerning the perceptions of teachers in Manitoba schools. Given this void in the literature, further study of teachers' perceptions of the variables which affect improvement in their performance was clearly warranted.

Additionally, since there is evidence that teachers of different ages may be motivated by differing supervisory methods and variables in the school environment, it seemed of particular value to identify motivators for performance improvement according to age groups. More specifically, because mid-career teachers appear to be more susceptible to burnout or becoming demotivated to improve despite their (generally) well-developed skills and knowledge, because they constitute the largest age group amongst teachers, and because, as Krupp (1987) has pointed out, there exists a paucity of research on career stage and professional development desires, it was evident that investigation into what mid-career teachers perceive as methods of supervision which will lead to performance improvement was needed. This study, then, examines teacher perceptions of the legitimacy and utility of selected models of teacher supervision.

Although a worthy undertaking, the purpose of this study was not to investigate the differences in perceptions toward supervision between male and female teachers; therefore, it was necessary to focus on the views held by one gender. Levinson

(1979) also found it necessary to limit his investigation to one gender because "...the differences between women and men are sufficiently great so that they would have become a major focus of analysis" (p.9).

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to survey the attitudes of selected mid-career males, teaching full-time at the secondary level in a Winnipeg-area collegiate toward four distinct models of supervision identified from the literature: 1) supervision according to prescribed behaviors, 2) clinical supervision, 3) differentiated supervision and 4) reflective supervision.

The purpose of the study was not to evaluate existing supervisory practices, but rather to attempt to understand what mid-career teachers perceived as being the means through which supervision becomes a process more successful for improving teacher performance and why they believe that means to be most effective.

Specifically, the study was an investigation of:

- 1) teacher perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses in each of the four models as approaches to improve the performances of mid-career teachers,
- 2) factors which should be considered during any supervisory process, and
- 3) the relationship between the supervisor and teacher which would be of the greatest value in making supervision productive in improving teacher performance.

In order to collect the data necessary to respond to these questions, fourteen mid-career teachers currently teaching in a Winnipeg area collegiate were interviewed according to the interview schedule in Appendix A. An initial draft of the

interview schedule was prepared by the researcher and field tested through interviews with three mid-career male teachers instructing in contexts other than the study school. Subsequent to piloting the schedule, modifications were made on the basis of suggestions by the three teachers and according to observations by the researcher.

With the cooperation of the study school's administration, the researcher met with sixteen of the seventeen mid-career males teaching in the Collegiate for approximately one hour on November 24, 1987 to discuss the purpose of the study and to assure prospective participants that they would be guaranteed confidentiality if they agreed to take part in the study. Of those sixteen teachers, fourteen agreed to be interviewed. The interviews with the teachers were conducted between the dates of November 25, 1987 and December 3, 1987 and the Collegiate's principal was interviewed on December 14 of that same year. The data produced through these interviews is discussed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven of this thesis.

Definitions

Mid-Career Teachers: In this study, the term mid-career teachers is used to refer to teachers between the ages of 35 and 45 with fourteen to twenty-one years of teaching experience in a public school setting (Levinson, 1979; Farber, 1984).

Supervision: For the purposes of this study, supervision of teachers will be defined as a formal process through which the teacher interacts with others within the school organization for the purpose of identifying and adjusting those factors which will enable him to make improvements in his teaching. In this

study a concern with supervision is not a concern with a summative process to determine the "right or wrong" in a teacher's classroom performance, it is not meant to be a means of determining the individual's worth to the organization nor is it an evaluative process to determine which teachers should be retained or terminated.

Limitations of the Study

The following parameters restrict the generalizability of the data collected during this study:

1. The purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions held by mid-career teachers in a Winnipeg collegiate toward four approaches to supervision of teachers. In that the study was confined to this population, the data collected and the conclusions based upon that data are not intended to be construed as automatically generalizable to other populations or contexts.
2. Because the study was an investigation into the opinions and beliefs of those interviewed, the data collected and the conclusions are perception-bound and are not presented as facts of an empirical or quantitative nature.
3. Out of necessity, the scenarios described to those interviewed were only brief summaries of the basic elements of diverse methods for supervision. Therefore, the responses given by teachers were, at times, reactions to the described scenarios; at other times, teachers had undergone supervision as described in the scenarios and they reacted to their experience as well as to the scenario.

Significance of the Study

As more Manitoba teachers enter mid-career, it becomes increasingly important that there exists a formal mechanism through which they may avoid stagnation and continue to improve their teaching performances. One means through which this may be accomplished is formative supervision. However, there exists persuasive evidence that unless mid-career teachers perceive that supervision is appropriate and valuable for them in performance improvement, they are not likely to commit themselves to improvement of their teaching through that method of supervision.

The significance of this study is that it offers insights, based upon data, regarding those approaches to supervision which a selected population of mid-career teachers perceive as having legitimacy and utility for the growing number of teachers in that career stage.

Although it will not be argued that the findings generated by this study are reflective of the opinions of teachers other than those interviewed, it is expected that the conclusions formulated may lead to a better understanding of how to make supervision of mid-career teachers a more productive process in affecting performance improvement. It is also hoped that the results of this preliminary investigation may serve as an inducement and a guide for further exploration of the ways in which supervision can be made more effective for improving the performances of teachers at all career stages.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Concern about the quality of education in North American public schools has resulted in schools having to demonstrate that they are judiciously investing revenues to provide students with optimal and beneficial educational opportunities (Pfeiffer and Dunlap, 1982). As the schools intensify efforts to empirically demonstrate accountability and to improve the instructional performance of teachers, increased attention is being given by the schools and in the literature to the evaluation and supervision of teachers for the purpose of improving performance (Darling-Hammond, Wise and Pease, 1983).

Historical Overview of the Literature

Advocating teacher supervision as a primary means through which to improve the quality of instruction is not an approach unique to the 1980s. In 1876 Edison emphasized the necessity for superintendents to be highly skilled in teaching teachers to do better work. Writing in 1887, Parker defined supervision of teachers as inspection conducted to improve teachers' performances. As performance improvement through supervision is not a uniquely modern phenomenon, neither is the strong impact of public demand for greater efficiency in the schools. In response to such demands in the second decade of this century, the literature on evaluation stressed the need to establish standard specifications for teacher performance and to formulate rating scales to determine a teacher's success in meeting prescribed

standards (Bobbitt, 1913).

Although, as will subsequently be detailed, certain contemporary models of scientific management emphasize the assessment of teaching performance on the basis of discrete, measurable teacher behaviors, as early as the 1920s theorists were advocating the evaluation of teachers according to observable behaviors (Bolin, 1987). An alternative approach to teacher supervision was concurrently being developed by Burton (1922) who, years before Likert (1961), Sergiovanni (1979), Glatthorn (1984) and Campbell, Cordis, Mcbeath and Young (1987), argued that individual differences in teachers necessitated that to improve instructional performance, supervision must be a cooperative, inspiring and encouraging venture individualized to the human development levels of each teacher.

While self-supervisory strategies to improve teaching may be thought of as contemporary models advocated by authors such as Schon (1982) and Sergiovanni (1985), in 1925 Breuckner described self-evaluation by teachers as a supervisory activity that would produce objective data to be analyzed by the teacher and principal in order to correct deficiencies and improve classroom performance. Likewise, predating current thinking which questions the value of objective evaluation models constructed on the basis of research theory (Sergiovanni, 1985; Russell, 1987) were the arguments of Scott and Simpson (1930) that effective supervision required supervisors to subjectively participate with teachers in an intellectual, humane and creative effort to promote the professional growth of teachers.

As may be evident from the discussion to this point, authors

writing on evaluation and supervision in the first half of this century held views as divergent as their counterparts writing in the 1980s. That theorists had difficulty in simply defining supervision is reflected in this remark by Woody (1934): "Supervision is like electricity; we don't know what it is but we've got it..."(p.396). The following contrast is typical of the diverse perspectives on supervision: while Ransberger (1946) was describing supervision as a process directed by an educational leader possessed of virtues such as "love of children, belief in people..vision and the ability to be a friend" (pp.18-20), Wilhelms (1946) was more succinctly explaining that good supervision was a means of providing teachers with an opportunity to participate in policy-making and to learn what they need and want to learn (a position remarkably similar to approaches later advocated by Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Glatthorn, 1984 and Krupp, 1987).

Individualized Supervision

At the onset of the second half of this century, researchers investigating methods which supervisors in the business sector could employ to motivate employees discovered that intangibles such as self-esteem and autonomy significantly influenced the performance of workers and that the extent of this influence appeared to vary according to factors such as age and gender (Herzberg, 1957). Likert (1961) formed the following conclusions on the basis of his analysis of numerous research studies:

- employees bring differing values, perceptions, and levels of maturity to their work
- younger employees often desire and require closer super-

vision while experienced workers perform better when they are given more complex, varied tasks (p.16) and the freedom to choose an approach to task completion

--employees have a need for recognition, self-esteem, a sense that their work is meaningful and an opportunity to participate (to varying degrees) in organizational decision-making

--given the variances between employees, supervisors intending to improve the performance of employees must endeavor to motivate them by selecting strategies most appropriate for their needs and developmental levels

Undoubtedly influenced by the work of Herzberg and Likert, and working on the premise that "quality education and effective schools depend largely upon the presence of competent administrators, supervisors and teachers who are...motivated to work" (Sergiovanni, 1979, p.151), Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) conducted a study concerned specifically with the motivation of teachers. On the basis of their research the authors concluded that teachers were not motivated to improve their performances by extrinsic variables such as salary or fringe benefits but by the extent to which their needs for self-esteem, autonomy and self-actualization were met; further, as their predecessors had determined, Trusty and Sergiovanni discovered that the intensity of these needs varied according to age and gender.

In effect, there emerged a literature which argued that, in contrast to scientific management which prescribed the evaluation of teachers according to uniform, pre-determined standards of performance, effective supervision was based on the recognition that teachers brought different values, abilities, strengths and deficiencies to their work and that to improve their performances, supervision should be tailored to the individual. In response to the work of Lewin (1951), Likert (1961), Argyris

(1964) and others investigating improved employee performance in the private sector, educational theorists also began to consistently acknowledge that the extent to which teachers are involved in the school's decision-making process may influence their performance.

These concepts are clearly embodied in the clinical supervision models described by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973). Basically, clinical supervision occurs across three phases: 1) A pre-observation conference between the supervisor and teacher during which the teacher may target classroom behaviors they want analyzed, discuss the lesson to be taught and provide the supervisor with pertinent background information; 2) observation of the teacher's classroom performance during which the supervisor records all that he/she sees and not only what he/she thinks (although methods of recording may include videotaping, systems of coding, diagramming, graphing or tape-recording, Goldhammer, (1969) explicitly recommends handwritten accounts); 3) a post-observation conference (as soon after observation as possible) during which the supervisor objectively and forthrightly identifies behavior patterns which must be modified or eliminated and works with the teacher as a colleague to design a performance-improvement plan, and 4) a follow-up observation to assess the extent to which targetted deficiencies have been ameliorated.

Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors

As previously noted early supervisory models advocating that supervisors and teachers join in a concerted effort to improve

classroom performance (Edison, 1876) were rendered inappropriate when public demands to improve education resulted in the evaluation of teachers according to standardized specification of teaching behaviors (Bobbit, 1973). Similarly, although clinical supervision in varying forms is still commonly practiced (Glatthorn, 1984), recent public concern over the quality of public education has been, in part, responsible for the development and popularity of scientific management models which require that all teachers be assessed on the basis of specific behaviors pre-formulated without teacher input (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983). Such a model, advocates contend, not only promotes the improvement of teacher performance, but provides the schools with a means to assure the public that all teachers are working at optimal levels.

Typical of the more scientific approach to supervision is the model developed by Madeline Hunter (Russell and Hunter, 1980) who dismissed the pre-observation conference as unnecessary, maintained that supervision/evaluation be used as a summative means to decide on contract renewals, and argued that there were nine specific components to teaching which had a cause-effect impact on student learning (Garman, Glickman, Hunter and Haggerson, 1987). According to the Hunter model, supervisors evaluating teachers would assess the extent to which teachers performed the following:

1. Setting a general objective and assessing the pupils' present relationship to it
2. Selecting a specific daily lesson objective
3. Preparing the students for the lesson

4. Clarifying the lesson objective
5. Providing learning opportunities
6. Providing verbal and visual examples of what is to be learned
7. Assessing student attainment of the objective
8. Guiding the students in practicing what is learned
9. Allowing independent practice of the learned skill (Glatthorn, 1984)

In preserving a vestige of the Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) models, Hunter additionally prescribes a post-observation conference during which the teacher and supervisor meet to formulate a performance-improvement plan with the supervisor assuming a "coaching role" (Garman, et al., 1987).

In varying descriptions a number of other theorists also recommend evaluating teachers according to observable, measurable objectives. One model (Mannat, Palmer and Hidleburgh, 1976) prescribes an evaluation procedure similar to that advocated by Goldhammer (1969) but drastically dissimilar in its strong emphasis upon the formulation of criteria by which to measure teacher performance and upon establishing standards for acceptable performance. Another system of evaluation by objectives is a multi-dimensional model which includes evaluation of pupil learning outcomes through criterion-referenced measures, interpretation of teacher behaviors and assessment of teacher personality and characteristics (Marks, 1976). Spivey (1976) recommends evaluating teachers according to predetermined objectives but argues that it is the teachers themselves who should identify those objectives upon which they will be evaluated. Such a procedure, contends the author, ensures a

higher degree of teacher commitment to goal attainment.

Carol Hunter (1987) also suggests that teachers should, in consultation with supervisors, formulate personal objectives that will be evaluated but these objectives must be clearly consistent with the goals of the school and the district. Typically, the objectives would relate to these areas:

- creating a safe and orderly environment
- providing students with an opportunity to learn
- having a clear sense of district and school goals
- having high expectations for students
- obtaining feedback on student academic progress
- involving parents in the mission of the school
- planning effectively
- demonstrating personal characteristics designated as important for enhancing student growth (p.4)

The Colorado Model (Blome, 1985) identifies eight elements of direct instruction which purportedly will promote higher student achievement on standardized tests:

1. Planning and organization
2. Instructional techniques
3. Inspiring and rewarding students
4. Relationships with students
5. Relationships with school staff
6. Community relationships
7. Professional growth and responsibility
8. Promoting affective development of students

Yet another approach to evaluation by objectives directs the evaluator to use a Likert scale to rate the teacher on these

behaviors: 1) Maintenance of student interest; 2) Teacher warmth and understanding; 3) Clarity in presenting concepts; 4) Teacher enthusiasm and 5) Methodology of instruction (Pfeiffer and Dunlop, 1982).

Points of Disagreement in the Literature

Over the last century, then, there has been no dearth of information or advice on procedures for evaluating or supervising teachers; what is lacking is a consensus on what approach to supervision will enable and motivate teachers to attain academic and behavioral classroom objectives. In remarking upon this lack of agreement, Bolin (1987) makes this observation about the history of teacher supervision: "We can safely say that the field of supervision still bears battle marks from the coalitions and compromises--the most significant scar was a loss of identity as a field" (p.378).

Assessing teaching behaviors.

A source of considerable disagreement has been, and continues to be, whether effective teaching can be associated with a particular set of teacher traits or characteristics. Based upon the foregoing discussion it is evident that many of those addressing the topic are of the opinion that teacher effectiveness can be assessed on the basis of observable behaviors (Russell and Hunter, 1980; Pfeiffer and Dunlap, 1982, Blome, 1985; C. Hunter, 1987). Doyle (1983), however, cites persuasive findings which suggest that there is no clear, predictable link between teacher behaviors and student learning. Darling-Hammond, et al. (1983) refer to an extensive study (Bush,

1979) which concluded that "...linking precise and specific teacher behavior to precise and specific learning of pupils is not possible at this time" (p.293), and Sergiovanni (1987) argues that teachers make decisions on the basis of informed intuition, not according to theoretically prescribed behaviors.

There are also strong indications that effective teaching behaviors vary for students according to their socio-economic background and mental-psychological characteristics (Brophy and Evertson, 1976) and that the most effective teachers vary their behaviors according to different teaching contexts (Phelps, 1976; Shavelson and Dempsey-Atwood 1976). Translated into practice, these findings suggest that, while a teacher being observed may not be exhibiting the behaviors targeted by the evaluator, the behaviors may be the most appropriate for those students and the teacher may display the desired behaviors with another group or in a different context. In effect, the evaluation would not be a reliable measurement of the teacher's effectiveness.

Further confounding the process of teacher evaluation is the probability that student achievement is influenced by variables beyond the teacher's control including student aptitude, student background and experience, size of the school and characteristics of the school program (Joyce and Weil, 1972; Cangelosi, 1984). Thus an evaluator assessing teacher effectiveness on the basis of grades or student achievement on standardized test scores (as suggested by Herman, 1976) may be endeavoring to measure a product for which the teacher is responsible to immeasurable degrees.

There also exists considerable disagreement over other

aspects of teacher evaluation. For instance, while the Oregon Model (Duncan, 1984) states unequivocally that teachers must master certain predetermined behaviors, other models call for teachers to participate in the identification of behaviors to be assessed (C. Hunter, 1987; Cogan 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). Although Gage (1978) strongly advocates that the measurement of professional commitment as evidenced through teacher participation in extra-classroom activities be used as supplementary evaluation data, other theorists argue that evaluators should focus only on classroom teaching behaviors since the consideration of outside activities dilutes attention to the improvement of instruction (Nottingham, 1985).

Key Actors in the Process of Supervision

Evaluation by students.

Another source of disagreement in the literature on supervision is the matter of which actors should evaluate teachers. While some writing on the issue maintain that both secondary and elementary students can provide teachers with useful feedback through formal evaluation (Nottingham, 1985; Barsalou, Killinger and Thompson 1974), other researchers have concluded that teachers view student evaluations as least reliable because students do not appreciate the complexities of teaching, they cannot differentiate between "good" and "popular" teachers and their ratings of teachers correspond with the grade they expect to get (Kauchak et al., 1985; Ovard, 1975; Wise, 1973).

Supervision by principals.

Although teachers may generally prefer to be evaluated by principals rather than by superintendents, peers, pupils or self-evaluation (Eastridge, 1976), numerous studies have yielded findings which suggest that this preference may be more a matter of teachers selecting that actor whom they find to be least unreliable, least threatening or least capricious. In a study by Kauchak, et al., (1985) teachers described principal evaluations as perfunctory, designed to maintain the status quo rather than to improve instruction and as having little impact on teacher performance. The majority of the teachers surveyed also viewed principals as lacking the competence and the time to perform meaningful evaluations. In a comprehensive study by the Rand Corporation (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983), the vast majority of the teachers interviewed felt that principals lacked sufficient resolve and competence to evaluate accurately.

The results of yet another study (Bullock and Davis, 1985) generate serious doubts about the objectivity of principal evaluation and the reliability of teacher ratings by principals. On the basis of several measurements, the researchers concluded that "...in rating teacher performance, principals were significantly influenced by attraction factors and tended to rate higher those teachers with whom they share lifestyles and behavior attributes" (p.8).

Frederich (1984) maintains that department heads rather than principals should perform evaluations since principals do not possess the expertise in all disciplines to provide teachers with subject-oriented advice and Goldhammer (1969) states bluntly

that principals generally lack the training and knowledge necessary for performing teacher evaluation or supervision.

Another difficulty in teacher evaluation by principals has been identified through studies which suggest that teachers and principals often disagree over what behaviors should be evaluated and the effectiveness of evaluation by principals. A study of Alberta teachers and administrators produced strong evidence that administrators put greater emphasis on the importance of collecting data about a teacher's performance (Duncan, 1984). While the teachers in another study reported that they did not know the criteria principals used to evaluate them, that they were rarely observed and received little feedback--their principals reported the opposite as being true (Natriello and Dornbusch, 1977).

Supervision with colleagues.

Evaluation of teachers through observation and artifact analysis by peers has been described as a "low-cost" method which allows teachers the benefit of working with an evaluator who is a specialist in the teacher's subject area and one which has considerable potential for improving teacher performance (Pfieffer and Dunlap, 1982). Again, however, there is no consensus that this method of evaluation is generally preferable. In a study by Kauchek, et al. (1985), some teachers favored peer evaluation or supervision while others believed that it would cause tension between staff members and would generate unhealthy professional competition.

Evaluating teachers according to student achievement.

While there exists a literature which argues for evaluating teachers according to student achievement on test scores (eg. Glatthorn, 1984; Herman, 1976), the following disadvantages appear to outweigh the advantages of evaluation through student achievement:

- there is evidence of strong and uniform opposition by teachers to evaluation through student achievement (Kauchek, et al., 1985)

- the reliability of test scores as a method of teacher effectiveness is low (i.e., the same teacher produces different results in different settings--Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983)

- the validity of the tests themselves is questionable (Cangelosi, 1984)

- there is a concern that instructors would teach only towards the tests (Kauchek, et al., 1985)

Individualiation of the Supervisory Process

As I have endeavored to establish, a review of the related literature reveals that there is considerable disagreement over nearly every aspect of teacher evaluation and supervision; further, this discord is not limited to dissension between theorists but exists also between teachers. A recent literature, which may in part account for the disagreement amongst teachers, argues emphatically that--as Burton (1922), Herzberg (1957), Likert(1961) Trusty and Sergiovanni (1969) had concluded decades earlier--to motivate teachers (employees) to improve their performance, improvement strategies must be formulated in relation to the varying ages, developmental levels and needs of teachers. When these factors are not taken into consideration, supervision becomes a "hit and miss" proposition

that misses much more often than it hits.

After conducting case studies of forty male adults working in various occupations, Levinson (1979) concluded that there were four distinct cycles in a man's life with the mid-life period spanning the ages of 35-45. Levinson describes "life in the middle years" as "...a process of gradual or rapid stagnation, of alienation from the world and from the self. Severe decline and constriction are common enough so that they are often seen as part of middle age" (p.26). According to the author, mid-life is a period when men began to question what they actually get from and give to their work. It is also a time when they come to the "depressing realization" that previous successes in their work are not as monumental as they had once thought and that future successes are not likely to bring the happiness for which they would have wished. Levinson's conclusion is that, while "most occupations are defined and understood from the perspective of early adulthood" (p.329), too little attention has been given to the fact that "the nature of a man's work changes appreciably in middle adulthood" (p.329) and more must be done to provide mid-career males with opportunity "for greater learning and rejuvenation within the same occupation..." (p.329).

In a seminal work on adult education, Knowles (1980) details the differing developmental characteristics between young (18-30) middle-aged (30-65) and older adults and stresses that in training or teaching adults, instructors must make adjustments according to the needs of individuals which vary with age. A clear implication of Knowles' work is that the way in which teachers are evaluated or supervised should be dependent, in

part, upon their age.

Krupp (1987) persuasively contends that differences in mid-career teachers and novices make differentiated supervision essential to motivate teachers to improve their performance. According to Krupp, mid-career teachers have often accomplished the goals they had established for themselves when they entered the profession. However, because goal-attainment is rarely as fulfilling as expected, teachers become disillusioned and it is the responsibility of the supervisor to present them with opportunities for personal growth through new challenges such as advising younger teachers, incorporating outside interests into their work, involving mid-career teachers in creative committee work and allowing them to develop their own professional-development plans.

Writing on the subject of teacher "burnout" in New York public school teachers, Farber (1984) points out that several studies have established that mid-career teachers (34-44) are most vulnerable to this syndrome characterized by disillusionment, lack of sympathy for students, little enthusiasm for their work, decreased dedication, poor planning and an assortment of emotional and physical symptoms (p.326). Amongst the causes of burnout identified through research are lack of recognition, little opportunity for self-esteem and self-actualization, discipline problems, student apathy, excessive paperwork, lack of administrative support and lack of promotional opportunities (Farber, 1984). Since 64 percent of 398 public school teachers surveyed by Farber felt that they rarely

or never received support from their supervisors, the author argues that, rather than accelerating burn-out through summative evaluation, supervisors should strive to treat and prevent burn-out, particularly in mid-career teachers, by forming self-support groups for teachers, coordinating the efforts of parents, teachers and administrators, eliminating non-teaching duties and unproductive staff meetings, involving teachers in meaningful decision-making and by developing a mechanism through which instructors may attain master-teacher status.

Krupp (1987) maintains that differing familial circumstances between young and veteran teachers dictate the two age groups be supervised differently. Mid-career teachers, for instance, often must cope with the death of a parent, departure of their children, divorce or heavy financial burdens. To maintain high levels of performance from teachers subjected to a crisis, supervisors may form groups linking people with similar problems, make a point of listening to distraught teachers or make a genuine effort to assist teachers in resolving their personal problems. Providing mid-career teachers with challenging opportunities, assisting them in dealing with personal concerns and promoting self-esteem generally results in improved classroom performance and effectively protects against what Farber (1984) terms burn-out and Krupp refers to as retiring on the job (1987).

Berliner (1986) and Glatthorn (1984) also contend that supervision of teachers should vary according to age since younger teachers are more likely to need more structured, clinical supervision in order to learn "how to;" experienced teachers, however, generally have acquired the skills and

accumulated the knowledge enabling them to teach effectively and may work more independently to enhance their professional development. Studies (cited by Berliner, 1986) have yielded information suggesting that, compared to novice teachers, competent veterans are more skillful in 1) higher-level problem solving; 2) changing quickly to more effective instructional techniques and strategies; 3) calling upon a greater store of academic information; 4) planning effectively and 5) using out of class time more efficiently. Because of these differences, argue Berliner and Glatthorn, the same approach to supervision for younger and veteran teachers is unlikely to improve the performance of both groups.

Although they do not relate developmental levels directly to age or years of experience, Sprinthall and Thiess-Sprinthall (1983) cite numerous studies indicating that adults grow developmentally in these domains: 1) cognitive, 2) value-moral, 3) ego-self, 4) conceptual and 5) ethical. Campbell, et al. (1987) identify the following as domains in which adult teachers develop: 1) ego/self, 2) content knowledge, 3) levels of conceptualization, 4) interpersonal communication and 5) instructional skills. Regardless of the different categorization of these domains, Sprinthall, et al. (1983) and Campbell, et al. (1987) concur on these points: 1) development within the domains is non-sequential and not necessarily always linearly progressive; 2) teachers who are more developmentally complex are more successful; 3) developmental growth, including cognitive development, is possible in adults of all ages; 4) developmental

growth is dependent upon the environment in which teachers work; 5) supervision of teachers includes identification of the developmental levels of teachers and 6) if they are going to assist the teacher in becoming more successful by developing in the various domains, supervisors must vary strategies according to the differing developmental levels of teachers. For instance, less mature teachers, usually younger, need more structure in supervision such as might be provided by clinical supervision (Sprinthall and Thiess-Sprinthall, 1983) and more developmentally complex teachers may benefit more from self-directed supervision (Glatthorn, 1984).

Individualizing Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers

In effect, this literature argues that to provide mid-career teachers with opportunities to improve their performance and avoid stagnation, supervisors must vary their methods of supervision according to the age, experience and developmental levels of teachers. Glatthorn and Holler (1987) contend that traditional supervision models, such as scientific management or evaluation by objectives, do not allow for the differences between inexperienced and veteran teachers. Sergiovanni (1985) maintains that supervision of teachers is an uncertain, complex activity, that a single concept of good teaching such as proposed by Madeline Hunter is impossible, and that effective supervision involves selection of the model which will be of the most benefit to the teacher in making sense of what they do as teachers.

In Differential Supervision, Glatthorn (1984) describes an approach to supervision which does recognize that teachers, like students, are individuals with unique needs and that different

supervisory models will be of greater value to some than to others. He describes this system of differentiating supervision in these words:

In the differentiated system, teachers can choose, within limits, whether they wish to receive clinical supervision, work with a colleague in a program of cooperative development, direct their own professional growth or have their teaching monitored by an administrator. They are given options in the expectation that their individual choices will be more responsive to their special needs (p.1).

Amongst the limits to which Glatthorn refers would be restricting inexperienced teachers, teachers new to the system and teachers with serious deficiencies to clinical supervision. Glatthorn would allow competent veterans to opt for clinical supervision but only periodically since, as others have argued, he perceives mid-career teachers to be at different developmental levels with different needs and believes these teachers would benefit most from more self-directed programs of supervision. Not only does differentiated supervision increase the likelihood that teachers will be supervised according to the model most certain to be of value in performance improvement, it "frees up" time for supervisors to work with the teachers in greatest need of assistance (Glatthorn, 1984).

For reasons similar to those offered by Glatthorn, Conley (1987) advocates a differentiated system of supervision in which veteran teachers performing capably are placed in a "growth improvement track" while inexperienced or less successful teachers are placed in a remediation track which is more intensively and closely monitored by supervisors. Freer and Dawson (1985) also recommend that teachers be placed either in a

"supervisory mode" to promote continuous development or an "evaluation mode" when supervisors determine that teachers are not meeting classroom objectives.

Teachers as their own resources.

A similar literature currently submits that, rather than theories developed out of research, teachers rely more upon personal experience and knowledge, or what Sergiovanni (1985) terms "informed intuition," and that through reflecting upon their actions and practices, they may improve their performance in the classroom (Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1985, 1987; Shulman, 1986; Smyth, 1986; Goldsberry, 1986; Little, 1986; Russell, 1987).

A fundamental tenet of reflective supervision is that teachers vary in the extent of their personal and professional development and should, with the assistance of a supervisor, examine their current practices, analyze what is or is not effective, then map out and test alternative strategies that will lead to both personal and professional growth (Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1985). Schon (1982) contends that effective professionals recognize and explore perplexing situations in their practice and that those who do not become "repetitive and routine in their work" (p.61). Yonemura (1982) observes that teachers have long been led to believe that only the "experts" have valid theories about effective teaching practices and that supervisors should encourage teachers to construct solutions on the basis of their own experience, knowledge and intuition.

Smyth (1986) effectively summarizes the practices and purpose of reflective supervision in the statement which follows:

[Reflective supervision] refers to collaboration [between teachers and their supervisors] in marshalling intellectual capacity so as to focus upon analyzing, reflecting on and engaging in discourse about the nature and effects of practical aspects of teaching and how they might be altered. In practical terms this means teachers engaging themselves in systematic individual and social forms of investigation that examine the origins and consequences of everyday teaching behavior so they come to see those factors that represent impediments to change. The intent is through collective action to overcome the fatalistic view that change in teaching is "impossible for me," and to see that circumstances can be different from what they are....In short, it involves teachers becoming orientated to the development of an enhanced 'consciousness' of their own circumstance and political involvement in working toward actively changing the frustrating and debilitating conditions that characterize their work lives (pp.338-339).

Put another way, rather than depending upon others, teachers become their own resources for discovering means through which to improve their performances.

The Need for Further Investigation into Effective Supervision

While the majority of those writing on differentiated and reflective supervision perceive these models as holding great promise for being systems which will motivate teachers to improve their performance, as Krupp (1987) notes, "Very little research exists connecting adult developmental change to staff development and motivation...[therefore]...an indepth study of the characteristics of adults at each life stage and their professional development desires would help educators ascertain the relationship between personal and staff development needs across the lifespan" (p.33).

Points of Agreement in the Literature

Supervision can promote performance improvement.

Although it is evident that there is significant

disagreement amongst theorists and between educators on many aspects of teacher evaluation and supervision, there do appear to be some areas of agreement. Firstly, there is little disputing the fact that teachers can expect to be formally evaluated or supervised in some fashion for the purposes of improving their instruction, to demonstrate to the public that teachers are performing competently, to oust incompetent teachers from the ranks, or--if for no other reason--they will be evaluated because evaluation is a prescribed duty of supervisors (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Glatthorn, 1984; Duncan, 1984). There is also considerable agreement that evaluation models which include teacher-specific approaches and improvement strategies tailored by the teacher and the supervisor to the needs of the individual can be of assistance in motivating and enabling teachers to reach academic and behavioral classroom objectives (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Manatt et al., 1976; Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Glatthorn, 1984; Hunter, 1987; Krupp, 1987). Yet another significant point of consensus is that when teachers perceive supervision as valid, reliable and appropriate for themselves, they are increasingly motivated to accept the supervision and actively participate in improving their classroom performance (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Glatthorn, 1984; Duncan, 1984; Kauchak, et al., 1985).

Concerns In Need of Further Examination

Since the teacher's perception of whether evaluation models and strategies for improvement are appropriate is, evidently, a critical factor in determining the extent to which the teacher will be motivated to improve performance in response to

supervision, it appears necessary to identify those models, strategies and variables in the environment which will motivate teachers to improve performance.

While a review of the literature identified one study (Kauchak, et al., 1985) which surveyed American teachers on their preferences in evaluation methods and one Alberta study (Duncan, 1985) in which administrators and--to a limited degree--teachers were questioned about evaluation, no information was retrieved concerning the perceptions of teachers in Manitoba schools. Given this void in the literature, further investigation on the matter of what Manitoba teachers perceive to be the variables which motivate them to respond to supervision by striving to improve their performance is clearly warranted.

Additionally, since there is considerable evidence that teachers of different ages and at different developmental levels may be motivated by differing supervisory methods and variables in their environment, it may be of particular value to identify motivators for performance improvement according to a specific age group through interviewing one group of teachers in one context about their perceptions toward the effectiveness of certain, discrete methods of supervision.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

To collect the data which would provide the basis for answering the questions proposed for this study, the researcher interviewed fourteen of seventeen mid-career (35-45 years old) teachers in a Winnipeg-area high school.

While it may have been possible to gather a greater number of teacher responses through the dissemination of questionnaires, the researcher concluded on the basis of recommendations in the literature (Good, 1966) that, by interviewing teachers, it would be possible to explore issues in more depth, pursue important matters beyond those cited in a questionnaire and also to clarify those items which were unclear or confusing for respondents. Further, it was anticipated that a two-way communication process--unbounded by the constraints of a questionnaire, would allow interviewees to identify concerns and issues not recognized by the researcher.

The Interview Schedule

The interview schedule used to gather the data this study was designed by the researcher according to methods prescribed in the literature on qualitative research (Good, 1966; Best, 1970).

A concern which arose during the development of the schedule was that the teachers may not be familiar with the various models of supervision advocated in the literature and would, therefore, be unable to make informed comments on the strengths and weaknesses of different models. To familiarize interviewees with a variety of supervisory methods, four scenarios were developed by

selecting the fundamental components of differing models of supervision and integrating those components into discrete models (See Interview Schedule, Appendix A).

In developing the interview schedule to be used by the researcher, a number of "prompt questions" were included for the purpose of encouraging the teachers interviewed to elaborate and expand upon their responses and to ensure that the researcher consistently asked the same questions of those interviewed (See Good, 1966).

Piloting the Interview Schedule

Once an initial draft of the interview schedule was developed, it was field tested in order to determine whether it would be an effective instrument for generating the data necessary to answer the researchable questions and to provide the researcher with experience in using the schedule to interview teachers (Good, 1966; Best, 1970). In field testing the interview schedule, the researcher interviewed three male teachers who were between the ages of 35-45 and who had a minimum of fifteen years of teaching experience.

Based upon suggestions made by those interviewed during field testing and upon the researcher's observation about the effectiveness of the interview schedule, extraneous questions were deleted, the introductory questions were simplified and made more specific and questions were reorganized into a sequence which flowed more smoothly and systematically.

Selection of the Study Population

Once it was established that the research data would be gathered through interviews, the study population was reduced to

fifteen mid-career male teachers instructing at the secondary level. To ensure homogeneity in the study population and to limit context-bias, it was determined that the study population would be confined to one school within one division.

To identify mid-career males in the study context who met the established criteria, the researcher acquired a list--from the division in which the school was located--with the names of all teachers in the Collegiate, their years of experience and gender and their dates of birth. When it was discovered that only twelve teachers met the criteria, the parameters of the study population were modified slightly to increase the number of prospective interviewees. When the number of years of experience was expanded from fifteen to twenty years, to fourteen to twenty-one, the number of prospective interviewees increased from twelve to seventeen.

On November 18, 1987, after receiving approval to proceed with the study from the Faculty of Education Ethics Review Committee and all members of the committee for this thesis, the researcher met with the principal of the Collegiate to inform him of the purposes of the study. The principal was provided with a copy of the thesis proposal, the abbreviated interview schedule to be given to interviewees (Appendix B), a letter describing the study to interviewees and assuring them of confidentiality (Appendix C), and the list of seventeen prospective interviewees.

Subsequent to a discussion of the study, the principal volunteered to disseminate the interview schedule to prospective interviewees along with the accompanying letter so that the

teachers could make a better informed decision regarding their participation in the study and have time to reflect on the questions they would be expected to respond to during interviews. The principal also suggested that the researcher and the interview candidates should meet to discuss any questions or concerns the teachers may have about the study or the interview process.

Upon arrival at the Collegiate on November 24 1987, the researcher was informed that the interview schedule and the cover letter had been given to all teachers named on the list of seventeen. Of these, one teacher explained to the principal that due to time constraints he would not be able to participate. No attempt was made to involve this teacher in the study and the potential study population was reduced to sixteen candidates.

These teachers, then, met with the researcher and principal for approximately one hour on November 24. During that time the researcher reviewed his academic and occupational background, explained his interest and purpose in doing the study and responded to questions posed by the teachers.

In total, fourteen of the sixteen teachers attending the meeting agreed to participate in the study and arranged times for interviews.

The Interview Process

The interviewing of teachers began on November 25 and was completed by December 3, 1987. All interviews were conducted during the school day in the Collegiate with the exception of one interview held in a teacher's home near the Collegiate. Typically the interview consumed the greater part of a teacher's

eighty minute preparation period.

Before each interview began, the researcher informed the teacher that the tape recorder could be turned off at any time upon teacher's request. At no time did a teacher make such a request, however two teachers stated that they preferred that the interview not be taped. In these two instances, the researcher made a handwritten record of the conversations and later reviewed each for accuracy. Generally, the tape recordings of each session were transcribed on the day of the interview to provide the researcher with an opportunity to review the conversation and to contact interviewees if clarification or additional information was required.

In questioning each teacher, the researcher followed the interview schedule in Appendix A. Before discussing each of the four scenarios, the researcher described each for the teacher and endeavored to clarify any components of the models which may have been confusing or unclear to the teachers.

On December, 14, 1987, the researcher met with the school principal to determine the characteristics of the supervisory model currently used in the Collegiate and the process through which this model was developed. The purpose of this meeting was to determine the way in which the teachers were currently supervised since it was anticipated by the researcher--and later substantiated to varying degrees--that the way in which those interviewed reacted to the four scenarios may be influenced by the present approach to supervision in the school.

The data collected during the interview process is discussed

and analyzed in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

During the entire interview process the researcher made field notes to maintain a record of dates, the sequence of events and unanticipated developments such as the modified criteria for the study population and the process through which those interviewed were selected. These notes were made to ensure that facts and dates were not subsequently confused and to later remind the researcher of modifications to the proposed thesis and the basis for those changes.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONTEXT FOR THE STUDY

The Setting

All fourteen of the teachers interviewed were male, mid-career teachers instructing in a single Winnipeg-area collegiate.

The Collegiate is one of three public secondary schools in the school division. It currently serves 1,038 students in grades ten to twelve and has an instructional staff of 64 teachers. The administration is comprised of one principal and two vice-principals. Of the 64 teachers, 44 are male. The average age of male teachers in the school is 42.6 years and the average number of years that each has taught is 17.5.

In addition to the basic programs prescribed by the Department of Education, the Collegiate has an English as a Second Language Program and a work experience program referred to as Occupational Entrance.

Teachers in subject areas, such as English, business education, and the social and physical sciences, are organized into clearly defined departments with one teacher in the department designated as the department head.

The school day is divided into four periods of eighty minutes each. Subject area teachers typically instruct for three of these periods and have one period reserved for preparation.

Supervision of Teachers

The present teacher supervision policy for the school was formulated by a committee of nine teachers within the school and the principal who meet annually to review and, possibly, revise

existing supervision policies.

As explained to the researcher and as indicated in the formal description of the Collegiate's model of supervision (Appendix D), the process of supervision currently being employed is an adaptation of clinical supervision (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973).

Before detailing the way in which supervision proceeds in the Collegiate, it should be noted that while teachers new to the school undergo supervision "about three times in the first fiscal year they are employed" (Collegiate principal), experienced teachers are formally supervised once every three years. Further, supervision of mid-career teachers is not intended to be a summative process to determine which teachers should be retained and which should be terminated; rather, it is, ideally, a process in which the principal and teacher work in a concerted effort to formulate performance improvement plans.

The supervisory process begins at the onset of the school year when the division office sends the principal a list of the personnel scheduled for supervision during that year. For reasons which will become more evident, formal supervision of teachers has been organized so that, in general, the majority of teachers identified for supervision are members of the same department; in effect, then, to some extent departments engage in supervision on a rotating basis.

Prior to meeting with the individual teachers, the principal--who is responsible for teacher supervision--meets with the department as a group to discuss the purpose of the process, to review the steps in the process and to schedule time frames

for supervision. Subsequent to this exchange and prior to classroom observation, the principal meets individually with teachers to discuss behaviors which the teacher targets for assessment and behaviors which the principal intends to evaluate. During this conference the teacher may also provide the principal with background information on the lesson to be taught during observation and specific dates will be fixed for observation.

In keeping with the official policy, the principal then observes each teacher for a minimum of two class periods or 160 minutes. During this time, the principal observes the teacher's performance and assesses the extent to which the teacher is effectively demonstrating the behaviors targetted during the pre-observation conference. The principal may also examine artifacts including teaching materials, tests and student work or notebooks. Further, teachers are requested by the supervisor to list extra-curricular duties they have performed as well as supervisions (such as hall duty) and memberships in professional organizations.

When the researcher discussed with the principal those behaviors which he focuses on during observation, he explained that--out of recognition that he is not knowledgeable enough to advise all teachers in all subject areas on the handling of subject matter--he generally scrutinizes teaching strategies and behaviors most closely. To evaluate the teacher's knowledge and presentation of subject matter, the principal confers with the teacher's department head who has had an opportunity to assess each teacher on lesson content and presentation.

Subsequent to making the classroom observation and conferring with the teacher's department head, the principal and teacher meet in a post-observation conference. During this session, the principal will report his observations to the teacher along with any concerns arising out of the discussion with the department head. The principal described for the researcher the process through which any necessary improvement strategies are then developed:

Suggestions for growth are done together rather than me coming down on the teachers because I'm their superior [in the organizational structure]. I think teachers appreciate it [working together] more when I say " You have a problem [we need to correct]. Basically, the report [put on record] we've done in conjunction with each other.

After this process has been completed for those within a department who were scheduled for supervision, the principal meets again with the entire department to share his impressions of the teachers' performance and discusses how the department might be strengthened. This meeting is also used as an opportunity for discussion of factors identified by the teachers such as proposals for new courses, access to copying machines, or the need for materials and resources. Additionally the teachers and principal formulate program goals the department will endeavor to attain during the two years before the next supervisory session.

A final component of the school's supervision model calls for the teachers to meet with the department head to assess their perceptions of the accuracy, reliability and worth of the principal's supervisory efforts. The department head prepares a report for the principal on the basis of observations and

recommendations made at this meeting. The principal then meets with the department head to review the report and later forwards any recommendations to the committee responsible for the development of the school's supervisory policy.

In areas where there are no department heads--for instance, art-- the principal relies more upon the individual for a critique of the supervisory process. Regardless of whether they are in the department currently under supervision, teachers new to the school will be supervised about three times during their first year according to the methods described; however, there is generally less feedback from new teachers to the principal on how the process should be modified.

Although the researcher was informed that building principals are expected to prepare and submit a formal supervision policy to the division office on a yearly basis, the policy provided to the researcher and identified by the division office as the one most recently filed is dated December 19, 1984. Despite this apparent inconsistency, the process of supervision as described in the 1984 policy did not differ from the current process as described by the school principal to the researcher.

In summary, the context for the study was a relatively large Winnipeg-area collegiate in which the teachers are departmentalized according to subjects they teach. Mid-career teachers undergo supervision with the school principal every three years in a process formulated by the principal and a committee of teachers within the school. The current method of supervision, which prescribes a pre-observation conference

between the principal and the teacher, observation of the teacher in the classroom by the principal and a conference subsequent to the observation clearly resembles clinical supervision as described by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973). In the following chapter, the perceptions of those interviewed toward this supervisory approach and three other methods is reported and analyzed.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARD DIFFERENT APPROACHES TO TEACHER SUPERVISION

Introduction

As anticipated, through an analysis of the observations made by the teachers interviewed, it is possible to identify themes, patterns and points of agreement in their perceptions toward the methods of supervision described in the four scenarios presented to them. More specifically as one literature may have predicted (Glatthorn, 1984; Berlinger, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1985; Krupp, 1987), teachers tended to find strengths in those methods which allowed them to work on a sustained basis with informed colleagues who could suggest new strategies, methods or materials and were inclined to find weaknesses in supervisory models which required that they conform to prescribed teaching practices or work with a supervisor who may have little time for supervision and little knowledge of the teacher's subject area.

The following is a discussion of the views held by members of the study population toward each approach to supervision and an analysis of the explanations the teachers gave for holding those views. Although emphasis will be given to points of consensus, areas in which there was disagreement will also be examined and dissenting comments by a minority of teachers or an individual will be discussed when they are seen as being of particular import or interest.

The tables included in this chapter report two sets of data. Tables 1, 3, 5 and 7 provide a sketch of the characteristics

of each approach to supervision as described by the researcher to the teachers interviewed. A cursory inspection of these tables will reveal that, while some overlapping of traits does exist between the models, each has its distinct characteristics.

Tables 2, 4, 6, and 8 summarize the teachers' reactions to each supervisory model. Under each column heading is listed a response made by at least one teacher. The corresponding numbers indicate the number of teachers who made, in essence, the same observation. Since one teacher may have made several comments listed under one heading, the total number of responses in that column may exceed fourteen.

To ensure the anonymity of those interviewed, two initials were selected simply by proceeding through the alphabet in this sequence of selection: A.B., B.C., C.D.,... When a combination coincided with the actual initials of a teacher in the Collegiate, that combination was disqualified. Through a random process, the names of teachers in the study population were drawn and assigned a set of initials by which they are referred to throughout the forthcoming discussion.

Teacher Perception Toward Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors

The first scenario that teachers were asked to respond to was based upon a literature (Russell and Hunter, 1980; Blome, 1985; C. Hunter, 1987) which argues that practice of pre-determined teacher behaviors improves performance and has a causal effect in promoting student outcomes. Before discussing this scenario with the teachers interviewed, this supervisory

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors
(Scenario One)

Possible Characteristics of Supervision	Characteristics of Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors
Pre-conferencing	Not advocated
Observation	By supervisor in classroom
Post-conferencing	Between teacher and supervisor to discuss teacher's practice of pre-determined behaviors
Follow-up	Supervisor observes to assess performance improvement of teacher
Input from teacher	Not provided for
Assessment of pre-determined behaviors	Teachers are assessed on the basis of behaviors they are expected to practice
Supervisor's role	Observe, assess and coach teacher
Approach adjusted according to teacher career stage	Not advocated
Supervision with colleagues	Not advocated
Teacher-planned professional development	Not advocated
Basis for termination or retention	Possible

model was described to them as a process in which the school or school board adopts a policy of supervision, based upon other models or upon recommendations in the literature, which mandates that the appointed supervisor observe teachers to assess the extent to which they practice the prescribed behaviors. Subsequent to observation, the supervisor would review with the teachers the results of his/her observation and provide the teachers with the coaching which would enable them to appropriately practice the designated behaviors. Since an assumption in the model is that the pre-determined behaviors have been accurately identified through research-based inquiry, this approach makes no allowance for negotiation of the behaviors targetted.

As reported in Table 2, none of the fourteen teachers interviewed regarded this approach to the supervision of mid-career teachers of the four models under analysis as the most effective method of supervision for mid-career teachers. Seven specified that it would be the least effective and four others cited it as one of two equally ineffective models.

Perceived Strengths

If each supervisory model was to be rated according to the teachers' perceptions of its effectiveness in improving the performance of mid-career teachers, supervision according to prescribed behaviors would certainly be rated as the least effective approach by the majority of the teachers interviewed.

Although this model was clearly not favored for supervision of mid-career teachers by the majority of the teachers, some

TABLE 2

Teachers' Perceptions Toward Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors for Mid Career Teachers (Scenario Two)

Strengths	Response Frequency	Weaknesses	Response Frequency	Identified as most Effective	Identified as least Effective
May force "burned-out" teachers to re-examine their techniques	2	May impose ineffective methods on teachers with different but successful techniques	14	0	7 3 (model one and two)
Supervisor may assess effectiveness of teaching techniques	2	Not effective in identifying strengths or weaknesses in teachers	13		1 (model one and four)
Could serve as a guide for teacher improvement	2	Teachers may inform each other of what supervisor expects: teacher behaves according to expectation then reverts	13		
		Mid-career teachers would not benefit	13		
		One set of behaviors could not be used across all disciplines	9		
		Effective teaching is too complex to be assessed by one set of behaviors	8		
		Too restrictive. inflexible	8		
		Puts teachers in molds: they can't really teach	5		
		Doesn't permit supervisor an accurate perception of teacher's performance	3		
		Too artificial	3		
		Veteran teaches would quit	3		
		Protects incompetent teachers	1		

teachers did suggest that it could be of some value as a general guide to gauge whether teachers were practicing effective techniques in areas such as the use of the blackboard and classroom management. K.L. was of the opinion that "...model one could have incidental benefits such as improving a teacher's questioning techniques," and F.G. pointed out that it could be a method for detecting inappropriate "mannerisms" in speech or behavior. H.I. argued that some mid-career teachers are in teaching "for the pay and the holidays," and A.B. concurred in saying that a number of teachers in the school were "...in a rut." Both suggest that, by mid-career, the quality of some teacher's performance has so declined that imposing practices--such as those prescribed by Russell and Hunter (1980)--could only serve to upgrade their performances.

Perceived Weaknesses

Approach may force teachers to adopt less effective methods.

Consistent with the work of writers such as Phelps, 1976; Shavelson and Dempsey-Atwood; 1976 and Good, 1983, a central concern of virtually all the teachers was that, because they believed that effective teachers vary their behaviors from class to class and from student to student, a list of prescribed behaviors may force teachers to adopt behaviors less effective and less appropriate for meeting the particular needs of their students. M.N. expressed this collective concern when he remarked that this approach to supervision "...would definitely limit the teacher's effectiveness in working with different groups." B.C. suggested that, at mid-career, most teachers have settled on

teaching methodologies most effective for their personalities and the needs of their students and would resent having strategies with which they were unfamiliar and which they regarded as less effective imposed upon them. In F.G.'s opinion,

You would have to set up several checklists keeping in mind where you are and who you are with...one [list] could be totally wrong for one class but the teacher could be doing his job.

L.M. argued the following:

You'd have to come in [to the classroom many many times]. You can't say that because you didn't see the teacher do something in one lesson that he doesn't usually do it.

While most teachers interviewed observed that teachers vary behaviors--such as classroom management, vocabulary and level of instruction--from class to class, B.C. added that a different teachers use dissimilar but equally effective methods: "Some use demonstrations, some do group work and others do one to one." It was his concern that a list of prescribed behaviors would reduce the variety in methods which teachers employ.

Consistent with findings by Phelps (1976) and Shavelson and Dempsey-Atwood (1976), those interviewed also found supervision according to prescribed behaviors to be problematic in that the use of one set of behaviors for teachers across all disciplines would render the assessment invalid. As C.A. pointed out:

There's different things you want from kids in different areas...in phys. ed. you want them to be outgoing and enjoying themselves [but] in the classroom there has to be more structure. As a result, you [teachers] have to vary behaviors according to the subject and one [supervisory] checklist could not be used to assess all teachers' effectiveness.

Expressing a similar sentiment, L.M. remarked, "I can't imagine

that you'd [teacher] conduct a junior high music class the same as you would a 300...[his subject]...class."

When asked whether the first approach would be an effective means of identifying a mid-career teacher's strengths and weaknesses, nearly all teachers agreed that it would not be because of the deficiencies reported in the foregoing discussion and, for eight of the teachers, also because effective teaching is an activity too complex to be gauged according to a set of pre-determined behaviors (See Joyce and Weil; 1972; Congelosi, 1984). F.G. argued that "You can't possibly cover everything on there [a set of pre-determined behaviors] that a good teacher does. Even before class starts you have important interactions with students." P.Q. echoed the same concern when he remarked that "There's much more to teaching than [scenario] number one could ever identify." In discussing the complexity of teaching, G.H. suggested that even teacher-student interactions in a shopping mart may impact on the teacher's effectiveness in the classroom and questioned how a supervisor using this model could measure the effect of such external considerations.

Method one promotes artificiality in teaching.

Although expressing the view in somewhat differing ways ("It's too artificial;" "It forces the teacher to play a role;" "It puts us all in one mold") most of those interviewed expressed concerns that supervision according to prescribed behaviors would pressure them to eliminate from their teaching repertoires behaviors essential to their effectiveness as teachers and into substituting ersatz behaviors--a process which they saw as being

stifling and ineffective. When asked whether he would see value in supervision as described in scenario one, L.M. voiced a common response: "No. It's artificial and limiting. It sounds like they [supervisors] want robots. But teachers are people with differing personalities." D.E. spoke about the artificiality which implementation of this model would necessarily produce and added that "...teachers wouldn't take chances with new methods or materials which might be controversial [in departing from the supervisory model]." C.A. contended that "[scenario] number one would definitely cut down on the creativity of teachers."

Five teachers volunteered the observation that if they were forced to teach according to prescribed behaviors, the activity of teaching would be so redefined that--in G.H.'s words, "...it's not teaching anymore...it just puts all in little molds." As did several of his colleagues, G.H. elaborated on this observation when he explained that adherence to prescribed behaviors would preclude teachers from making spontaneous departures from lessons even when they felt it was essential or from undertaking discussions when students raised issues only tangentially related to the day's topic but of vital concern to the students.

In expressing misgivings over the way in which supervision according to prescribed behaviors would re-define and effect teaching, two teachers indicated that they would resign rather than conform to such a model and H.I. estimated that "If number one was implemented you'd lose half the teachers--they'd leave." Although it remains to be seen whether adoption of model one would precipitate a mass exodus of mid-career teachers or result in any teachers quitting, the comments expressed by these

two teachers appear to indicate the degree of their dissatisfaction with model one because of its adverse effects on their teaching.

Coping without conforming.

Rather than thinking that teachers would resign in response to the implementation of model one, thirteen of the fourteen teachers (including the three who said that they would quit) believed that most mid-career teachers would "cope" with this method of supervision by displaying the behaviors desired by the supervisor during observation then returning to their preferred practices after observation. K.L.'s speculation about the mid-career teacher's reaction to model one is typical of the conjectures of his colleagues:

After two or three evaluations teachers would ask "How did it go?" The teachers who'd already been through it would say, "He [the supervisor] nailed me on this," and I'd say, "Okay, well, I won't make that mistake." You can play the game--do all the things that day which you know the supervisor likes [then] he's happy, we're all happy and we don't see him for another three years. The minute he leaves we go back to our old behaviors.

L.M. envisioned that most mid-career teachers would resign themselves to the model with the following attitude:

I guess we'll just have to fake it...when the supervisor comes into my classroom, I'll plunk those things into my lesson and when he's gone I'll go back to what I feel is right. You'd certainly discuss it with other teachers and if you were the twentieth teacher [to be observed] you'd probably have it down pat.

Indeed, it was this opportunity to discuss the process with previously assessed teachers then prepare exceptional lessons which led H.I. to comment that supervision according to prescribed behaviors would serve, more so than any other, to

protect teachers whose performances were ordinarily deficient. It was his thinking that, knowing beforehand what the supervisor expected, incompetent teachers would appear effective by adopting prescribed behaviors for observation then return to their previous methods.

Comments based upon experience.

Although supervision according to prescribed behaviors is not a part of the Collegiate's formal supervisory process, two teachers reported being assessed according to this model in other settings. A.B. made this comment:

I had three principals use [scenario] number one. Others told me what to do to look good and that's what I did. It was a laugh...I got my best evaluations from those guys and I taught totally opposite of the way I normally teach.

P.Q. fared less favorably when he modified his behaviors according to his supervisor's expectations: "During the principal's observation I had my two worst lessons ever because I was prepared in a way that was totally different and the behavior of the kids was totally different." In effect, A.B. confirmed the teachers' suspicions that teachers may "perform" as the supervisor expected during observations and P.Q. gave credibility to the argument that when teachers adopt methods less appropriate or effective for themselves, their performances may deteriorate.

Conclusions

In discussing the tendency for teachers to "really put on the dog" (J.K.) during observation, it was evident through their comments that the interviewees believed model one to be defective in that supervisors would not get an accurate impresssion of how each mid-career teacher actually and typically performed the

activity of teaching. Those interviewed held that, because of this defect, the supervisor's observation would be unreliable and any conclusions about the teacher's performance would be invalid. Implicit in their observations about teachers "performing for one day," (G.H.) is the unspoken axiom that when mid-career teachers perceive supervision as unreliable or inappropriate, they feel justified, if not bound, to protect their preferred behaviors by "playing the role" (K.L.). Given this tendency, supervision according to prescribed behaviors may potentially place the teacher and supervisor in adversarial roles rather than in a relationship through which accurate assessment and improvement of the teacher's performance may take place.

While a minority of those interviewed saw some nominal value in model one as a general guide for assisting novice and veteran teachers with deficiencies in need of amelioration, the majority of interviewees (including those who saw method one as having some merit) went beyond simply questioning the utility of this model for improving the performances of mid-career teachers and described it as being inappropriate or defective to the point of being useless or dysfunctional. K.L. expressed an opinion shared by twelve of his colleagues when he commented that "This method [model one] would not change one thing of importance to mid-career teachers."

Teacher Perception Toward Clinical Supervision

As commonly described in the literature (Goldhammer, 1969, Cogan, 1973) and depicted for the teachers, scenario two--or "clinical supervision"--is a process which begins with the

TABLE 3

Characteristics of Clinical Supervision (Scenario Two)

Possible Characteristics of Supervision	Characteristics of Clinical Supervision
Pre-conferencing	Between teacher and supervisor
Observation	By supervisor in classroom
Post-conferencing	Between supervisor and teacher to formulate improvement plans
Follow-up	Observation by supervisor to assess performance improvement
Input from teacher	Teacher may participate in targeting observed behaviors and in developing performance improvement plan
Assessment of pre-determined behaviors	Supervisor will target certain behaviors for observation
Supervisor's role	Observe, assess, assist in a colleague relationship
Adjusted according to career stage	Novice teachers may go through supervisory process more often
Supervision with colleagues	Possible
Teacher-planned professional development	Not advocated
Basis for termination or retention	Not advocated

teacher and supervisor meeting in a pre-observation conference. The conference affords the teacher an opportunity to discuss the lesson to be taught during the supervisor's observation and to provide the supervisor with background information which may enhance the supervisor's understanding of the teacher's methods and rationale. The teacher is also given the option to target any behaviors which he wishes the supervisor to observe and assess as either strengths or weaknesses in need of amelioration.

While in the classroom for an entire lesson, the supervisor makes a record of all that he/she sees whether teacher or student behavior. During a post-observation session, the teacher and supervisor work together to devise strategies which may be of worth to the teacher in correcting significant deficiencies in his performance. Subsequent to the post-observation conference, the supervisor again observes the teacher to assess the extent to which performance improvement is evident.

Formal Process of Supervision in the Study Context

Before discussing the teachers' perceptions toward scenario two it should be noted that thirteen of the fourteen teachers interviewed indicated that this model of supervision is the one currently employed for the purpose of formal supervision in the Collegiate. A review of the school's present policy on supervision (see Appendix D) and remarks by the building supervisor confirmed that clinical supervision is the basis for teacher supervision in the school. However, in a departure from the literature--which typically advocates a yearly assessment of teachers--the school's policy calls for "evaluation" of tenured

TABLE 4

Teachers' Perceptions Toward Clinical Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers (Scenario Two)

Strengths	Response Frequency	Weaknesses	Response Frequency	Identified as most Effective	Identified as least Effective
Would be more effective for novice teachers needing structure	6	The supervisor lacks time to effectively use this approach for all teachers	14	3	1 2 (model one and two)
Allows teachers input	3	The supervisor would not get an accurate impression of the teacher's typical performance	13		
Supervisor can access whether teacher does exhibit correct teaching techniques (eg. questioning)	3	The supervisor cannot advise teachers on subject matter across disciplines	11		
Forces teachers to think about what they are doing during supervision	2	Teachers would teach to Supervisor's expectations then revert	9		
		Supervisors bring biases to the process	7		
		Most supervisors lack the know- ledge to offer teachers better methods/strategies	7		
		Most supervisors have been out of the classroom too long to judge appropriate teaching behavior	6		
		This approach protects the incompetent teacher	6		
		As practised in the study context, this approach allows the supervisor to observe the teacher only once in three years	5		
		Supervisors feel obliged to find deficiencies in teachers	4		

teachers only once in three years although novice teachers are to be evaluated three times during the first "fiscal year" of their service.

As a cursory inspection of Table 4 might indicate, the teachers interviewed perceived this model of supervision as fraught with weaknesses; however, the majority of teachers were not as strongly opposed to it as to supervision according to prescribed behaviors which eleven of fourteen identified as the least or one of the least effective methods of supervision for mid-career teachers. Indeed, while only three teachers judged scenario two as the least or one of two equally ineffective models, three teachers also identified it as the most effective method of supervision for mid-career teachers. It must also be noted, however, that, of these three, C.A. added a qualifying remark when he observed that model two would be most effective only if "...it happens so that the principal comes in more often than once in three years."

In effect, the teacher responses seemed to indicate that, while most of those interviewed did not have very strong feelings about the value of scenario two (as compared, for instance, with their reactions to scenario one), they did have fixed and shared perceptions about the weaknesses in the model. It may be that, because most have "experienced" scenario two without serious threat to their positions, they are accepting of it as being relatively innocuous; correspondingly, it may also be that because they have experienced it, they have fairly uniform notions about the fundamental flaws in this method of supervision

for mid-career teachers.

Strengths Perceived in Method Two

As reported in Table 4, three teachers appreciated the opportunity provided by model two for teacher input into the process of supervision and three also identified it as a means through which the supervisor could determine whether teachers were practicing proper technique in areas such as questioning, proper use of the blackboard and classroom management. Perhaps on the basis of experience, two teachers offered that "clinical supervision" forces teachers to think about their teaching during the supervisory process and six teachers expressed the opinion that model two could be particularly effective for novice teachers needing more guidance and structure.

Weaknesses Perceived in Method Two

Time restraints.

All of those interviewed argued that, particularly in a school as large as the Collegiate, it would be impossible for the supervisor (or principal in this instance) to conduct clinical supervision for all teachers with a frequency that would make the process productive and still attend to his other duties (See Pfieffer and Dunlap, 1982). According to G.H., "...one person couldn't do it every year...it's virtually impossible...the principal here has trouble finding time to do it every three years." D.E. expressed this opinion:

There is definitely not enough time to do this [model two] effectively...the work load would be horrendous and it wouldn't be fair [to the teachers].

Implicit in the preceding remark is the sentiment that not only would the lack of available time preclude the supervisory process

from being an effective means of improving teacher performance, it would not afford the supervisor sufficient opportunity to get an accurate impression of how the teacher usually teaches; therefore, to assess the teacher on the basis of one annual observation would be unjust. D.E.'s concern was corroborated by twelve of his colleagues including A.B. who contended that...

This [model two] does not give enough opportunity [for the supervisor] to get a sense of what strengths and weaknesses a teacher might have...I don't think it's nearly enough...[and]...that's why I'd like to see what we have [model two] change.

Yet another teacher remarked on the unfairness in judging a teacher on the basis of one observation:

Teaching is a total process and someone seeing a little snippet then saying "I don't like that" or "I think you're doing a good job,"...that's unfair to the teacher. [For example]...if you came into my room and saw my blackboard, you'd wonder, "What's he teaching here?" You can't tell if you weren't there. (G.H.)

Forming misimpressions of teachers.

When they were asked whether supervisors form an accurate impression of a teacher's typical performance using model two, K.L. said quite bluntly, "[supervisors]...have got no idea," and P.Q. remarked that "They [supervisors] haven't got a clue...they don't see the real thing."

The potential for supervisors to perceive teachers as being something other than what they actually are (or see themselves as being) is a defect which teachers saw as problematic in either scenario one or two. As Table 2 indicates, thirteen of the fourteen interviewees felt that, during supervision according to model one, mid-career teachers would teach toward the supervisor's expectations during observation then revert to the

previous behaviors. As reported in Table 4, nine of those interviewed indicated that teachers would similarly disguise their normal behaviors if supervised according to model two. An opinion shared by the majority of those interviewed was expressed by B.C.:

You prepare...you perform...you're probably more prepared that day...you're going to perform as he [the supervisor] wants you to perform. I'm going to try to make it one of my better days and I think somebody performing poorly for one day could prepare for this then go back to their old methods.

Protection of incompetent teachers.

Although model one resembles model two in several respects and, in theory, requires less interaction between the teacher and supervisor, only one teacher suggested that model one would protect incompetent teachers who continually prepare and perform toward the supervisor's expectations in order to avoid identification of their deficiencies. However six of the teachers--five more than in any other instance--volunteered that supervision as described in scenario two would protect incompetent teachers from identification. L.M. remarked, "This system [model two] permits a poor teacher to survive quite nicely as long as they don't rock the boat." C.A. explained that, not only was it true that teachers "perform" during supervision, it is also true that supervisors using model two do not have the time to identify the incompetent teacher:

Sad to say, but there's some of them [teachers] cheat...they're putting in time...and the principal not having time to see them makes the problem...they get away with it and just keep it up.

Another teacher elaborated upon how the incompetent teachers

"survive:"

I object to the models going on [model two] here because the teacher knows what the supervisor wants and it's not true evaluation...it's pretty easy to pull the wool over their [the supervisors] eyes...[and that]...protects incompetent teachers because they perform during evaluation. J.K.

Earlier in this chapter, it was speculated that the teachers' uniform identification of the deficiencies of model two may be due, in part, to having directly experienced scenario two. While it is true that only six of the fourteen interviewees indicated that supervision according to model two would protect incompetent teachers, the fact that five more identified this model more than any other as having such a potential suggests that their observations are, indeed, based upon what they have actually perceived to be a serious defect in model two.

Supervisor biases.

Yet another development suggested that when discussing scenario two teachers were basing their remarks upon experience rather than upon speculation: although they were not questioned on the matter, half of those interviewed volunteered that when using model two, supervisors bring pre-conceived, often inaccurate ideas about the teacher into the classroom and that these notions become a part of the supervisor's conclusions regarding the teacher's performance (See Bullock & Davis, 1985). A further indication that this perceived deficiency was experientially based is the fact that such a deficiency was not cited by any teacher discussing any other model regardless of the similarity to model two.

In discussing the biases which a supervisor may bring into

the process, B.C. commented that "...if the principal thinks the teacher has a problem before he goes in, he goes in [for observation] and makes sure he finds it that day."

D.E. suggested that parents may bias supervisors by complaining about a teacher; the complaint then prompts the supervisor to find the identified parental concern during observation. Another teacher explained that the way in which a teacher's performance is assessed may depend upon teacher-supervisor relations outside of the school:

Preconceptions the supervisor might have about the teacher may be...[due to] personality conflicts which may have occurred without having to do with school business at all...this could taint the evaluation. (I.J.)

Supervisors lack knowledge of subject matter.

In discussing the weaknesses inherent in model one, nine of the fourteen teachers interviewed suggested that supervisors could not gauge the effectiveness of teachers by using one set of behaviors as a measuring instrument across all disciplines; similarly, in commenting on the deficiencies in model two, eleven of those interviewed expressed a concern that supervisors would lack the familiarity with subject content to advise teachers on subject matter. Although three teachers acknowledged that a supervisor might be able to assess the effectiveness of a teacher technically (eg. questioning, classroom management), even those holding this view shared the sentiment expressed by I.J.:

What I see as being a problem is when they [supervisors] don't know the subject matter and then make a criticism. They are not in a position to fairly evaluate because they don't know.

E.F. voiced an opinion which was reflective of the view held by the majority of those interviewed:

I'm not sure they can evaluate you on the thing you're attempting to do...commonly they're not skilled enough to do that...[so]...they evaluate on areas...[such as]...noise, use of the board and the seating plan.

L.M. explained that, while he doesn't expect a supervisor to be knowledgeable in all subject areas, a supervisor would have to possess such a familiarity to properly use model two:

I don't expect the principal to tell me how to teach my subject. I don't expect him to be an expert in all subjects...that's unrealistic, but that's what he'd have to be if he's going to use clinical supervision.

When asked how mid-career teachers would respond to the supervisor advising them on subject content, the teachers reacted with remarks typified by the following:

I don't think we'd be pleased with that...that's a little different than one of your [subject area] colleagues commenting because they know where you're going. (E.F.)

I'd have difficulty with that...it's taken me twenty-five years to learn my subject. How does that compare with what he [the supervisor] knows? (P.Q.)

...in one school [where the principal advised teaches on subject content] the teachers utterly rebelled...it became a sore spot every time the principal came in. (C.A.)

Supervisors may not understand current classroom milieu.

Seven of those interviewed argued that, not only do most supervisors lack the expertise to advise mid-career teachers on subject matter, most also could not offer mid-career teachers strategies for improving their instruction because most supervisors are out of touch with the classroom milieu. K.L. made the following comment about the necessity for supervisors to understand teaching before they can supervise teachers:

The principal may not have been in the classroom for years...you must be in the trenches to understand the job. It wouldn't hurt any administrators to go back into the classroom to see what it's really

like...they don't have the expertise or the credibility [since they have not been in the classroom for years].

L.M. also indicated that he would question the credibility of a supervisor who had not taught in the classroom for an extended period:

I would be skeptical about everything he says; I would see it as being theory and not based on practice...particularly if he got into content--I would question whether he knows as much as I do.

According to D.E., many supervisors are unable to effectively supervise mid-career secondary teachers because they often have dissimilar backgrounds in education:

A lot of supervisors have worked through the ranks...they may have come out of an elementary school and know little about classroom skills, lesson planning or handling students at the high school level.

M.N. expressed a similar opinion when he observed that supervisors can't offer alternative strategies to mid-career teachers because, typically, supervisors "...haven't been on the firing lines...things [in teaching] are different now." M.N. expanded on his comment that "things are different now" when he explained that, in his opinion, because students are more apathetic toward school, often have jobs and can't do homework and are less respectful of authority, teachers are finding it more difficult to promote student outcomes as effectively as they once could.

Conclusions

While the majority of those interviewed found model two to be less undesirable than model one, very few of them (three) expressed any confidence that it would be an effective supervisory process for improving the performance of mid-career

teachers. Perhaps based, in part, upon their direct exposure to clinical supervision, the great majority of those interviewed were of the opinion that supervisors would not have the time to effectively implement this model for all teachers nor would there be enough observation time for the supervisor to form an accurate impression of a teacher's performance.

Teacher Perception Toward Differentiated Supervision

Scenario three, based upon a differentiated model of supervision (Glatthorn, 1984; Berliner, 1986; Krupp, 1987), was described to those interviewed as a process in which teachers are allowed, within limits, to choose whether they wish to receive clinical supervision from a supervisor (as described in scenario two), work with a colleague in a program of cooperative development or direct their own professional growth according to a plan developed by the teacher and presented to the supervisor. The limits mentioned would include restricting inexperienced teachers, teachers new to the system and teachers with serious deficiencies to clinical supervision. Mid-career teachers performing acceptably may choose clinical supervision, work with a colleague or plan their own performance improvement with the supervisor using strategies such as reading in the literature, observing other teachers, taking formal coursework, assisting novice teachers in their development, attending workshops or incorporating outside activities into their school work.

Strengths Perceived in Differentiated Supervision

Options for teachers.

According to the study population, a serious defect in

TABLE 5

Characteristics of Differentiated Supervision (Scenario Three)

Possible Characteristics of Supervision	Characteristics of Differentiated Supervision
Pre-conferencing	Between supervisor and teacher for those teachers on Clinical Supervision track
Observation	By supervisor for teachers on Clinical Supervision track
Post-conferencing	Between supervisor and teacher on Clinical Supervision
Follow-up	By supervisor for teacher on Clinical Supervision
Input from teacher	Novice, deficient and new teachers are assigned to Clinical Supervision; others may chose Clinical Supervision. supervision with a colleague or independent professional development
Assessment of pre-determined behaviors	Supervisor targets behaviors for observation of teachers on Clinical Supervision
Supervisor's role	Clinical Supervision: observe, assess, assist; other tracks: facilitate
Approach adjusted according to career stage	Possible
Supervision with colleagues	May be chosen by competent veterans
Teacher-planned professional development	May be chosen by competent veterans
Basis for termination or retention	Not advocated

model one and--to a lesser degree--in model two was the potential for a mid-career teacher to be trapped in a supervisory process which would not only be ineffective for improving their performances but could force them to adopt practices which might lessen their effectiveness in the classroom.

In reacting to scenario three, eleven of the fourteen teachers interviewed indicated that a significant advantage to differentiated supervision is that mid-career teachers are not restricted to one supervisory process prescribing a single means of becoming a more effective teacher; rather, teachers may chose the mode of supervision which they believe will be most beneficial to them in improving their classroom performances. As A.B. explained, teachers--like students--develop their skills in different ways; for example, just as some students may learn more effectively from a demonstration than from a lecture, some teachers may learn to be better teachers by watching a colleague than by being told how to perform by a supervisor.

Having an opportunity to chose from alternative forms of supervision was seen by the majority of the teachers as being advantageous then, because it increased the probablility that more teachers would be engaged in a process of supervision that would be suitable to their needs. Five teachers also remarked that they appreciated being allowed a choice since that implied that the mid-career teacher was being recognized as a professional. When asked for his assessment of model three, A.B. responded:

I love it...I'm not a henchman anymore...I'm allowed to open up as a professional...[and]...allowing the teacher

TABLE 6

Teachers' Perceptions Toward Differentiated Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers (Scenario Three)

Strengths	Response Frequency	Weaknesses	Response Frequency	Identified as most Effective	Identified as least Effective
Provides opportunity to share with colleagues	12	Teachers working independently may lack time/interest to design and implement an effective plan	9	5 5 (model three and four)	2
Allows teachers to chose supervisory track most effective for themselves	11				
Colleagues are more familiar with subject matter and classroom milieu than supervisors	7	Mid-career assigned to Clinical Supervision may feel resentment	6		
Mid-careers placed on Clincial Supervision would be pressured and given a chance to improve	6	Ideological or personality conflicts between colleagues could occur	4		
In being allowed to chose a supervisory track, teachers are recognized as professionals	5	Teachers may feel obligated to report colleague deficiencies	2		
Differentiated supervision allows the supervisor to work with novice teachers and veterans in need of assistance	4	Colleagues may not have time to observe others	2		
Working with a colleague is less threatening than working with a supervisor	3				
Allowed to work independently, teachers may explore new interests and strengthen weaknesses	3				

to chose promotes self-esteem.

L.M.'s reaction to the same question was similar:

It's [model three] the best...there's not just one method...[and]...since you chose, you're much more cooperative and willing to work harder.

E.F. was also of the opinion that when mid-career teachers chose a mode of supervision, they will be more dedicated to using it to improve their performances than when they are told to adopt a set of prescribed behaviors:

If I can chose, then I have some commitment. When it's [a form of supervision] dumped on us [teachers] we tend not to want it. (E.F.)

E.F. expanded on his remark when he offered that, unlike models one or two which would encourage teachers to adopt prescribed practices during observation then abandon them, model three does not force teachers into "performing" but allows them to build on their "real strengths" and to honestly correct their "real problems." Put another way, E.F. appears to be arguing that teachers are more aware of their strengths and deficiencies than are the superordinates who see them perform only sporadically and that most mid-career teachers have a desire to become "better" teachers. That most have this desire is a point disputed by other teachers interviewed and one which will be considered in the forthcoming section ("Weaknesses").

Working with colleagues.

As reported in Table 6, ten of those interviewed chose model three as the or one of two most effective methods of supervision for mid-career teachers. Clearly the opportunity to chose from different supervisory modes was one reason for the teachers'

favorable reaction to this model. Another aspect of the model to which the teachers responded enthusiastically was the opportunity to work with a colleague whether a teacher or the department head. For a variety of reasons, twelve of those surveyed perceived such an opportunity as a distinct advantage to model three.

K.L. gave this explanation for wanting to work with a colleague:

I'm isolated...I don't know what these other teachers are doing. Although they are a resource of very competent people, I never get to see them...I'd like to see how others run their subject programs...maybe somebody has a better idea that I can borrow or share.

Although K.L spoke more specifically than others about the irony in being surrounded by people (students) throughout the day yet being isolated from the colleagues with whom he would most like to share, others expressed a desire for the opportunity to see other teachers perform:

I think that [model three] could really work...the thing is, you may have other teachers with different, terrific ideas that you may never know about unless you get a chance to see them. (F.G.)

M.N. proposed that during the process of observing other teachers, not only would the teacher observing benefit from seeing different strategies and ideas, but, wanting to impress his colleague, the teacher being observed would be motivated to improve his performance.

In discussing model two, it was pointed out that a majority of the teachers were concerned that a supervisor would lack the familiarity with subject matter across all disciplines to make accurate judgements about the way in which teachers dealt with

subject content; an additional concern was that many supervisors had been out of the classroom too long to appreciate the current classroom experience. In reacting to scenario three, half of those interviewed noted that an advantage to working with a colleague rather than a supervisor is that a colleague is more informed in the subject area, is in closer contact with the classroom milieu and has more time available to share ideas.

L.M. offered the following assessment:

This [model three] would be more collegial...getting ideas from each other...I would be much more likely to take criticism from a colleague working in my subject area [rather than from a supervisor]. You can have a greater and more intense discussion because you both know what you're talking about. In discussing how to get a certain concept across, you both know what it's like.

It was P.Q.'s belief that working with a colleague would be more beneficial than working with a supervisor simply because "We're [teachers] in this together and understand it [teaching] better."

In addition to providing teachers with an opportunity to exchange ideas and observe a variety of methods, E.F. thought that the presence of a colleague in the classroom would have another benefit:

The [observing] teacher would come in maybe three, four times a week for just a part of the class...after awhile, the students would get use to another teacher being there and would use him as a resource also.

Additional strengths.

Essentially, then, the majority of those interviewed were of the opinion that differentiated supervision offered two vital components not available in models one or two--1) the opportunity for competent teachers to chose the mode of supervision which they desired, and 2) the opportunity to work

with colleagues who know the subject matter and understand the dynamics and dilemmas current in the classroom.

Four of those interviewed proposed that another advantage in supervision as described in scenario three is that it permits the supervisor to work most closely with those teachers in greatest need of assistance to improve their teaching performances. Three other teachers felt that scenario three was preferable to either one or two because it was "less threatening" than working with a supervisor who might feel obliged to find some deficiency in every teacher--however trivial--or use supervision as a means to build a case for termination of a teacher.

Yet another three of the fourteen teachers interviewed expressed an appreciation for the opportunity for teachers to formulate their own performance improvement plans. Speaking on the matter, B.C. made the following point:

I think it's ideal [scenario three, independent development]...you get to a point at mid-career where you've done your training and now can develop yourself.

What B.C. appeared to intend with this remark is that formal, uniform training of teachers is valuable (or required) to a point, but after reaching that point in mid-career teachers would benefit from an opportunity to individually develop their skills according to their unique needs.

M.N. also extolled the benefits of being given an opportunity to develop an individualized improvement plan and suggested that it might provide the mid-career teacher with the time and motivation to develop a new course or to prepare to teach one with which they had no experience. P.Q. indicated that

he would take advantage of this option to visit other schools to observe teachers and review programs.

As the comments cited in the following section may suggest, however, the majority of those interviewed did not share the sentiment that the opportunity to develop an individualized plan would have much merit for mid-career teachers.

Weaknesses Perceived in Differentiated Supervision

Difficulties with independent professional development.

As reported in the foregoing discussion, three teachers were of the opinion that an advantage to scenario three is that teachers would have an opportunity to design a performance improvement plan suited to their needs; conversely, nine of their colleagues--most of whom favored supervision with another teacher--identified this component as possibly the the least effective element in the model for several reasons. C.A. expressed his concern in these words:

It'd be tough for mid-careers to develop a plan of their own...during mid-career most have a family, they're married and some even have a second job...suddenly, they're given this opportunity to expand...it would be tough to find the time.

J.K., too, voiced a concern that, in reality, mid-career teachers would not have--or take--the time to develop a worthwhile plan:

...at mid-career, I wouldn't have time...teaching can be an eighteen hour a day job if you want it to be but I value my family and don't want teaching to interfere with that.

J.K. went on to speculate about how other mid-career teachers would perceive the "opportunity" to design a performance improvement plan:

...many would gripe...they don't want to be bothered... [they would say]..."Don't bother me if I'm getting by."

They get very cushy and don't work on professional development. That's unfortunate but I think teachers in many cases would just say "No..."

K.L. also discussed the probability that teachers would lack the time or enthusiasm to develop an effective plan:

Some teachers wouldn't find the time. After awhile, you get tired and things just don't seem as important anymore.

Because "things don't seem so important" at mid-career, L.M. suggested that, "...a certain lethargy may set in and they [teachers] may commit performance improvement to paper then not do it at all." According to A.B., the more "cynical" mid-career teachers would go beyond ignoring the opportunity to plan independently and scoff at the prospect "...because they think they're already there [at optimum performance levels]."

Implicit in the observations made by the nine teachers harboring doubts that mid-career teachers would actually develop then faithfully follow a performance improvement plan is a cautionary note to schools intending to adopt model three that careful consideration should be given to 1) the number of teachers who would make effective use of this component; 2) methods through which plan implementation may be monitored by the supervisor and 3) the advisability in offering this component to all teachers performing at acceptable levels of competency.

Difficulties in working with colleagues.

While, as mentioned, the great majority of those interviewed welcomed the opportunity to work with a colleague, several teachers foresaw difficulties which could arise out of this arrangement. One of the two teachers who identified scenario three as the least effective model of supervision for mid-career

teachers did so on the grounds that, although teachers expect a supervisor to be critical, they would resent criticism from a colleague however well-intended.

Four teachers were concerned that conflicts would develop when colleagues engaged in supervision held dissimilar philosophies or attitudes toward their work. K.L explained that "...you might run into someone you don't agree with and you won't learn anything." A.B. expressed a comparable opinion:

If I was conservative, I would have trouble working with someone on the opposite end of the scale. [For instance], ...somebody in arts would have problems working with a conservative teacher.

Several teachers explained that they would find it difficult to work productively with a "know-it-all." G.H. observed that "I wouldn't want to work with somebody who says 'I'm a master teacher and you're a nobody,'" and K.L said that he would refuse to work with colleagues "who think they know it all."

Two teachers indicated that, in their opinion, it may be difficult for colleagues to find the time to work closely on a routine basis. In F.G.'s words, "Unless you have some prep, it's difficult to find time to work with another teacher...everyone has something during prep' time." On the basis of past experiences in working with inept colleagues, two of the teachers also thought problems would arise when one teacher reported the deficiencies of another to the supervisor.

Although those interviewed clearly favored working with a colleague above the other alternatives in differentiated supervision and above all other models, it may be argued that numbers sufficient enough to warrant attention also identified

potential problems with this component. In particular, when offering this option to teachers, it would appear that school planners should have a clear sense of the mechanism through which teachers will be paired (for instance, whether through choice or assignment), a sound rationale for offering this component that is clear to the teachers and a means through which to alter arrangements not mutually beneficial to both teachers.

Assignment of Teachers to Clinical Supervision

Although it was not identified in the literature reviewed a problem anticipated with differentiated supervision was the possibility that when a mid-career teacher is singled out for clinical supervision, that teacher would feel considerable resentment and humiliation. During the interviews with the teachers in the study school, the researcher endeavored to gather additional data regarding this potential flaw in the model by describing the following scenario and asking those interviewed to speculate about "Teacher X's" reaction:

Suppose that your supervisor came to you and said, "(teacher's name), you're doing a fine job and can choose to work with a colleague, design your own improvement plan or opt for clinical supervision." He then goes next door to Teacher X and explains that, due to deficiencies in his performance, he will be assigned to the clinical supervision track.

The supervisor's management of the assignment.

Of the twelve teachers who ventured to conjecture over Teacher X's reaction, nearly all agreed that his response would depend, in large measure, upon the way in which the supervisor apprised the teacher of the decision. K.L. effectively summarized the opinions of his colleagues in the following remark:

You [the supervisor] would have to be very, very careful ...the most important qualification is how they handle people...you have to handle people so that they want to work for you. The supervisor's job is different than the teachers, not better...[and]...the supervisor can't just order the teacher, he's got to show the teacher how he will make the teacher's job easier [through clinical supervision] or better or it's not going to change.

The point which K.L. and his colleagues appear to be stressing is that before a supervisor can begin to hope that the teacher will respond receptively to being placed on clinical supervision, he/she must have a basis for the decision which the teacher will perceive as reasonable and also be able to clarify precisely for the teacher how clinical supervision will improve the teacher's performance or make his job "easier."

Even when supervisors diplomatically approach teachers with sound reasonings and specific strategies, a number of the teachers felt that there was no assurance that the teacher would respond positively. Despite the consensus over the supervisor's deportment as a variable affecting the teacher's reaction, the twelve who spoke to the matter were evenly divided over the impact that being placed on clinical supervision would have on a mid-career teacher. As one of six who felt that the outcome would invariably be adverse, D. E. made this argument:

...it would cause friction because a mid-career teacher would feel threatened that he's losing his job. Besides, if they hadn't identified the problem before now, something's wrong [with supervision].

A.B. also felt that there would be tension caused by the teacher's resentment over a problem being identified so late in his career and that, rather than being placed on clinical supervision, the teacher would feel less conspicuous and defensive if he was assigned to work with a colleague. H.I.

imagined that Teacher X would become overly-conscientious about his performance causing it to deteriorate further and I.J.--one of the two who identified model three as the least effective form of supervision for mid-career teachers--argued that teachers expect to be treated consistently and would very much resent being singled out.

The prevailing sentiment amongst those who believed that being placed on clinical supervision would not have a deleterious effect on the teacher was that incompetent teachers are a reality of the profession and that, if high standards are to be maintained in teaching, their performances must be brought up to acceptable standards. The following responses are typical of their reactions:

That's [assignment to clinical supervision] a reality. You can't ignore poor teaching and you can't make good teachers do the same thing because of these poor teachers...the poor teacher may not like it, but that's a reality. (L.M.)

It's the nature of the job...some teachers are better than others...if you're not doing your job and this [clinical supervision] is a way to improve it, that's life. (G.H.)

If the supervisor feels there's a problem, that's [assigning the teacher to clinical supervision] his prerogative...he [the teacher] may feel resentment but that's maybe a necessary evil. (B.C.)

As may be evident in the preceding quotations, nearly half of those interviewed expressed the view that improving the performance of the incompetent teacher is of foremost concern, that teaching--as a profession--should not tacitly condone incompetency by ignoring it and that (if it is an issue at all) the teacher's reaction is a tertiary concern.

Of the six interviewees who held that the teacher's reaction

was not of paramount concern, three felt that when the reaction was considered it would prove to be one of receptivity:

If the teacher is realistic, they'd say "Things aren't going well for me." If it's made clear you take clinical supervision because of so many problems, I don't think a teacher could refute it...I think the teacher would welcome it. (K.L.)

If I was told by the principal [that I was on clinical supervision] I'd accept that the other teachers did a better job...I would like to find out why [I'm on that track]...if I'm doing something wrong, tell me and I'll change. (F.G.)

The clinical supervision track should be seen as a growth opportunity for a teacher to correct a problem. It's only for a certain length of time then he can go back [to choosing his own track]. (B.C.)

If no other conclusions may be drawn from the disparate reactions of the teachers to this scenario, perhaps it may be reasonable to suppose that in exercising this option, the prudent supervisor would have persuasive evidence that such action is justified, would have viable strategies to offer Teacher X and would have cause to suppose that the action would produce more good than harm.

Conclusions

If, as findings in the literature suggest (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Glatthorn, 1984; Duncan, 1985), teachers are most inclined to engage in performance improvement when they perceive the supervisory process as accurate, reliable and appropriate for their needs, then clearly differentiated supervision merits consideration as an alternative model of supervision for the study population. As noted earlier, differentiated supervision was selected more than the other three combined as being the most promising method of supervision for mid-career teachers.

Two aspects, in particular, which appealed to those interviewed were the opportunities to choose the mode of supervision most appropriate to the needs of the teacher and to work with a colleague who understood the subject matter and the classroom context more clearly than most supervisors. However, the majority of the teachers candidly discussed flaws in the model in a way which suggests that, if such a model were to be implemented, preventive steps would have to be taken so that deficiencies in the model would not undermine its effectiveness.

More specifically, nine of those interviewed expressed a concern that mid-career teachers who were allowed to design their own performance improvement plans may not have the time or the desire to develop and practice an agenda of much value. Further, eight teachers anticipated that problems could arise when teachers engaged in supervision with colleagues, and almost half of the interviewees speculated that assigning mid-career teachers to a clinical supervision track would produce resentment and could be counter-productive.

In conclusion, while the majority of teachers found flaws in differentiated supervision as it was presented in scenario three, they also found it to hold real promise as an alternative to the other models and to the way in which they are currently supervised.

Teacher Perception Toward Reflective Supervision

Supervision as presented in scenario four and as described to those interviewed calls for the supervisor to "collaborate with the teacher in marshalling intellectual activities" (Smyth, 1986

TABLE 7

Characteristics of Reflective Supervision (Scenario Four)

Possible Characteristics of Supervision	Characteristics of Reflective Supervision
Pre-conferencing	Optional, informal; teacher may seek supervisor's assistance
Observation	Optional; teacher may request that supervisor observe
Post-conferencing	Optional
Follow-up	Optional
Input from teacher	Essentially, teachers direct their own development
Assessment of pre-determined behaviors	Behaviors may be targeted by the teacher
Supervisor's role	Facilitator
Adjusted according to career stage	Assumes mid-career teachers can be their own resources
Supervision with colleagues	Optional
Teacher-planned professional development	The focus of this model is independent professional development
Basis for termination or retention	Not advocated

p.338) in order to systematically reflect upon his current teaching practices. The purpose of this reflection is to determine what is or is not effective in promoting desired student outcomes and to identify those impediments in promoting outcomes. The teacher also examines changes which should be made in the teacher's worklife to enable him to improve performance. With the assistance of the supervisor, the teacher maps out and tests alternative strategies in the classroom (See Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1985; Smyth, 1986). Parenthetically, it may be added that the model also allows for teachers to work with colleagues in reflective supervision as well as--or in place of--superordinates.

Although reflective supervision resembles the professional development component of differentiated supervision in that it affords teachers a measure of independence, there is a distinction to be made between the two processes. According to the differentiated supervision model (Glatthorn, 1984), teachers would be allowed to independently improve their performances by engaging in specific activities including coursework, workshops, observing other teachers or serving as mentors to novice teachers. Reflective supervision, however, emphasizes the role of the teacher in "examining the origins and consequences of everyday teaching behavior so they come to see those factors that represent impediments to change" (Smyth, 1986, p.338). Once these factors have been identified, teachers become "truth-makers" (Sergiovanni, 1985) or professionals endeavoring to eliminate impediments and enhance strengths in their

performances. In effect, while differentiated supervision would direct the teacher to other sources for performance improvement, reflective supervision would direct the teacher to look inward.

Informal Practice of Reflective Supervision

Before discussing the strengths and weaknesses which the teachers perceived in scenario four, it should be noted that--although clinical supervision (model two) is the formal mode of supervision in the Collegiate--thirteen of the fourteen interviewed stated that they currently practice reflective supervision (model four) on an informal basis. Given this prevalence of model four as a method which teachers have adopted to improve performance, it would have seemed likely that the majority would have identified a number of advantages to the model and selected it as the most effective method of supervision for mid-career teachers.

However, as reported in Table 8, there was not a single instance in which the majority of the teachers interviewed pointed to an aspect of scenario four as being advantageous; furthermore, although four of the teachers indicated that they would select model four as most effective if it were incorporated into model three, only one teacher believed that reflective supervision, unmodified, was the most effective form of supervision for mid-career teachers.

The question which naturally arises is, if nearly all teachers routinely practice reflective supervision, why was there so little agreement on its strengths and why did so few identify it as most effective of the approaches to supervision? While teacher reactions to scenario four offer little on which to

TABLE 8

Teachers' Perceptions Toward Reflective Supervision for Mid-Career Teachers (Scenario Four)

Strengths	Response Frequency	Weaknesses	Response Frequency	Identified as most Effective	Identified as least Effective
Allows teachers to identify and ameliorate weaknesses	6	Teachers would not recognize their weaknesses	4	1	1
It is an ongoing process of supervision	5	Teachers don't have time to reflect	1	4 (model four and three)	(model four and one)
Allows the teacher independence	4	Too unstructured to be of value	1		
Prevents teacher stagnation	4				

formulate a probable explanation, in returning to their responses to scenario three (Table 6), it may be noted that nine of fourteen teachers perceived that a serious defect of model three would be that--when expected to formally develop their own performance improvement plan--many mid-career teachers may not have the time nor inclination to design and implement a plan in a way that would fulfill its intended purpose.

Because reflective supervision also permits teachers considerable independence and autonomy during supervision, it is possible to surmise that when model four is proposed as the only formal method of supervising teachers rather than as an informal process which teachers may use at their discretion, those interviewed would not believe it to have many advantages nor would they see it as being the most effective means of identifying teacher strengths and correcting deficiencies.

Additionally, of those nine who believed that, commonly, teachers on the plan-design track of scenario three would not make the process worthwhile, nearly all nine spoke about other teachers rather than themselves as failing to make the activity productive. Perhaps while they feel that--on the basis of personal experience--reflective supervision does serve to improve their performances, the teachers were reluctant to suppose that all colleagues would take the time and make the effort to ensure that such an unstructured, relatively unmonitored model would result in appreciable performance improvement.

Teacher Perception Toward Reflective Supervision

Strengths Perceived in Reflective Supervision

In discussing the advantages to supervision as described in scenario four, six of the teachers indicated that this model would be of value in helping teachers to identify weaknesses in their performances and to plot alternative strategies. However a point that lends further credence to the supposition that those interviewed generally believe that teachers--left to their own devices would not improve appreciably--is the fact that five of these six indicated that deficiency identification and amelioration would be most effective when done with a colleague or supervisor. F.G's observation was typical of those made by his four colleagues:

There are times when a teacher has a problem. I'm sure it wouldn't hurt to discuss it with another teacher or the principal...I think it's terrific when you can ask the supervisor or even colleagues for help.

H.I. said quite simply that "it [reflective supervision] is especially productive if there's another participant."

In explaining the value in a colleague's participation in the process of reflection, K.L. recalled an instance in which members of his department observed each other for a class period and wrote down all that they saw transpire. The observer made no judgments or suggestions but merely gave the observed teacher the recorded notes for the purpose of analysis. K.L. described the benefits of the activity in these words:

It gave you a map of your classroom...you could better see where trouble areas were...[and]...where not-so-trouble areas were. For example, one thing is that a lot of teachers don't walk around [the classroom] like they should but never realize it.

Quite evident in the preceding remark is that--in K.L.'s opinion--teachers do have deficiencies which go uncorrected simply because teachers are not aware of them; therefore, "reflecting" their behaviors off of a colleague may be more enlightening than simply reflecting on themselves as teachers.

B.C. also felt that reflecting on classroom performance and mapping out alternative strategies is of value but that it may sometimes be necessary for others to point out undetected problems: "You may not see it [a weakness] but if you have a weak area you'll get messages from students and colleagues."

Reflective supervision is sustained.

Five of those interviewed were of the opinion that a benefit of supervision according to model four is that it would be a sustained process rather than the annual event prescribed in other models. A.B. and G.H. explained that they routinely go home and reflect upon the events of the day in order to build on their strengths and to improve in areas where they are weaker. F.G. observed that an advantage to scenario four is that it is an ongoing process through which he strives to "...break my ideas down even more to get more out of them."

I.J. suggested that reflecting over work on a continual basis with a supervisor is productive:

Discussion with the supervisor is very important...I know that I can go see my administrator...chat with him and come up with solutions to problems as they happen.

C.A. saw yet another advantage in ongoing collaboration with the supervisor:

When it's continual [discussion] the supervisor has a better idea of what's going on in the classroom and the teacher would get continually reinforced for doing a

good job.

(As desirable as this ongoing interaction between a teacher and supervisor may be, however, one might consider whether it is feasible given that all fourteen interviewees reacting to scenario two argued that it would be impossible for a supervisor to annually devote as little as four hours to each teacher for clinical supervision.)

Reflective supervision affords teachers independence.

While, again not a majority, five of those interviewed saw reflective supervision as being beneficial because it allowed the teacher more independence (than other models) to seek out alternative strategies and methods. In the following quotation, C.A. is discussing the advantages in being able to test new methods without fear of consequences from a supervisor who wants all teachers to practice a prescribed set of behaviors:

Just the freedom [in model four] certainly improves the teacher's self-esteem...and you can get the kids really motivated without getting kicked in the rear-end.

M.N. also expressed an appreciation for the independence afforded teachers by this method and pointed out that teachers are relegated to a status something less than professional when a supervisor prescribes behaviors:

"Yes, it's better [scenario four] because we're quasi-professionals when somebody else sets it up [teaching] and says "This is how you shall do it."

Implicit in the following remark is the belief that encouraging teachers to independently reflect upon their work and test new methods is important to performance improvement:

Independence is definitely important to have and [scenario] number four would give the most independence

...it would work in that I'm analyzing myself and allowed to make decisions on my own.

Based upon the preceding observations, then, it is evident that over one-third of those interviewed are of the opinion that mid-career teachers are capable of effectively using reflective supervision to assess their performances and make productive efforts to improve their instruction. Again, however, the weak support for scenario four as the most effective method of supervision and the concern expressed by the majority of teachers over their colleagues possible lack of interest or time to develop effective plans independently may reasonably lead one to inquire whether mid-career teachers--in general--believe that their peers would use formal reflective supervision productively or take advantage of the independence to do little toward performance improvement.

Generates new strategies.

Four interviewees observed that scenario four has merit in that it prevents teachers from "falling into a rut" or may encourage those in the rut to develop new strategies when they are encouraged to reflect upon their current practices. K.L. explained that his experience using reflective supervision with a colleague was of considerable value in prompting himself and others into reconsidering their methods:

We did [informal reflective supervision]...it's a really useful exercise...it brought out things we never thought about...it's so easy to crack out your usual formula and just have the kids adjust.

However, K.L. also noted that the exercise was "just something another teacher picked up in a university course," and, despite its apparent value, it did not become a routine practice within

the department. K.L. hinted at a possible explanation for the rapid decline of a worthwhile activity when he observed that at mid-career teachers aren't as prepared to go the extra mile because they feel they have put in their time: "You don't have time for it...after awhile you get tired...[and]...things don't seem as important."

Weaknesses Perceived in Reflective Supervision

As there was no strong support of model four, likewise, there was no strong opposition to it. Only one of those interviewed judged it to be the least effective method of supervision (along with model one) and the greatest number of times a specific aspect of the model was identified as being a weaknesses was four.

Teachers may not productively implement model.

The teachers who were dubious about the ability of mid-career teachers to reflect upon their performances, recognize weaknesses and correct them each had a different basis for their doubts. A.B. argued that mid-career teachers who are performing poorly are often in crisis in their private lives or are frustrated over the lack of upward mobility or opportunity in teaching (See Krupp, 1987). Regrettably, according to A.B., it is when they most need to reflect that mid-career teachers are least likely to do so: "A person in crisis probably won't want to look at themselves."

J.K. suggested that most mid-career teachers want to be as good as they can be but simply wouldn't recognize their flaws through merely reflecting; therefore, to be productive, model

four would have to prescribe ongoing input from other staff members:

I'd like the supervisor or colleague to also be involved in the reflective process since teachers don't always recognize their problems and there has to be input from someone you feel comfortable with.

C.A. seemed less charitable in his reason for doubting that mid-career teachers would use reflective supervision to improve their performances in the classroom: "To an extent...a lot of them [mid-career teachers] just aren't willing to change." Another interviewee viewed model four as potentially unproductive because "with some teachers so booked, they won't have time [to reflect]." (A.B.)

Conclusions

While the teachers were most strongly opposed to supervision as described in scenario one and most supportive of scenario three as the most effective method for improving the classroom performance of mid-career teachers, they were most indecisive and inconsistent in their reactions to model four. Although the researcher was concerned that the exchange with teachers regarding scenario four was not as extensive since it was generally discussed near the close of interviews when time restraints may have pressured teachers into being less expansive, there is evidence that a more probable explanation for the reactions to scenario four lies elsewhere.

As suggested earlier, most of those interviewed find that model four practiced informally may be an effective, if not essential, means through which to improve classroom performance. However, based upon reactions to a component in model three-- which

has similarities to model four--it may be suggested that those interviewed perceive model four as giving less "dedicated" teachers too much autonomy and too little structure to be of value in performance improvement.

This possibility is given further credence by the fact that, through the course of the interviews, twelve of the fourteen teachers surveyed volunteered that formal, structured supervision is necessary for one or any combination of these reasons: 1) to assist incompetent teachers in correcting deficiencies; 2) to have in place a preventive process which ensures that effective teachers don't deteriorate, and 3) to afford teachers recognition of their successes.

The following are comments which were typical of the remarks made by teachers on the necessity of formal supervision:

Mid-careers get set in their ways and need to be disturbed [by new ideas]...some teachers get in, they're still there [in the classroom] and they shouldn't be there. (G.H.)

Just because you're in mid-career doesn't mean that you can't learn. (H.I.)

I think it's important that if a teacher has faults they should be pointed out and it's important they accept these factors [that they have faults and may benefit from the supervisor's input]. (F.G.)

It's important for the supervisor to see teachers because some don't belong in teaching. (C.A.)

We [mid-career teachers] can always learn from somebody else. (I.J.)

Teachers want the supervisor to come in and see that they're good teachers and doing good things. (K.L.)

I invite them in [supervisors]...I want them to see what I'm doing and not just basing it [assessment of the teacher] on what they might hear from one parent or student...but they don't have time and they don't come in. (D.E.)

In referring to Table 11, which reports the many factors which those interviewed felt should be included in the supervisory process, it becomes even more evident that participants in the study expect formal supervision to be a process sufficiently structured so that a plethora of factors may be placed on the supervisory agenda. Again, it is not unreasonable to suppose that--as they understood it--supervision according to model four is too unstructured or lacking in specificity to serve as a means through which these factors could be effectively included.

In summary, there appears to be some basis for suggesting that supervisors would be well-advised to encourage teachers to reflect on their practices and to assist teachers in adopting new methods and materials as time and resources permit. However, it also appears that the teachers interviewed do not perceive model four as the most effective method of supervision for mid-career teachers because the lack of structure, and clear guidance and monitoring by the supervisor (particularly of less competent teachers) may result in the following:

- 1) teachers not making the effort or taking the time to engage in the process of reflection in such a way that it becomes productive,
- 2) the absence of a mechanism through which to consider the many factors which should be taken into account during the supervisory process,
- 3) incompetent teachers not getting the structured assistance they need, and
- 4) limited opportunity for the supervisor to routinely observe all competent teachers and give recognition for their successes.

Having discussed the strengths and weaknesses which those

interviewed percieve in the four approaches to supervision, the two chapters which follow will focus on the relationship which the teachers prefer with their supervisor during supervision and on those factors which they believe should or should not be considered during the supervisory process.

CHAPTER SIX

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SUPERVISOR AND THE TEACHER

Introduction

A sub-question stated in the original proposal for this thesis read: "What sort of relationship should exist between the supervisor and the teacher in each circumstance [or model] of supervision?" Subsequent to field testing the interview schedule, however, and during the initial interviewing of the study population, it became evident that--regardless of the supervisory model--the mid-career teachers interviewed expected that their preferred relationship with the supervisor would remain the same and they appeared somewhat frustrated over this sub-question being repeated for each scenario. Further, as models three and four were presented to the teachers, both models allowed for instances in which the competent mid-career teacher would be working with a colleague rather than a supervisor or would be working independently. In these situations, asking those interviewed to describe the relationship they would wish to have with their supervisor when the supervisor's involvement was minimal appeared to confuse and bewilder those being surveyed. Given the reaction of the teachers to the repetition of the sub-question, the researcher discontinued posing the question more than once after the initial interviews with the study population.

Because the teachers desired essentially the same relationship with the supervisor under all four supervisory models, what follows next in this chapter is a description of the characteristics they expect of a working relationship with a

supervisor if supervision is to be productive.

Since scenarios three and four allow for teachers to work with colleagues during the supervisory process, the characteristics identified by those interviewed as being of greatest importance in making this supervisory relationship productive are discussed in another section of this chapter.

Characteristics Desired in Supervisor-Teacher Relationship

Supervisor's knowledge of subject area.

Ten of the teachers interviewed indicated that, in order for the supervisory relationship to be productive in improving teacher performance, the supervisor must have a "working" understanding of the teacher's subject area (See Table 9). Although it may be argued that possessing this knowledge is more a characteristic of the supervisor than of the relationship, the fact that ten of fourteen teachers volunteered this as a characteristic attests to the perceived importance of subject-area knowledge to the effective supervisory process.

Indeed, this response is clearly congruent with the findings of Goldhammer (1969) and with the fact that eleven of the teachers discussing the merits of a clinical supervision approach identified the probability that supervisors would be unfamiliar with subject matter across disciplines as a serious flaw in the clinical supervision model. The following comments may bring further understanding to the rationale behind the teachers' interest in the supervisor knowing each teacher's subject area:

You [the supervisor] must have some expertise in the [subject] area...you have to know what we're trying to teach and why we're teaching it. (K.L.)

TABLE 9

Characteristics of the Preferred Relationship Between the Teacher and Supervisor

Desirable Characteristics	Response Frequency	Undesirable Characteristics	Response Frequency
Supervisor is familiar with teachers' subject area	10	Condescending supervisor	3
Supervisor has expertise based on classroom experience	9	Supervisor is demanding, dogmatic	3
Supervisor is honest, trustworthy	9		
Supervisor is friendly, non-threatening	8		

TABLE 10

Characteristics of the Preferred Relationship Between the Teacher and a Colleague

Desirable Characteristics	Response Frequency	Undesirable Characteristics	Response Frequency
Colleague must be accepting of diverse methods	4	Colleague is dogmatic	6
Colleague should be congenial	4	Colleague doesn't share	2
Colleague should have "personality" similar to teacher	3	Colleague smokes	1
Colleague must care about students	3		
Colleague must be willing to share ideas	2		

Whether the teacher saw the supervisor as knowledgeable in the subject area would be a variable in acceptance of him as credible...if a supervisor came in with no knowledge of the subject and he feels I'm not dealing properly with the subject...well, who's to judge? (H.I.)

The supervisor must have knowledge [of all disciplines] and how they have changed...the supervisor's analysis [of the teacher] is going to be affected by what he [the supervisor] knows about the subject. (A.B.)

The supervisor must know the subject...[and be] ...someone who can relate to the subject to get a feeling of what's suppose to be happening. (P.Q.)

The supervisor's experience in teaching.

In addition to knowing the subject areas of teachers under supervision, the majority of those interviewed also felt that to have a productive supervisory relationship with teachers, supervisors must have an understanding and appreciation for the current complexities of teaching based upon their own classroom experience (See Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Kauchak, et al., 1985). Nine of those interviewed explained that, in order for supervisors to make legitimate observations about a teacher's performance and offer worthwhile strategies for improvement, the supervisors must have had successful classroom experiences themselves (preferably in a context closely approximating the teacher's situation).

J.K. remarked that it is problematic that supervisors aren't experts in all subjects and added that it is essential for them to have had teaching experience:

Academically, they [supervisors] can't be experts in all fields and that's a problem if you're looking at subject matter...the supervisor must have classroom experience and stay current if only five minutes [in different classrooms] routinely and not twenty years [without being in a classroom]. I would like to see supervisors enter the classroom so they can relate to what's

going on...and deal with kids for a block of time.

A.B. emphasized the correlation between good supervisors having been good teachers:

Supervisors have to have been good teachers themselves and have to know how students and teachers think...they must be able to know why teachers do what they do and be able to communicate [back to the teacher] what they see going on.

During the course of several different interviews, teachers volunteered that--in their estimations--the classroom milieu has changed over the years--that students are less enthusiastic about learning and less respectful of authority. To these teachers, a crucial aspect of "being in touch" is that supervisors are sensitive to the fact that teachers are confronted with circumstances and problems that the supervisor--as a teacher in the past--did not have to contend with. J.K. expressed this concern when asked whether supervisors have the skills to identify problems in the classroom and provide teachers with problem-solving strategies:

No...particularly if they haven't been in a classroom. Administrators have a responsibility, too, to stay current...to read in journals. Most supervisors haven't been in the classroom for a very long time and that's a very key part. Things have changed a lot and supervisors do lose sight of that.

What these teachers appear to be saying is that, if the supervisory process is going to be of value, the supervisor must bring to that relationship an understanding of the present classroom dilemmas and dynamics; when they do not, there is a danger that they will be unable to understand why teachers behave as they do, a danger that supervisors will attempt to impose obsolete or inappropriate methods on teachers, and there is the

possibility that supervisors will have little of value to offer teachers for performance improvement.

Honesty and trust.

Nine of the teachers observed that if the supervisory process is to be productive, they must believe that the supervisor is honest and trustworthy. However, there were differing interpretations of how supervisors demonstrate these qualities and about how teachers would gauge them. E.F.'s remark on the veracity of supervisors suggested a concern about political motivations:

[A supervisor] should be honest, with integrity...I have to be convinced that there are no ulterior motives--some people get promoted by stepping on others.

To M.N., being able to trust the supervisor meant that he could test new methods without fear of consequences enacted by the supervisor:

I must be able to trust that the supervisor allows me to make mistakes and will help me improve without being threatened.

A.B. stated that there were several means through which a teacher determined the extent to which a supervisor is trustworthy including the following:

The teacher would first look at how the supervisor handled conflict between a teacher and a student. If a supervisor supports a student before seeing the teacher, there's mistrust automatically.

G.H. gauged a supervisor's honesty--in part--according to his/her candidness in dealing with less-than-competent teachers:

I've seen supervisors be pretty cruel with teachers but the teacher deserved it. They weren't doing their jobs.

Taking a somewhat contrary position, L.M. believed that one of

the most desirable attributes which a supervisor could bring to the teacher-supervisor relationship would be honesty; however, he voiced a concern that supervisors may honestly criticize the teacher on something the supervisor knows little about:

Honesty is very important, but I don't know if he [the supervisor] knows [what he's talking about]. There's a danger in him commenting on something he doesn't know about.

Friendly and non-threatening.

Eight teachers observed that while working with a supervisor they would prefer that the supervisor be friendly and non-threatening. B.C. indicated, that during supervision, he would like to be able to discuss matters of concern with the supervisor and, much the same as M.N. would like the opportunity to test new methods without fear of consequence for failure:

I would want to walk in [to the supervisor's office] and discuss these things [new strategies] in a non-threatening atmosphere and be able to try things and maybe fail but still be able to go on from there.

J.K. believed that to have a productive professional relationship with supervisors, they should be friendly, genuinely interested in people and should make an effort to maintain contact with teachers:

[The supervisor] must be out-going and friendly. He has to have a real interest in people and stay in touch by moving around, popping in to see how things are going.

As did J.K. and several others, A.B. felt that, in order for the teacher and supervisor to have a productive relationship during the supervisory process, the supervisor must be available for friendly exchanges with the teacher. A.B. explained that--too often--supervisors are threatened by veteran teachers and are reluctant to visit with them then added the following:

Most [supervisors] have the skill to help teachers improve but few can communicate it..they're worried about their positions...they put up a false wall. They [his past supervisors] wouldn't communicate informally but our [current] principal does talk and visit. [The supervisor] must be a friend and not a foe.

H.I. indicated that, while supervisors may be available, they may not be approachable because the teacher anticipates that--rather than working in a collegial relationship to resolve problems--supervisors will unilaterally demand that teachers follow their prescriptions:

[The supervisor] must be approachable. Some supervisors, it's hard to talk to them...especially someone who demands that you do things their way...then you're doing something abnormal to yourself.

Summary

In a remark which captures the essence of what the majority of interviewees evidently want in a relationship with their supervisors, C.A. pointed out that supervisors "...must recognize that teachers have skills and are professionals." Based upon the comments by those interviewed, in recognizing teachers as professionals, supervisors will respect their capabilities and work amiably with them as colleagues rather than as dogmatic, autocratic authorities.

Most of those interviewed also indicated that they believe that to accurately assess teacher performance and offer viable methods for improvement, the supervisor should be familiar with the teacher's subject area and must have a clear vision of the current classroom milieu. Implicit in the comments made by most of the teachers is the sentiment that they would prefer working with supervisors who honestly admitted their limitations rather than

with those who are self-ordained authorities prescribing remedies which they expect the teachers to use.

Before describing the characteristics in a supervisory relationship which those interviewed found least desirable, it may be worthwhile to recall that, in discussing differentiated supervision, twelve of the fourteen teachers noted that an advantage to model three was the opportunity to work with colleagues. In detailing why they found that option to be so appealing, the majority explained that colleagues knew the subject matter, were aware of current classroom dilemmas, were less threatening than superordinates and had more time available for exchanging ideas.

Given the striking similarity between the advantages those interviewed saw in working with a colleague and the characteristics the majority desire in a supervisory relationship, it is not unreasonable to conclude that most of the mid-career teachers interviewed believe that working with a colleague to improve performance through formal supervision is likely to be more productive than working with a superordinate as they currently do.

Characteristics Undesirable in the Supervisory Relationship

Low response rate.

The comparatively few comments on the matter of characteristics which the teachers perceived as least desirable in a supervisory relationship may be explained by the fact that when they explicitly described desirable characteristics, they were tacitly identifying characteristics they believed would limit the effectiveness of formal supervision. For instance, in stating

that supervisors should be familiar with the teacher's subject area as well as with the classroom milieu, the majority of those interviewed was implying that unfamiliarity with these intangibles would be an undesirable characteristic in the supervisor; similarly, when nine of those interviewed reported that they would want to work with a supervisor who was honest and trustworthy, they were clearly implying that they would not want to work with someone who was dishonest and not worthy of their trust.

A minority of those interviewed did, however go beyond implying what they believed would be undesirable in a supervisory relationship and specifically identified characteristics in the supervisor which would have a detrimental effect on the productivity of formal supervision.

Supervisors who are condescending.

In discussing supervision according to prescribed behaviors (scenario one), nearly all of the teachers stated that--given their experience, confidence and desire for independence--mid-career teachers would be less accepting of prescribed behaviors than the untenured novice more in need of structure and more easily intimidated by supervisors. While discussing the teacher-supervisor relationship, B.C. echoed this observation when he noted that mid-career teachers--in particular--would not respond to a condescending supervisor:

[Whether teachers accept advice from a supervisor]
...depends on how it's put to you. As soon as you
get a condescending attitude [from the supervisor]
you turn your back and say "How good are you?"
And mid-career teachers would be most likely to
react this way.

In the following observation, C.A. reminds us that a teacher and supervisor engaged in a power struggle risk losing sight of their common purpose--providing quality education for the students:

[Supervision] has to be two people working together without him [the supervisor] being up here and you down low. They have to be working together for the good of the kid.

Based upon experience in other settings, A.B. explained that when teachers perceive the supervisor as being aloof, "...the teachers don't relax enough to communicate problems."

Dogmatic supervisors.

Given the teachers' negative reactions to those models in which certain behaviors may be prescribed by supervisors, it is not surprising that three teachers made a point of stressing that they could not have a productive relationship with a dogmatic, unyielding supervisor:

I would find it difficult to work with a person who just stomps into the room and says, "This is the way it's [teaching] going to be done and that's that!" (E.F.)

An ineffective supervisor would be someone unapproachable ...teachers couldn't discuss problems with the supervisor because he'd be too dogmatic about what should happen in the classroom. (I.J.)

[The least desirable supervisor to work with would be] a supervisor who tried to tell me what I must do and how I must do it. (L.M.)

Conclusions

If, as Giles and Proudfoot (1972) argue, one characteristic of a profession is that it "...is based upon a body of knowledge which has taken a long period of time to develop..." (p.155), then, clearly, the majority of those interviewed consider that--

at mid-career--they have developed that knowledge and are, indeed, professionals. As professionals they expect their supervisors to treat them with respect, to understand the nature of the teachers' work to the extent that supervisors may offer them viable methods of improving their performance and to interact with teachers in an honest and friendly manner.

In reviewing the messages communicated through the teachers' descriptions of a productive supervisory relationship and taking into account their negative reactions to models of supervision which allow little teacher input but considerable direction from supervisors, it is evident that--if they wish to use formal supervision to improve teacher performance--those supervising the process must understand the needs and perceptions of mid-career teachers and have the time, interest and knowledge to offer them assistance. When supervisors lack these qualities, it may be of greater benefit to both the supervisor and the teacher to adopt a method of supervision which permits teachers to work with other colleagues or department heads (See Frederick, 1984).

Characteristics Desired in Teacher-Colleague Relationship

Although it was not stated as a researchable question in the proposal for this thesis, it became evident to the researcher during the initial interview that--because models three and four allow teachers to work with colleagues during formal supervision--the teachers should be questioned on the relationship they would find to be most productive in working with a colleague just as they were as they were encouraged to discuss the same relationship with a supervisor. During the

first and all subsequent interviews, then, all study participants were asked to describe the characteristics of an effective teacher-colleague relationship.

Differences in the Two Descriptions

When asked to describe the relationship they would prefer to have with their supervisors during formal supervision, most of those interviewed typically cited three or four characteristics; however, in discussing the traits most desirable in a supervisory relationship with colleagues, the teachers rarely mentioned more than one trait despite efforts by the researcher to identify additional characteristics (which accounts for the relatively few responses in Table 10.) (This might be explained by the fact that, because all of the teachers interviewed had undergone formal supervision with an administrator and few had worked exclusively with a colleague in formal supervision, experience provided them with a clearer sense and a greater number of characteristics which they desired in their relationship with the administrator as supervisor.)

Another respect in which the teacher's observations about the characteristics of the two relationships differed was that, in discussing colleagues, only one teacher interviewed indicated that the teacher should know the subject area (ten interviewees mentioned this for supervisors), and there was not a single suggestion that the teacher should be familiar with the classroom milieu (a characteristic cited eight times for supervisors). Quite simply, these discrepancies may be explained by the probability that teachers presumed that they would work with a

teacher in their subject area (or department) and that they regard these colleagues as being significantly more informed on either matter than the supervisor; therefore, they likely did not deem it necessary to point out what--for them--was a characteristic they assumed would be inherent in the relationship.

A third striking difference between the characteristics the teachers mentioned for the colleague relationship and for the supervisor relationship is that, although nine teachers indicated that the supervisor would have to be honest and trustworthy, these attributes were mentioned as desirable only once in the discussions of the colleague relationship. It is the researcher's opinion that this difference is due to the probability that teachers see the superordinate's role as being dissimilar from their colleagues. More specifically, it seems probable that the teachers perceive superordinates as having a duty and the power to enact consequences for teachers but--for political, personal or other reasons--the superordinate may not always be acting in good faith; rather, as one teacher put it, he may reprimand or terminate a teacher "...to protect his own butt." Colleagues, on the other hand, would not be perceived as having the power or the political motivation to be less than honest or trustworthy in their interactions with other teachers. Further, it is quite probable that--because they work more closely with their colleagues than with the superordinate--they have grown to trust them more (in general) and have learned to interact more openly and candidly with one another.

Characteristics of an Effective Supervisory Relationship with Colleagues

Accepting, not dogmatic.

In referring to Table 10, it may be evident that a fundamental concern of most teachers interviewed was that colleagues working with each other should not seek to impose their beliefs upon one another, but, rather, be accepting of the fact that teachers may employ different methods and have different styles without being less effective in the classroom than their colleagues. J.K. expressed this sentiment clearly in these words:

[A colleague] would have to recognize a teacher's own feelings and methods...[and must]...recognize that teachers have different philosophies. They should agree to be different...and still be able to share strengths.

B.C. explained that, just as he would expect colleagues to be accepting of his particular style, he would recognize that those whom he observes may employ different but equally effective methods:

If I go to his [colleague's] class I go to learn and observe...[teachers]...must be accepting of other teachers' style.

In the following remarks, the teachers comment on dogmatism as a characteristic likely to jeopardize the effectiveness of the supervisory process and on the difficulty they would have in working with a colleague who was condescending and arrogant:

I wouldn't want to work with a person who knows it all...a person who wants to be a god-figure. (E.F.)

It would be difficult to work with a teacher who was particularly obnoxious...[someone]...who thinks they know everything. (K.L.)

I would have trouble with a colleague who imposed his opinions on me. We're on an equal plane--don't criticize me. (I.J.)

I don't want [to work with] somebody who says, "I'm a master teacher and you're a nobody." (G.H.)

Working with a colleague would probably be worthwhile but it could become a "holier than thou" sort of thing and that would never work with mid-career teachers. (D.E.)

The preceding remarks are clearly consistent with the teachers' reaction to model one as being ineffective because it limits the extent to which teachers may vary their behaviors. What those interviewed appear to be saying is that teachers may employ methods most suitable to their personality and appropriate for the needs of their students without compromising their effectiveness despite the fact that these methods may differ between teachers in the same discipline. Again, those surveyed seem to be expressing a desire to be recognized and respected as professionals offering one another new ideas for performance improvement rather than "laborers" having behaviors imposed upon them by a "superordinate" colleague (See Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983).

Congenial relationship.

In describing the relationship they would prefer having with a colleague during supervision, four teachers indicated that they would want the relationship to be congenial, not adversarial. B.C. effectively summarized the opinions held by these teachers when he explained, "The more congenial, open, receptive attitude [between teachers] the better they will work as equals."

Each doing his share and sharing.

While discussing characteristics desirable in a supervisory relationship with colleagues, three teachers made four comments on the matter of sharing. To G.H., sharing meant teachers accepting equal responsibility for making the supervisory process productive:

I wouldn't want to work with someone who expects me to do everything...it's got to be 50-50.

C.A. expressed the same concern and added that teachers have to be willing to share and not keep secret their most prized ideas out of concern that their colleagues would get credit for them:

I wouldn't be able to work well with somebody who doesn't really care [about performance improvement]...somebody who stuffed everything on to you [the teacher]. [A good colleague to work with is]...somebody who's willing to share their stuff, share their philosophies, share how they do things so you can draw on their strengths. [Undesirable colleagues are]...uncooperative, selfish and don't really want to share their ideas so somebody might look better.

Compatibility

Three of those interviewed indicated that teachers would work together most effectively in supervision if they had similar personalities (See Kauchak, et al., 1985). A.B. made the following comment:

People with different personalities might find it hard to work with colleagues. [For example]...if I was conservative, I would have trouble working with somebody on the opposite end of the scale. Somebody in the arts would have problems working with a conservative teacher. The personalities must match.

H.I. also felt that to form a productive supervisory relationship teachers should have compatible personalities and philosophies:

I wouldn't want to work with an authoritative disciplinarian. I'd want to work with somebody similar to myself who has a similar teaching style-- somebody who cares about students.

Concern for students.

H.I.'s interest in working with a teacher who "cares about students" was shared by M.N. who said that, in order for him to work productively with a colleague, the colleague "...must have an interest in the students," and by C.A. who explained that he has no desire to enter into a supervisory relationship with a colleague if "...their approach with students is negative."

Conclusions

Although it was expressed through the identification of somewhat different traits, the teachers' discussion of the supervisory relationship they desired with a colleague communicated a message similar to the one delivered through their comments on the working relationship they preferred with the supervisor. Just as they wanted to work with supervisors who respected them as professionals and interacted with them accordingly, so, too, did they want to work with colleagues who would accept that they were experienced teachers who had developed the particular styles and strategies effective for their personalities and students. Just as they did not want to work with an ill-informed supervisor intending to impose his beliefs on them, neither did the interviewees want to engage in supervision with dogmatic colleagues who expected them to adopt their principles and practices.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FACTORS IN SUPERVISION

Factors Which Should Be Considered During the Supervisory Process

A final sub-question posed in this study was: "What factors should be considered in each supervisory method?" The basis for this inquiry is the contention that variables such as teaching methodology, classroom management and knowledge of subject area are factors which--in part--determine the effectiveness of a teacher's classroom performance (eg. Farber, 1984); since it appears that teachers' perceptions of whether supervision is appropriate is a critical variable in determining the extent to which they will endeavor to improve their performances (See Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Glatthorn, 1984; Duncan, 1985; Kauchak, et al., 1985), the researcher elected to question the teachers on which factors they believe to be appropriate for consideration during the supervisory process.

The following definition of factors was stated in the thesis proposal:

Factors are meant to include in-class variables--such as teaching methods, class-size and available resources--out of class variables such as salaries, support services, interaction with colleagues, in-services, support from administrators, recognition of teachers' work--and other variables, such as teacher self-esteem, which have been identified in the literature as influencing teacher performance (eg. Likert, 1961).

While the teachers had little difficulty in discussing whether factors such as those cited in Table 11 should be included in the supervisory process, they tended to perceive other variables in the definition of factors--such as salary and preparation time--

TABLE 11

Factors Which the Teachers Believe Should or Should not be Considered During the Supervisory Process

Factors	Should be Considered	Should not be Considered	Indecisive Response
Knowledge of subject matter	14	-	-
Teaching methodology	12	1	1
Classroom management	12	1	1
Teacher's personality	11	3	-
Extra-curricular supervision	5	3	6
Relations with colleagues	5	-	9
Evaluations by students	2	12	-
Student achievement	1	11	2
Continuing education	5	2	7
Factors identified by teachers	11	-	3

TABLE 12

Factors Which Impact on Motivation of Mid-Career Teachers

Factors	Do Impact	Do Not Impact	Indecisive Response
Preparation time	14	-	-
Support from administration	14	-	-
Input into decision-making	13	-	1
Salary	2	10	2

as concerns that would relate to motivation rather than to supervision; therefore, these factors which may be more appropriately examined as matters of motivation will be discussed in a sub-section apart from the discussion on factors in supervision.

The researcher began each interview by listing the factors cited in Table 11 and asking the teachers whether each should or should not be included in the supervisory process; however, these queries were not repeated during the discussions of each model.

Knowledge of subject area.

Through the concern expressed by the majority of the teachers that supervisors lack the knowledge of subject matter across disciplines to effectively supervise mid-career teachers, those interviewed indicated how highly they value knowledge of subject matter as an attribute in teachers and supervisors. It is not surprising, therefore, that teachers agreed unanimously that the teachers' knowledge of their subject matter is a factor which should be considered during supervision. The following were amongst the explanations given by interviewees as reasons for including this factor in supervision:

The teacher has to go beyond what they're teaching so that the teacher has more insight than the students. The more you know, the better teacher you are...how can you prepare them [students] if you haven't gone beyond what they know? (L.M.)

At this level [secondary] you can't bluff your way through... (H.I.)

You can't teach if you don't have it [subject matter] down pat...the kids sense if you don't have it. (P.Q)

I don't believe that anybody can teach anything...they

have to know their subject area. It makes a big difference. (K.L.)

It seems that there can be little doubt that those interviewed are convinced that the teachers' knowledge of subject matter should be assessed during supervision. The problem which arises, however, is that if--as the majority of those interviewed believe--supervisors do not usually know enough about all subject to provide every teacher with assistance in handling subject matter, how can supervisors assess the extent to which teachers are informed on their subject and assist those who are not sufficiently knowledgeable? Again, as the teachers themselves suggested in their favorable responses to the opportunity to work with a colleague in supervision, perhaps knowledge of subject matter may be a factor in supervision most effectively examined with another teacher or department head.

Methodology.

In reacting to scenario one, all fourteen teachers expressed a concern that if their method of instruction--whether lecturing, demonstrating, working with small groups or other approaches--were to be assessed as described in scenario one, there was a probability that supervisors would impose prescribed methods on teachers who appropriately vary their behaviors. It may, therefore, seem contradictory that twelve of the fourteen interviewed believed teaching methodology should be considered during any supervisory process. However, in reviewing the reasons teachers gave for including this factor, it becomes clear that such a contradiction is non-existent.

Indeed, a reason often cited for assessing methodology was

that supervisors should know whether teachers do have a variety of methods at their disposal and do use them as circumstances dictate:

The bottom line is how the teacher gets the job done...it's beneficial when students see a variety of teaching methods. (K.L.)

Teachers should be able to be flexible and should vary their methods according to different classes (H.I.)

Others interviewed suggested that a function of supervision should be to ensure that a teacher's instruction is not unorganized but that it proceeds according to some plan:

At mid-career, you can have plans in your mind, not on paper, but there must be a teaching plan. (P.Q.)

Obviously you have to have a methodology. That's your delivery system. (G.H.)

I think that it [methodology] should be involved [in the supervisory process]. Some methods work and some don't. (F.G.)

Classroom management.

The twelve teachers who believed that classroom management-- or management of student behavior--should be a factor assessed during supervision gave two reasons: 1) control of the students is essential to effective teaching and 2) regardless of their subject-area experience, most supervisors can assess a teacher's classroom management skills and offer viable suggestions for improvement. The necessity for control of students was expressed in the following comments:

You have to have the personality to control. You can have all the [instructional] methods in the world, but without control you don't get anything done. (G.H.)

Yes [classroom management is a factor to be assessed]...generally, if you can't get their

[students'] attention, you can't get to first base. (E.F.)

If you can't run the class, you really can't teach. (K.L.)

If the teacher doesn't have control, no matter how wonderful the lesson is, it's ineffective. (L.M.)

Recognition, on the part of the teachers, that most supervisors can distinguish between effective and ineffective management of students is suggested in the following remarks:

Supervisors can offer teachers support in discipline...[and]...when supervisors are in the classroom, students know there's more than just the teacher [to handle behavior problems]. (H.I.)

Supervisors can assess teachers on how well they discipline and on their general conduct...[for example]...does the teacher swear at kids? (B.C.)

The one teacher who stated that classroom management should not be a factor for consideration during supervision offered a rationale which appears to assume that the supervisory process would afford the supervisor limited opportunity for observation:

The principal being in the room creates high stress levels...[so]...the principal can't see typical class interactions. (M.N.)

Teaching personality.

Teaching personality, as the term was used in the discussions with teachers, is the collective intellectual, emotional, temperamental and behavioral characteristics displayed by a teacher in his interactions with students. Twelve of the teachers believed that because a teacher's success with students depends--to a considerable degree--on the teacher's personality, it should be a factor considered during supervision. The following typify the comments made by those interviewed on the relationship between personality and successful teaching:

Personality is so important that I've based my whole career on it. I think it's one of the greatest factors. To me, if students like you and respect you, they'll work for you...it's such a key factor. (G.H.)

...we're [teachers] dealing with people. If you're not good at inter-personal relationships, you're going to cripple your teaching. (K.L.)

...the role of the teacher has changed. To be effective today, a teacher must have a good rapport with students. (P.Q.)

Although the majority of teachers interviewed clearly expressed the opinion that teaching personality should be a factor considered during supervision and mentioned traits such as empathy, consistency, ability to communicate and respect for students as being desirable in a teacher, no one suggested that one particular personality would be best for all teaching contexts. Indeed, the two teachers who objected to personality as a factor in supervision did so on the grounds that--as so many teachers noted in discussing scenario one--effective teachers vary their behaviors from class to class. A.B. explained the basis for his objection in these words:

...each person [teacher] is going to be different in how they get along [with students] in each different situation. I teeter-totter according to the type of class.

While teachers predictably stopped short of describing a prototype for the perfect teaching personality, they did indicate that a teacher's personality is certainly a variable in successful instructional performance not only in terms of characteristics which promote success but also in terms of traits which abridge success.

Supervision of extra-curricular activities.

Although according to Table 11 the teachers may appear to be more divided on whether to include teacher participation in extra-curricular activities in supervision than on the inclusion of any other factor, this is not an altogether accurate conclusion to draw. While five indicated that it should be included, and three said, unequivocally, that it should not be, of those six reported as being indecisive in their responses, all felt that it was an important part of teaching but that--by mid-career--most teachers had made their contributions.

Among the five who favored extra-curricular participation as a factor in supervision was G.H. who explained that, through extra-curricular supervision, teachers get to see another side of students just as students see teachers in a different light:

It's [extra-curricular participation] an excellent way to get to know students...and develop rapport with them since they get to see you as a human being.

A.B. suggested that, not only does extra-curricular participation allow teachers and students to view one another from a different perspective it gives teachers and students an opportunity to deal with personalities other than those to which they are accustomed.

In the following remarks, H.I. and M.N. appear to be saying that some teachers contribute more than others and that by including extra-curricular participation as a factor in supervision, less active teachers will be encouraged to assume more responsibility:

I think some teachers should become more involved with students outside the classroom--some have to be told to get involved.

[Supervision of activities]...should be spread out equally [between teachers]...it's still a part of the working day.

As noted earlier, nearly half of those interviewed indicated that teacher supervision of extra-curricular activities was a part of the teachers' responsibilities but that mid-career teachers who have made significant contributions should not be expected by supervisors to participate as much as novice teachers. P.Q. expressed an opinion commonly held by this group of those interviewed.

For at least ten years a teacher must give of their time...I did my part...[but]...at mid-career, I limit what I do.

J.K. explained why he, too, participates less in extra-curricular supervision:

It's [supervision of extra-curricular] important, but I have kids now and I don't participate as much as I used to.

K.L. also pointed out that, at mid-career, most teachers have families which put demands on their time and limit the contributions they can make to extra-curricular supervision:

...when you're young and keen and living alone you might just as well supervise...when you're married and have four kids, you have other agendas.

In effect, what the six ostensibly indecisive teachers appear to be saying is that during supervision, a supervisor should take into account the unique circumstances of the mid-career teachers and assess them more according to what they have contributed than by what they are contributing to extra-curricular activities.

Of the three teachers who objected to the inclusion of extra-curricular involvement in supervision, L.M. reasoned that "If it's suppose to be voluntary, it shouldn't be included [in

supervision],” and C.A. argued that “...they should do that separately [from formal supervision of teacher performance].”

To summarize, the majority of interviewees perceive that supervision of extra-curricular activities is a part of the teachers’ responsibilities; however, more than half of that majority of eleven felt that it was a factor of greater concern when assessing the performances of novice teachers or veterans who had made only nominal contributions through-out their careers.

Relations with colleagues.

Much the same as their reaction to extra-curricular involvement as a factor in supervision, the teachers had no firm objections to including the teacher’s relationship with his colleagues in the supervisory process. Five teachers said that, without question, that if teachers are going to work closely toward common goals, the extent to which each productively interacts with colleagues must be a consideration. Generally, the nine who were less decisive indicated that a teacher’s relationship with his colleagues should be considered, but only when it is interfering with the attainment of program objectives.

In the following comments, teachers explained why relations with colleagues should definitely be a part of supervision:

If you’re going to work as a team and attempting to get support [by] drawing from a colleague, you have to have a good relationship. (J.K.)

Yes, definitely [it should be a factor]...you’re trying to work together to teach students. If

there's dissension that's not good for morale and that could affect effectiveness. (L.M.)

Yes [it should be a factor]. To make morale work nicely you have to have people working together. We [in our department] are constantly contacting each other. (F.G.)

It may be worthy of note that the five teachers who felt that a teacher's relations with colleagues should be considered during supervision also had very favorable opinions about working with colleagues as described in scenario two. Perhaps it is because they perceive colleagues as such important resources and highly value a productive colleague relationship that they have a strong concern that teacher interactions remain healthy and productive.

As mentioned, several teachers felt that relations with colleagues should be a factor to be considered only when serious problems arise. B.C. summarized the opinion of nearly half of those interviewed in this comment:

[Relations with colleagues] should be considered to a lesser degree [than the other factors discussed to this point]. It should be looked at only if there's a problem.

H.I. also expressed only limited support of relations with colleagues as a factor to be included in supervision:

[It should be considered]...to some extent. Not everybody gets along with everybody, but your personality plays a part in how you function. If you don't get along with other teachers they're not as likely to help and that's when it [relations] should be looked at.

I.J. pointed out that with the present model of supervision in a collegiate as large as the study context, "It [relations] should be considered but it [a teacher's relations with colleagues] would be difficult for a supervisor to assess with so little

time."

As a tangential point of some interest, four of those interviewed, in responding to the question about relations with colleagues as a factor in supervision, expressed a concern that in a school as large and departmentalized as the Collegiate, teachers had little contact with teachers outside of their departments. Two of these four suggested that it would be productive for administrators to encourage more interaction between teachers and create means through which to exchange ideas and materials between subject areas.

Student evaluations.

In discussing with the teachers those factors which should be considered during formal supervision, the participants were asked whether student evaluations of the teacher's performance would be included in the process. J.K. believed that it should be a consideration, particularly in the lower grades: "...kids can be very honest...especially those who are younger." K.L. also said that student evaluations should be a part of supervision but dissented in his view about which group would be most capable of offering reliable feedback:

At grade twelve...they [students] can perceive, assess and make suggestions--about the way you do things--that are legitimate.

These comments notwithstanding, the great majority of those interviewed argued that student evaluations should not be a consideration in the formal evaluation process. Their primary concerns were that students would not discriminate between "popular" and "good" teachers or that students do not understand why effective teachers do what they do. C.A. speculated that,

if student evaluations became a part of formal supervision, teachers would become preoccupied with being popular:

That [student evaluations] becomes a popularity thing and you'd start teaching to your kids just to be well thought of.

G.H.'s concern was similar, but he also implied that, as an informal means of improving performance, student evaluation of teachers "...couldn't hurt:"

No [it shouldn't be a factor]...if they [students] like you they'll say great things about you...they can't tell the difference between good and popular [teachers]...[but] it doesn't hurt for the teacher to just ask them.

P.Q. was of the opinion that, generally, students lack a clear appreciation for and understanding of effective teaching:

No [student evaluations should not be considered]...they can't identify what it is that makes teachers effective.

In their remarks, L.M. and M.N. commented on both the students' inability to identify effective teaching practices and their inclination to perceive popular teachers as good teachers:

Some very good students judge a teacher as simply, "He's nice." I don't think enough of them know who's effective and how do you find those that can assess [a teacher's effectiveness]?

That [student evaluations] puts teachers in a popularity contest. Plus a lot goes on in a class that they [students] don't understand. (See Wise, 1973; Kauchak, et al., 1985)

After discussing student evaluations as a factor with the the teachers and based upon comments made throughout the course of the interviews, it became evident that the majority of those interviewed would not favor a process in which students assessed a teacher's performance then submitted that assessment to the supervisor. They based their opinions on the belief that

students could not reliably identify means through which teachers could improve their performance and on the belief that if teachers were expected by their supervisors to modify their behaviors according to student input, teachers would be more concerned with popularity than productivity. However, the majority of the teachers also left the impression that when student evaluation is an informal interaction directly with the teacher, it can indicate to teachers what they are doing that is effective and what they are doing that is not promoting desired outcomes. Further, while teachers did imply that a teacher can be good without being popular, none of those interviewed said that a popular teacher could not be a good teacher as well.

Student achievement on standardized test scores.

In prompting those interviewed to discuss whether student achievement on standardized test scores should be a factor considered during formal supervision, the researcher explained that--as a part of the "excellence in education" movement--some North American school divisions are using student performance on standardized tests as one means of assessing teacher performance in the classroom (See Herman, 1986). When asked whether they believe student achievement on standardized tests should be a factor in formal supervision (See Rosenshine, 1971; Cangelosi, 1984; Kauchak et al., 1985), one of those interviewed stated that it should be, eleven responded unequivocally that it should not be and two gave "yes-and-no" answers.

J.K. voiced a common concern about the results of using student achievement on tests as a factor in supervision (See Kauchak, et al., 1985):

That's not sound. You're then teaching specifically to a subject form or guide. You're not really giving a broad understanding of the subject to your students.

A.B. also expressed the opinion that teachers would be inclined to teach toward the test rather than to explore important concepts other than those on that test: "You'd teach toward the test instead of what should be learned."

E.F. discussed the notion of fixing a teacher's salary or status according to his students' achievement on tests and found the entire process to be wanting:

I think they're [schools which base pay on student performance] working on a bankrupt system of education. The best education is education for its own reward...compare that with learning to teach for pay. You want to be careful about paying much attention to test scores because, on the next test, I can just make easy question and easy answers. I think a person ought to be morally honest but if someone really put the heat on you [to improve student gains], you can solve it in a nutshell by making things easy or just teaching what's on the test.

K.L., I.J. and H.I. argued that because different teachers have classes of students with different capacities to achieve, using test scores to measure a teacher's performance would be unreliable:

I don't think I should be rewarded because I have intelligent kids or penalized because I have slower kids.

Suppose you get a bunch of ...[slow students]...in class-- I'm suppose to suffer? Teachers would just begin teaching to the test.

You can't assess teachers [using test scores] from setting to setting. Motivational levels are different ...the type of student differs so [from program to program] that that's [using test scores] not an accurate measuring device.

F.G. explained that using test scores to assess teacher

performance would result in teachers becoming more competitive amongst themselves and less willing to divulge their ideas:

I don't think that [student achievement on tests] should play a part [in supervision]. You may take away from the teachers' goals because the teachers become competitive to look better than each other...they may not share ideas anymore because they don't want the other teacher to get ahead [in the supervisor's estimation].

The two teachers whose responses were not as decisive as their eleven colleagues objecting to test scores as a factor, did not voice support for student achievement on test scores as a factor in formative supervision; rather, they reasoned that when a disproportionate number of students in a teacher's classes are doing poorly on achievement tests, supervisors ought to assess the teacher's performance more closely:

Tests are there to let you know how well you're doing. I guess if all your students fail all the time, there's going to be some concern [about teacher performance] (B.C.)

In summary, then, the majority of those interviewed clearly did not believe that student achievement on standardized tests should be a consideration during formal supervision. Not only were they concerned that these scores would be an unreliable indicator of the quality of a teacher's performance, but that the use of the tests for this purpose could result in effective teachers becoming poor teachers (much the same as if supervision as described in scenario one were to be implemented).

Continuing education.

Prior to the teachers commenting on whether continuing education should be a factor in supervision, it was explained by the researcher that the process of including this factor would involve the supervisor assessing the teacher's present education

status and making a determination about the teacher doing formal coursework in a post-secondary institution to upgrade skills or to become current in their subject areas.

Five teachers stated that continuing education should be a matter for consideration, two said it should not be and seven others said that it would depend upon the circumstances.

Four of the five teachers who favored the inclusion of continuing education were quite succinct in their responses saying, in effect, that teachers should continue to take courses to stay current in their fields. However, K.L. argued that, while it certainly should be a factor in supervision, continuing education is, in reality, discouraged in the study school:

[Continuing education] should be encouraged...[but]...it's discouraged in this division. We no longer have sabbaticals...if you go back and do coursework you're going to cost them [the division] money [because your salary will increase]. There is a dis-incentive to do that [return to university].

K.L. went on to add that some supervisors may feel intimidated by teachers with more formal education than they have and that this might also discourage teachers from continuing their education.

The opinion prevailing amongst those teachers not committing themselves to a "for or against" position seems to be that--because many mid-career teachers with a four-year degree are performing at acceptable levels--it should not be mandated that all must do coursework; rather, according to these teachers, whether a teacher should have more schooling depends on both the individual and the subject area. A.B. summarized the opinion of those who held this view in this remark:

Going back to university should have some bearing [in

supervision] but that's not to say that if you only have a B.Ed. at mid-career you're not a good teacher...still, some [teachers] should go back to stay current, especially in the sciences.

L.M. also observed that teachers in areas where subject matter is continually changing--such as the science and computer fields--should be encouraged to continue their educations to remain current. J.K. expressed a similar opinion but added that formal coursework is not the only means through which teachers acquire skills and knowledge:

There can be a lot of [teacher] knowledge without a degree...but, yes it's [continuing education] a part of it [formal supervision]. It's legitimate to encourage teachers to gain broader experience and to be current. [But it]...may not have to be through a course; it could be through in-services or journals.

E.F., in the following comment, went beyond J.K.'s observations and pointed out that some courses would be of little value to the mid-career teacher:

Teachers should continue their education--they shouldn't be able just to get a degree twenty years ago and then just percolate. Teachers should take courses to stay current but I question whether there's any value in taking a course in education.

E.F. went on to explain that, based upon his experience, he would benefit from taking coursework in his field but that education courses, which have nothing new to offer to an experienced teacher, would be a "waste of time."

The two teachers objecting to continuing education as a factor in supervision suggested that after four years of university, "...the basics of education are there..." (M.N.) and after that it's a matter of "...learning to deal with people..." (B.C.).

In commenting on continuing education as a factor in the

supervisory process, the majority favored its inclusion as a means to ensure that all teachers are performing as they should in the classroom. In keeping with a general trend, however, most of the teachers were reluctant to support a process which mandates that all mid-career teachers adopt specific behaviors--in this instance, continuing their education.

Factors identified by teachers.

Yet another question posed for those interviewed was whether factors which teachers identify as enhancing or abridging their effectiveness should be considered during supervision. As examples of teacher-identified factors, the researcher mentioned class size, availability of materials and equipment, and access to copying machines (Likert, 1961; Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Farber, 1984).

Although it is not apparent from the data reported in Table 11, virtually all teachers interviewed agreed that factors identified by teachers should be discussed during supervision. The three teachers listed on Table 11 as indecisive did say that these factors should be considered but added qualifying remarks that these same factors should not be the basis for teachers excusing their own deficient performances:

Yes [these factors should be considered]...there may be a situation where you could do a better job if you had more materials...[but]...there is a concern that some teachers would use this [factors] as an excuse not to do well. (L.M.)

Yeah [these factors should be considered] but some people use that as a crutch as to why they're not doing well. (C.A.)

[These factors should be considered] but not so that teachers should define the agenda for supervisors by saying "I need this to do my job." (A.B.)

Clearly these teachers are communicating the message that teachers can and should perform acceptably despite being handicapped by less than ideal circumstances.

Of these teachers supporting the inclusion of teacher-identified factors without qualification, D.E. was, perhaps, most adamant that these factors be included in supervision. It was his contention that if his supervisors expected his performance to improve, the way in which they could most assuredly affect this outcome would be to allow him to locate and to copy more supplementary materials for his students.

Prior to making the following remark, K.L. pointed out the irony in schools hiring a teacher for \$50,000 a year and then not giving him the materials to do the job he was hired to do:

The teacher is the most expensive thing in the classroom and the job of the administrator is to facilitate the functioning of the teacher with resources and materials. The administration should be inquiring as to what's needed [by teachers] on an ongoing basis.

In the following comments, other teachers briefly detailed factors which they believe should be considered during supervision:

We find a strain on space...equipment...it's very difficult. I think supervisors should take that [strain] into account during supervision. (H.I.)

Certainly class size...[should be a factor discussed during supervision]...we never have enough of what we have for students. (P.Q.)

...in some cases it's hard to teach without materials...I could use a copier every day if they let us. I could show one video-tape a day and these things are important. (G.H.)

[One factor]...that use to be a problem was when the least experienced teacher was given the most difficult courses...but we discussed the matter and now it's

changed. (E.F.)

[Supervision] should look at what the teacher is working with. The more material you have available, the more effective you can become. (M.N.)

In supporting the proposal that factors identified by teachers should be a part of supervision, those interviewed seemed well aware that fiscal restraints placed limitations on the extent to which they could expect those factors to be modified to the teachers' liking. Rather than the ideal working environment, what the teachers seemed to be asking for was an opportunity to discuss with supervisors those factors which impacted upon their teaching performances and for administrators to be as responsive as time and resources permit (See Likert, 1961; Argyris, 1964; Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973; Krupp, 1987). As I.J. asserted: "[Supervision] can't just be a one-way assessment...teachers must have input back to administrators about their concerns, too."

Conclusions

When one takes into consideration that those teachers responding indecisively on whether specific factors should be included in supervision generally favored inclusion of those factors in some respect, the majority of the teachers agreed that a considerable number of factors must be considered if supervision is going to be effective in improving teacher performance. Even when teachers objected to factors being included--such as student evaluation or student achievement on standardized test scores--their reasoning was premised on the belief that to include these factors in supervision may be to, ultimately, erode the quality of a teacher's performance rather than enhance it.

In their identification of a profession, Giles and Proudfoot (1984) explain that in a profession, "...active, planned efforts are made to understand this knowledge [unique to the profession] and further it for the betterment of mankind (p.187). In identifying the broad range of factors which the teachers said they wanted to be included in supervision for the "betterment" of their teaching and the benefit of their students, these teachers were expressing not only the desire that teachers should be respected as professionals but that they should earn that respect by being subjected to the same rigorous performance assessments characteristic of other professions.

The Impact of Factors on Motivation for Mid-Career Teachers

As indicated earlier in this section, when the teachers were asked whether factors such as salary, preparation time, input into decision-making and administrative support should be included in supervision, they spoke about these factors as relating more to motivation than to supervision. Quite possibly, their disinclination to discuss these factors in the context of supervision may be explained by the probability that they had never engaged in supervision with those factors on the agenda.

However, there is a literature (Likert, 1961; Trusty and Sergiovanni, 1966; Farber, 1984; Krupp, 1987) which argues that if supervision of teachers is going to result in teacher performance improvement, those factors which impact on teacher motivation to improve should be identified and considered during supervision. In other words, authors supporting this position

argue that the scope of traditional supervisory models must be broadened to include factors which may impact on performance but which are not ordinarily on the supervisory agenda.

Although the literature may discuss these factors as part of supervision and those interviewed may have perceived them as motivational factors, as the following discussion suggests, these factors however categorized clearly do impact on the performance of the teachers and do--therefore--merit consideration in a study on supervision as a means for improving teacher performance.

Preparation time.

As reported in Table 12, all of those interviewed indicated that, for mid-career teachers at the secondary level, preparation time is crucial to effective teaching and that, without it, most teachers would not have the time or the motivation to perform as they now do.

G.H. and J.K. both speculated that without preparation time, they would reduce their workloads in other ways:

Without prep' time, I don't know how I'd make things work...I wouldn't come home and mark...I'd teach for half of each class then mark and prepare during the rest of class.

If I didn't have prep' time, I would do more work at home but that would demoralize me and not last for long.

As Levinson (1979) and Krupp (1987) may have foreseen, both of these mid-career teachers emphasized the importance of their families to them and viewed having to do all preparations at home as unwarranted intrusions into their family lives.

As did J.K., H.I. spoke about reduced preparation time

resulting in reduced teacher morale and added that this would eventually impact on groups other than teachers:

[Less prep' time]...could hinder the quality of teaching by creating low morale. For example, teachers would be less inclined to supervise activities which would eventually affect student morale then the morale of parents and parents would pressure the board to return prep' time to teachers.

H.I. added that presently he uses "every minute of my time marking papers or seeing students," and that without preparation time "you wouldn't see the students."

In the comments which follow, teachers discuss the importance of preparation time as an opportunity for teachers to recover from the intense, stressful work they do:

If you don't have prep' time, I don't think you can survive...a teacher can't teach all day long without time for a break just to reorganize. (L.M.)

Prep' time is important for teachers in all areas at all levels. You need it just to think and reorganize. (P.Q.)

It's the prep' time that allows you to, one, unwind and two, prepare for the next class. (M.N.)

Without it, I'd be less motivated...you need it just so you don't get worn out. (C.A.)

In discussing preparation time, those interviewed explained that it gives them an opportunity to prepare better lessons, exchange ideas with colleagues, perform tasks such as marking and copying, meet with students and simply "unwind." If this opportunity was denied them, it was their perception that mid-career teachers would become resentful, less motivated and, therefore, less effective in the classroom.

Support from administration,

Before each teacher commented on the importance of administrative support, the researcher explained that

administrative support was intended to mean that the school administrators assisted teachers--when warranted and appropriate--in their efforts to attain desired student outcomes either academic or behavioral. Again, all fourteen of those interviewed stated that there was a strong correlation between administrative support and teacher performance (See Likert, 1961; Smyth, 1986; Berliner, 1986). Although L.M. remarked simply that "if the administration's not behind you, you're not motivated to do your best, E.F. and G.H. were more specific in describing those ways in which administrators should support teachers:

Administrative support affects morale...part of a supervisor's job is to get both sides [of a conflict] as opposed to a supervisor getting a call [from a parent] then coming right down and giving the teacher hell...there should be administrative support financially, too. Especially in providing equipment and materials.

It's very important that supervisors back you up. There's nothing worse than you saying [to a student], "This is going to happen," then they go to the office and nothing happens.

In elaborating on their responses both of these teachers (quoted above) indicated that they did not expect administrators to invariably side with the teacher despite the circumstances but did expect administrators to provide the teacher with an opportunity to present his version and to "back" the teacher when he deserved it. A.B. also explained that he wanted support from administrators but expected them to confront him when he was in error:

If I get stepped on a lot [without justification], I can get discouraged. But if I do step out of line, straighten me out.

J.K. and K.L. said that, to them, supervisors demonstrated support by taking an interest in teachers and making a point of interacting with them as colleagues:

...administrators must have an interest in teachers as human beings and be visible...just to converse. I would like the administrator to pop in [to the classroom] but they often don't...that would be a way to take an interest in what's going on and to support teachers.

[Administrators] must be friendly...must talk to people and know what's happening in the teachers' lives. If they isolate themselves in the office they make their jobs harder.

Based upon the preceding observations and on comments reported in other sections of this study, it is clear that most of these mid-career teachers desire collegial interactions with supervisors and that, ordinarily, they are motivated to perform well when they perceive that supervisors do take an interest in them as individuals and as teachers. As Krupp (1987) reports, this is particularly true for mid-career teachers who are disillusioned with their work and often experiencing some turmoil in their personal lives.

Two other interviewees argued that administrators must be consistent in their support of policies adopted by the school or it will be difficult to implement policies as they are intended:

[Administrative support is important] especially with regard to attendance or lates. One expects administrators to consistently fulfill obligations [in policy implementation]. If they don't there's no direction. (I.J.)

You must have supervisors who are consistent in their support of teachers and consistent in following policies otherwise there's chaos. (D.E.)

As may be recalled, in the discussion of characteristics which teachers desired in their professional relations with

supervisors, nine of those volunteered that the supervisors must be honest and trustworthy. From their comments on administrative support as a factor affecting teacher motivation, it is evident that when those interviewed trust the supervisor to act fairly and consistently in supporting teachers, they are less inclined to grow indifferent about their effectiveness in the classroom.

Input into decision-making.

Researchers including Herzberg (1957), Likert, (1961) and Argyris (1964) have argued that most employees (teachers) are motivated by the opportunity to participate in decision-making. As their findings may have predicted, all fourteen of those interviewed stated that the extent to which teachers were allowed to participate in policy decision-making would influence the degree to which teachers were motivated to do their jobs effectively. Further, while teachers were generally satisfied with their salary and preparation time, several of the teachers strongly recommended that teachers be given more opportunity for input into decision making than they are currently afforded. K.L. discussed the consequences of limited opportunity for teacher input:

We have good teachers in this department but their biggest problem is morale. They feel they are not a part of any decision-making so small issues get blown out of proportion. You get isolated, too, if you don't have the sense that you're a part of what's happening up there [in administration].

H.I. also argued that if teachers played more significant roles in decision-making, they would be more inclined to support school policies:

All teachers should have more input into school policy...the'd feel more confident that the school is being run as they think it should...if they had more input they'd be more likely to practice the policies.

Yet another teacher expressing a desire to be included more in decision-making made this comment:

I'd like more opportunity [to participate in decision-making]...if I'm involved, I feel I know what direction we [the school] are going. (P.Q.)

Implicit in these remarks is the probability that those teachers interviewed, at least, suspect that some teachers, however many, do not adhere strictly to policies they had no part in shaping. Unlike the three previously quoted teachers, the teachers making the following observations did not make specific reference to their school; however they did point out that when teachers are involved in decision-making they are more inclined to accept the determinations ultimately made:

If you help make decisions you're more likely to try to make the right decision to make it work. If you're just told "This is what you're going to do," you might take exception to that. (L.M.)

If you know you're a part of the decision, you support it better. If it's forced on you, you rebell [against it]. (C.A.)

The one teacher cited in Table 11 as giving an indecisive response explained that some teachers aren't interested in becoming involved in decision-making; however, he does want the opportunity to participate for the reasons mentioned by several of his colleagues:

Yes..No. Some are content with being followers. I would like to participate...because those decisions are going to affect your environment and they're easier to accept if you know how they came about. (I.J.)

In effect, all the teachers reported that they wanted the

opportunity to participate in the process through which decisions that would impact on their teaching were made. The teachers were confident that, by mid-career, they could provide valuable input into the process and that they would be more likely to adhere to policies when given the opportunity to play a role in policy formulation. In general, these teachers did not proclaim that they would abide only by those decisions which they endorsed; rather, what they appear to be saying is that when administrators recognize the experience and skills mid-career professionals may bring to decision-making and, consequently, entertain seriously suggestions made by these teachers, the teachers will feel a stronger motivation to support decisions even when they are not those proposed by the teacher.

Salary.

Perhaps influenced by the work of earlier researchers in the private sector, Trusty and Sergiovanni (1966) conducted a study which led them to conclude that, by mid-career, teachers are not likely to be motivated by salary to improve their performances.

Consistent with these research findings, ten of the teachers stated that, at mid-career, salary is not a factor in the quality of their teaching performance. Two of those interviewed spoke not of salaries as a motivation for themselves but for other teachers and two teachers, listed in Table 11 as indecisive, explained that salary does motivate mid-career teachers.

B.C. made a comment that was typical of the responses given by those who denied that salary motivates mid-career teachers:

[Salary] is not really a factor. I feel I'm making a

good wage. Whether I get a raise won't affect my teaching.

F.G. and K.L. made similar observations:

I don't think [salary] raises are motivational factors. A raise isn't going to make a mid-career teacher work harder to improve themselves.

Whether I get a two percent or three percent increase [in salary] makes no difference. When you get to mid-career it doesn't make a difference.

Although the majority of the teachers did not believe salary to be a motivational factor for mid-career teachers most implied that, as H.L. explains, it could be a factor in motivating novice teachers:

[Salary] is not [a motivating factor] for me. For a beginning teacher it may be but I'm pretty well established by now.

While interpreting these comments, it may be advisable to keep in mind that teachers are not saying that, at mid-career, they become indifferent to the salary they make; rather, the message most are communicating is that, by this stage in their careers, they are making enough money so that nominal increases or decreases in their salaries are not likely to affect their standard of living or their teaching performance. However, it seems probable that, as E.F. explains, if salaries were significantly reduced, teacher performance may decline:

I don't think [salary is a motivator at mid-career]. If I was making two or three thousand dollars less I wouldn't do anything different [in the classroom], but there's also a minimum you don't want to fall below.

Contrary to the majority of his colleagues, B.C. argued that, while a salary increase would not have an effect on his teaching, it was his belief that many mid-career teachers would put less effort into teaching if they were not given annual

raises. He also added the following observation:

I think it's [a salary increase] a motivator for a lot of people...a lot of people are in teaching for the money.

It was M.N.'s contention that, even at mid-career, teachers are inclined to assess the amount of work they do and judge whether their pay is commensurate with their efforts; if they believe it is not, they may do less:

Yes [salary is a motivator]...a teacher looks at the amount of work he's doing and if he's doing more than what he's getting paid for, he may cut back.

In effect, while most of the teachers did not believe that salary is a factor which motivates the mid-career teacher to improve performance, there is no reason to suppose that, at mid-career, teachers become more altruistic and less concerned with equitable remuneration for their services; rather, the evidence suggests that because the mid-career teachers interviewed perceive that they are being paid a salary which allows them to live comfortably, slight vacillations in the amount are not likely to affect their performances. However, one could also argue that, given the high expectations the public holds for teachers, those interviewed were less inclined to mention monetary rewards as motivational factors and more given to portraying themselves as teaching out of humanitarian concerns. Further, it is not unreasonable to assume that--if significant wage reductions were made--their perceptions may change and salary could become a factor in motivation. I.J. expressed this notion in these words:

A comfortable teacher [who feels his income affords him a comfortable living] is going to perform much better

and be more productive [than a teacher who is not content].

Conclusions

Consistent with a literature that maintains that teacher performance is more likely influenced by factors such as participation in decision-making, support from the administration and time to prepare rather than by extrinsic variables such as salary, the majority of the teachers commented upon salary as being of less consequence to a mid-career teacher than other factors. E.F. put this process of prioritization into perspective when he made this remark:

[At mid-career], teachers would take another half period of prep' time rather than more money.

Judging from their comments in general, most of the teachers interviewed in the Collegiate appear satisfied with the preparation time and salary they are currently afforded. However, if trustees or administrators were to significantly decrease either, they should also expect a corresponding decline in teacher performance. There appears to be a basis for suspecting that most mid-career teachers have a clear sense of what is fair and that when they judge that they are being treated inequitably, they feel justified in compensating for inequities by making less of an effort than they otherwise would.

In discussing factors such as support from the administration and input into decision-making, several teachers indicated that, to varying degrees, they were troubled by an occasional instance when they did not have the support they expected from the supervisor and several also mentioned that, currently, they do not believe that they have the opportunity to

participate in decision-making to the extent they deserve.

Since a majority of teachers volunteered that they are satisfied with the support given them by the current administration, those who were less pleased may be basing their opinions on isolated incidents or may have unreasonably high expectations regarding administrative support in which instance their discontent need not be of concern to school administrators.

An issue which the administrators may want to examine is whether mid-career teachers are, indeed, being given sufficient opportunity to participate in the decision-making which bears on their work. Although only three of the teachers stated emphatically that they wanted greater opportunity to participate, the researcher was given the impression that the majority of those interviewed would probably be more than willing to share their ideas and opinions if they were given more opportunity.

In summary, the teachers did perceive preparation time, salary, input into decision-making and administrative support as variables having the potential to impact upon the performances of mid-career teachers. However, because they typically felt that they were afforded sufficient salary, preparation time and administrative support, the single factor which may be affecting the motivation of some of the teachers is--what they perceive to be--limited opportunity for input into decision-making in the school.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSIONS

The discussion which ensues is an offering of conclusions which may be drawn on the basis of the data gathered through the interviews with the fourteen mid-career teachers in the study school. This chapter, also, is a focused response to the following questions:

1. What method of supervision do those interviewed believe would be of greatest value in promoting improvement in the teaching performance of mid-career male teachers?
2. What relationship do those interviewed believe should exist between the supervisor and the teacher to make supervision a productive process?
3. What factors should be considered during the supervision of mid-career male teachers?

Implications for Supervision According to Prescribed Behaviors

Consistent with the conclusions of researchers such as Darling-Hammond, et al., 1983; Duncan, 1984; Kauchak, et al., 1985; and Driscoll, 1987, it appears that the extent to which mid-career teachers will engage in performance improvement is, at least, partially dependent upon the degree to which they perceive formal supervision as being appropriate for their situation. This hypothesis was substantiated by those interviewed through comments made in response to a variety of questions, but particularly in their discussions of supervision according to prescribed behaviors (scenario one).

The central concern of those interviewed was that mid-career teachers would not benefit from this method of supervision because 1) it would not allow teachers the flexibility they need to vary their behaviors according to different classes or disciplines and

2) it would not be an accurate means through which the supervisor could identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses.

The teachers did not suggest that their superordinates lacked the power or authority to employ supervision according to prescribed behaviors nor did they question whether a superordinate had the right to expect teachers to adopt the behaviors prescribed. Rather, the teachers focused on the means through which mid-career teachers would circumvent this approach to supervision in order to both meet the expectations of the supervisor and to "protect" the teaching methods which they normally practice.

In predicting that most mid-career teachers would practice the prescribed behaviors only during the supervisor's observation of them, then revert to the practices with which they were most comfortable, the teachers were clearly suggesting that mid-career teachers would not be coerced by a superordinate's authority into adopting methods which they did not want to use. The teachers were also expressing a certain confidence in the power of mid-career teachers to negate or neutralize the authority of the supervisor. More specifically, while the supervisor may have the authority to expect--or even insist--that teachers exhibit prescribed behaviors in the classroom, the nature of this supervisory process is such that teachers can appear to be conforming to the supervisor's expectations then go about teaching as they ordinarily would. Typically, the teachers discussed this process of disguising their behaviors as justifiable on the basis that they would not become more effective teachers by adopting the behaviors identified by the

supervisor and may become less effective in the classroom.

A factor which may render supervision according to prescribed behaviors not only ineffective but dysfunctional, is the tendency for the teachers to view the supervisor in this model as a superordinate adversary demanding that teachers conform to the supervisor's expectations rather than as a facilitator enabling teachers to perform more effectively and assisting them in removing the impediments to improvement of performance. A possible consequence of this adversarial relationship is that teachers would lack trust and confidence in the supervisor as an educational leader and may be even more inclined to reject the supervisor's agenda for improving the performance of teachers.

In effect, the teachers did not perceive supervision according to prescribed behaviors as an approach which would lead to improved performance in the mid-career teacher. Regardless of the potential value this method of supervision may hold for the teachers, their unwillingness to accept it and their capability to circumvent it would appear to indicate that adopting such a supervisory model for mid-career teachers in the study school would be of little true value in the improvement of teacher performance. Stated simply, while the current structure of the school would allow superordinates to mandate this approach to supervision, it would just as easily permit teachers to subvert it.

Implications for Clinical Supervision

Because the present approach to supervision in the study

context is premised on a clinical supervision model, the teachers' discussion of this approach is more likely to have been based upon experience than upon speculation.

Considering that the veteran teachers in the Collegiate undergo formal supervision only once in three years, it would be difficult to argue that supervision has been deemed a high priority by those allocating the principal's time for supervision. Accordingly, the teachers interviewed tended to perceive clinical supervision as a perfunctory, diluted process of little or no value to mid-career teachers for performance improvement. It was their belief that, because the supervisor had so little time or opportunity to formally observe teachers, it would be impossible for him to accurately formulate impressions of the teachers' performances or to design appropriate strategies for improving those performances.

Generally, the teachers seemed to tolerate the present methods of clinical supervision as a relatively innocuous nuisance; however, that is not to say they perceived the process as virtually non-threatening. There exists amongst the teachers a clear concern that during supervision, the supervisor may identify a deficiency--real, imagined or contrived--that would result in negative consequences for the teacher whether in the form of closer scrutiny by the supervisor or recommendations on how to correct the deficiency. In that the teachers--typically--were of the opinion that most supervisors lacked the knowledge to advise mid-career teachers on subject content or teaching methods, being given recommendations for improvement by the supervisor would (as in scenario one) place the teacher in a

position of having to "assume" practices--or appear to assume them--to demonstrate compliance with a superordinate's recommendations. In order to protect against giving the supervisor cause for concern about a teacher's performance in the first place, the majority of those interviewed believed that mid-career teachers would simply "perform" during observation as they thought the supervisor would want them to return to their normal practices.

If, as may be presumed, clinical supervision is practiced in the Collegiate for the purpose of improving the quality of instruction, a particularly disturbing probability--in the opinion of those interviewed--is that, not only is the current approach failing to accomplish that objective, it may be preserving mediocrity in the quality of some teacher's instruction.

In discussing clinical supervision, nearly half of the teachers interviewed volunteered that, because incompetent teachers can readily perform according to the supervisor's standards once in three years, they remain in the system without expectations or strategies for improving performance being imposed upon them. Indeed, several teachers remarked that the present method of clinical supervision protects incompetent teachers because they could successfully contest a termination made on the basis of a principal's eighty minute observation once in every three school years.

As with supervision according to prescribed behaviors, those interviewed did not perceive clinical supervision to be an

approach which would result in improved performance for mid-career teachers. At its best, they viewed it as a rare opportunity for the principal to see them teach and positively reinforce what they were doing; at its worst, the teachers believed that clinical supervision actually protects incompetent teachers and may pose a threat to competent teachers toward whom the principal has formed an inaccurate, unfavorable impression on the basis of one observation in three years or on erroneous information (from other sources). In either instance, clinical supervision does not hold much promise in the minds of those interviewed as a supervisory method through which mid-career teachers would become better classroom instructors.

Implications for Differentiated Supervision

In reacting to supervision as described in scenarios one and two, the teachers tended to view these approaches as a matter of superordinates "tinkering" to no avail with the classroom instead of a means for teacher improvement. In contrast, the majority of those interviewed generally perceived differentiated supervision (scenario three) as an unambiguously formative method of supervision which could enable mid-career teachers to develop their real strengths and correct their actual weaknesses.

The most appealing aspect of differentiated supervision was the opportunity for the teachers to work with another teacher or department head during supervision. Ongoing collaboration with someone having expertise in the same subject area as opposed to assessment by a superordinate between long intervals was thought, by the teachers, to be advantageous in several respects. It was the collective belief of those interviewed that subject-area

colleagues--whether a fellow teacher or a department head--would be more informed on subject content and more familiar with the classroom milieu than a superordinate and would, therefore, be better prepared to assist each other in performance improvement. Additionally, supervision with a colleague rather than with a superordinate could be sustained over the course of the year to allow teachers to form more accurate impressions of each other's strengths and weaknesses. Yet another perceived advantage to supervision with colleagues was that teachers would feel less concerned about formative supervision actually being a summative process which a superordinate could use as a basis for enacting negative consequences against a teacher.

The teachers also reacted favorably to differentiated supervision because it permits mid-career teachers to opt for the method of supervision which they believe will be of the most benefit to them in performance improvement. It was generally held that, in allowing teachers to chose a supervisory track, it would become more likely that 1) teachers would engage in activites that would be of real value to them, 2) teachers would accept more "ownership" of supervisory activities when they were self-imposed rather than externally imposed and 3) teachers would respond more positively to supervision which allows them a choice because such an approach tacitly credits them with being experienced professionals.

Differentiated supervision, in contrast with supervision according to prescribed behaviors or clinical supervision, appears less likely to create a circumstance in which

superordinates struggle to impose behaviors on experienced teachers while those same teachers struggle to maintain autonomy and preserve their teaching identities. Because this approach to supervision does not seem as likely to generate a potentially destructive power-struggle between teachers and their superordinates, it is probable that differentiated supervision has the potential not only for improving the performance of the mid-career teacher but also for enhancing the relationship between teachers and their superordinates.

None of this is to suggest, however, that the supervisor should assume a laissez-faire role in the process of differentiated supervision. As noted previously, most of those teachers interviewed expressed concern that not all of their mid-career colleagues were performing acceptably. In a differentiated approach to supervision, the supervisor has a clear responsibility to identify less than competent instructors and, as advocated by models in the literature, assign these teachers to more structured, closely monitored supervisory tracks (such as rigorous clinical supervision).

Further, it is worthy of reiteration that the majority of those interviewed expressed doubts that mid-career teachers working independently to improve performance (through coursework, workshops and other activities) would invest much time or effort in this venture. A significant implication of this commonly-espoused view is that, if teachers are given the option to work independently, supervisors--at the very least--should assist these teachers in prioritizing their time and in making efforts to ensure that supervision is productive.

Additionally, it may not be unreasonable for the supervisor to request some evidence that the teacher has engaged in worthwhile activities even if no more than a brief report by the teacher.

Although not without flaws, differentiated supervision was perceived by the majority of those interviewed as the most effective of the four models for improving teacher performance at mid-career. They were far more accepting of a process which enabled them to negotiate a strategy for improvement with the supervisor than they were of approaches which required that they accept imposed methods of supervision.

Implications for Reflective Supervision

In view of the teachers' concern that mid-career teachers may not invest the time and effort necessary to make independent performance improvement (scenario three) a productive activity, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they would have a similar concern over an approach to supervision--such as reflective supervision--which allows teachers even more autonomy. Although those interviewed did not react decisively in favor or against reflective supervision, the fact that nearly all of the teachers chose to discuss this model as a process which they currently practice on an informal basis suggests that they perceive this approach as so unstructured and free from external direction that they had difficulty envisioning it as a formal process of supervision. This probability is given further credence by the fact that four of the five teachers who identified reflective supervision as the most effective approach to performance improvement explained that it would be most effective

only if integrated into a more structured model such as differentiated supervision.

Through their strong preference for working with a colleague to improve performance and their apparent perception of reflective supervision as lacking structure or opportunity for input from an external source, the teachers appear to be advocating that formal supervision should have structure and should provide an established mechanism through which the teacher interacts with another individual in the system.

In consideration of their discussions in total, it may be concluded that the teachers interviewed believe that when there is an absence of external power during supervision--if even in the form of a colleague's knowledge and insight--the following consequences may occur:

- incompetent teachers would have limited means through which to improve their performances,

- teachers, in general, would feel little incentive to "go the extra mile" toward performance improvement at mid-career, and

- teachers, as resources unto themselves, would be restricted in the extent to which they could identify and ameliorate deficiencies in their performances.

Taking into account the belief of those interviewed that superordinates would be of nominal assistance in working with mid-career teachers to formulate strategies for improvement and of virtually no value in working with them on matters relating to subject content, another ramification which may prove problematic with the use of reflective supervision is that mid-career teachers may be less than enthusiastic about engaging with a superordinate in the "mapping out and testing of strategies" as

advocated by the literature on reflective supervision.

In view of the weaknesses identified by the teachers and the conclusions drawn in the foregoing discussion, it would appear evident that--if the study school were to adopt reflective supervision as the formal means of supervision for mid-career teachers--the model should be structured to include an additional source upon which teachers may predictably rely for motivation and for strategies to improve their performances. Further, it seems probable that some method of gauging a teacher's progress toward improvement--such as feedback from another teacher or department head--would be of value to teachers in assessing whether they are, indeed, improving their performances in the classroom.

In that teachers report that they currently engage in reflective supervision informally, it would seem redundant to adopt reflective supervision as a formal method of supervision. Rather, it would seem more advantageous for superordinates to encourage teachers to continue reflection on their work and to offer them additional means--such as the differentiated supervision they prefer--through which to improve their performances.

Inferences about the Teachers' Preferred Relationship with the Supervisor

As pointed out in the discussion of clinical supervision (the supervisory model currently followed in the study school), the majority of the teachers interviewed expressed very little confidence that the performance of mid-career teachers could improve through engaging in supervision with a superordinate once

every three years. Further, it was generally their opinion that even if the superordinate did observe them on a more regular basis, it was improbable that he would be able to advise the mid-career teacher on matters of subject content or on strategies for performance improvement.

The question which arises out of the teachers' perception toward current supervisory practices is: If they recognize clinical supervision as being an ineffective means of performance improvement for mid-career teachers, what do they suppose the actual purpose of supervision is in their school? The answer to this question appears to be that the teachers view formal supervision as an administrative activity which their superordinate must perform in accordance with district policy.

Put another way, it appears unlikely that those mid-career teachers interviewed really do believe that current supervisory practices provide them with a reliable, ongoing means through which they can become better teachers. Rather, they perceive the process as a matter of superordinates fulfilling their administrative responsibilities. Supervision, it appears, becomes most significant when the superordinate endeavors to make it more than a harmless, perfunctory process by using supervision as a punitive process or a means through which the superordinate endeavors to modify the behaviors of mid-career teachers without input from them. When the majority of the teachers interviewed indicated that they preferred a relationship with their supervisor that was based on trust, what they evidently were expressing, in one respect, was the hope that--because their

superordinate cannot get an accurate impression of their teaching from observing them once every three years, and because the superordinate could not, in the teachers' opinions, offer much worthwhile advice on the basis of that observation--the teachers can "trust" that their supervisor will not enact consequences against them on the basis of a diluted, ineffective process of supervision.

Those teachers who talked about the superordinate bringing biases into the supervisory process seemed also to be addressing this same issue. For instance, several teachers spoke about superordinates harrassing teachers not because of incompetency but on the basis of a complaint from an external source or because of tension or conflict between the teacher and superordinate outside of the classroom.

Quite clearly, the teachers who view supervision not as a means of promoting teacher effectiveness but as a potentially punitive process depending upon a superordinate's hidden agenda are not convinced that current supervision is a formative rather than a summative process. Additionally, there is evidence to indicate that--regardless of a superordinate's intentions--supervisory models such as clinical supervision and supervision according to prescribed behaviors tend to cast the teacher and supervisor in subordinate--superordinate roles thus strengthening the teachers' perception that supervision is more a matter of summative evaluation than a formative means through which to improve teacher performance.

All of this is not to imply that the teachers expect supervision to produce adverse consequences for them, but it is

to say that they are keenly aware of the potential for difficulties to arise. Further, teachers at mid-career appear ever-mindful that, with tenure and a firm power-base of their own, it is unlikely that a superordinate could use the current approach to supervision alone as a justification for termination. Essentially, the teachers' concerns appear to stem from the possibility that--on the basis of misimpressions, inaccurate conclusions drawn from a single observation or hidden agendas--the superordinate may use supervision not as a means for terminating mid-career teachers but as a justification for making their jobs less pleasant and more difficult.

Given the teachers' concern that superordinates generally do not have the time or expertise to observe and advise all teachers on strategies for performance improvement and taking into consideration their suspicions that supervision by a superordinate would be--to some extent--a summative evaluation process to assess a teacher's worth to the organization, it appears crucial that a clear distinction between supervision and evaluation should exist in policy, process and in the minds of administrators and teachers. Further, given the collegial, non-threatening relationship the teachers believe they must have with a supervisor to make supervision a productive process, it may also be advisable to appoint someone other than the superordinate charged with evaluation of the teachers to work with teachers in supervision.

Although, initially, it may be somewhat difficult to accept the foregoing discussion as a conclusion regarding the

relationship the teachers prefer to have with a superordinate during supervision, it is precisely those elements and issues discussed which appear to have the greatest influence in shaping the teachers' views on the relationship they desire. While the teachers would like their superordinate to be knowledgeable in all subject areas and to have expertise based on recent classroom experience, in reality, they do not expect him to bring those qualities to the supervisory relationship nor does their superordinate contend that he does possess the experience and knowledge to use the current method of supervision for improving the performances of all mid-career teachers. Concurrently, both the teachers and the superordinate are, indeed, aware that each possesses a power that could be turned against the other when either party feels wronged during the supervisory process whether it is the teacher who is inappropriately reprimanded or the superordinate whose observations are scoffed at by a teacher. In essence, then, the relationship the teachers desire with the supervisor during supervision is one in which the teachers can trust the supervisor to recognize the severe limitations of the present model as a means of improving the performance of mid-career teachers and can trust him to foresee and to avoid the serious conflict which may ensue from the use of the present model as anything but a routine compliance with written policy. In other words, it is, to a considerable extent, the approach to supervision in the study school which has defined the relationship the teachers prefer to have with the superordinate during supervision.

As it probably should, if a concern arises over the apparent

ineffectiveness in the study school of a superordinate working with teachers during supervision, an alternative perhaps worth exploring is to offer mid-career teachers in the Collegiate the option of working with another classroom teacher or the head of the department in formal supervision.

Allowing the mid-career teacher to undergo supervision with a colleague is suggested as an alternative on the basis of the teachers' perceptions that 1) colleagues are better informed than superordinates on matters of subject content and current classroom dilemmas, 2) colleagues would be more readily available to participate in supervision, 3) teachers "know" their colleagues better than they "know" their superordinates and have a clearer sense of who they trust and who they distrust rather than the common mistrust some of them seem to have toward all superordinates and 4) teachers appear less suspicious that colleagues would be following hidden agendas during supervision.

To conclude, when the teachers are locked into a supervisory relationship by a model of supervision which neither the teachers nor the superordinate regard as having potential for improving teacher performance, supervision may become little more than an unproductive, time-consuming process for either party. A step in making the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor more productive in the view of the teachers appears to be to allow teachers to engage in supervision with a colleague; however, since there are indications that the approach to supervision plays a significant part in defining the teacher-supervisor relationship (even when the "supervisor" is a

colleague)--to simply pair a teacher with a subject-area colleague without paying heed to the method of supervision the teachers prefer may be of limited value.

Considerations to be Included in Supervision

In reacting to scenario one (supervision according to prescribed behaviors), the teachers were strongly opposed to a supervisory process in which the performance of mid-career teachers was assessed by a supervisor on the basis of the extent to which the teacher practiced certain pre-determined behaviors. It appears somewhat inconsistent, then, that those interviewed decisively identified a number of factors which should be considered during the supervision of any teacher (see Table 11). However, several points may serve to account for this apparent contradiction.

Firstly, most of those factors identified by the teachers for consideration were comparatively broad in contrast to the specific behaviors recommended for assessment in supervision according to prescribed behaviors. For instance, although teachers indicated that teaching methodology should be considered during supervision they did not insist that a teacher's method of presenting a lesson should proceed according to the nine steps prescribed in one supervisory model (Russell and Hunter, 1980) or be deemed unacceptable.

Additionally, at no point did the teachers identify the number of variables considered during formal supervision as being a concern. Rather than the the quantity of variables, the teachers were more inclined to focus on the following matters:

- 1) Whether manipulation of the variables would, indeed,

result in performance improvement (for example, while the teachers believed that better classroom management could lead to improved teacher performance, they did not, typically, believe that higher scores by students on standardized tests indicated or predicted improved performance by the teacher),

2) Whether the supervisor had the expertise and the time to accurately identify strengths and weaknesses in a mid-career teacher,

3) Whether the supervisor could work with the teacher in a collegial relationship to formulate effective performance improvement strategies,

4) Whether the teacher was afforded an opportunity to participate in the identification of behaviors to be considered during supervision, and

5) Whether the teachers perceived the method of supervision as one which would promote improvement in the performance of mid-career teachers.

In effect, those interviewed evidently recognize that teaching is a complex activity and that to enhance their abilities to perform that activity, a good many factors must be taken into consideration. However, given this complexity and given the differing circumstances in which teachers work according to disciplines and contexts, they also recognize that if supervision is going to result in performance improvement, the supervisor must have expertise to assess a number of teacher behaviors and the method of supervision should be appropriate for each teacher.

Further, those interviewed rarely spoke about factors for consideration from the first-person perspective preferring to discuss them from the second-person viewpoint as in "...your personality plays a part in how you function..." While it would be unjustifiably speculative to offer a psychoanalytical interpretation of this tendency, it would not be unreasonable to

presume that, often, when the teachers discussed factors which should be considered during supervision they were thinking of factors to be considered in the supervision of someone other than themselves. Expressed another way, while most of the teachers conceded weaknesses in the performances of other mid-career teachers, very few spoke of the flaws they perceived in their own teaching. Perhaps, had the researcher asked each teacher what factors should be considered when they--personally--undergo supervision, the frequency with which factors were identified may have been noticeably diminished.

The significance of the teachers' comments on factors which should be considered in supervision of mid-career teachers lies partly in the identification of those factors; equally important, however, may be re-emerging evidence of the considerable control teachers have over the actual impact that consideration of these factors will have in performance improvement. Just as teachers saw ways of subverting the superordinate's power in scenarios one and two, so, too--for instance--did a number of them anticipate that if student test scores were to become a factor for consideration during supervision, many teachers would simply "teach" the material on the test then proceed as they ordinarily do.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that--invariably--all mid-career teachers refuse compliance with policy which they do not fully support. What is more likely is that when, on the basis of their experience and judgment, mid-career teachers perceive that compliance with a particular dictate could have a deleterious effect on their teaching or on student outcomes, they

may chose to subvert or circumvent that particular directive or policy despite the "paper power" of superordinates to enforce it.

Additional Factors to be Considered During Supervision

Although they are not commonly considered during formal supervision, one literature submits that the scope of supervision should be broadened to include variables which may impact on the motivation of mid-career teachers. To determine the extent to which several of these variables do impact upon the motivation of mid-career teachers to improve their performances, the teachers were asked to discuss preparation time, support from administration, input into decision-making and salary in terms of the influence each has on performance improvement.

It was evident from the teachers' remarks on salary that-- at mid-career--teachers are usually being paid a salary which affords them a "comfortable " living and the majority of those interviewed did not consider salary a variable which impacts on their teaching performances. Although preparation time was described as a crucial variable in the quality of a teacher's performance, nearly all of the teachers interviewed felt that they were allocated sufficient preparation time and that it would become an issue only if attempts were made to reduce or eliminate the time they presently have for preparation.

As noted in the the discussion on the relationship teachers prefer with the supervisor during supervision, the teachers' current supervisor appears to recognize the benefits in supporting teachers in their efforts to accomplish classroom objectives whether behavioral or academic. While all fourteen teachers

interviewed commented that administrative support impacts appreciably on teacher performance, most, also, were generally satisfied with the support they currently are given and, at this point, it seems that the teachers would not deem administrative support to be a variable that should be placed on the agenda for supervision.

The teachers, likewise, reached a consensus that input into the making of decisions which would impact on their teaching is of importance in motivating teachers to improve performance. However, several teachers expressed strong concern that, presently, experienced teachers in the study school were not given the opportunity for participation into decision-making that they ought to have. Agruably, these concerns reflect a belief amongst mid-career teachers that, on the basis of their experience and expertise, they could make positive contributions to the school if only superordinates would relinquish some power over decision-making to the teachers. Based upon the observations made by the teachers, there is little reason to suppose that those teachers seeking more control over decision-making do so simply to serve their own purposes or merely for the sake of having power; more likely they want greater input into decisions, primarily, because they perceive certain policies or practices as impediments to effective teaching and feel that they can provide guidance in correcting the flaws in these matters.

Conclusion

What is most evident in the data gathered for this study is that the teachers interviewed believe that mid-career

teachers are less likely to perceive those approaches to supervision which dictate that the teacher adopt specified behaviors as viable methods for performance improvement. Further, the teachers are skeptical that changes in their classroom behavior prescribed by a superordinate would make them more effective teachers. According to those interviewed, when mid-career teachers are told to adopt behaviors which they judge to be less effective or appropriate than those they practice, most will "cope" with such demands by displaying the behaviors when under the superordinate's scrutiny but otherwise teach as they ordinarily do. In effect, when a superordinate exercises the authority to insist that mid-career teachers improve their performances by adopting behaviors which the teachers perceive to be ineffective, it is quite unlikely that they will actually modify their current practices or that the teachers' performances will truly become what the superordinate expects them to be. Therefore, supervision according to prescribed behaviors and clinical supervision appear to be methods of supervision which have little value for improving the performances of mid-career teachers in the study school.

In general, those interviewed appeared confident that they have the experience and expertise to function as effective teachers in the classroom. However, the teachers clearly recognized that, although mid-career teachers often have well-developed teaching skills and an accumulation of subject-area knowledge, they are also susceptible to stagnation or deterioration and require some formal mechanism within the

school structure through which to improve their teaching and avoid "burn-out."

The teachers' assessment of reflective supervision as an effective means of informal supervision suggests that they prefer a method of formal supervision that is clearly structured and one which affords them an opportunity to engage in supervision with another individual knowledgeable in their subject area and familiar with current classroom dilemmas.

Of the four supervisory models described to those interviewed, differentiated supervision (scenario three) appears to have the greatest potential for improving the performances of mid-career teachers in the study school for these reasons in particular:

- it allows teachers to choose a method of supervision which they believe will be of worth for performance improvement,

- it provides the teachers with an opportunity to work with colleagues knowledgeable in the teachers' subject-areas and familiar with the present classroom climate, and

- the teachers perceive differentiated supervision to be the model holding the greatest promise for promoting improved teacher performance; given this common perception, it appears that differentiated supervision is the method of supervision most likely to motivate mid-career teachers to improve their performances.

Although there is no hard, empirical evidence that the implementation of a differentiated supervision model will result in performance improvement for all or even most of the mid-career teachers in the study context and, although it is probable that formal supervision alone will not impact significantly on the quality of public education in general, there is evidence that current, commonly-practiced methods of supervision--such as

supervision according to prescribed behaviors and clinical supervision--do not promote improvement performance in mid-career teachers, and that adoption of a differentiated model of supervision certainly merits consideration.

Implications for Further Research

Based upon conclusions reported in other studies and upon the data generated by this study, there is reason to hypothesize that the extent to which teachers commit themselves to performance improvement through supervision is, at least in part, dependent upon the degree to which they perceive supervision as a fair and reliable process appropriate to their needs. Additionally, it may be posited that these perceptions will vary according to the career stage of the teacher.

While the results of this study suggest that mid-career male teachers in the study context prefer a model of supervision which

- 1) allows them options according to their needs and preferences,
- 2) affords them the opportunity to work with colleagues and
- 3) has in place a mechanism through which amelioration of deficiencies in marginal teachers may occur,

replication of this study in other contexts is necessary to substantiate the conclusions submitted. Further, because there is reason to suppose that female teachers, teachers at other career stages and teachers instructing at lower grade levels or in special needs areas may hold views toward the efficacy of certain models which diverge from those held by the study population, investigation into the perceptions of these teachers toward supervision may produce results of value to improve supervision as a means through which most teachers may improve their teaching performances.

References

- Argyris, C. (1964). Understanding organizational behavior. New York: Wiley.
- Basalou, J.M., Killinger, J.E. & Thompson, J.E. (1974, February). Student evaluation of secondary staff members. NASSP Bulletin.
- Berliner, D.C. (1986, August). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher. pp. 5-13.
- Best, J.W. (1970). Research in education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Blome, A.C. (1985, April). Developing a teacher evaluation process. NASSP Bulletin.
- Bobbit, F. W. (1913). Some general principles of management applied to the problems of city school systems. In F.W. Bobbit (Ed.) The supervision of city schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bolin, F.S. (1987, Summer). On defining supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. pp. 368-380.
- Brueckner, L.J. (1925, March). The value of time analysis of classroom activity as a supervisory technique. Elementary School Journal. 25, 518-521.
- Brophy, J.E. & Evertson, C. (1974). Process-product correlations in the Texas teacher effectiveness study: Final report. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
- Bullock, W. & Davis, J. (1985, Spring). Interpersonal factors

that influence principal's rating of teacher performance.

Planning and Changing. 16, (1).

Burk, P. & Kray, R. (1985, April). Experienced and inexperienced teachers' attitudes toward supervision and evaluations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

Burton, W.H. (1922). Supervision and the improvement of teaching. New York: Appleton.

Campbell, C., Cordis, L., McBeath, A. & Young, E. (1987, March). Implementing responsive supervision. The Canadian Administrator. 26 (6), 10-21.

Cangelosi, J.S. (1984, November). Evaluating teachers: A suggestion for principals. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 18-23.

Cogan, M.L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Conley, D.T. (1987, April). Critical attributes of effective evaluation systems. Educational Leadership. pp. 60-64.

Darling-Hammond, L., Wise, A.E. & Pease, S.P. (1983, Fall). Teacher evaluation in the organizational context: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research. 53 (3), 285-328.

Doyle, W. (1978). Paradigms for research on teacher effectiveness. In L.S. Shulman (Ed.) Review of the research in education. Illinois: Peacock.

Duncan, A.N. (1984). An assessment of formal teacher evaluation practices in Alberta. (Report for Teacher Evaluation Practices in Alberta Education).

- Eastridge, H.E. (1976, September). Student evaluation of teaching. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 48-54.
- Edison, A.W. (1876). School supervision. Education. 13.
- Farber, B.A. (1984, July). Stress and burnout in suburban teachers. Journal of Educational Research. 77 (6) 325-330.
- Frederich, G.H. (1984, November). Recognizing the difference can increase value, effectiveness. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 12-17.
- Freer, M. & Dawson, J. (1985, June). Don't evaluate your teaching. Phi Delta Kappan. pp.720-722.
- Gage, N.L. (1978). The scientific basis for the art of teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garman, N., Glickman, C., Hunter, M. & Haggerson, N. (1987, Winter). Conflicting conceptions of clinical supervision and the enhancement of professional growth. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 2 (2), 152-177.
- Giles, T.E. & Proudfoot, A.J. (1972). Educational administration in Canada. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises.
- Glatthorn, A.A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Goens, G.A. & Lange, R.W. (1976, September). Supervision as instructional analysis. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 15-20.
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goldsberry, L.F. (1986, Summer). The reflective mindscape. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 1 (4) 347-352.

- Good, C.V. (1966). Essentials of educational research. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Herman, J. (1976, September). Developing staff evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 8-14.
- Herzberg, F. (1957). Job attitudes: Review of research opinion. Pittsburgh: Psychological Service of Pittsburgh.
- Hunter, C. (1987, February). Implementing performance appraisal. The Canadian School Executive. pp. 3-7.
- Joyce, B.R. & Weil, M. (1972). Models of teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Kauchak, D., Peterson, K. & Driscoll, A. (1985). An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 19 (1), 32-37.
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). The modern practice of adult education. New York: Cambridge.
- Krupp, J. (1987, April). Understanding and motivating personnel in the second half of life. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Journal, San Fransisco.
- Levinson, D.B. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science. New York: Harper.
- Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Little, J.W. (1986). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. In Lieberman,

- A. (Ed.) Rethinking social improvement. New York: Columbia College.
- Mannat, R.P., Palmer, K.L. & Hidlebaugh, E. (1976, September). Evaluating teacher performance with improved rating scales. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 21-23.
- Marks, M. (1976, September). Effective teaching evaluation. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 1-7.
- Natriello, G. & Dornbusch, S.M. (1980). Pitfalls in the evaluation of teachers by principals. Administrator's Notebook. 29 (6).
- Nottingham, M. (1985). Teacher appraisal for career ladders. (Report available in D.S. Woods Library, University of Manitoba. ERIC document No. ED257215).
- Ovard, G.F. (1975, January). Teacher effectiveness and accountability. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 91-93.
- Parker, F. W. (1887). City and country supervisor. Curricular of Information. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education.
- Pfeiffer, I.L. & Dunlap, J.B. (1982). Supervision of teachers. Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Phelps, L.A. (1976, September). Another base: Diversity of students. NASSP Bulletin. pp. 28-32.
- Ransberger, M. (1946). Leadership through supervision. Washington, D.C.: A.S.C.D. Yearbook. pp. 18-20.
- Redfern, G.B. (1980). Evaluating teachers and administrators: A performance objectives approach. Colorado: Westview Press.

- Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N. (1971). Research on teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), Research in teacher education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Russell, D. & Hunter, M. (1980). Planning for effective instruction. Los Angeles.
- Russell, T.L. (1987, March). Reflection in action: A new perspective on teachers' work. The Canadian Administrator. 26 (6), 2-4.
- Schatzman, L. & Strauss, A.L. (1973). Field Research: Strategies for a new sociology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Schon, D. (1982). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, Z.E. & Simpson, I.J. (1930). The superintendent surveys supervision. Washington, D.C.: Eighth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1985). Landscapes, mindscapes and reflective practice in supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 1 (1), 5-17.
- Serviovanni, T. (1987, Spring). The metaphorical use of theories and models in supervision: Building a science. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 2 (3), 221-232.
- Shavelson, R. & Dempsey-Atwood, N. (1976). Generalizability of measures of teacher behavior. Review of Educational Research. 46, 553-612.
- Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher. 15 (2), 4-14.
- Smyth, W.J. (1986, Summer). Clinical supervision: Technocratic mindedness; or emancipating learning. Journal of

Curriculum and Supervision. 1 (4), 331-340.

Spivey, J.R. (1976, September). A model for teacher evaluation.

NASSP Bulletin. pp. 40-44.

Sprinthall, N.A. & Thiess-Sprinthall, L. (1983). The teacher as an adult learner: A cognitive development view.

In G.A. Griffin (Ed.) Staff Development: National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook (pp.13-35).

Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Trusty, F.M. & Sergiovanni, T. (1966, Autumn). Perceived need deficiencies of teachers and administrators.

Educational Administration Quarterly. 2 168-180.

Wilhelms, F. (1946). Leadership through supervision.

Washington, D.C.: A.S.C.D. Yearbook. pp. 115-119.

Wise, C.N. (1973, Summer). Students ratings of teachers:

A perspective for speech communication. Western Speech.

Woody, C. (1934, May). An evaluation of the Seventh Yearbook. Education Method.

Yonemura, M. (1982, Fall). Teacher conversations: A potential source for their own professional growth. Curriculum Inquiry. pp. 239-256.

APPENDIX A
Interview Schedule Used
by Researcher

Interview Schedule
(To Be Used by Researcher)

NAME
SCHOOL
AGE
EXPERIENCE

Each of the following scenarios is based upon a method of teacher supervision advocated in the literature by authors holding divergent views about effective supervision. I am interested in your identification of the strengths and weaknesses of each method of supervision for the mid-career secondary teacher instructing in a subject field. More specifically, I am interested in these sub-questions:

1. Under what circumstances would you see each method as being of value to the mid-career teacher and why?
2. To what extent is each method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?
3. What factors should be considered in each supervisory method?
4. What sort of professional relationship should exist between the supervisor and the teacher in each circumstance?

Mid-Career Teachers is meant to include teachers between 31 and 44 years of age with ten years of teaching experience.

Supervision is defined as a formal process of inter-acting with others within the school organization for the purpose of identifying and adjusting those factors which will promote improved teacher performance.

Prompt Question

1. To what extent, if any, should these factors be considered in the supervision of mid-career male teachers?

--teaching methodology
--personality traits such as warmth and understanding
--relationships with colleagues
--knowledge of subject matter
--internal factors such as lesson planning and classroom maintenance
--factors mentioned by teachers as limiting their capacity to accomplish classroom objectives
--classroom management
--supervision of extra-curricular activities
--involvement in community affairs
--student achievement on test scores
--student evaluation of teachers

- teachers level of education
- continuing education through formal coursework

Scenarios

1. Supervision According to Predetermined Behaviors (Russell and Hunter, 1980; Pfeiffer and Dunlap, 1982; Blome, 1985; C. Hunter, 1987):

The supervisor has a list of teaching behaviors which have been identified as having a cause and effect impact on student learning. For example, according to one model, this list would focus on the following behaviors:

1. Setting a general objective and assessing the students present relationship to it.
2. Selecting a specific daily lesson objective.
3. Preparing the students for the lesson.
4. Clarifying the lesson objective.
5. Providing learning opportunities.
6. Providing verbal and visual examples of what is to be learned.
7. Assessing student attainment of the objective.
8. Guiding the student in practicing what is learned.
9. Allowing independent practices of the learned skill.

During observation of the mid-career instructor teaching a lesson, the supervisor assesses the extent to which the teacher exhibits these behaviors and during a post-observation conference, the supervisor coaches the teacher on how to more effectively and deliberately employ these strategies.

1. Under what circumstance would you see this method as being of value to the mid-career teacher and why?

--are supervisors adequately prepared to identify whether teachers are exhibiting the prescribed behaviors?

--are supervisors adequately prepared to accurately and objectively identify teacher strengths and weaknesses using this method?

--does such a procedure give the supervisor ample means and opportunity to assess the teacher's performance?

--would the supervisor be knowledgeable enough in all subject

areas to effectively assist the teacher through this method of supervision?

--what characteristics would a mid-career teacher possess that would make this method valuable?

1. strong or weak instructional methods
2. effective or ineffective behavior management
3. openness to criticism
4. novice or veteran teacher
5. teacher new to system
6. teacher who does not recognize own deficiencies
7. belief that certain behaviors have a cause/effect impact on student outcomes

--how would the supervisor identify the teacher who would most benefit from supervision according to prescribed behaviors or should this method be used for all teachers?

--what would mid-career teachers perceive as being the purpose of this method of supervision?

--how important to performance improvement is the teacher's perception of this method as accurate and reliable?

--would it be of value to mid-career teachers in performance improvement?

--can the performance of mid-career teachers be assessed according to mastery of pre-determined behaviors?

--would a mid-career teacher want to engage in this method of supervision?

--does this form of supervision affect the teacher's autonomy?

--is this a method which could be used to promote self-esteem in mid-career teachers?

--does this method provide a sufficient means and opportunity for the teacher to take part in decision-making?

--is this a process that would permit recognition of the teacher's successes in the classroom?

2. To what extent is such a method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?

--would this system be more effective in schools depending upon system characteristics such as size, location or student demographics?

--what factors within your school system (eg. salary, resources, support services, teacher participation in decision-making, recognition of teacher successes, preparation time, support from

the administration) would enhance or limit the effectiveness of this method as a means of improving the performance of a mid-career teacher.

--who, in your school system is responsible for supervision and why would they be or not be the most appropriate person to use this method of supervision?

--who should be responsible for supervision according to prescribed teacher behaviors?

3. What factors should be considered in this supervisory process?

--factors identified by mid-career teachers as limiting their capacity to accomplish classroom objectives

--teaching methodology

--personality traits such as warmth and understanding

--knowledge of subject matter

--internal factors such as lesson planning and classroom maintenance

--classroom management

--external factors such as participation in community affairs

--supervision of extra-curricular activities

--relations with colleagues

--student achievement on test scores

--student evaluation of teachers

--does this process serve as an effective means to identify and adjust those factors which interfere with a teacher's success in promoting desired student outcomes?

4. Describe the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor which would be most effective in making this method of supervision valuable to the teacher.

--what characteristics should the supervisor possess and why?

--how could trust and confidence be established?

--what factors might interfere with the development of a productive relationship?

--what characteristics in the supervisor would limit the potential for this method of supervision to be of value to mid-career teachers?

--what status roles should each assume to make the process most beneficial to the teacher?

II. Clinical Supervision (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973):

During a pre-observation conference, the supervisor and mid-career teacher discuss the lesson the instructor will be teaching when observed by the principal for at least one class period and also identify those teaching behaviors targeted by

both for the closest scrutiny. During the observation, the supervisor records all that he/she observes including notations about the targeted behaviors. Subsequently, the teacher and supervisor review the supervisor's observations. In a cooperative effort, the two design a performance improvement plan which, when implemented, will enable the teacher to more successfully promote student outcomes. The supervisor later makes a follow-up observation to assess the teacher's progress toward performance improvement.

1. Under what circumstances would you see this method as being of value to mid-career teachers and why?

--do supervisors possess the skills to guide teachers in planning improvement strategies?

--are supervisors adequately prepared to accurately and objectively identify teacher strengths and weaknesses using this method?

--does such an approach give the supervisor ample opportunity and means to assess the teacher's performance?

--would the supervisor be knowledgeable enough in all subject areas to effectively assist the teacher through this method of supervision?

--what characteristics would a mid-career teacher possess that would make this method of value?

1. strong or weak instructional methods
2. effective or ineffective behavior management
3. openness to criticism
4. novice or veteran teacher
5. experienced teacher new to the school
6. teacher who does not recognize deficiencies

--how would a supervisor identify the teacher who would most benefit from this method?

--would this method motivate mid-career teachers to improve in performance?

--what would mid-career teachers perceive as being the purpose of this method?

--would this be an effective method of supervision for mid-career teachers?

--would a mid-career teacher want to participate in this form of supervision?

--does this method affect teacher autonomy?

--is it a method which could be used to promote self-esteem?

--is the teacher given sufficient opportunity to participate in decision-making?

--does it permit recognition of the teacher's successes?

2. To what extent is such a method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?

--would this system be more effective in schools depending upon system characteristics such as size, location and student demographics?

--if it is not practiced, what effect would this method have on mid-career teachers?

--What factors within your school system would enhance or limit the effectiveness of this approach as a means of improving teacher performance and student learning?

--why would your present supervisor be or not be the most appropriate person to conduct this type of supervision?

--who in your school should conduct clinical supervision and why?

3. What factors should be considered during this process?

--factors identified by mid-career teachers as limiting their success in attaining classroom objectives?

--teaching methodology?

--personality traits?

--knowledge of subject matter?

--internal factors such as lesson planning and maintenance of classrooms?

--classroom management

--external factors such as participation in community affairs,

--supervision of extra-curricular activities

--relationships with colleagues?

--student achievement on test scores?

--student evaluation of teachers?

--does this process serve as an effective means to identify and adjust those factors which interfere with a teacher's capacity to promote desired student outcomes?

4. Describe the professional relationship between the supervisor and teacher which would be most effective in making clinical supervision valuable to the teacher.

--what characteristics should the supervisor possess and why?

--how could trust and confidence be developed?

--what variables could interfere with the development of productive interaction?

--what characteristics in the supervisor could limit the potential for clinical supervision to be of value to mid-career teachers?

--what status roles should each adopt to make the process optimally effective?

III. Differentiated Supervision (Glatthorn, 1984; Berliner, 1986; Krupp, 1987; Sprinthall and Thiess Sprinthall ; Campbell, McBeath and Young, 1987; Glatthorn and Holler, 1987):

Teachers may chose, within limits, whether they wish to receive clinical supervision (described in Scenario II.) from a supervisor, work with a colleague in a program of cooperative development or direct their own professional growth according to a plan designed by the teacher and presented to the supervisor. The limits mentioned would include restricting inexperienced teachers, teachers new to the system and teachers with serious deficiencies to clinical supervision. Mid-career teachers performing acceptably may chose clinical supervision, work with a colleague or plan their own development in cooperation with the supervisor using strategies such as reading in the literature, observing other teachers, taking formal coursework, assisting novice teachers in their development, attending workshops or incorporating outside interests into their school work.

1. Under what circumstances would you see this method as being of value to mid-career teachers and why?

--do supervisors possess the skills to conduct this form of evaluation?

--would supervisors be able to accurately determine which teachers should be on a particular track?

--are supervisors adequately prepared to identify teacher strengths and weaknesses?

--would a colleague be of value in assisting the teacher in professional development?

--what difficulties, if any, might arise in developing an improvement plan in conjunction with a colleague?

--do mid-career teachers have the insight and preparation to identify deficiencies and develop their own professional growth plans?

--are the criteria for determining which method of supervision a teacher undergoes appropriate, and, if not, how should they be modified?

--would mid-career teachers have the time and motivation to develop professional growth plans?

--would this method of supervision motivate the mid-career teacher to improve performance?

--what would mid-career teachers perceive as being the purpose of this method?

--would a mid-career teacher want to participate in this form of supervision, which track would they select and why?

--does this form of supervision impact on the teacher's autonomy?

--is this a method which could be used to promote self-esteem in mid-career teachers?

--does this process provide a sufficient opportunity for the teacher to take part in decision-making?

--is this a process which would permit recognition of teacher successes in the classroom?

2. To what extent is this method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?

--would this system be more effective in schools depending upon system characteristics such as size, location or student demographics?

--what factors in your school would enhance or limit the effectiveness of this method as a means of improving the performance of a mid-career teacher?

--who in your school should be responsible for differentiated supervision and why?

3. Which of these factors should be considered in such a supervisory process?

--developmental levels of teachers

--factors identified by mid-career teachers as limiting their capacity to accomplish classroom objectives

--teaching methodology

--personality traits such as warmth and understanding

--knowledge of subject matter

--internal factors such as lesson planning and classroom maintenance

--classroom management

--external factors such as participation in community affairs

--supervision of extra-curricular activities,

--student achievement on test scores

--student evaluation of teachers

--relations with colleagues

--does this process serve as an effective means to identify and adjust those factors which interfere with a teacher's success in promoting desired student outcomes?

--what factors might interfere with the development of a productive relationship?

--what characteristics in the supervisor, colleague or teacher would limit the potential for this method of supervision to be of value to the mid-career teacher?

--what status roles should the teacher and supervisor or colleague each assume to make the process most beneficial to the teacher?

IV. Reflective Supervision (Schon, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1986; Smythe, 1986)

In a collegial manner, the supervisor encourages the teacher to systematically reflect upon his current teaching practices to determine what is or is not effective in promoting desired student outcomes, and to identify those factors which are impediments in promoting outcomes. The teacher also examines changes which should be made in the teacher's work life to enable him to improve his performance. With the assistance of the supervisor, the teacher maps out and tests alternative strategies. In effect, the teacher becomes his own resource for discovering means through which to improve his performance.

1. Under what circumstances would you see this method as being of value to mid-career teachers and why?

--do supervisors possess the skills to guide the teacher in such an activity?

--are mid-career teachers capable of using reflective supervision to improve performance?

--does such a method permit the identification of a teacher's strengths and weaknesses?

--does such an approach provide the opportunity and means necessary to assess a teacher's performance?

--would the supervisor be knowledgeable enough in all subject areas to effectively assist the teacher through this method of supervision?

--what characteristics would a mid-career teacher possess that would make this method of supervision of value?

1. self-starter
2. high or low confidence
3. insightful
4. others

--how would a supervisor identify the teacher who would most benefit from this method?

--what would mid-career teachers perceive as being the purpose

of this method?

--would this be of value to mid-career teachers in an effort to improve their performances?

--would a mid-career teacher want to engage in this method of supervision?

--how does this method impact on teacher autonomy?

--is this a method which would promote self-esteem in the mid-career teacher?

--does this method provide a sufficient opportunity for the teacher to take part in decision-making?

--are mid-career teachers capable of objectively and accurately diagnosing deficiencies and identifying impediments and what might they commonly point to?

--is this a process that would permit recognition of the teacher's successes in the classroom?

2. To what extent is this method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?

--would this system be more effective in schools depending upon system characteristics such as size, location and student demographics?

--what factors in your school would enhance or limit the effectiveness of this method as a means of improving the performance of a mid-career teacher?

--who, in your school, would be most capable of assisting the mid-career teacher in reflective supervision?

3. Which of these factors should be considered in this supervisory process?

--factors identified by mid-career teachers as limiting their capacity to accomplish classroom objectives

--teaching methodology

--personality traits

--knowledge of subject matter

--internal factors such as lesson planning and classroom maintenance

--classroom management

--external factors such as participation in community affairs

--supervision of extra-curricular activities,

--relations with colleagues

--student achievement on test scores

--student evaluations of teachers

--does this process serve as an effective means to identify and

APPENDIX B

Interview Schedule Provided
for Study Population

adjust those factors which interfere with a mid-career teacher's success in promoting desired student outcomes?

4. Describe the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor which would be most conducive to making this method of supervision valuable to the teacher.

--what characteristics should the supervisor possess and why?

--what characteristics in the teacher would limit or enhance the potential for reflective supervision to effectively promote performance improvement?

--how could trust and confidence be established between the teacher and supervisor?

--what characteristics in the supervisor would limit the potential for this method of supervision to be of value to mid-career teachers?

--what status roles should each assume to make the process most beneficial to the teacher?

5. Which of these four methods of supervision, if any, would be of greatest value to mid-career teachers in improving their performances?

6. Describe the supervisory process which would be of greatest value to you in improving your performance?

Appendix B

Interview Schedule

Each of the following scenarios is based upon a method of teacher supervision advocated in the literature by authors holding divergent views about effective supervision. I am interested in your identification of the strengths and weaknesses of each method of supervision for the mid-career secondary teacher instructing in a subject field. More specifically, I am interested in these sub-questions:

1. Under what circumstances would you see each method as being of value to the mid-career teacher and why?
2. To what extent is each method currently practiced in your school and how does it impact on mid-career teachers?
3. What factors should be considered in each supervisory method?
4. What sort of professional relationship should exist between the supervisor and the teacher in each circumstance?

Mid-Career Teachers refers to teachers between 31 and 44 years of age with ten years of teaching experience.

Supervision is defined as a formal process of interaction with others within the school organization for the purpose of identifying and adjusting those factors which will promote improved teacher performance.

Scenarios

I. The supervisor has a list of teaching behaviors which have been identified as having a cause and effect impact on student learning. During observation of the mid-career instructor teaching a lesson, the supervisor assesses the extent to which the teacher exhibits these behaviors and during a post-observation, the supervisor coaches the teacher on how to more effectively and deliberately employ these strategies.

II. During a pre-observation conference, the supervisor and mid-career teacher discuss the lesson the instructor will be teaching when observed by the supervisor for at least one class period and also identify those teaching behaviors targeted by both for the closest scrutiny. During the observation, the supervisor records all the he/she observes including notations about the target behaviors. Subsequently, the teacher and supervisor review the supervisor's observations. In a cooperative effort, the two design a performance improvement plan which, when implemented, will enable the teacher to more successfully promote student outcomes. The supervisor later makes a follow-up

observation to assess the teacher's progress toward performance improvement.

III. Teachers may chose, within limits, whether they wish to receive clinical supervision (described in Scenario II.) from a supervisor, work with a colleague in a program of cooperative development or direct their own professional growth according to a plan designed by the teacher and presented to the supervisor. The limits mentioned would include restricting inexperienced teachers, teachers new to the system and teachers with serious deficiencies to clinical supervision. Mid-career teachers performing acceptably may chose clinical supervision, work with a colleague or plan their own development in cooperation with the supervisor using strategies such as reading in the literature, observing other teachers, taking formal coursework, assisting novice teachers in their development, attending workshops or incorporating outside interests into their school work.

IV. In a collegial manner, the supervisor encourages the teacher to systematically reflect upon his current teaching practices to determine what is or is not effective in promoting desired student outcomes, and to identify those factors which are impediments in promoting outcomes. The teacher also examines changes which should be made in the teacher's work life to enable him to improve his performance. With the assistance of the supervisor, the teacher maps out and tests alternative strategies. In effect, the teacher becomes his own resource for discovering means through which to improve his performance.

APPENDIX C

Letter Attached to Interview Schedule

Given to Study Population



of Educational Administration and Foundations

Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2 Telephone: (204) 474-9019

November, 1987

Dear Mr.

Although public demands for accountability from schools have made formal supervision of teachers common practice in most divisions, there exists amongst educators a concern over which, if any, supervisory practices will be most successful in improving teacher performance.

As a mid-career teacher myself, I have a long-standing interest in the supervision of teachers at that career stage and wish to study the attitudes toward certain supervisory models held by mid-career high school teachers in the division. As a component of this study I will be interviewing fifteen randomly selected instructors teaching full-time in the division with the hope that the results of the study may provide educators with a better understanding of how to make supervision of mid-career teachers as productive a process as possible.

It is anticipated that each interview will require about one hour of the teacher's time and a copy of the questionnaire to be used as a basis for each interview has been attached for your consideration. As is customary in a study of this nature, all responses will be treated as confidential information and specific quotations will not be attributed to anyone by name or other descriptor. Further, instructors may refuse to participate in the study or elect to discontinue involvement at any point. Subsequent to the completion of the study, general results of the study will be available to those who agree to participate.

If you have any questions or suggestions regarding the study, please phone me at 453-4317.

Sincerely,

Michael Bergsgaard

APPENDIX D

Policy on Supervision for
the Study Context

COLLEGIATE MEMO

Winnipeg, Manitoba

Phone:

Principal:
Vice Principal:
Vice-Principal:

RECEIVED

TO:

FROM:

DATE: December 17, 1984

Per

Div. No.

RE: EVALUATION MODEL - COLLEGIATE

The following format has been laid down in consultation with staff for the 1984-85 evaluation model.

1. Departmental meeting to set time frame and climate for the evaluation of all teachers in the department.
2. Conference with each individual teacher prior to class visits to set performance objectives.
3. Observation of classes (minimum two).
4. Conference with teacher re: test materials, log book, attendance cards, etc.
5. Conference with teacher to discuss "Duties of Teacher" as per policy manual.
6. Conference with Department Head.
7. Post observation conference with teacher to discuss "summative report".
8. Departmental conference to share observer's opinions of the team.
9. Lay down departmental goals & objectives to be worked upon during the next two years.
10. Departmental response to the effectiveness of the Observer.