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CHAPTER I
NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Despite a 300-year history in the United States (Burnham, 1976), supervision in the seventies is suffering from an identity crisis.

Wilhelms (ASCD, 1969, p. x) describes supervision as having just come through a "decade of groping." In another forward four years later, Frymier (Wilhelms, 1973, p. v) reminds readers that there had been very little substantive change in the theory and practice of supervision over the past fifty years, although some promising practices are on the horizon.

More recently, Blumberg (1974) summarizes current supervision in the schools in two statements:

1. Supervision . . . constitutes a waste of time, as teachers see it. . . . [T]he best evaluation that teachers can give of their supervision is that it is not harmful.

2. The character of the relationships between teachers as a group and supervisors as a group can be described as somewhat of a cold war. (p. 2)

Tennessee teachers (Lovell & Phelps, 1977) in the mid-seventies saw their instructional support as inadequate, did not normally request conferences with supervisors, and
disagreed with their superiors even about the quantity of services they were receiving.

Blumberg (1974) highlighted the bind in which supervision finds itself.

Teachers tend to say they find their supervision of little value. Supervisors say their work has a lot of value. Supervisors seem to be saying that they want to spend more time doing what their clients (the teachers) consider to be relatively useless. (p. 13)

In 1977, The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development convened an ad hoc working group to examine the roles and responsibilities of instructional supervisors, as currently seen by persons in various sectors of educational supervision.

One important part of their findings, reported by chairman Sturges in Educational Leadership (1979), points to one basis for conflict: there seem to be two distinct kinds of supervisory positions--administrative and consultative. Functions of administrative instructional supervisors include responsibility for federal programs and evaluating teachers for tenure. Principals, department heads, and assistant superintendents are likely to perform these duties. Consultative instructional supervisors work more directly with teachers. Their roles may include helping a teacher improve his or her instruction and diagnostic evaluation for the purpose of planning instructional improvement. Conflict occurs, Sturges says, with teachers' wanting personal help on one hand, but rejecting it from
persons in administrative roles, on the other. Sturges concludes with the committee's recommendations that the dichotomy of these two roles be recognized, legitimized by appropriate preparation and certification, and used to the better advantage of all concerned.

Let us table temporarily this supervisory Yin-Yang while we look at another frame of reference, that of helping professions, which has been evolving over the past three decades. I will briefly trace this thread to the present, summarize it, then juxtapose it with consultative supervision, in order to establish the ground for this study.

The work and thought of many persons have contributed to theory and practice of the helping professions: Clark Moustakas, Earl Kelley, Prescott Lecky, Sidney Jourard, Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, and Arthur Combs, for instance. The work of Maslow, Rogers, and Combs stands out especially and will be considered briefly here. These three, essentially contemporaries of each other, have contributed significantly to a conceptual framework for all helping professions. Each makes it clear he is influenced and joined in turn by many others.

Maslow coined the term "Third Force Psychology" (Goble, 1970, p. xiv) to characterize the work of many persons committed to studying human behavior from the point of view of persons themselves. This designation helps
distinguish Humanistic Psychology from the two other, established theories of human behavior, Behaviorism and Freudianism. Maslow sees persons as carriers of impressive individual potential, whose philosophies of human nature "tucked away in their bones" give rise to their behavior (Goble, 1970, p. 15). Human beings' striving for fulfillment of the concept of self, he says, may transcend even the maintenance or enhancement of the physical self. Maslow himself recognized that the order of needs in his noted hierarchy of needs was variable. He believed basically and above all in man's unceasing reach for fulfillment of concept of self.

Looking at education in the light of Third Force psychological theory, Maslow foresees important stress on "development of the person's potential, particularly the potential to be human, to understand self and others and relate to them, to achieve the basic human needs" (Goble, 1970, p. 69). Maslow assumes that the individual of the species is disposed and equipped, individually, to seek his or her own growth.

Carl Rogers' 1958 landmark paper, "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," (Rogers, 1977b) and his thoughtful and thorough work for over two decades conceptualizing a theory of personality, have been significant. Both Maslow and Combs acknowledge the influence of Roger's ideas on their own thinking. Succeeding theorists,
researchers, and practitioners in the arena of helping relationships and the helping professions must ultimately trace and acknowledge their indebtedness to Carl Rogers.

Rogers, as does Maslow, recognizes the significance of one's self-view as a behavior antecedent and determinant. He sees one's ongoing search for self-fulfillment (paralleling Maslow's self-actualization) as man's basic motivation.

In the fifties while Getzels and Guba were developing their social systems analysis for administrator and supervisors as a need to balance the interaction between school and individual (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1971), Rogers was strengthening his conviction that what individuals do to maintain and enhance themselves also may enrich the lives of persons around them. He does not see one aspect being enhanced at the expense of the other (Maddi, 1976).

For Rogers and others, one's phenomenal self-concept is not only basic to the tendency to be a fully functioning person, but self-concept is learned--socially determined, especially by persons significant in one's life (Maddi, 1976).

It is a logical step from seeing self-concept as a result of what one learns from others to value about oneself to Rogers' belief that "the facilitation of significant learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities
which exist in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner" (Rogers, 1977c, p. 129).

Coming first from psychotherapy, these ideas have been increasingly applied to education. Rogers briefly characterizes the truly facilitating helper as empathic, having positive unconditional regard for the other person in the relationship, and demonstrating congruence between his internal feelings and his words and behavior. According to Rogers, the degree to which one can "create relationships which facilitate the growth of others as separate persons is a measure of the growth" one has achieved in oneself (Rogers, 1977b, p. 17).

Arthur Combs and his colleagues (1969) suspected that while various forms of the helping professions vary in techniques, theoretical orientations, and purposes, they nonetheless have something in common. Good helpers operationalize in the best ways we know, basic "good" human relationships. Fiedler's modest study of nearly 30 years ago (1950) which foreshadowed Combs' hunches, found that experienced therapists from different schools of thought came to see the helping relationships quite similarly.

Combs and his group of researchers in the College of Education at the University of Florida, looked at various helping professions such as counseling, nursing, Episcopal priesthood, and teaching. They went up the
blind alleys of what teachers know and value, and what methods they use in search of answers to their question, What is a good teacher? The researchers' shift in perspective from external approaches to a phenomenological orientation enabled a series of productive research efforts to take place (Combs, 1969). They identified a common characteristic of all of these professions as instantaneous response. Jackson (1968) would underscore this finding independently when he found that classroom teachers, for example, may interact with students, albeit briefly, up to one thousand times daily. The person of the helper must necessarily come through in making these myriad responses, no matter if he has been trained in techniques, schooled in methods, or has role-played otherwise. "Professional helpers must be thinking, problem-solving people; the primary tool with which they work is themselves" (Combs, 1969, p. 10).

The phrase Combs came to use to represent the above concept was "self as instrument." He found that both the phrase and the concept had long been used by the social work profession. (Certainly anthropologists have all along recognized that data-gathering and meaning-making in field research are primarily functions of themselves as their own instruments). The effective physician, social worker, nurse, or dental hygienist, for example, is one who has learned to use him- or herself as well as his or her
knowledge to accomplish professional goals. Combs and his colleagues came to regard the use of the helper's self as the outstanding fact about the helping professions. Patterson (1973) agrees:

In a basic sense one's self is the instrument of teaching, as of all human relationships, and one must learn to use one's self as an instrument for facilitating the development of others. (p. 127)

Mooney (1970) puts it this way: in the natural order of things, life-giving development begins first with one's own self-development. Development of oneself is the "delivering into consciousness" of the ways one learns to fit into the universe. Development necessarily starts with the self, as it is the only place it can occur. The self, developing, looks ahead to life coming on, and puts into motion with another person the ways of developing one has found in oneself.

Having presented various aspects of helping from the accumulated efforts of several persons, I have summarized what I judge to be the most fundamental concepts as they translate to helping supervision.

(1) Helping supervisors shift their perspective to the teacher and the teacher's own, inside-out views of self, others, and the world.

(2) Helping supervisors have a pervasive belief in the "growth principle" as life motivation of teachers.

(3) Interactions between helping supervisors and teachers reflect mutual confidence in the teacher's individuality and uniqueness, his or her right, responsibility, and capacity to make professional decisions, to direct his or
her own growth, and to own his or her own problems and their solutions.

(4) The person of the helping supervisor is more important to teacher growth than any technique, material, approach, analysis, or objective brought to the process.

(5) Significant growth is a function of the attitudinal quality of the relationship between helping supervisor and teacher.

A rational, linear, sequential list such as this does not do justice to a concept which, when operationalized, can also be dynamic, intuitive, simultaneous, affective, and holistic. Re-reading the above list, too, one may be struck by the fact that perceptions, rather than behaviors, comprise the summary. Going back to the basic thesis that "all behavior is a function of a person's perceptions or personal meanings" (Combs, Richards & Richards, 1976, p.16), we are reminded that perceptions are considered antecedent to behavior. A supervisor with a perceptual field similar to the one above would live out and behave in observably helping ways, in the sense with which I have intended to use the work "helping" in this study.

A process I have found useful in the sometimes difficult on-the-line changeover to helping supervision, is to ask myself the two freeing-binding questions:

Is what I am doing or saying binding the teacher to dependency or to present or limited alternatives? or,

Is what I am doing or saying freeing the teacher to grow from within by taking charge, and exploring or increasing his or her alternatives?
This concept, adapted from *Interpersonal Communications* (1972) by Boyan and Copeland (1978), also parallels Gibb's classic "Is Help Helpful?" (1964), and T.E.T.'s Language of Acceptance and Unacceptance (Gordan, 1974).

It is here that I wish to look once more at supervision's two official faces, as described in the ASCD report (Lovell, 1978). I believe supervision as a helping profession squares more with consultative, as opposed to administrative, supervision, as defined in the report. It is my conjecture, however, from the overtones of consultative supervision so defined, that is does not go far enough, that the ways a supervisor could work as a facilitating helper may not be clearly or widely perceived, even among the profession. This conjecture is based as often on missing cues as on cues present. Let me present my case:

(1) The ASCD survey responses (to the extent that we may presume their representativeness or their meta-perspective) too often don't hit helping assumptions head-on (Krajewski, McNeill, & Ness, 1978). Respondents recognized teacher interpersonal skills when responding to the question, What are the activities of supervision? but cited programs, procedures, and materials when discussing objectives, revealing a conceptual split. (This is well understood by the Working Group.) Also, there seem to be no references to the development of either the supervisor or the teacher as a person, although "teacher competence"
was used throughout, presumably with "teacher skills" as the meaning. In addition, the survey summary carries the following statement:

The supervisor supports, suggests, and corrects all aspects of the classroom experience on the basis of a complete and accurate appraisal of that experience. (p. 22, italics mine for emphasis)

For me, this flies in the face of Maslow's belief in the capability and will of a teacher to strive for growth, or any of Roger's dimensions of a helping relationship. The teacher is not even mentioned above. He or she is objectified and "done to" by the supervisor.

(2) The review of literature section of the ASCD report (Lovell, 1978) appears to arrive at conclusions just as removed from the essence of helping. The approach that Esposito, Smith and Burbach have worked out is singled out as a promising way to look at supervision. Their work anticipated the ASCD report's conclusion of a marked dichotomy in supervision. The earlier study (Esposito, Smith, & Burbach, 1975) titled one category "Helping"—a telling designation when one examines the indicators. The list includes 16 "services," direct and indirect, to teachers. Even on the "direct service" list, "Hold individual conferences with teachers" is the closest to the notion of one-to-one interaction. Nearly all the others are remote kinds of assistance.
(3) The summary of supervisory certification programs reviewed for the report "reflects the influence of administrative preparation rather than emphasizing close working relationships with classroom teachers" (Krajewski, 1978, p. 64). For example, persons seeking supervisory certification may study the current state of the profession, its roles and functions, its history, its technological developments and techniques, instructional analysis, human development, change strategies and theory, teacher behaviors, research techniques, leadership styles, organizational development, and other areas. There may be one characteristic common to these academic areas: they may be external to the person of the supervisor him- or herself. These topics represent "knowledge about" phenomena and unless balanced by other kinds of knowledge, serve to continue to keep the supervisor at arm's length from what she or he is about as a helper or facilitator of teacher growth.

(4) There is a general dearth of literature which addresses supervision squarely as a helping profession.

(5) Research on supervisory process, especially as a helping process, is even more scarce.

Although there are many indicators pointing to supervision's being imperfectly perceived as a helping profession, the basic, undergirding assumption upon which this study is based is that supervision--consultative
supervision redefined as helping supervision, if you will—should be given a place squarely within helping profession parameters.

Combs et al (1974) calls for a new role for supervisors--helping teachers explore their own beliefs and values. Zahorik (1978, p. 669) suggests value development supervision may be the means for bringing "consistency and commitment to teacher behavior." Dinkmeyer (1971, p. 617) asks, "How can a teacher operate as an effective facilitator of learning if he is not thoroughly aware of his own functioning?"

One may well add, How can a supervisor effectively help a teacher develop if the supervisor does not have an opportunity to explore and develop his or her own helping potential?

Objectives of the Study

This study's major objective was to study the varied individual experiences of supervisors who are using their helping potential to help teachers develop, in order to answer the question,

> If facilitating conditions can be provided, how do supervisors mobilize their own unique helping potential in the development of teachers?

In order to create a context in which functioning supervisors could be studied, an enabling objective was to create a setting for, and to set into motion, some ways to help supervisors focus on and enhance their own helping
potential. This experiential learning was intended to round out the complementarity of supervisors' knowing and provide data for the question,

What are the processes, content, and organization, as well as problems encountered, in a seminar which provides planned experiences to help supervisors mobilize their own helping potential?

Having created such a facilitating setting, and having studied the varied experiences of working supervisors in this context, a final objective was to examine, consider, and weigh the findings from these elements of this study in order to answer the question,

What are the emergent, tentative propositions suggested by this study, which might appear to have value as leads for future research?

Significance of the Study

The findings of the study may be helpful to supervision as a profession simply because of the vacuum in research efforts in the area of supervision, in general. The study may have additional significance because several of its elements may be unique: (1) Deliberate creation of a setting for the purpose of helping supervisors know and use their own helping potential with teachers; (2) Analysis of the process of supervision; (3) Assumptions of supervisors' differential capacities, with stress on strengths in development; and (4) Methodology which makes use of the Teacher Advocate Interview.
To the extent that supervision is accepted by others in the profession as deserving active recognition, support, and promotion as a true helping profession, this study may lend some weight. If this kind of recognition is forthcoming, the setting for the study may be of interest to supervisory curriculum planners.

Analysis of the individual ways supervisors learn to work using their strengths, may add to general understanding of the supervisory process. The explicit focus on strengths may have implications for improving supervisory curriculum, as well as providing insight into the helping process itself.

Use of the Teacher Advocate Interview may hold promise, methodologically, for future research. The possibility of using it as a development tool for supervisors may be of interest to those preparing supervisors, as the Interview's somewhat limited use to date with supervisors has not been documented.

Generalizability of the study's findings will occur as this study is replicated in whole or in part in other settings and with other individuals.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Several limitations are inherent in the study. (1) The concept of helping potential as defined for this study is a function of the particular interview instrument selected for use in this investigation. Conceivably, helping
potential could be defined differently with other instrumentation. (2) The seminar participants are not a sample of any population of supervisors. How similar or dissimilar they are along relevant dimensions to any designated population of supervisors is not known. Therefore, generalization otherwise appropriately made from sample to population cannot be made in this study. (3) Likewise, the four case study supervisors are not only not regarded as a sample of any designated population of supervisors, they are also not a sample of the population of seminar participants. Generalizations cannot be made from case studies to seminar participants. (4) The study is exploratory. Hypotheses are not being tested. Rather, the analyses will be examined for patterns and regularities which suggest propositions to be tested in future research efforts.

One delimitation is particularly appropriate: there will be no value comparisons made between or among supervisors in the study. Juxtaposition of certain dimensions or characteristics of supervisors is meant to demonstrate uniquenesses; no comparisons of "better" or "more effective" are intended.

Definition of Terms

Several words and phrases, while commonly used in many contexts, have very specific meanings in this study.

Helping will be used to mean actively facilitating
the development of another, through interactions which free
the other person to use and expand his own unique capac­
ities. This meaning is different from that frequently
ascribed to helping in the sense of "assistance" or
"service."

Development in this study means a process with two
components: learning and meaning-making. Learning is sim­
ply the acquisition of knowledge, the taking in of inform­
ation, input. Meaning-making is the other side of the coin
--a personal, creative, individually accomplished process
(Bargar) by which learning is assimilated with feelings and
values and fittings made with one's existing perceptual
field. Development, then, is learning which has been given
personal meaning, manifesting eventually in behavior change
(Sanders, 1977). "Person-development" is facilitating the
development of another individual, as opposed to one's
self-development.

Helping Potential is different for each individual.
The term is used in this study for the configuration of
theme-clusters and facets of the capacity to help another,
as interpreted from each person's responses to the 53-
question Teacher Advocate Interview (see Chapter Three,
Methodology). Helping potential in this sense would con­
stitute each supervisor's major strengths, and in some in­
stances conceptualizations, values, or beliefs as well as
predicted behaviors.
Mobilizing (helping potential) carries with it a series or sequence of meanings: (1) To bring one's helping potential to one's own awareness; (2) To put one's helping potential into use; (3) To receive feedback and perceive that the use of one's helping potential has resulted in change or development or effectiveness with a teacher; and (4) To reflect upon the experience, give it meaning, and fit it into one's being.

Facilitating conditions refers both to common experiences and dyadic helping interactions built into a seminar structure, the setting for the study. The seminar itself was intended to facilitate supervisors' development with a growthful climate, fresh perspectives, relevance to supervisors' professional needs, and congruence between its presuppositions and its actuality. Instructor-supervisor dyads were important opportunities to establish and model helping, supportive relationships. It is important to note, however, that facilitating conditions are limited to and by the realities of the context, including the instructor's own helping potential. The facilitating conditions for this study were unique to this setting and to this instructor. The term facilitating conditions may also be applied to supervisor-teacher interactions.

The structured interview used in this study contained questions which were presented exactly as researched. Probes, if any, were indicated in the manual. Most of the
questions were open-ended, enabling the interviewee to present himself freely in oral response to the stimulus questions. The taped responses, when interpreted by someone trained to perceive them, help the perceiver begin to know how the respondent constructs his own world in a framework of supervision, in the instance of this interview.

Supervisor designates all ten participants who registered for the supervisory preparation course which was the context for the study. The term also extends to the four case study subjects whose experiences as supervisors were analyzed for the study. None was certified at the time of the study; however, their intents and their functions made this designation reasonable.

Teacher refers to the teacher client each supervisor was working with, even though several of the subjects were, in fact, primarily classroom teachers themselves.

Instructor and researcher are the same individual. During the university quarter when the emphasis in the study was on instruction in the seminar and on supervisor helping potential, the instructor (participant) functions dominated. After instruction terminated and while findings were being organized and analyzed, the researcher (observer) functions were more in evidence.
Summary

I have introduced the present study with pertinent background information, and have stated the study's three objectives. The study's significance, limitations and delimitations have been outlined, and the major terms defined. In Chapter II, supervision literature is reviewed. A rationale and guidelines for an alternative research design are presented in Chapter III. Data sources and collection are outlined and content analysis of the data is discussed in the same chapter. The setting, a course designed and taught once for this study, is described with students' and instructor's perspectives relative to it analyzed in Chapter IV. The experiences of four participants who supervised teachers within the context of the course are presented and analyzed in Chapter V. Patterns and regularities suggested by these four analyses are presented in the same chapter. Propositions which may be leads for future research, as well as implications of the study, are specified in Chapter VI.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Three observations were made as a result of searching the literature on supervision. One, the term supervision non-selectively bridges not only instructional supervision but also supervision in business and industry, and supervision in the preparation of counselors, allied health workers, secretaries, nurses, and social workers.

Second, the literature in counseling supervision, especially, often seems more pertinent to helping supervision in the sense intended in this study, than some of the literature from teacher supervision. By that I mean, the literature of counseling supervision is often much less ambiguous with respect to its congruence with "helping" than some literature of instructional supervision. Furthermore, supervision of counselors is considered a competency in its own right within the helping professions, albeit recently, with its own assumptions, theories, models of practice and skills (Scott, 1976). Although it was tempting to delve into some of the counseling supervision literature for this review because of its
congruence with concepts of helping and its more developed sense of itself, my need to set reasonable boundaries led to my decision to limit this review of literature to the narrower perspectives of educational in-class, direct supervision. The search turned toward supervision which had been categorized, or appeared to be, humanistic, individualized, enlightened, creative, non-evaluative, collegial, collaborative, or helping in nature.

Third, often after I began reading thoroughly or delving deeply into a selection, it appeared not to be relevant to "helping" supervision at all. The right words might be there, but the basic meanings or assumptions would be out of kilter. Sometimes the messages coming across were mixed. A point made by Sergiovanni (1971, 1975) began to shed some light on this. In the earlier reference, he presents Miles' Two Models of Participative Leadership (p. 152) contrasting the human relations and human resources models of supervision. In the later reference, discussing McGregor's well-know theory X and theory Y assumptions underlying supervision, Sergiovanni introduces two forms of theory X--hard and soft. Theory X-soft is Miles' human relations model with a new designation. The differences between theory X and its "no-nonsense approach characterized by strong leadership, tight controls, and close supervision" (1975, p.10) and the basically developmental assumptions of theory Y are known well and widely
understood. Not so obvious, however, are the differences between the soft version of theory X and theory Y. Theory X-soft uses velvet-gloves approaches such as persuading, and treating persons benevolently or kindly in order to create compliance toward authority, but has the same controlling, managing, manipulating assumptions as theory X-hard. The discrimination between theory X-soft and theory Y suggests an interesting way to look at supervision literature. I believe theory X-soft assumptions underlie much of our current thinking about supervision. Furthermore, I believe a good deal of the literature to be reviewed rests on theory X-soft assumptions. Sometimes these assumptions are blatant, sometimes subtle. Occasionally they remain an enigma when one is unable to probe further into the author's meanings. Nonetheless, applying the foregoing criteria may be helpful in sorting through the literature. Clearly, theory Y assumptions are the more relevant to this study.

Literature Reviewed

Evidence of widespread concern for supervision as a profession is reflected in the variety of perspectives, practices, and visions for reviving supervision which appear in the literature.

Harris (1977) would have supervisors become more assertive in exercising their leadership to effect
meaningful changes. He also notes the vague meanings we attach to supervision-related words, and suggests we not only clean up our semantics but, more to the point, clarify what it is we are about as a profession.

Esposito, Smith, and Burbach's 1975 study served to sharpen the profession's collective awareness about its own internal role dichotomy. They believe that a clearer understanding of the two broad dimensions of the tasks and activities of supervision--helping and administration--can help the supervisor reduce role confusion and allow him or her to work in a way congruent with his or her beliefs.

There is much written about teacher inservice education. By that I mean, group instruction or group learning for instructional improvement. While I shall not review this segment of the literature because of its conceptual distance from personalized helping supervision, Waynant's (1971) report of successful inservice, based on teachers' strengths and interests, rather than on their deficiencies or needs, was initially intriguing. The program (singular) which emerged, however, was the result of an underlying assumption of uniformity of teacher strengths and interests. There is much evidence indicating otherwise.

Two articles reviewed present rationales for peer supervision. White recognizes that dealing with people is "an interchangeable role" (1973, p. 761) and suggests that many persons, including teachers, could ably and
profitably supervise. White sees this desirable redefinition of supervision linked with group process. McGee and Eaker (1977) espouse peer supervision to alleviate an ubiquitous and persistent problem: teacher anxiety. They contend, with some evidence to back them up, that in the profession's pervading concern about upsetting teachers, too often we have leaned toward doing nothing at all. McGee and Eaker would capitalize on the team teaching organizational structure already operational in many schools, to implement collegial supervision.

There is no lack of expressed regard for the comfort and growth of the individual teacher who is being supervised. Various authors focus on supervisor-teacher interaction, especially in the conference. Diamond, writing in mid-decade (1975), outlines ten suggestions for giving thoughtful and constructive guidance to teachers, based on classroom observations. He believes conference discussions should center on one or two needs or problems, and should culminate with the teacher taking one or two specific ideas to work with.

Beatty (1976) believes that dialogic as opposed to monologic communication will best release teacher potential. He offers nine conditions which, if met, will permit supervisor and teacher to begin to engage in dialog. This exposes a glaring lack of recognition of the spontaneity with which one interacts with another.
Gordon (1973) examined supervisors' perceptions of their own most effective supervisory behaviors. As a group they saw their own advice- and information-giving as the most helpful. Armed with this contradictory data, Gordon suggests that supervisors should look in depth at how they interact with teachers in one-to-one conferences. Cooperative, democratic sharing of ideas should be their guiding principle.

Salek presents a six-step "non-directive supervisory conferencing" technique (1975) as a means of eradicating judgmental attitudes toward teachers. It is a curious juxtaposition of Carl Rogers (not referenced or acknowledged by the author) and behavior-oriented procedures. Present are some of the words of a non-directive approach; missing is its essence.

Byrnes (1973) uses and compares four methods of analyzing and comparing a dyadic supervisory conference. Although the original conference transcript is not included in the article, the data from each method are. The four systems he uses are (1) Blumberg's System Analysis; (2) Flanders' System; (3) Kelman's Classifications; and (4) Benjamin's Classifications.

In order to "cause supervision of faculty to become a more cerebral and serious part of teachers' lives," Goldstein (1972, p. 391) proposes a simple system: that teachers set performance goals for themselves. Early
examination of the procedure in his school reveals positive teacher attitudes and some teacher growth.

Manolakes describes advisory systems, networks of human support for teachers, including teacher center personnel (1975). The advisory system is based on two assumptions: (1) the teacher is the core of the instructional system, and (2) the teacher who controls help to be received is trusted with professional judgments.

Diamond in a second article states his belief that what is offered a teacher for his growth "must include him in some way that is clearly perceptible" (1978, p. 96). This inclusion centers mainly on the teacher's spelling out his own objectives. If this is done, and the teacher respects the supervisor and his means for "delivering" supervision, Diamond expects that he will "unquestionably accept help" (1978, p. 96).

While the greater part of the literature addresses current supervisory practice, there is also some concentration of effort on supervisory preparation.

The 1978 ASCD report is a valuable synthesis of nationwide practices in certification and academic programs. As would be expected, internal role confusion has its analog in varied (or non-existent) certification requirements. Academic programs are developed by institutions to meet state certification requirements, and therefore tend to mirror those requirements. As noted in Chapter One, the
preparation of supervisors as described by the Working Group reveals its origins and erstwhile link with educational administration, rather than its complementary side, the facilitation of teacher growth. Where there was agreement among certification and academic requirements, the ASCD report notes that it lies in prior teaching experience for supervisors; supervision experience is not generally required.

Persons addressing supervision preparation almost universally favor experiential learning. Dyer reported on a humanistic competency training effort for student teacher supervisors, accomplished in good part by the use of audiotapes in groups of eight or ten persons (1976).

Microcounseling as a means of developing effective supervisory interpersonal skills is described by Bradley (1975). Bradley asserts that effective and ineffective supervisors can be differentiated by a number of classifiable, observable behaviors. The training he describes is a behavioral skills approach to improving interpersonal communication.

McCormack likewise suggests that the "skills of compassion" can and should be learned by supervisors (1975, p. 6), the best way being from someone who is treating them compassionately.

Miltz and Kanus report on their training model for "helping skills" (1977), the source of which remains
obscure. Use was made of videotaping for role-played sessions. Results of the study were "positive."

Pace reported (1976) a controlled study with 44 pairs of student teachers and cooperating teachers who were trained in collaborative supervision, to investigate the effects of collaborative supervision on helping relationships. The process was not detailed; all participants learned both how to help and be helped. She found that collaborative supervision positively affected both participants' ability to perceive helpfulness and their attitudes toward being helped. In addition, changes in subjects' self-perceptions as a helper correlated positively and significantly with changed perceptions of others as helpers. Pace concluded that the ability to perceive helpfulness is a necessary but not sufficient condition to being able to give helpful responses.

Finally, an extensive inservice program for 24 administrators was designed, implemented, and reported in detail by Ward (1976). This was described as a humanistic approach to supervision, centering on four supervisory models from which participants chose to develop personal expertise: clinical, values clarification, goal-oriented, and peer. Increases in supervisory activity and decreases in teacher negativity as evidenced by several quantitative measures, were dramatic.
Possibly coming closer to demonstrating theory Y assumptions about supervision than several (not all) of the foregoing, are several authors whose articles or writing I shall review now.

Koehn and Goens illustrate their belief that the supervisor's perceptions determine how he or she will work, with a fictitious conversation between Mr. X and Ms. Y (1977). Theories X-hard and Y are presented antiphonally.

Pfeiffer (1978) characterizes supervisors three ways depending upon his or her value system. The humanistic supervisor, he says, values people and process, is often viewed "approvingly by subordinates and skeptically by superiors" (p. 12).

Abrell (1974) describes quite cogently his notion of how a humanistic supervisor would believe and act.

The humanistic supervisor is characterized by . . . a consistently overt attitude which reveals a definite preference for asking rather than telling, sharing rather than controlling, and trusting rather than mistrusting. (p. 214)

Harty and Ritz base their model of supervision upon a non-evaluative helping relationship between supervisor and teacher (1976). The supervisor's chief responsibility during the observation interval is to collect the data the teacher wishes to have.

An editorial over a decade ago was Berman's vehicle for asserting that the crux of supervision is facilitation (1966). She describes an ideal facilitator and asks for
the nature of facilitation itself to be studied.

Four authors, writing in pairs, present data suggesting that a supervisor is indeed in a position to have impact. Carkhuff and Truax, writing in 1966, respond to a challenge made over a quarter of a century ago: the helping professions had been called to task generally, when a review of carefully controlled research to that date revealed no significant average differences between persons not treated and those treated by therapy. Carkhuff and Truax found that, indeed, there were no average differences between groups, but there was significantly greater variability on several dimensions. In other words, there was significantly more improvement as well as regression. The interpersonal interaction may have a positive or negative effect, the previous "no significant difference" findings being a result of the positive and negative effects' cancelling each other out. Carkhuff and Truax conclude, "We have an impact!" (p. 724) and extrapolate their conclusion to teacher-student relationships, and others.

Teachers who are facilitative... are not unlike the effective counselors, those who provide the highest levels of... facilitative conditions. (p. 726)

More recently, Aspy's and Roebuck's (1977) experiments with teachers which built upon Rogers' work, provide some insights into helping relationships. These two researchers operationalized Rogers' three conditions for
client-centered therapy, making them more applicable to a school setting. Empathy was restated for educational settings as a teacher's attempt to understand the meaning that the student's school experience has for the student. Congruence remained the same—the extent to which the teacher was genuine in relationships with the student. Positive Regard was redefined as the ways a teacher shows respect for the student himself. Teachers were rated on these three dimensions for maximum effectiveness in helping.

Then, 3700 classroom hours of instruction of 10,000 students, by 550 elementary and secondary teachers were assessed. Numerous variables such as student achievement test scores and problem-solving ability were correlated with teachers' ratings.

Two of the findings as summarized by Rogers (1977a) are especially pertinent to this study: (1) The most facilitative condition for student achievement was "high level" (on Rogers' three dimensions) teachers who were backed up and supervised by high level principals; and (2) Teachers improved in these attitudes (empathy, positive regard and congruence) only when their trainers demonstrated high levels of these conditions. (Italics were added by me for emphasis.)

Aspy's and Roebuck's work lends strength to the significance of the relationship between teacher and supervisor implied in this study. That high level teachers who
were backed up by high level superiors effected greater student achievement, and that teachers improved in their helping attitudes only when their trainers exhibited them, make the importance of studying a supervisor's mobilizing his or her own helping potential even more compelling.

Four authors specifically zero in on one's belief system as the starting point for effecting growth and change, as opposed to stressing behavior primarily. All four speak of teachers' belief systems; we may safely apply their notions to the belief systems of supervisors.

Weinstein, in a forward to a book written to help teachers acquire professional self-knowledge (Curwin & Fuhrmann, 1975), agrees with Maslow that understanding oneself is a major means toward development. Says Weinstein,

The product of self-knowledge is to create more response-ability, more choice . . . Understanding, clarifying, and admitting to yourself the structure of your response pattern is a necessary but insufficient condition for creating alternative responses. (p. xix)

Recognizing that growth doesn't occur solely with cerebra-
tion, Weinstein adds with emphasis,

There must also be a commitment to experiment with alternative responses. (p. xx)

Zahorik (1978) likewise talks like a perceptual psychologist when he suggests supervision should begin with teachers' values, as well as the supervisor's. He recognizes that a teacher's behavior is completely bounded by his or her belief system. This is not to ignore behavior,
which is seen as an outgrowth of values. Zahorik would focus on achieving consistency between values and behavior.

The recognition of incongruencies between one's values and one's behavior has been grasped and expanded greatly by Sergiovanni (1976). He, like Zahorik, Weinstein and others, believes the widespread behavioral focus in supervision needs to be offset with attention to the corresponding personal theoretical base. Sergiovanni contrasts one's "platform in use" or actual teaching behaviors, with one's personal assumptions, theories and beliefs which together, when self-reported, he calls the "espoused platform." Platforms in use are inferred from teaching plans, dialog, materials, seating arrangements, and the like. He sees movement toward congruence as desirable and growthful, and believes the major task of supervisors is to help construct platforms in use (since they are not generally known to the teacher), thereby illuminating a dilemma for the teacher to resolve. Because of the link between espoused platform and self-esteem, he believes dilemma resolution will occur with the behavior modifying to be congruent with values espoused.

Parenthetically, this whole notion is exposed to view in the profiles written for each supervisor in this study. (A sample Positive Portrait is in Appendix A. The process will be discussed briefly later.) Together, the Values, Successes, and Goals sections of the Portrait are
the analog of Sergiovanni's espoused platform. The
Strengths section of the Portrait is analogous in content
to his platform in use. One important difference: the
strengths, or helping behaviors, were derived from response
to an oral interview, rather than from classroom artifacts.
The predictiveness of this process is a side issue in this
study and will be dealt with later.

In a footnote, Sergiovanni notes that one might
find an occasional teacher who is performing in "mindless
or mechanistic" ways (1976, pp. 26-27). In such a case, he
speculates, the teacher will probably have no espoused the­
ory of classroom practice. From the experiences of my col­
leagues and from my own, having often used Positive Por­
traits as a tool in the development of teachers, I  would
make two assertions: (1) There is more than an occasional
teacher performing mindlessly in our schools, and (2) The
espoused platforms of these kinds of teachers are weighty
with lip service, while their platforms in use barely tip
the scales, contrary to Sergiovanni's speculation.

Simon picked up the espoused platform in use con­
struct (1977) and developed a four-stage process using a
videotape of the teacher to construct her platforms.
Whether the supervisor confronts the teacher with discrep­
ancies, or waits for the teacher to perceive them, is not
clear. At any rate, once a dilemma has surfaced, the
teacher and supervisor together are to deal with it. The
expectation is that once the teacher sees the difference between the two, she or he will be capable of behavior change.

Spokesmen for supervisory process across disciplines agree that research is scarce in their areas. Educational supervision does not stand alone in this regard. Squires refers to the "dearth of useful research in the field of supervision" (1978, p. 5). Feldens and Duncan (1978) note that research which honors the autonomy of the subjects in pre-determining their own goals seems to be lacking. While Feldens and Duncan included this variable in their study of teachers' instructional behavior changes, they report finding no antecedent research which deliberately builds in teachers' own decisions about the nature and direction of the changes to be studied. A collection of ERIC document resumes abstracted 38 studies or documents (Administrative-Supervisory, 1973). Collectively they illustrate a behavioral, systems trend of supervision. In the other direction, Reavis reviewed clinical supervision research (1979). Despite its 20-year history, and widespread regard as an accelerating movement, the review comprised only six studies. Denham (1977) adds further evidence of neglect of research in "in-class" supervision:

(1) Only two significant pieces have appeared since Goldhammer's original book in 1969—Cogan's Clinical Supervision (1973) and a complete issue of the Journal of Research
and Development in Education (1976); (2) Except for some doctoral dissertations, very few research studies have been done; (3) Only five articles (and of these, only two were research) were cited in Encyclopedia of Educational Research; (4) The past six years of the Review of Educational Research yielded nothing; and (5) Educational Leadership averaged only seven articles on supervision yearly between 1960-1968, and only two percent of the articles in several other leading periodicals dealt with the subject.

If research on supervision is as scarce as I have attempted to demonstrate above, it is not surprising that my literature searches turned up little which addresses teacher or supervisor growth based on strengths; studies emphasizing developmental growth; supervisor preparation oriented to the self of the supervisor; exactly what occurs as supervisors learn to supervise; what the meanings of the experience are to the supervisor; how supervisors work uniquely; or what the relationships are between a supervisor's perceptions and his or her lived-out supervisory behaviors.

Five studies were found which touch on one or more of the aspects of supervision mentioned above.

Kyte (1971) reported a study in which 20 supervisors evaluated two lessons "blind" via typescripts, not having been told the lessons were actually "before-and-after" with a planned conference between. All 20 judged
the second lesson better than the first one, even though half the supervisors read it before they read the other lesson. All 20 gave written reasons for their judgments. The reasons were matched with the item stressed in the supervisory conference, serving as a gauge of effectiveness that the particular conference item had. The complete dialog between the supervisor and the teacher, which occurred between the first and second lessons, was included in the report because of its quality, Kyte says. So far as I can determine, the criteria applied to it, besides being antecedent to a "better" second lesson, include commendable use of the English language, spontaneous communication, and rapport established and maintained. Kyte's running commentary is placed beside the dialog, illuminating to some degree the content analysis used. While the format is probably a useful one, the conference itself appeared to me to be of mediocre quality.

Grumet (1979) presents in detail and full example, a unique teacher development technique called Currere, devised by Pinar. It allows the teacher to learn what he already knows by providing him with a way to extract information from his own response to his situation. (p. 207)

Specifically, Currere entails extensive written dialog between supervisor and teacher, initiated by an orientation session, and the teacher's subsequent autobiographical essay on her own "Educational Experience." In the
published report, one can read exchanges of dialog on a given point, followed by Grumet's commentary on it. Her comments to the teacher are forthright, stimulating, and teacher-freeing to expand or explore further. Grumet freely owns her own feelings and viewpoints. Although in reality the written dialog occurred over a protracted period of time, the reader experiences a very dynamic interchange. One can only wonder how powerful the exchange would have been face to face. This distance is deliberately created, allowing the teacher to ask questions of her own work, choose what or what not to reveal, and to use contemplative time.

A second aspect of Currere also incorporates a proximity-distance dimension: the teacher is asked to keep notes on her teaching daily—immediate, emotional, scribbled, rich. Once weekly, from an overall perspective, and with more time, she is to reflect and make sense of the week's notes, making use of the same "close and distant scanning of experience" (pp. 245-6) that the essays require. The supervisor participates less fully in this phase.

A third phase is classroom visits using any observation method, i.e., Cogan's pattern-finding, interaction analysis, or videotape. Grumet summarizes her visits by letter.
Outcomes, occurring all along the way, include the teacher's real self-questioning, trying new techniques, changed student attitudes, and an altered role for herself. The power of the dialog lies with the insight, honesty, openness, and directness with which each communicates. Grumet is remarkably skillful. Her subject, a teaching psychiatric nurse, has the personal qualities to respond to and grow with an opportunity of this nature. This report affords a privileged view onto an extraordinary supervisory process.

Squires' recent study (1978) spanning three disciplines, investigates supervisors' perspectives of positive experiences. His four case study subjects includes. two educational administrators doing instructional supervision, and two supervisors in counselor education and social work, respectively. Data are the taped, typescripted responses to one open-ended interview with each subject. Data were analyzed by a method adapted from Colaizzi (1978) involving extracting significant statements from each interview. Meaning units were formed from these statements, verified, and all subjects' were combined, reduced, and organized into clusters of themes. The result is the "fundamental structure" of a positive supervisory experience from the point of view of the supervisor (p. 127). Squires builds upon several previous studies also done at the University of Pittsburgh. Horgan (cited in Squires, 1978) analyzes
supervisor strategies in the training of counselors, using a natural history approach. Rutenberg (cited in Squires, 1978) uses a case study model to study self-supervision process. Squires' study is the complement of Herrick's more recent 1977 study (cited in Squires, 1978) investigating both positive and negative supervision experiences from the point of view of six supervisees. Squires' study is of particular relevance to this study in at least three dimensions: (1) Its phenomenological point of view centering on the supervisor; (2) Inclusion of the often-neglected area of supervisory process, and (3) Its study of excellence in supervision.

Squires' findings parallel Herrick's in several ways which reflect current literature. For both supervisor and supervisee, positive supervision means more task focus; mutual initial anxiety, relieved soon in the experience; positive personal relationships; supervisor is actively helpful, but structures the relationship; supervisee becomes more secure, more autonomous, and more effective; supervisee uses supervisor as a model; initial anxiety about evaluation is reduced by collaboration. Where Herrick finds "from the supervisee's point of view, it is the relationship which teaches" (quoted from Squires, 1978, p. 133), Squires' supervisors focus more on the supervisory process. One important additional finding from Squires' study: supervisors perceive themselves as
growing in the supervisory experience.

Brown (1979) applied the Selection Research, Incorporated staff development model in a suburban high school over a school year. His stated purpose was to investigate the dynamics of staff development through the perceptions of those participating. Brown himself was the staff developer, reporting his perspectives as well as those of the teachers, the students, and the school administration. Since the model, as well as the research, was developmental, the expected teacher outcomes were individual, differing from person to person. Each teacher's development was deliberately based on his or her own strength areas. Teachers themselves determined the direction of their own growth efforts, drawing up specific objectives to that end with knowledge of their own strengths, in collaboration with the staff developer. The entire model, and therefore the study, was predicated upon the assumption that a teacher's unique thought patterns, or perceptual field, as determined by responses to the Teacher Perceiver Interview, can be the basis for determining his or her strengths, and therefore an important tool for teacher growth. Participation was voluntary, an important value in the model, consistent with its developmental nature. Feedback is likewise a salient feature of the model. A teacher's understanding of where he is, is considered essential to his setting growth objectives which spell out where he
wants to be. Students' assessments were likewise regularly collected as part of the feedback data to the teachers. A significant component of the model was the person of the staff developer himself. Personally exemplifying one of the basic assumptions of the model, that development is facilitated through the establishment of rapport, a relationship with a "significant other," Brown actively built individual relationships with each of the 13 participants; this strong component pervades both the model and the study.

The study, focused on process, finds that teachers see Brown's personal facilitation as instrumental to their growth. The more clearly they learn to conceptualize their goals toward "good" teaching, the more involved they become. Strengths-focus is associated with increased levels of performance. Teachers who carefully draw up their own chosen objectives act upon them more readily. Students' assessments influenced teachers' behavior. Perhaps the strongest force in teachers' movement to growth found in the study is heightened self-awareness, especially the "affirmation of behaviors and beliefs they hold as valuable" (Brown, p. 150).

The present study and Brown's, both having sprung from the same "roots," share many characteristics: developmental nature; focus on individuals and individual outcomes; use of a Perceiver interview for determining teacher or supervisor perceptions; deliberate use of strengths for
growth direction; growth of self-knowledge as a way to activate helping behaviors and the relationship between the two; investigation of process; purposeful development of a helper-helpee relationship; placement in two different but appropriate field settings; and predominantly qualitative analysis. In some ways the two studies complement each other.

Skidmore's quasi-experimental study (1977) of administrator growth outcomes is of the same genre, using the Administrator Perceiver Interview to establish administrator strengths for targeting growth directions.

Perspectives on Clinical Supervision

The reader of this review who is familiar with supervision literature may well have noticed, long before this point, the absence of an extended review of the literature of clinical supervision and its relationship to the present study. This is not an oversight. However, it is appropriate that I deal with it now. In doing so, I shall have made my personal stance on supervision clear.

Clinical supervision evolved out of the need for better supervision expressed by the students in the Master of Arts in Teaching program at Harvard 25 years ago. Morris Cogan, one of those supervisors, remains the person, and his book, Clinical Supervision (1973) is the vehicle around which proponents center. The term "clinical" represents its commitment to in-class, close-up, direct
observation of teaching. Its cycles are well-known: (1) Pre-observation conferences to establish plans, purposes, and procedures; (2) Observation and data-gathering as agreed upon; (3a) Analysis by the supervisor of the classroom events, focusing on strengths, perhaps identifying patterns; (3b) Deciding and planning the strategies for presenting the information to the teacher; (4) Post-observation conference; and (5) Critique of the entire cycle. An important aspect of the model precedes the cycle: a long "work-up" period (Wilhelms, 1973, p. 31) for building the trust and rapport necessary for a growth-oriented relationship. Wilhelms points to this as the heart of the system, the induction of the teacher into the role of supervisor. The essence of the model is the collegiality of supervisor and teacher. Furthermore, the model, if it is to be carried out as designed demands a generous time commitment by the persons involved.

How, one might fairly ask, can someone have reservations—and I do—about a model as teacher-centered, strength-focused, and collegially-disposed as the model for clinical supervision appears to be? Let me give my reasons.

First, there has been, as Sergiovanni and others aptly point out (1976) a bandwagon effect. The mechanics of clinical supervision have too often been embraced without full understanding. Competency-based clinical
supervision is one example of merging two incompatible ideas (Sergiovanni, 1976, p. 22). Part of my reservation lies with clinical supervision that uses the name but has lost some of the original intent.

My second reservation echoes a point well made by Sergiovanni (1976) regarding clinical supervision's association with workflow. In Sergiovanni's words,

The intellectual capital inherent in clinical supervision is in my view more important than its workflow as articulated into steps, strategies and procedures. (pp. 21-22)

It is much easier to emulate motions than to incorporate meanings—a basic problem with all educational innovations.

Third, despite limited evidence in the literature "that clinical supervision has made much impact on the practice of instructional supervision" (Lovell, 1978, p.44), the Summary of the survey results by the Working Group ends with these words,

[The supervisor makes] an appraisal made possible through the application of the methodology of clinical supervision and a thorough grounding in both theory and practical experience. (p. 22)

So another part of my reservation rests with the widespread lip-service we have accorded clinical supervision. Its appropriateness is assumed and unquestioned by those surveyed. But there is sparse documentation of success with the model. The question arises, Is anyone using it?

The fourth reservation leads me directly to Cogan's clear statement of the proper domain for the clinical
supervisor—the teacher's observable classroom behavior, "not the teacher as a person" (Cogan, 1973, p. 58, italics mine for emphasis). Any other focus beyond the teacher's classroom behavior suggests the supervisor's intent of changing the teacher's personality, says Cogan, and is immediately classified as counseling. Although he recognizes a teacher's behaviors have antecedents in the person, he seems not to recognize the difference between wanting to change the person, and acknowledging and appreciating who the teacher as a person is.

A fifth reservation stems from a confusion I sense in Cogan's understanding of "relationship" and its function. On one hand he states that one important objective of clinical supervision is the teacher's becoming his or her own supervisor. On the other hand, the relationship between teacher and supervisor is to be cultivated. If the teacher is ultimately to work alone, why cultivate the relationship? Or, if the relationship is valuable or instrumental to a teacher's growth, why work for termination of the relationship? One wonders, too, about the depth and quality of a "relationship [which is] based on observation of teaching" (Simon, 1977, p. 582).

A sixth reservation goes back to Sergiovanni's proposed integration of clinical supervision with more "naturalistic" assumptions (quoted by Simon, 1977, p. 580). In Sergiovanni's tentative theory of clinical supervision, a
teacher's platform in use, or actual teaching behavior, is to be compared to his or her espoused platform, with discrepancies resolved by improved teaching behavior. Cogan, Sergiovanni and Simon all reiterate the strength-focus of observations in clinical supervision. If a supervisor focuses on teaching strengths, he or she will find them fairly well backed up by matching values, beliefs, and attitudes. I make this statement out of experience with teachers' Positive Portraits and observing their lived out teaching behaviors. There will likely be few discrepancies to resolve. If the above theorists would have the supervisor observe for areas of behavior not congruent with espoused values, beliefs, and attitudes, he or she is, in effect, operating in a way incongruent with the espoused platform of clinical supervision itself by focusing on weaknesses. If the crux of this variation on clinical supervision is making platforms congruent, then they are necessarily working with weaknesses in behavior. It seems to me Sergiovanni and Simon themselves have a dilemma to resolve.

A seventh very personal objection has to do with Sergiovanni's unfortunate term "search behavior" (1976, p. 28). Simon defines it as "statements made by teachers that indicate that the teachers are scrutinizing their ideas and strategies of teaching as the result of the videotaping process" (p. 581). The term seems more appropriate
for laboratory animals than for teachers.

If clinical supervision has theory Y assumptions, as many would contend, then the model should be found to be developmental in nature. But closer look at the model reveals some aspects which do not square with concepts of development: focusing only on classroom behavior; emphasis on workflow in the model; not dealing with the person of the teacher which is where development occurs; vagueness about the role of the relationship in development; and a hedging on the strengths-focus in the "platform" version.

If the clinical supervision model is not clearly developmental, then I must conclude its assumptions are theory X-soft, rather than theory Y.

Summary

I have introduced the Review of Related Literature with three observations: the wide meaning of the term "supervision;" the necessity for limiting this review to educational, in-class supervision; and the speculation that current literature leans heavily toward theory X-soft assumptions.

Literature was reviewed which dealt with in-class or direct supervision, concluding with a discussion of clinical supervision and its relationship to the present study.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

Rationale

Thoughtfully arranging a special learning environment for a particular group of students is a uniquely human activity. Interacting as a student in that environment with materials, ideas, peers, and instructor is undeniably a specialized human undertaking also. Even more profoundly human may be the enterprise of using oneself as an instrument to help another human being grow and develop, as in the instance of a supervisor working with a teacher in a helping framework. A context accommodating these events in the same ten-weeks must also necessarily be important to the processes being investigated. The essences of these phenomena as lived out and experienced by the persons involved in the research being described, as nested in their fleeting short-term setting, must be captured in the research design.

I will develop several ideas about research with human subjects in an educational setting. From each point made I will state an "assertion," to be reiterated within a complete list at the end of the Rationale section. The assertions, applied to the particular events being probed in
this study, will provide the guidelines which shaped the research design to be described in the following section, Design of the Study.

Traditional experimental design comes to educational research from experimental psychology. Psychology in turn took over and adapted the methods of the natural sciences whose subject matter was inanimate. Chemistry and physics, for example, were well served by these methods. Experimentation in its simplest, classical sense, means that all factors are held constant by the experimenter except two: the independent variable and the dependent variable. The experimenter then systematically varies the independent variable and notes the effects of this upon the dependent variable. Psychologists as well as natural scientists could use this traditional experimental methodology, even though psychologists' subjects were human, when they focused only on that subject behavior which was observable and measurable by the experimenter. However, since one of the aims of humanistic education is to include the whole person, research which limits itself to observable and measurable effects clearly has not fit the event in its entirety. Mead (1976) points out the necessity of recognizing that our knowledge of ourselves and of the world comes from not one but two sources: we have the capacity, certainly well recognized, to make objective observations on physical and animate nature; but in addition, we have a complementary
capacity to explore human responses through introspection and through empathy. It is as inappropriate to extend ways of studying human beings onto the physical world, Mead says, as it is to lay the methods of physical science onto the study of human beings.

It is logical to propose, therefore, that a research design be as congruent as possible with the event(s) being studied, in this case, experiencing, learning, reflecting individuals engaged in a complexity of events over a ten-week period of time.

Assertion one: An alternative design should be sought which includes methods appropriate to the study of the whole person, not just observable behaviors.

Scientific activity according to Duncan (1979) includes assigning numerals to objects or events according to rules, and similarly assigning objects or events to numerals. Both processes constitute measurement. Duncan refers to S.S. Stevens' description of scientific process: science is engaged in fitting a formal set of symbols, i.e., language, logic, or mathematics, to phenomena experienced in observation for the purpose of generalizing confirmable propositions. Measurement in these terms removes separations between quantitative and qualitative description. More to the point, then, is the broader meaning of measurement. Rather than associating measurement solely with mathematics and applying it just to observable behavior,
a broader interpretation of measurement extends in two directions: going beyond observable behaviors to personal meanings as observed events in scientific activity, and going beyond mathematics to language as another formal set of symbols. "Creative use of measurement [is] the key to arriving at communal meaning--something different from although not unrelated to personal meaning" (Duncan, 1979).

Assertion two: The alternative should include a concept of measurement which includes assignment of language symbols to personal meanings.

If it be the case as perceptual psychologists say, that "all behavior, without exception, is completely determined by and pertinent to the perceptual field of the behaving organism" (Combs, 1976, p. 18), then another guideline for studying human subjects comes into clearer focus. Attitudes, values, prior experiences, intellectual capacities, self-concept, expectations, and maturity, to name but a few, are integrated into one's perceptual field. These in turn impact upon events as experienced, and upon the subsequent meanings to be made of experiences. An investigation of human beings who are purposefully involved with each other in their own development, the development of others, and in reflection upon these, must attend closely to meanings as perceived by the persons themselves.

Assertion three: The alternative should reflect the assumption that the persons in the study are not
objects, but experiencing individuals whose experiences as well as lived out behaviors are legitimate data.

Research with human subjects must also address the issue of how their meanings are formed. Mishler (1979) in a compelling discussion of the need for methods more relevant to educational research, refers to traditional experimentation as "context-stripping." Mainstream research design intends to isolate variables from their personal and social contexts. Mishler and others who are currently dealing with this issue believe that all meanings are context-dependent. No meaning stands alone without reference to its context. Therefore, removing the event to be studied to a so-called neutral laboratory, for example, or substituting an expert experimenter for the teacher, have changed meanings by changing contexts, rather than isolated meanings by controlling contexts. Sanders and Schwab (1978, p. 5) referring to the "fundamentally complex, subtle, and whole" nature of educating processes, agree that traditional means for studying them do not serve well. The scope of phenomena making up the ten-week graduate seminar being studied included peer relationships, similar and dissimilar attitudes and values, self-disclosure, teaching method, anxieties, triumphs, group processes, dyadic interaction, boredom, insights, personal objectives, and many more. As Sanders and Schwab (1978, p. 5) point out, these do not affect persons one at a time or in orderly
progression, but "combine to form the whole of students' experience of educating." Isolating them for study is out of the question if their essential nature is to be kept intact. Looking at these processes in their natural settings, with the contexts made as explicit as possible, appears as an approach demanded by the nature of this study.

Assertion four: The alternative should allow for the research to be carried out in a natural setting and for data about the setting to be included as research data.

Colaizzi (1978) adds yet another contingency to be taken into account in designing research for human subjects: the phenomenon needs to be "contacted up close." In apparent contradiction to the folk definition of objectivity as "standing back" or "removing oneself from the event" Colaizzi (1978) says objectivity means fidelity to the phenomenon. This meaning of objectivity from a phenomenological perspective implies

a refusal to tell the phenomenon what it is, but a respectful listening to what the phenomenon speaks of itself. (p. 52)

Respectful listening cannot be done at a distance. It is accomplished by attending with one's whole being, affirming both the experience of others and the experience of the listener. Personally participating in an event being studied has been required of anthropologists for decades. Mooney (1957, p. 171) notes that when the researcher observes he is also participating. "The careful searching of
possibilities on the horizon" is akin to observing, while he likens participating to "the aggressive grasping and shaping of what has already been named and wanted." In both instances the researcher is part of the action. The design needs to let the researcher remain in the action, both as participant and as observer, getting as "close up" as she needs, for her purposes.

Assertion five: The alternative should provide for the phenomenon to be studied "up close."

Education is "creat[ing] something which did not exist prior to the intervention of the educating process" (Sanders & Schwab, 1978, p. 8). This particular effort was to be systematically arranged as a multi-faceted, multi-planed learning experience. The intervention strategies were fairly well predetermined, with primary responsibility being mine. Results or outcomes were not designated beforehand. It was my intention, however, that each supervisor become more aware of, and use his or her own helping potential to facilitate another's growth, that effects, if any, be noted, and that each supervisor reflect thoughtfully on the total experience. A new state of being was hoped for, for each participant, yet the specifications for the new state were neither explicit nor expected to be alike. Frequent and reciprocal feedback is essential to development, as is the preservation of the autonomy of the participants to set their own objectives and to determine their own
convergence on those objectives.

The immediately foregoing description tallies closely with Bronfenbrenner's concept of "transformational experimentation" as Schwab (1977) has contrasted it, along several dimensions, with Dunn's "evolutional experimentation." (The latter refers to broader-scale efforts of experimenting with social forms.) Sanders uses the term "developmental research" to include both of the above types.

Experimentation of the transformational (or developmental) type addresses itself to "determining whether through particular interventions desirable results can be achieved, and if so, under what conditions" (Sanders & Schwab, 1978, p. 15). Generalizations are not appropriate because of the uniqueness of such phenomena and their temporary structure and function (Schwab, 1977). An acceptable design must be responsive to the developmental nature of this research.

Assertion six: The alternative should accommodate to the particular developmental nature of this research, including feedback loops, teacher autonomy, and hypothesis-testing by goal convergence.

Implicit in developmental research and its subset, transformational experimentation, is the recognition that the researcher himself is always an integral part of the effort. Speaking in the first person plural as one researcher among many, Lyons (1963) says,
We will be able to discover what the person is...only by approaching him to have some dealing with him. When we do so, what he does will inevitably be done toward us as well; so that what he is becomes inextricably tied to what we are, which must also be expressed through what we ourselves do. There is no escape from this completely human arena. (p. 225)

One difference between this viewpoint and that of a classical researcher may be clearer and more straightforward recognition that the researcher always has been part of the experiment. There can be no research without a researcher. Mooney (1957) says,

There is no escaping one's self in observing, generalizing, thinking, imagining, proving, testing, dreaming, sleeping--in any act of one's own experiencing. The self is central and though one may be privileged to speak of goings-on at places not present to him, he is not privileged to deny that it was he who spoke. The world a man knows is a world created within his experience and not apart from it. (p. 171)

What has also not been a part of traditional research is the researcher's making explicit his or her biases, presuppositions, values, and predispositions with regard to the research at hand. This can never be done completely; however, if the researcher is as much a part of the undertaking as the subjects are, and there is every reason to believe that she is, her biases should become part of the data also.

Assertion seven: The alternative should provide for including the experience, including biases, and lived out behavior of the researcher as data.
Traditionally, experiments were designed to be repeated—anywhere in the world, or by a stranger, or even in another time or age. One assumed that the results would be the same if the original conditions were duplicated. With human beings who are characterized by their intentionality, a researcher cannot be sure of getting the same results, even if experimental conditions are meticulously copied. The phenomenon being examined in this study, teacher supervisors' mobilizing their own individual helping potential to facilitate the growth of a teacher, is an intensely individual, personal event. It is "an instance in action" (MacDonald & Walker, 1977). Out of her own research experiences Mead adds, "the data of the human sciences are in great part derived from time-consuming shared experiences that cannot be replicated" (1976, p. 907). For the human sciences it is appropriate and enough that the themes of a phenomenon be followed through their varying expressions in individual persons. According to Giorgi (1966, p. 44) even the ways a phenomenon occurs in different persons "sheds light on its essential nature." Bruyn (1966) states that the larger truth will be created by combining partial perspectives.

Man is truly a paradox steeped in irony. He is predictable and he is unpredictable. He is unique and he is general. He is individual and he is communal. He is, indeed, richly endowed. (p. 254)

If we accept these claims about the nature of man, we can also accept that not all research on human beings is
replicable. A research design is needed which will focus on elements of the event which are reproducible, while allowing for and encouraging interpersonal differences to emerge and thrive for study.

Assertion eight: The alternative should permit studying the phenomena through their multiple variations, as opposed to trying to insure identical repetition.

The eight assertions developed in this Rationale, together with the idiosyncratic requirements of this particular study, served as guidelines for the research design. The assertions are summarized in abbreviated form:

1. Alternative design
2. Broader interpretation of measurement
3. Personal meanings of subjects
4. Natural setting, explicated
5. "Up close" study
6. "New state of being" recognized
7. Personal meanings of researcher included
8. Multiple variations

There is, of course, no one phenomenological method. The design for this particular study evolved as the foregoing assertions were heeded and translated into a plan. This plan reflects both my aims and objectives as well as the nature of the phenomenon being studied.
Design of the Study

This was a phenomenological study. Arrangements were made to facilitate ten supervisors' mobilizing their helping potential in a natural setting of ten weeks' duration. Their perspectives, experiences, and meanings were sought and treated as original data, as were the researcher's perspectives and biases. The phenomenon of mobilizing helping potential, manifesting itself differently in each of the supervisors, was studied, analyzed, and described in detailed case studies of four of the ten. Data were treated qualitatively by content analysis. The investigator was first primarily an instructor (participant), then subsequently a researcher (observer).

A review of the essentials of the research design which evolved, when cross-checked with the eight assertions developed in the Rationale, confirms that the design is, in fact, an alternative one, based on the assumptions of humanistic research with human subjects, and shaped by the nature of this particular phenomenon.

The setting for the study will be described in the following section.

Setting of the Study

In the Autumn Quarter of 1978, Educational Foundations and Research course 884.49, Planned Field Experience for Supervision, became a seminar, the setting for this study. Planned Field Experience, offered quarterly, is one
of the requirements for supervisory certification by the state. Registrants in past quarters had either convened as a seminar, or processed their supervisory field experiences individually with the coordinator of the University certification program. The formation of this seminar, based upon relatively heavy enrollment under the course number this particular quarter, was a routine procedure. My teaching the seminar was not routine. However, my role as designer-instructor of the seminar was approved for the quarter by the coordinator of the program and by the chairman of the Department of Educational Foundations and Research.

These registrants met as a group seven of the ten weeks of the quarter. This part of the experience was conducted as an informal seminar with all participants treated similarly. The emphasis was on supervision as a helping profession, with the topics of each session intended for building toward their understanding of that concept. Regular, reciprocal exchange of information and experiences was built in.

In addition to the seven two-and-one-half-hour sessions, I met individually with each participant a minimum of three times: once to conduct a taped, structured interview, a second time to feed back interview data, discuss the written profile, and cooperatively refine individual course objectives, and a third time at the end of the quarter to have each supervisor reflect at length upon the
experience. These meetings averaged an hour each.

Each supervisor in the seminar was asked to arrange if possible to work "as a supervisor" with a teacher over the course of the quarter. I anticipated that this would provide an arena for trying out some of the techniques to be presented in seminar, to have an individual experiential learning context, and to help provide current "real" data for sharing with other participants in the seminar.

I made every effort to individualize the out-of-class interactions with each of the ten supervisors, and to facilitate their growing as helpers. Individual supervisory strengths were identified and focused upon; the supervisor's own goals and objectives were honored; goal achievement was determined individually by each participant; each supervisor brought his or her own experiences to share and work through; and of course each relationship developed differently with both his or her teacher-client and with me.

Four of the ten participants were selected after the fact for analyzing in depth as case studies. (See Selection of Subjects). Data from or about each case study were treated individually in order to illuminate their differences, rather than combined to obliterate unusual or individual effects (Parlett & Hamilton, 1977).

The seminar was computer-assigned to a small classroom which featured bolted-down chairs with writing arms. As this did not lend itself readily to the laboratory-type
activities-centered seminar anticipated, a room with more flexible furniture was located and used for the second through seventh class meetings.

Individual meetings with subjects were held wherever an empty office or classroom could be found. Most conferences were held privately and without interruptions, although one notable one occurred, for lack of a more suitable location, in an office hallway with students freely passing through, some asking directions. This was the exception.

The course syllabus given to participants at the first class meeting is found in Appendix B.

The designs of both the study and the course were quite compatible, having been developed to complement each other. The events were not "bent" to accommodate the research. Data were all a normal residual of the seminar, as will be detailed later.

If any accommodations were made, they were likely on the part of the research design to keep it true to the phenomenon being studied. For instance, it was tempting to introduce a tape recorder into seminar sessions to capture specific comments or thought patterns of participants, or just for analysis of my own teaching. I judged this potentially too disruptive and too unlike the natural setting. It was never done. The possibility of observing each supervisor with his or her particular client was
entertained, but rejected as dissimilar to the way such a seminar could be conducted under usual circumstances.

Selection of subjects for both the seminar and for the case studies is discussed in the next section.

Selection of Subjects

Eight of the ten persons who became seminar participants registered under the course number in partial fulfillment of requirements for supervisory certification by the state. None was known to me previously, nor did they have knowledge of the intended focus of the seminar. Of course the fact that it was doubling as a study was not known to participants until they arrived. The ninth member was a university colleague who audited the course because of her interest in the content. She did not arrange a working field relationship with a teacher. The tenth member, also a doctoral student, registered on the recommendation of a professor who knew the focus of the seminar would be of particular interest to him.

Two other individuals were registered under the course number but arranged to process their experiences with the university coordinator instead for personal reasons--great traveling distance, and previous practical experience as a principal, respectively.

Six of the ten were women. Five were in their thirties, three in their late twenties, and two in early forties.
Half were currently classroom teachers. In addition, there was one counselor, one resource teacher, one public school supervisor, and one supervisor of student teachers for the University. Again, the auditing member was a doctoral student who had supervised student teachers previously.

Participants typically were at or nearing the end of their course work for certification. Two, however, were just beginning and another was halfway finished. Only one member was taking another course in the certification program concurrently.

While all ten seminar members were treated as participants for the part of the study focusing on their planned group experience, the selection of subjects for case studies presented different considerations.

It had been hoped originally that each seminar participant could be a case study. All readily signed Human Subject consent forms. Each was willing to be written up as a separate case study; in fact, each was willing to have his or her own name used in such a writeup. It became clear soon after the quarter began, however, that not all the participants could qualify for case study analysis. The crucial element was the supervisor's having a teacher with whom he or she could interact "like a supervisor." Two had no client; two took colleagues as projects--albeit covertly; one worked with a parent volunteer; one had job
expectations which made working with one teacher difficult. The four remaining participants, then, became the four case study subjects for the second part of the study. Their selection was not final until the course was over.

These four included a middle school department chairman who had a first-year teacher in his department; a university supervisor of student teachers currently responsible for four in one school; an experienced fourth-grade classroom teacher who had just received her first student teacher; and a second year supervisor who was responsible for several dozen music teachers. Each will be described more fully in Chapter V.

Human Subject Conditions

Policies followed by the Human Subject Behavioral and Social Sciences Review Committee of the University were adhered to, including the condition that participation or not in the study have no effect on a student's grade for the seminar.

Participation in the study was voluntary. Full information on subjects' involvement in the study was presented to them at the second class meeting. The study proposal itself was offered for their perusal, if interested. None was. Alternatives to participation had been worked out with the University program coordinator, but they were not needed. No known risks or stress accompanied the study.
Indeed, participation was expected to be growthful, a professional opportunity not otherwise available.

Although I had permission to do otherwise, I altered the names of each of the four supervisors and their teacher clients for the case studies portion of this study.

A copy of the consent form is in Appendix C.

Data Collection

All data were either written to begin with, or were ultimately transformed into written format. Each kind of datum was quite plausibly a natural part of the seminar and its out-of-class activities. Each kind of datum was intended to serve both the participant supervisor and the (participant) instructor exclusive of research needs. I believe it is one strength of this research design that all the data gathered, with the exception of the followup interview, could stand on their own as functions of the seminar itself. That the data could all eventually be in a form amenable to content analysis and be a rich resource for the (observer) researcher is an additional strength of the study.

Figure 1 displays the various kinds of data gathered during the seminar, their sources, their original forms and the processes by which each became written data, and their purposes or uses, both within the seminar framework and as research data. All participants provided all kinds of data, whether or not their data were subsequently
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Original Format</th>
<th>Analysis Format</th>
<th>Purposes or Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Supervisors | Oral responses (taped) to Teacher Advocate Interview items | Transcribed verbatim | - To help build relationship between supervisor and instructor  
|             |                 |                 | - To provide basis for beginning understanding of each supervisor's helping potential  
|             |                 |                 | - To provide data for writing each supervisor's Positive Portrait  
|             |                 |                 | *- To provide basis for writing predictions for each case study participant  
| Supervisors | Original taped interview | Taped responses listened to, perceived, and reorganized by instructor in predetermined written format | - To create written Positive Portrait for each supervisor  
|             |                 |                 | - To provide tangible basis for discussing each supervisor's helping potential  
|             |                 |                 | - To provide data for objective-setting by supervisor  
|             |                 |                 | - To provide opportunity to experience strengths-focus  
|             |                 |                 | *- To provide a check for case study predictions  

Figure 1. Data sources, formats, and purposes
| Supervisors | Supervisory Log | Typed for ease of reading | - To provide reference points for supervisor to see growth in self and/or teacher  
| Auditing student | Weekly log | Used as written | - To provide check for utility of techniques from seminar  
| Supervisors | Weekly Reaction Cards | Used as written | - To provide opportunity for supervisor to reflect and make sense of experience  
| Instructor | Weekly log | Used as written | - To provide major data source for case studies  
|           |           |           | - To provide feedback for teaching  
|           |           |           | *- To provide a student's perspective  
|           |           |           | - To provide opportunity to express values, insights, and reactions  
|           |           |           | - To provide opportunity to relate and integrate ideas  
|           |           |           | - To provide feedback for instructor for teaching  
|           |           |           | *- To provide data for case studies  
|           |           |           | *- To provide record of seminar sessions  
|           |           |           | *- To provide data for case studies  

Figure 1. Continued
| Instructor | Notes on dyadic interaction | Used as written | - To help instructor express and record insights about each supervisor's helping potential

* - To provide data for case studies

| Supervisors | Open-ended course evaluation | Handwritten evaluations typed in uniform format to preserve anonymity | - To provide opportunity to express values, insights, and reactions

- To provide feedback to guide future teaching

* - To provide data about course for explication of context of study

| Supervisors | Oral responses (taped) to debriefing questions | Transcribed verbatim | - To provide opportunity for supervisor to reflect upon and integrate total experience

* - To provide data for case studies

| Supervisors | Oral responses (taped) to followup questions, and reactions to own case study | Transcribed verbatim | * - To get supervisor clarification of specified points in case study analysis

* - To get supervisor verification of accuracy and completeness of own case study

* Purposes which serve the study only.

Figure 1. Continued
analyzed for the case studies. I will then discuss each kind of datum in detail describing how each contributed to the learning experiences of the seminar participants as well as to the study itself.

The Teacher Advocate Interview used in this study is a structured interview schedule of 53 open-ended questions. This interview is one of many Perceiver interviews developed by Selection Research, Incorporated of Lincoln, Nebraska. Interviews are based on certain assumptions suggested and supported over the years by successive research efforts. Some of their assumptions follow.

(1) The person of the helper in a helping relationship is the critical factor in the effectiveness of helping (Teacher Perceiver, 1975).

(2) Helpers can be distinguished from non-helpers by their thought-patterns (Teacher Perceiver, 1975).

(3) Oral interviews with open-ended questions seem to facilitate freer expression of thought patterns than do pencil-and-paper responses, even to the same questions (Gaeddert, 1956).

(4) Teacher thought patterns (and presumably others') appear relatively stable over time (Dodge, 1964).

(5) Thought patterns of teachers as revealed in interview responses and perceived by trained users, correlate highly with judgments of effectiveness by students (Bonneau, 1956, and Millard & Brooks, 1974).
(6) Perceiving a helper's thought patterns by a trained user can be a valid basis for predicting helpful effectiveness (Lieske, 1969 and Warner, 1969).

(7) The thought patterns of a teacher, perceived by a trained user, can be the basis for development of the teacher (Brown, 1979).

(8) The effectiveness of any of the Perceiver interviews for selection and especially for development is predicated upon both the technical competency and the person of the perceiver him- or herself (Brown, 1979).

Perceiver interview questions in general are developed, used, and refined to elicit responses related to the themes or organization points which have showed up in the expressed thought patterns of practitioners considered "successful" by folk definition.

The Teacher Advocate Interview stems directly from the Administrator Perceiver Interview. In 1975, the director of a federal project in New Orleans needed an instrument to help identify several persons who would likely be successful as project staff developers in helping teachers grow. Selection Research, Incorporated worked with her to modify the Administrator Perceiver Interview to a form appropriate for staff developers. Ten administrator themes (of twelve) were retained, and some questions were altered situationally to be more relevant to staff developers. The result was the first version of the Teacher Advocate
Interview with ten themes and 48 questions. Subsequent use of this interview has probably been light and not well documented.

When this seminar and study were being planned, I turned to the Teacher Advocate Interview as a means for identifying supervisors' helping potential and as a reference point for the study. With the permission and collaboration of SRI I updated some questions with their more recent 1977 counterparts in the Administrator Perceiver, situationally altered several, and added all five Listening theme questions from the Teacher Perceiver Interview. The result was a workable, eleven-theme, 53-question schedule, quite appropriate to the work-worlds of supervisors. I recognize, of course, that the version used in this study differs somewhat from other Perceiver interviews in the processes through which parts of it evolved. A description of the eleven themes of the Teacher Advocate Interview used, is in Appendix D.

To be certified by SRI to use any one of their Perceiver interviews, one must attain a cumulative .85 inter-rater agreement with their trainers (who maintain a .90 agreement among themselves). I am certified in both the Teacher Perceiver and Administrator Perceiver Interviews and have had considerable experience writing Positive Portraits for teachers. I felt myself ready to use these data with supervisors.
The interviewing process itself, aside from data generated, can be a significant part of helping. This had a relationship-building purpose as I tried to hear what each supervisor was telling me about their perceptions of themselves as present or would-be supervisors. Each interview was taped. Transcriptions from which the case study predictions were written were not made until the course had terminated and the case study subjects were selected.

I wrote each supervisor's Positive Portrait directly from the taped interview responses. Working from a transcribed script is the preferred procedure; however, in order to interview and get back to each participant as soon as possible in the ten-week quarter, I had to interview, profile, and meet with ten individuals in about two weeks' time. This time constraint dictated the shorter process. (In checking profiles of the four case study participants against the more leisurely written and minutely examined analyses for the study, I found no significant errors. Aside from an occasional fine point which was lost, each checked well with the other).

The Positive Portrait for each supervisor was shared in a feedback conference with him or her. Typically in this conference, the strengths or helping potential of each was emphasized, perhaps related to a work setting, and tentative objectives were looked at and sometimes refined. Supervisors invariably found it a new experience to spend
this much time with someone, discussing what the supervisor does well--a very affirming process. I wanted each supervisor to experience this strength-focus, hoping that from modeling, it might begin to pervade their supervisory work. The Positive Portraits, however, probably of all data, were less helpful for the study itself as they gave way to the infinitely more detailed case study analyses. I used the Portraits, however, to check my final analyses of the four case studies. An anonymous Positive Portrait is in Appendix A.

One of the major sources of data for case study analysis came from the Supervisory Logs. They were basically four open-ended questions to which each supervisor was asked to respond weekly or oftener to record supervisor-teacher interactions. Two administrators with supervisory functions piloted this Log format for me on the job several weeks before the study. No changes seemed called for and the Log was used as piloted. The four questions were:

(1) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

(2) At your own personal meaning level, what seems to be happening?

(3) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

(4) What is going on that you feel good about?
An example of a sequence of logs (one of the pilots typed up anonymously) was given each supervisor for a model. The possible meanings for each question were processed in class. The purposes were outlined orally as follows:

(1) To help feed back data about the course, specifically, How, or do, any ideas or techniques from the seminar filter into practice?

(2) To establish the contexts for each interaction for more accurate understanding

(3) To help relate the supervisor him- or herself to what was happening

(4) To keep a focus on objectives already set

(5) To keep a "what's right" focus

A copy of the Supervisory Log format is in Appendix E, with an anonymous log in Appendix F.

I had anticipated that the weekly log kept by the auditing student for the seven class sessions might be a data source for case study analysis. It did not prove to be useful for this purpose, again, possibly because it was set against the seminar context. Her log, however, provided another perspective besides my own of the classes.

A regular part of each class session was the Reaction Card--each participant's tongue-in-cheek "ticket" to leave. I prepared beforehand a cue or question related to the topic of the class session and provided 5 x 8 cards and ten minutes to react. My main purpose was to give them
opportunities to move forward on, or to integrate ideas, but some case study data were provided as well. It gave me as instructor some immediate feedback about the weekly class sessions also.

I kept fairly detailed weekly accounts of each class session. This served as a record for detailing the course experience later, and also helped me as an instructor to reflect on each class, set objectives, and determine direction for the following session. As I wrote, I always included a time to visualize each student in order to write what I remembered of their participation that time. This was intended as a data source for case study analyses but did not produce very fruitful data for that purpose. One possible explanation is that these data, too, were class-specific, rather than relating to the supervisor-teaching helping context.

Each interaction with a supervisor was recorded, even though briefly. These occasionally provided data for case studies.

The final Reaction Cards were in effect an open-ended course evaluation. The handwritten responses were, by prearrangement, given to the auditing student who in turn delivered them to the secretary who typed them, destroying the originals and giving me the typed, nameless copies. They provided one perspective, the student's, about the course. The question (following Silberman &
Allender, 1974) read,

Imagine that someone said to you, "I'll be taking Field Experience Seminar next quarter. Could you tell me what it's been like for you?"

How would you respond?

One of the most valuable data sources for analysis of the case studies was the taped debriefing interview. These were held during the last week of the quarter, with one exception, after the seventh and final class session. These interviews were briefer—twelve to fifteen questions—and were intended to help the supervisor reflect on and talk about his or her "mobilizing." Many of the questions were the same for each supervisor, but each one was asked one or more questions pertaining to his or her own strength areas. Perhaps it was the oral format, or perhaps it was the end-of-quarter timing with its more complete perspective; at any rate, these interviews were rich with useful data.

One final data source, the followup interviews for each of the four case studies, afforded a chance to get clarification of participants' meanings when they were unclear to me, or when high inferences would have been required to give meaning. Small details were cleared up, and some "what if" questions were raised. An important part of this interaction was having the supervisor read his or her complete case study, comment on any part of it, and verify or deny its accuracy from his or her
perspective, making corrections of any magnitude, if desired.

In summary, all data sources except the followup interviews provided data for both the seminar and the study. The major, most helpful data sources for the conduct of the seminar itself included:

- Teacher Advocate Interviews
- Positive Portraits
- Supervisory Logs
- Reaction Cards
- Course Evaluations

The most fruitful data for the study itself came from:

- Teacher Advocate Interviews
- Supervisory Logs
- Weekly Instructor Logs
- Debriefing Interviews
- Followup Interviews

A postscript should be added about one anticipated data source which never got further than the study's prospectus. SRI's Administrator Rating Form is a 72-item questionnaire for teacher response. It is a form of feedback which helps an administrator elicit teachers' perceptions of him or her that are keyed to the twelve Administrator themes. With the majority of Teacher Advocate Interview questions being Administrator items also, I reasoned that a Teacher Advocate Rating Form could be
devised from the Administrator Rating Form. With the permission of SRI this was accomplished. Matching items were used, some were rewritten, and a few were created to produce a 53-item Likert-like scale for teachers to respond to anonymously with their perceptions about their supervisors.

I modeled the use of this scale one week in seminar. Responses came back, mostly anonymous, from seminar participants ranking me almost uniformly at the Agree and Strongly Agree end of the scale across all themes—even in Ambiguity Tolerance which I have in scarce supply. With misgivings, I asked the supervisors in turn to have their teachers fill out the same Rating Form on them, anonymously. Fewer than half were returned to me, and those which did come in looked like the forms ranking me. The rest were simply never returned, or in some cases, were never given to the teachers. Participants' reasons for this ranged from, My teacher thought my seminar grade depended on how he ranked me, to, I just wasn't comfortable giving this out. For whatever reasons, this data source did not contribute to either the seminar or the study and was not included in the list.

Data Analysis

Holsti's Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (1969) is a valuable source for information about content analysis as a research tool. This reference
was relied upon heavily for guidance in this area. One broad definition is: "Content analysis is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages" (p. 14). The analysis used in this study may further be designated qualitative content analysis because it involves drawing inferences on the basis of appearance or non-appearance of attributes of messages. Tallying appearance or non-appearance can quickly become nominal (quantified) data; however, data were processed qualitatively for this study.

Content analysis as a research tool has advantages as well as limitations. Its usefulness lies in several areas. (1) Content analysis can be used with a wide range of different kinds of verbal data. In this study, data came from such diverse sources as taped oral interviews, written records of interactions, spontaneous verbal responses, and responses written directly to specific cues. Content analysis is a means of extracting meaning from a diversity of data connected by their commonality as messages. (2) An important feature of content analysis is its relatively unobtrusive quality. Thanks to the "technologies" of writing, audiotaping, and modern copy machines, analysis of content can be carried out at spatial and temporal distances, thus minimizing disturbances to the natural setting. (3) Because of assumptions underlying this study regarding the importance of one's personal
meanings, content analysis lends itself well to analysis of
data in the subjects' exact language. (4) Content analy­sis permits the researcher to glean attributes of messages
which may otherwise "escape casual scrutiny" (Holsti, 1969,
p. 20).

As excellent a fit as content analysis appears to have with the data analysis requirements of this study, its
limitations and cautions should be noted. (1) Representativeness of sample is a concern of the same magnitude as
for quantitative analysis. (2) Content analysis does not determine the truth of an assertion. (3) Intuition, though
a valuable attribute for creative research at some stages of the researcher's work, cannot be substituted for objec­tivity and regularity in doing content analyses. (4) The immense complexity of language makes it essential to be
systematic in analyzing its content.

For the reasons presented above, content analysis was judged appropriate for use in this study. The cautions
and limitations have, I believe, been heeded.

Although definitions and procedures for content analysis vary, there is general agreement on the necessity for objectivity, system, and generality in these kinds of analyses. Objectivity demands that each step be carried out according to explicit rules and procedures. A systematic analysis requires categories conforming to accepted notions and inclusions or exclusion of content into
categories done by consistently applied rules. For generality, findings must have theoretical relevance.

An investigator using content analysis has at least three interrelated decisions to make. These decisions should be guided by underlying theory. These decisions, specified by Holsti (p. 94) are:

1. How is the research problem defined in terms of categories?
2. What unit of content should be used?
3. What system of enumeration should be used?

Each of the three decisions will be addressed separately.

Decision one: how is the research problem defined in terms of categories?

The four categories into which content data were ultimately coded were the four phases of "mobilizing," operationally defined. Let us remind ourselves that this research was developmental, that is, active and purposeful efforts were made to create new states of being in supervisors. "Create" was the key.

Ross Mooney's provocative, life-long explorations of creativity led him to outline the conditions for the existence of a living thing (1963). What describes life at its highest, most creatively productive levels also is the story of life at its most primitive point. The proposition that life through all levels has a consistency gave rise to my defining "mobilizing" in similar terms.
I will briefly outline Mooney's concepts, tie them first to the four phases of mobilizing, and then to a fuller description of the analogous coding categories.

A creative organism must (1) be open for transactions between itself and its environment; (2) center itself in time and space, "get itself together;" (3) be in transactional give and take with its environment, that is, sequentially order the give-and-take with the environment; and finally, (4) selectively make fresh fittings or adaptations. Mooney represents these essential conditions for man's existence with an infinity sign, one half inside the organism and one half outside. See Figure 2 (following Mooney, 1963, p. 50). Outgoing arrows signify openness; incoming arrows, centering; infinity sign, transactions with the universe; and plus, minus, and equal signs at each pole of the infinity sign, continual fitting by the organism.

Figure 2. Essential conditions for existence
Arising from and suggested by the essential conditions for existence are the four phases of mobilizing helping potential, as defined for this study which then became coding categories: (1) to bring one's helping potential to one's own awareness; (2) to put one's helping potential into use; (3) to receive feedback and perceive that the use of one's helping potential has resulted in change or development or effectiveness with a teacher; and (4) to reflect upon the experience, give it meaning, and fit it into one's being.

An expansion of each of the categories as it relates to supervision and this study, follows.

Awareness, category one, includes expressed understandings, beliefs, and attitudes by the supervisor about his or her own helping, teachers' ability to grow, or supervision in general. This category is essentially one of conceptualizations which do not express integrations of new experiences. It may include mention of helping approaches in one's repertoire as well as intentions about helping.

Use, category two, is bounded by conceptualizing on one hand and perceiving results on the other; it is neither, but falls in between. A synonym for Use might be initiating. There is a preparation-with-purpose flavor to Use. A supervisor putting his or her helping potential in to use demonstrates behaviors which step beyond and play
out conceptualizing. These are observable, albeit reported, and include the array of helping behaviors which serve to bring teacher and supervisor closer together—in space, in time, and as persons. These initiating behaviors help build a good working relationship, involve the persons rather than the roles, focus on growth and ways to achieve this, and support teacher autonomy. Some indicators at first glance might appear to belong to category three. They are gathered under the Use category instead, however, because they help to create the context for projected teacher growth. For instance, report of a teacher's feeling more comfortable with the supervisor is coded as Use, category two, because the improved interpersonal relationship is part of the context in which growth is hoped to occur. The same reasoning applies, for example, to helping teachers set growth objectives, facilitative listening, working toward problem-resolution in teacher-centered ways, and other. In a coding sense, gains in the above-mentioned areas are enabling, or facilitating, of the growth to be identified in the next category, Perceiving Results, category three.

Perceiving Results of one's helping, category three, implies initiating helping having happened, passage of some time for effects to occur, and the supervisor's perception of those effects. All effects are related to the teacher in some way—his or her growth or development,
help-related responses to teacher growth by the supervisor, and/or the teacher's report of his or her own or students' growth. This category brings the feedback loop back toward the supervisor in readiness for his or her Reflection upon it, category four.

Reflection on one's experience of helping, category four, implies some passage of time to enable the experience to occur, and to allow for the reflection and fitting necessary to make personal meaning. All indicators connect in some way to the supervisor him- or herself. Reflections and integrations may focus toward the past and touch on the effects on self or supervisee, of his or her helping; the focus may be more here-and-now with sharpened awarenesses or an increased sense of growth, self-understanding, or accomplishment. A statement of intent, future-focused, integrating one's new meanings into projected helping, poised to initiate another rhythm of transaction, would also be appropriately coded Reflection.

Each category must also specify the indicators which become its operational definition. A pair of open-ended lists of indicators for each category was devised, each indicator balanced with a negative indicator. These not only clearly reflect my assumptions about supervision as a helping profession, but served as a guide for reliable coding of content. The lists of indicators for each category are found in Appendix G.
Decision two: what unit of content should be used?

Although the most difficult and laborious to code, theme or meaning was selected as the only appropriate recording unit for this study. Explicit categories, clear indicators, and systematic procedures helped offset potential loss of reliability from this choice.

Decision three: what system of enumeration should be used?

Qualitative and quantitative dimensions are not thought of as a dichotomy, but rather as points on a continuum. Therefore, "enumeration" can, but need not, yield quantified data. In analyzing the data from each supervisor used as a case study, I looked at four dimensions in terms of each theme:

(1) Presence or absence of supporting evidence.
(2) Frequency of supporting evidence.
(3) Clarity of supporting evidence.
(4) Scope of evidence.

When these dimensions were taken together by theme for each supervisor, they provided quite clear bases for judging the original prediction made about that theme. Each prediction might be corroborated in one of four ways:

(1) Prediction unsupported by lack of data.
(2) Prediction weakly supported by incomplete, ambiguous, or highly inferential data.
(3) Prediction supported by data within boundaries drawn, with no refuting data to weaken prediction.

(4) Prediction strongly supported or expanded by especially frequent or clear data, or data which take prediction beyond its original scope.

The concerns of sampling, reliability and validity are shared by investigators using content analysis. In the sense that all data from all data sources were analyzed for all four case studies, there was no sampling problem. Though abundant enough to make the analysis time-consuming, the data were all used, so no sampling was involved.

Reliability was established early in analysis by three methods: (1) Comparisons of my analyses of documents from early in the quarter with analyses of documents from quarter's end; (2) Comparisons of my analyses over time on the same documents; and (3) Comparisons of my analyses with those of an anthropologist using my categories, indicators, and procedures.

Content or face validity is usually established through the informed judgment of the investigator, according to Holsti (1969). Content validity, which is more likely to be accepted if the research is purely descriptive, was substantiated by continually keeping in mind and answering the questions, Are the results plausible? and, Are the results consistent with other information about the phenomenon? To the extent that the case studies reflected
the experience as reported by each case study supervisor, face validity was established by seeking their feedback on their own writeups.

Following is a summary of the steps followed in treating data by content analysis for this study. Steps 1 through 5 were preparatory to building the case studies.

Step 1 Categories were determined.
Step 2 Indicators were written for each category.
Step 3 All data were scanned for fit, one category at a time.
Step 4 Each unit of meaning was underlined in the category's color code, and number-coded in the margin for category and indicator.
Steps 3 and 4 were repeated for the remaining categories.
Steps 5 through 9 concerned actual building of each case study.

Step 5 Predictions of supervisory helping facets were written from the original interview script, checked against the Positive Portrait. (This step could have been done at any time before this, even before Step 1).
Step 6 One prediction at a time, data sources were scanned for all units of meaning (themes) relating to the particular prediction.
Step 7 As these units were used, they were checked off to prevent their being used twice, and coded to
indicate where they were used.

   Step 8  The text of each case study was built around the framework of predictions, with a running explication of the supervisor's experience, supported by direct quotations.

   Step 9  Coding for source and location were carried through the first typewritten draft. Steps 6 through 9 were repeated for each prediction. Steps 10 through 14 involved final checks for accuracy and completeness.

   Step 10  Original documents (data sources) were scanned for all units being used in the case analysis.

   Step 11  Units not used were either accounted for (i.e., redundant) or used to complete the case.

   Step 12  Predictions were plotted on a matrix to summarize the extent to which they had been supported.

   Step 13  Case study subjects were asked to clarify minor points in the analyses.

   Step 14  Case study subjects read their own cases and were asked to make any changes desired.

In addition to the major content analysis effort described above, the anonymous course evaluations were analyzed by a coding system suggested by Silberman and Allender (1974). The end-of-course reactions to the open-ended question previously detailed (pages 78-9) constitute a kind of semi-projective technique. These data were
sought as one means of getting participants' perspectives about the course itself. The two dimensions, evaluative tone and impact, which this coding system helped tap, are particularly relevant ones for looking at the course itself.

Summary

In this chapter I have presented my rationale for the methodology by developing, one by one, assertions to be taken as guidelines for the research design. The setting of the study has been described. Subjects' inclusion in the study and the conditions under which they participated have been discussed. Data types, their collection and courses, their various uses, as well as data analyses have been presented.
CHAPTER IV
CONTEXT: DESCRIPTION AND PERSPECTIVES

Overview

As a vehicle for the study of supervisors' helping, the course itself will be described, the instructor-researcher's perspectives presented, and participants' reactions analyzed in Chapter IV, in order to answer the question,

What are the processes, content, and organization, as well as problems encountered, in a seminar which provides planned experiences to help supervisors mobilize their own helping potential?

Four case studies will be presented and analyzed in detail in Chapter V in order to answer the question,

If facilitating conditions can be provided, how do supervisors mobilize their own unique helping potential in the development of teachers?

In Chapter VI, findings presented in Chapters IV and V will be examined in order to answer the question,

What are the emergent, tentative propositions suggested by this study, which might appear to have value as leads for future research?

Description of the Course

The nature of the course was spelled out in the syllabus which was distributed at the first session (Appendix B). At that time, students were made aware of its being the
basis for a study, but were not asked to sign consent forms until the following week.

Basically, the course was conducted through three strands: one, instructor-supervisor interactions including interview and feedback, two, regular supervisor-teacher interactions, and three, shared group experiences in the seminar itself. At times over the ten-week quarter, these were happening concurrently.

Use of the Teacher Advocate Interview and subsequent sharing feedback with each supervisor, strand one, have been described on pages 72-75. Supervisors' choices of supervisees, strand two, has been described on pages 66-67. Analyses of four of these relationships are presented in Chapter V. Each of the seven seminar sessions, the shared group experiences, strand three, remains to be described. They will be addressed sequentially.

**Session One**

My expressed aims for this session were to (1) Acquaint participants with the three strands of the course without their feeling overwhelmed; (2) Make my value stands clear; (3) Introduce participants to my workshop style; and (4) Set up the interview mechanics with appointments during the forthcoming week.

The syllabus was discussed and clarified. The Teacher Advocate Interview intents and assumptions were
presented. In order to make my expectations about the weekly logs very clear, I had prepared for each participant a sample log consisting of three succeeding interactions, adapted from one of the two piloted logs. A notebook with ten blank logs was distributed to each person. Some time was spent as a group simply sharing our professional settings, backgrounds, and expectations for the quarter. Interview appointments were set up at the break, and the last segment of the session was spent in a workshop activity I called "My Life Committee." This was designed and adapted for helping participants identify those persons whose help at any stage in their life has continued to influence them; to focus on one helper and isolate his or her essential helping characteristics; and to share with each other these experiences of having been helped, in order to create a composite list of People Helper characteristics.

The seminar session concluded with a Reaction Card from each participant who responded to: "Please react, here-and-now, to the 'supervisor as helping relationship' approach to supervision.

Session Two

I wanted to (1) Tie this week's session to the previous one, including incorporating two newcomers; (2) Further establish a comfortable, affirming climate to
invite participation; (3) Probe and examine further our understandings of helping relationships; and (4) Share a listening technique some participants might be able to use with a supervisee.

Two new participants briefly introduced themselves and became acquainted with the rest of the group. To let everyone settle in and reorient, I took the floor to summarize our consensus on helpers from session one, and shared with the group what I felt good about from the previous session. Reactions and impressions were solicited and offered.

To facilitate examining the many meanings and assumptions underlying commonly-used words, I had participants pair up for "What's the Meaning of This?" They were instructed to take 20 minutes to create between themselves joint definitions for the words "help" and "relationship." The activity was processed as a group in terms of their awareness, personal meanings, and where it might take them.

The listening technique was a simple interview designed for getting acquainted and for relationship-building. We discussed its uses, ways of introducing it, and some possible spinoffs. Participants paired off to give and take alternate halves of it. Again, the brief experiences were processed in the group.
Rounding out the "relationship" focus of the session, the cue to which participants responded on their Reaction Cards was: "Please react to relationship-building efforts in your particular setting."

Participants were asked to bring results of their listening interview to the next session, should it be feasible for them to use with a teacher.

Session Three

My objectives for the session included (1) Processing actual usage of the listening interview; (2) Moving beyond the interview to organizing the information for use; (3) Bringing to collective awareness any understandings gleaned so far from the three strands of the course; and (4) Getting participant input on most-desired areas to pursue for the last four sessions.

Two participants had given the listening interview, so they shared with the group their experiences with it. Having anticipated that all participants would not have had an opportunity to interview a teacher-supervisee, I had prepared an interview protocol--an anonymous one adapted with a few modifications from the responses of a teacher acquaintance from an interview with me. Participants read it through and responded to the invitation to examine what they now understood about the teacher, and to suggest how they, as supervisors, would work with the teacher.
To move the seminar one step further, I demonstrated how information from the interview responses could be pulled and placed on an informal Positive Portrait for the teacher. Participants used either their own interview or the protocol to construct Portraits.

Having processed portrait-writing and objective-writing as a next step, I gave the class a "supervisory dilemma" for their discussion. The activity was particularly well received and several participants volunteered to supply them for future use out of their own experiences.

Fleeting time dictated our not addressing objective three at all, but finishing the session with some joint decisions for future sessions and a Reaction Card. The cue for response was: "Please pick [either listening interview or Positive Portrait] to react to, and comment on its meaning to you as a supervisor."

**Session Four**

In this halfway-mark session I planned to (1) Pull together the events of all three course strands to help all focus on what was happening; (2) Introduce an activity which helps elicit and experience a strength focus; (3) Address objective-writing with teachers; and (4) Demonstrate a structured conference.

We pooled ideas about how Positive Portraits could be used with teachers, coming up with a half dozen items.
The entire group of ten then divided into two groups of five to do the strengths activity--simply five questions each responded to in their turn, which channeled their thinking, one-by-one, about the ways they have been successful or helpful as teachers. The whole-group processing revealed a general positive view of the strength focus.

There was clearly not much class interest in objectives-writing. Rather than ignore the topic, I prepared a handout in a humorous vein which made, but did not belabor, some key points.

In the last segment of the session, I demonstrated with a participant a structured conference, adapted from Ward (1976). The class followed its phases and steps on a reference sheet and critiqued it briefly. To conclude this activity, participants paired off and developed their own alternative transitions or lead-ins for each of the 11 conferencing steps.

They mulled over as a group how they might deal with one of the dilemmas brought in by a participant. This week's Reaction Card question was an opportunity for them to begin to put together for themselves their reactions to, and opinions of some of the techniques introduced in the last two sessions. They responded to: "Select any two (or more) of the above [teacher Positive Portrait, strengths questions, objectives-writing, or structured
conference) and briefly write how you connect them--either conceptually, or how you would use them together."

**Session Five**

In responding to one valuable suggestion about a getting-into-gear time for the class (most of the class were on empty stomachs after a day of teaching), my first objective was (1) Warmup time, followed by (2) An activity to examine a personal dimension in ourselves and how others perceive it; and (3) A second attempt at gleaning from all three strands what concepts and values have been explicit or implicit.

The warmup was casual, including some points made by a recent provocative speaker, spontaneous updates by several participants about their supervisees, and a post-script-in-poetry response to a point made at the last session.

The "Tender-Tough Connection" activity (adapted from Welter, 1978) was introduced by elaborating on the notion that the better helpers possess, accept, and express both sides of themselves. The group checked which descriptors best characterized themselves, then placed their communication on a tender-to-tough continuum. By now, sharing something of self in the group of ten was comfortable, so the activity was carried out and processed as a whole group.
The bringing together what each had picked up about helping from various aspects of the course was to be a group activity done by induction--"to conclude or infer from particulars." As we sat around the big seminar table, whoever wished to, supplied a descriptor, tossed to the center of the table, with marker and 5 x 8 cards. These were briefly discussed and elaborated upon, and remained visible for the erstwhile dilemma discussion. My instructions were to work over the dilemmas they selected with the helping concepts "in front of them" or "on the table" literally.

The Reaction Card cue took them back to the first activity: "Should you decide to move yourself to another point on the tender-tough continuum, how would this increase your 'help-ability' to teachers you supervise?"

**Session Six**

Objectives for this next-to-last session included

1. Helping participants make concrete connections between supervisors' behavior and attitudes, and teachers' growth;
2. Looking in depth at what kinds of verbal responses are facilitating from several vantage points;
3. Introducing the Teacher Advocate Questionnaire.

To develop the first objective, I introduced the term and reviewed the assumptions behind "teacher autonomy" as a guide for all of us. The whole activity was much
more instructor-directed than usual; it centered on a broad expanse of blackboard. I indicated the locations for four wide columns on the board and did column two—six teacher indicators of no growth: dependency on helper or others; defensiveness; passivity; less willing to risk; conforming; less competent, not coping. Column three was filled in by the class with the polar opposite of each indicator, developing a list of "growing" or "teacher autonomy" indicators. In column one we entered possible contributing supervisory behaviors for each no-growth item. Column four became, then, some corresponding supervisory behaviors which might facilitate teacher growth. There was easy class consensus on the indicators and contributing behaviors, and good group participation in constructing the three columns.

Turning to facilitating verbal responses, I shared Welter's (1978) suggestions about response time, and illustrated the salutory effects to the speaker of the listener's not talking by recounting that week's M*A*S*H episode. The binding/freeing response construct was introduced, using printed material from Boyan and Copeland (1978). Binding responses were illustrated by means of a tape I had made, with class participants holding up cards from a packet they were supplied with, to indicate their judgment of which specific binding response they were hearing on the tape. The same learning process was
followed for freeing responses, using a second tape. Spontaneous discussion followed with some divergent opinion about the whole construct (as is the usual reaction to it).

Teacher Advocate Questionnaires were distributed and discussed, and requested to be filled out on me and returned the following week. The Reaction Card question was: "What verbal response(s) do you use which have freeing effects? Can you describe why, or give an example?" A parallel question was prepared, but eliminated for lack of time. It read: "What binding response (if any) would you want to change in your own supervisory behavior? Why this one? What results would you anticipate?"

Session Seven

Objectives were (1) Having participants experience personal and individual affirmation; (2) Demonstration of a teacher-self-evaluation technique; (3) Bringing together each participant's understandings of him- or herself and successes as supervisors; and (4) Writing a final Reaction Card from the perspective of the whole course.

I shared with the group the story of "The Dipper and the Bucket" (Clifton, 1972) and gave each one a personal "drop for their bucket."
One of the participants, by previous arrangement, prepared and taught a lesson with us as students. I modeled a supervisor leading the teacher to evaluate his own just-taught lesson using the Lesson Analysis Continuum (Curwin & Fuhrmann, 1975, pp. 183-187).

The activity which culminated both the session and the course I called "The Supervisor I Am," a set of four questions which helped elicit evidence of supervisory successes over the past ten weeks, with room for a statement of intent for further growth. In order to give each participant maximum "floor" time, we shared these in groups of five.

The Reaction "Card" for this last session was to be an anonymous course evaluation. The cue for response, adapted from Silberman and Allender (1974), read as follows: "Imagine that someone said to you, 'I'll be taking Field Experience Seminar next quarter. Could you tell me what it's been like for you?' How would you respond?"

The entire course concluded for each participant when he or she had completed an out of class debriefing interview with me.

Instructor-Researcher's Perspectives

Not unlike Grumet's (1979) near-and-distant data scanning, my perspectives on the course began with closeup notes jotted after seminars and after some feedback- objectives-setting talks. This, then, is my very personal
meta-view of my immediate reactions from the temporal distance of six months.

The students in the class shared at least one common perception: to varying degrees, they were accustomed to separating what they do and how they work from what they officially "learn" at places like a university. And too often, there is a split for them between what they learn and who they are. I could empathize with them. But for me, the course experiences I was orchestrating, and the seminar I was teaching were who I was. The wholeness was energizing and I looked forward to Tuesdays. Unlike the seminar participants, as I began to realize later, I spent the day psychologically gearing up for the four o'clock class, even while tending to numerous other job functions.

Seminar participants arrived with the wave of teacher-students who stream into the campus parking lots after full teaching days. I never cease to be struck by the distances they drive, the shortened nights' sleep they endure, and especially the day's fatigue they bring with them on their faces and in their posture. One element of the seminar which seemed to fall into place for most of us, was that it often became a time and a place where learning and self could merge, and some lost energies be restored.

There was across-the-board consensus about "helping," "relationships," "growth," "strengths," and "facilitating," for instance, when we talked at more abstract
levels than at the times when we were dealing more concretely. But then, "learning" these kinds of things, in my view, was more than memorizing definitions. Such personal integrations happen slowly.

The course was intended to include experiential learning and abstractions, individual opinions and shared understandings, knowledge "about" and practical usage, constant modeling and hoped-for integrations. As a part of this intention, there were frequent built-in "focusers"-opportunities to bring together for oneself different parts of the experience to make some sense of it. Logs helped serve this purpose, as did the Reaction Cards, some class discussions, and some class activities. The completed Reaction Cards, especially, always delighted me. Certainly, at a conceptual level the participants were putting things together beautifully. I was sometimes disappointed in other integrating activities because they did not always seem to serve that purpose for everyone. I had to remind myself that experiential learning is a necessary but not sufficient basis for development. It needs to be constant, continuous, occasionally accompanied by explicit verbalizations, and still it may not be what an individual is ready for, or ever will be, or will integrate in a way recognizable to anyone else. The ambiguities notwithstanding, my sense of the whole is that many or most of the participants were able to make some sense for themselves
out of parts of their total experience.

Several specifics may help give a more complete picture of the view from the instructor's place at the seminar table. One of these was the popular supervisor's dilemma discussion. Several pluses were built in: real-life situations worked on from a safe distance; opportunity for different participants to share their world with others; high degree of class participation; vicarious experiencing of the "real world" of supervision; and availability of an immediate check with the owner on, "What did you do?" or, "How did it turn out?" In the heat of discussions, some newly-"learned" notions were sometimes used, just as frequently forgotten. Even at this level of abstraction, our knowings and understandings are hard-won, indeed.

My own supervisor's dilemma the first two to three weeks lay in my self-imposed deadline of completing ten interviews and ten feedbacks in that time. I had to balance the advantages of participants' experiencing these early on in the quarter against my ability to carry this off productively for them. I would never recommend doing more than one feedback a day, yet I did so. (One should alternately immerse oneself in the other's world to the extent of being able to recall and organize into themes, most of their interview responses; then to empty oneself of these in order to do the same for the next person.)
The schedule was accomplished in about three-and-a-half weeks, as it turned out, yet perhaps at some detriment to the quality of some of my feedbacks. Another time I would seek an alternative to this arrangement.

I find it interesting that the logs, my most regular way of tuning in to how supervisors were working with teachers, carried but infrequent mention of specific techniques introduced in the class. Techniques were asked for by the participants; they were apparently well-received; they were often judged relevant and workable; and we always tried them out first. Yet, their mention rarely filtered into the daily logs, even though directions for log-writing included, "Your logs will help me know what parts of the class will have proved useful to you." Is it yet another illustration of the person of the supervisor being the essence of helping, not the techniques he or she uses?

As in every college class of this type ever taught, I suppose, I had to deal with the preference on one hand for the class-as-experiential-medium, and on the other, a desire to pursue the literature or untangle theoretical dissonances. The decision to lean toward a practicum and away from an academic focus left a couple members hanging, even though I provided a reference list the first session. Such discussions could have been dealt with individually, too—except I was not aware of the need until the debriefing interviews. This item is red-flagged for my "next-time"
Another time will also improve my perspective on many dimensions of helping supervisors—"to be." One such dimension is empathy, or figuratively standing in the teacher's shoes, to view a situation with the teacher's eyes for a moment. Dilemmas and protocols elicited a fairly persistent I-the-supervisor viewpoint. I never was able to bring this personal dissonance to a head satisfactorily. Once or twice, it was tempting to draw their collective attention (in an unempathetic way, of course) to their lack of empathy for a teacher. Clearly, I was the only one who owned the problem!

Also stuffed into my "next-time" folder is a note to myself which reads, "How answer 'nice but impractical' attitude?"

One last observation centers around the class participants as supervisors. As a group and as individuals, they truly rose to the occasion. They built relationships when I might have predicted otherwise; they weathered crises I thought could overwhelm them; they showed insights and compassion that sometimes stunned me; they supported, initiated, facilitated, and celebrated beyond my first guesses. They occasionally outran their predictions. Thinking back, I recalled the comment made by one of my research committee members who was seeing me through a knotty design problem. He said, "In order to study their
strengths, you will have to make an all-out effort to get them to use their strengths." Perhaps that is what happened. Perhaps for a brief interval in a climate that supported it, who each was, came together with what each learned and how each helped, to energize a surge of personal becoming into what each might be.

This reminds me of the story about a hospital ward of children, all in iron lungs, in an age fortunately past, when polio still eluded modern medical technology. To allow the children some needed diversion, the whole group--iron lungs and all--were rolled into a larger room where an entertainer waited to brighten their day and perhaps bring a few smiles. As sometimes happens, entertainer and audience got caught up in reciprocal magic. The smiles became giggles, and the giggles, chuckles, and the chuckles, laughter. Tears rolled down cheeks--for whatever diverse reasons--as entertainer and children forgot all else but the moment and the delicious hilarity of it. When the entertainment was over, and the children were rolled back to the ward, doctors found that the lung capacities of several of the children had been so increased by their laughter that they could sustain their own breathing outside of the lung for significantly longer periods of time than they ever had before.

A concerted effort to facilitate the use and expansion of another's life-giving capacities is where this
study began.

Students' Perspectives

The most concrete and lasting indication of the way students viewed the course is the set of anonymous responses each wrote at the end of the last class session. Their analysis is based on methods originally employed by Silberman and Allender (1974) which have been adapted for analysis of some kinds of data by the Exxon Reflective Teaching Project at The Ohio State University (Nott, 1979).

Silberman and Allender's one open-ended question is designed to "tap the students' strongest feelings, those uppermost in their minds" (1974, p. 451). Their analysis proceeds along two dimensions, evaluative tone and impact.

Evaluative tone is the "predominant value (positive or negative) and intensity of evaluative remarks made about the course" (p. 452). Impact is the extent to which the student's description seems to indicate "that the course has contributed to personal change" (p. 452).

The adapted scoring for evaluative tone consists of coding each unit of analysis +1, 0 or -1 for positive, neutral/descriptive, or negative statements. Analysis unit is a unit of meaning. Three sample statements follow with codings:

Felt very involved in what we did in class. +1
Oriented to finding strengths in oneself. . . . 0
[The dilemma] might have been used more intensively.

The numbers of negative statements were subtracted from positive statements to give an evaluative tone score for each respondent. See Table 1.

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sub-scores</th>
<th>Total score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ 0 -</td>
<td>Total units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 1 0</td>
<td>7/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 1 0</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 3 0</td>
<td>7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 3 0</td>
<td>3/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 2 0</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 1 1</td>
<td>6/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 3 2</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 5 0</td>
<td>5/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 9 2</td>
<td>3/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 9 1</td>
<td>2/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean evaluative tone score for the group is +4.1, the range between +1 and +7. Total meaning units average 8.9, the range being 5 for a brief response to 16 for a lengthier one. Neutral statements, not counted in the total score, nonetheless contribute to the total count of meaning units, and therefore to the ratio of evaluative tone score to total units.
As convergent as participants' judgments were about general "positiveness," the personal meanings of their experiences were divergent. Seminar participants expressed themselves at their debriefing interviews. Asked how their thinking about supervision might have changed over the previous two-and-one half months, their replies ranged from no change to drastic change, from significance to self and self-concept to a specific notion about the practice of supervision, and from projecting work as a supervisor to teaching supervision courses. Responses of the six who were not case studies follow:

My thinking did a 180° turn.

The course reinforced what I had already learned about helping.

I see supervision now as a continuing relationship.

I have more confidence about working with adults.

I agree with the helping style. The seminar helped me plan a course I may have to teach some day.

I feel more confident that I have something of value to say, that my ideas contributed.

Impact ratings were based on a simple four-point rating scale. Total responses were rated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impact = 1</td>
<td>Recounting of details; factual, content-centered; outside of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferred Impact = 2</td>
<td>Self-involved; significant experience; offered opportunities; could learn skills; judgments; emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Impact = 3</td>
<td>More specific; can or will use in future; one statement of &quot;I learned.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustained  Tried it; changed them or their values; new way of behaving
Impact = 4

Three representative examples with ratings follow:

A central point was the ongoing logs we kept.  
Logs helped me pause and think about what I was trying to do.
The logs were ... useful for understanding and future use.

There were no sustained impact statements among the responses, so no example is included.

To make impact ratings, I read the entire response, then rated it with the highest number found in the response. For example, although a given response might contain three factual statements about content, two which refer to helpfulness or opportunities provided, and one mentioning the Lesson Analysis Continuum the supervisor tried and liked, the rating is 3, limited impact, based on evidence of specific learning. See Table 2.

With one respondent rated no impact, four, inferred impact, and five, limited impact, the mean impact score is 2.4. Grouping all impact ratings together, one may say ten percent of the respondents appeared to experience no impact, while ninety percent appeared to experience some degree of impact from the course experience.

Participants' impact ratings suggest that while they as a group felt responsive, were involved, and sometimes named specifics they learned or were positive about,
how they would work in a changed way in the future is less often spelled out.

TABLE 2

SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS' IMPACT RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Ratings Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inferred impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Limited impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to look at responses in another sort of framework, I grouped the topics of these comments from the evaluation responses, finding they could all be placed in four broad categories: (1) Oneself and one's feelings, (2) Class climate, (3) General comments about the class, and (4) Various specifics associated with the class. Most of the comments so grouped, follow.

Representative comments about self or feelings included: self-aware, left feeling good, enjoyed, worthwhile experience, threatened by my [projected] relationship with a teacher, valuable, and positive.
The climate was described by: refreshing, stimulating, encouraging, non-threatening, others' good ideas, good participation, non-competitive, and active.

General comments about the class were: good size, good pace, interesting, impractical, practical, many usable techniques, and should evaluate the model.

Some specific element of the experience was named by nearly everyone: logs, interview technique, personal profile, instructor as a model, finding one's own or a teacher's strengths, organized class, innovative self-evaluations, opportunity to practice theory, and the supervisory dilemmas.

There were approximately the same numbers of unsolicited comments in each of the four broad categories, taken from the whole group. Individuals' comments, however, might be entirely skewed into one or two categories. The one element of the whole experience mentioned more frequently than any other, as tabulated in this admittedly casual way, was the instructor herself.

Finally, in each debriefing interview, I included an inquiry of each supervisor about how the course or I might have met his or her individual needs more squarely. Participant responses follow:

I'd like more activities to take back to school, and more dilemmas. I need reading requirements to make me read.
It was a good class, stimulating, good sharing. I have no way to improve the format.

I still don't know how to give bad recommendations.

I would like to have shared one of my tapes so the rest would know better what I was doing.

[The seminar] fit my needs very well.

I was very happy with the ideas and meeting the people.

There isn't a lot more that I would expect from the class . . . from the approach that you took.

There was no space in the log for other remarks.

I don't see that there's any place [in the model] to provide for inevitable conflict.

I can't think of anything I could have added that wasn't there.

Discussion of Context

The content of seminar presentations, activities, and discussions tend to spiral around five basic points: relationship-building, identifying strengths, basing development on strengths, objectives-setting, and cultivating attitudes and behaviors which contribute to goal-convergence. Iteration and reiteration of the five salient features of the course were deliberately built in to the organization as a means of advancing understanding of helping. In the first strand, participants experienced aspects of one model of helping--including all five above-mentioned features--as supervisees. In the second strand, they experienced helping from the perspective of a supervisor,
implementing those of the five features which fit their supervisory style. The third strand, shared group experiences, offered opportunities for substantive input of several kinds, again relating to the five basic points. Regular ways and times were provided for participants to extend their own meanings—to verbalize, challenge, work through, or modify. The meaning-making process itself is an integral part of the content of supervision-as-helping, and reflects the individual person-centered point of view ascribed to throughout the study.

It is important to note here that however the course was conceived and carried out, it is only one way in which one person chose to do so. As an extension of one individual, it might well be artificial to another.

"Problems encountered" might be looked at from the perspectives of both student and instructor, and might also be addressed as part of a program as well as a context for the study itself. These will be taken in order.

It seems safe to say, on the basis of course evaluation data as analyzed, that for the students themselves the course was the basis for a generally positive experience. Student evaluations had an across-the-board, predominantly positive evaluative tone, that is, in all ten instances, there were more positive statements than negative. Half made no negative statements at all, and the remaining five made few. A positive experience, however, meant something
quite different to each person.

By the same token, having an overall positive experience did not preclude one's having personal concerns and unmet needs of varying sorts and degrees. Student-perceived problems could often be addressed quite easily: a simple log format alteration, a procedural change in class, and expanded use of one kind of activity could be accomplished readily. It is worth noting that these minor points may be idiosyncratic to these particular persons. Another time, the complaints may be entirely different. More important, it behooves the instructor to solicit and be open to student views. Responsiveness to them could well improve individuals' outlook on their whole experience.

Three participants seem to have reservations or unmet needs more basic to the conduct, or even the assumptions, of the whole course, and therefore these are less readily resolved. One concern expressed by two participants had to do with giving unfavorable feedback to a teacher, or an even harder question, How does the supervisor fit the "unfit" teacher into a model in which one searches out strengths and supports the person? This is, of course, a perennially knotty and distressing problem, especially to those involved or anticipating such involvement. It is also a completely legitimate and appropriate topic which falls well within the parameters of a seminar of this nature. Dealing with this concern stands out to me as very
important, not only to help resolve some dissonances within individuals expressing them, but also to round out more completely the whole helping framework conceptually.

For one participant much of the entire course must have been irrelevant. I have no remedy. I can only operate from my own value system. This includes acknowledging any other individual's right and capacity to make one's own judgments; making my own value positions as clear as possible; making opportunities for another to place his or her values and choices on the table, if desired, for examination and clarification; interacting in ways which minimize defensiveness and maximize openness; continuing to acknowledge another as a worthwhile person. As an instructor exercising hindsight, I have to conclude I could have done better on all dimensions at times. I must also concede that even should all the above dimensions be exercised to the utmost, the chances of the course remaining irrelevant to selected participants will always be there.

"Problems encountered" for the instructor seem few in retrospect. Those identified seem to fall into two categories: (a) Areas in which some adjustment would make a more meaningful, more productive setting for the participants; and (b) Problem areas owned exclusively by the instructor.

Student problem areas have been discussed above. They become instructor problems when they indicate
directions in which to move to create a more responsive learning setting. As instructor, while assuming responsibility for being open to student input, I also recognize that student concerns can probably never all be expressed or resolved. There is one more aspect to consider. I hypothesize that the better the relationship between instructor and participant, not only will concerns be dealt with more openly and earlier before they become bothersome, but the less significance they may assume to the owner. It seems to me that the nature and perceived lack of intensity of most (not all) of the student problems may be a manifestation of the above phenomenon.

There were several minor problems which only I owned. (1) Responsiveness to participant end-of-day fatigue; (2) How best to help participants integrate their own learning; (3) Supervisors' recycling habitual attitudes in working through dilemmas; (4) Capitalizing on logs as two-way communication between instructor and supervisor; (5) Helping supervisor objectives to be more related to the supervisor's behavior, rather than to the teacher's; (6) Re-thinking use of the supervisor questionnaires; (7) Seeking alternatives to squeezing interviews and feedbacks into a brief time frame; and (8) Creating more teaching protocols.

Resolution of the first three problem areas named above seems to me to mean increased openness to participants' states of being, coupled with patience, tolerance, and a
clearer fix on the whole picture. Items four through eight are points which my quarter's experience as an instructor suggested might be handled in improved ways in the future. None except the time squeeze difficulty presented major problems to me.

About "problems encountered" from a programmatic point of view, I have only incomplete and inferential information. No special effort was made to get program-related data for this study, although one issue arises from the experience: because of the time involved to do interviews, profiles, and feedbacks, there might need to be a special kind of programmatic support for a course of this type. A course which, because of its format is necessarily limited to ten or a dozen students, and which also may require a disproportionate amount of instructor time, does not contribute its share to the coffers of the sponsoring agency.

Finally, and more directly relevant to this study itself, the course as designed and taught once seems to have hung together conceptually and operationally. It was experienced positively by the participants. Useful meanings seem to have been made of the experience by those involved. It likely facilitated the development of some, and appears to have effected some impact. The hoped-for facilitating conditions considered necessary for this investigation seem to have been established.
CHAPTER V
CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The four supervisors whose helping potential was analyzed for the studies which follow, were members of the Planned Field Experience seminar taught Autumn Quarter, 1978. They and the other members of the class were in various stages of progress toward state supervisory certification. All seminar participants whose field experience allowed them to work "like a supervisor" with a teacher were included as case studies. These four, of the ten, met this criterion.

As previously defined, helping potential is each supervisor's individual configuration of behaviors, conceptualizations, and values, as determined by a trained perceiver, in this case, myself, from oral responses to the 53-item Teacher Advocate Interview.

The Teacher Advocate Interview, as discussed in the Data Collection section of Chapter III, has eleven themes. These themes or organization points are Mission, Human Resources Development, Relator, Catalyzer, Listening, Audience Sensitivity, Group Enhancer, Discriminator, Performance Orientation, Work Orientation, and Ambiguity.
Tolerance. (A brief description of each theme can be found in Appendix D).

Ten of the eleven themes have five questions each, excepting Discriminator with three. For the most part, each question helps "get at" a distinct part of that theme. One might visualize the theme as a pentagonal form, with each of five facets being accounted for by one question, designed for that purpose. Selection Research, to my knowledge, does not use the term "facet," but as will be clear eventually, a term was needed to represent fairly this concept, and this has seemed to serve the purpose for this study. Positive Portraits tend to be written by facets (see example, Appendix A).

The helping potential, or configuration of facets and themes for each supervisor, was separated into its component facets. These facets, the sources of predictions, became in turn the basic structure for each case study. Each prediction, then, is a facet of that supervisor's helping potential, couched in the future tense.

Predictions were based solely on oral responses to the Teacher Advocate Interview. No prediction was added, deleted, or modified on any basis other than accuracy, and the criteria below.

(1) Predictions were helping predictions only. Certainly, predictions can be made about a negative or non-helping quality, or about the absence of a helping quality.
Predictions for this study, however, were based only on helping potential.

(2) Each prediction was a complete facet of its respective theme.

(3) Predictions were more likely to be included for case study analysis when the facets they represented clustered within themes. The more predictions per theme, the likelier that that whole theme would be selected for followthrough for the particular supervisor.

(4) Next, predictions were more likely to be included for analysis if they were behavioral in nature rather than conceptual.

(5) Finally, predictions were added to each supervisor's list for a total of eight or nine if need be, even though a prediction might not be clustered with others in a theme, or was conceptual rather than behavioral.

Case Studies One, Two, and Three include one or two predictions each which are "strong" predictions. Let me explain: most themes, noted earlier, have five facets, each of which describes a related but discrete aspect of the total theme. In a few of the themes, there are but three or four facets. In other words, although a given theme has five interview questions, in some cases two of the questions might cover the same, or very similar facets. This was exactly the situation for each of the strong predictions: in each instance, two identical or approximately
like facets were combined and identified as one strong prediction, when indeed there was helping strength for that supervisor in each of the facets being considered for combination.

Predictions were couched in the future tense to connote their tentativeness until support was demonstrated or not.

Each prediction was considered singly and judged either not supported or supported, and to what extent. A prediction was judged not supported if there were no data to apply. The presence of only a few, unclear, or highly inferential data led to a judgment of weak support. For predictions supported "within boundaries" there were sufficient data with enough clarity to convince the researcher or reader that this prediction would likely be lived out as an integral part of the supervisor's repertoire. Should the data be especially abundant and clear, or its scope spill over into areas beyond a prediction, that prediction would be judged strongly supported.

Thus, there were two "intensities" for predictions--typical or base-line, and strong. There were four degrees of support--not supported, weakly supported, supported within boundaries, and strongly supported. In the four instances of strong predictions, I decided beforehand that a strong prediction demanded strong support to be judged supported within boundaries. Likewise, should relevant data
be of only reasonable abundance and/or average clarity, a strong prediction should be judged weakly supported.

The discussions of each prediction and the presentation of its relevant data were threaded against a "story line" so that meanings could be derived more accurately, thereby permitting as authentic a reconstruction as possible of each supervisor's helping experience.

Case Study One

Ed C., in his middle-to-late twenties, is a doctoral candidate in Educational Humanities. He came to the Planned Field Experience seminar less interested in supervisory certification, per se, than in exploring supervision for personal reflection and learning. He hoped "ultimately to pinpoint a workable theory of supervision." Ed hopes to be a curriculum developer, supervisor, change agent, community-school relations worker, and specialist in English Education.

Ed's university teaching associateship included, besides teaching two undergraduate courses, supervising four student teachers who were placed at the same center-city high school. His logs focused mainly on Alice K.; however, references also are made occasionally to all four as a group, and to another individual student teacher, a member of the group.

Nine predictions were made from facets of Ed's helping potential, based on original interview responses.
Helping Potential Predictions

Relator Prediction A. It will be important to Ed that he be liked by the teachers he supervises.

Catalyzer Prediction B. There will be strong evidence that Ed will have specific ideas of his own which will facilitate teacher growth.

Listening Prediction C. Ed will value being a concerned listener to his student teachers.

Listening Prediction D. Ed will be sought out as a facilitative listener and he will take time to do so.

Performance Orientation Prediction E. Specific goals and objectives for himself will be projected by Ed, relative to his supervising student teachers.

Performance Orientation Prediction F. Ed will work with teachers to refine and extend their goals based on their interests.

Work Orientation Prediction G. Sincere interest in his work as a supervisor will be reflected partly by Ed's extensive preparation for the work day ahead.

Ambiguity Tolerance Prediction H. Important decisions will likely be made fairly deliberately by Ed who may expose the projected decision to others involved in the matter, for their input.

Group Enhancer Prediction I. Ed will be generous with his support of individual teachers, involving himself personally in backing and encouraging them, and giving his
praise to them individually.

Supporting Evidence

Relator Prediction A. It will be important to Ed that he be liked by the teachers he supervises. This was documented by Ed throughout the quarter.

The exchange was direct, casual, informative.

Alice has been taking me into her confidence.

Alice continues to be fairly open with her thoughts.

These sessions served to extend our relationship.

I just am confident in my ability to understand what's happening between myself and somebody else.

Ed met weekly with his four student teachers as a group, and reported on the growing closeness among the five.

The four student teachers and I are meeting regularly.

They volunteered as the quarter went on, and we developed our relationship to the point where they could trust me and they knew I trusted them.

They were freer with those kind[s] of [critical] comments.

One of the four student teachers was a young man who had been brought up in a rural area. He was unsure of himself in this center-city school and was having some problems.

Ed initiated contact with him, demonstrating relationship-building beyond the original prediction.

I was available. And I called him a lot. . . . He thought it was odd that I would call him at home to find out how he was doing. . . . But I kept after him and volunteered to sit down with him and work out a lesson plan.
The reason was just to show him that I was really concerned about him. . . . It wasn't just a school-related matter because I know that some of his problems were personal.

A very interesting "sub-plot" unfolded as Ed’s supervising experience went on. While he was working intensely with the four pre-service teachers, he was having to define and re-form his relationship with the school in general and the four respective cooperating teachers in particular. He "toed" the line by wearing a tie on school visits, for instance, because this had been requested by the administrator and because Ed respected the request. As he came to understand it more clearly later, he had been preceded by a supervisor with whom the school faculty had had trouble relating. Their hostile attitude was unwittingly transferred to him. Furthermore, Alice's cooperating teacher had not been receptive to Alice's plans to introduce her classes to small group work because the "students can't deal with it."

As the quarter was ending, one cooperating teacher asked Ed, "Did you feel the coldness the first time you were there?"

A tribute to the turn the relationship had taken for the better in ten weeks was Ed's laugh and honest comment, "Coldness is a euphemism! You were ice-like!"

The open exchange continued with the teacher asking Ed how he had felt. He replied,

Just awful . . . I . . . was very concerned but was determined that I would prevail.
I meant, just be successful and establish some kind of relationship with them.

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the early negative feelings were soon diffused—or defused.

I worked through . . . [the initial hostility] by meeting with . . . [the cooperating teachers] individually.

[I tried] to be supportive, I used the model that we discussed in class . . . and they reacted well to that. . . . Interpersonally, we got along well.

We were all able to develop individually a rapport, and that just spilled over into the group. Myself and the four cooperating teachers.

I got along very well with their cooperating teachers so there was never any friction [sic].

I like . . . all [the cooperating teachers] and I respect them. And I think it's probably mutual.

Contact . . . [and] professionalism, I think . . . enabled us to develop some rapport. And they saw that, in fact, a supervisor can be used to their advantage.

By the end of the quarter, the evidence was in, and it was clear that there was a different set of dynamics working, compared to those of Ed's first visit or two.

I had lunch with . . . just the cooperating teachers and not the student teachers.

The feedback was good. Everybody felt fairly comfortable with what happened. They would certainly be willing to take student teachers in the future.

It was a good experience for everybody involved. And that seemed to be the consensus of opinion.

[The cooperating teachers] . . . express[ed] satisfaction, a lot of satisfaction on the whole enterprise.
To cap the positive feelings, the cooperating teachers volunteered to write a letter to the University in Ed's behalf.

We always write letters to the University when we have had bad supervisors and we were wondering if you'd like to have an evaluation, because we thought things went well.

Early in the quarter Ed mentioned to me that he sometimes comes on strong and recognizes that this turned people off at first. Two weeks later, he still did not project the possibility that his relating to the cooperating teachers as well as to the student teachers was within the scope of his intentions—or perhaps even a dimension that should concern him. Indeed, Prediction A went no further than to highlight Ed's wish to be liked by his student teachers. The prediction was certainly supported. He not only valued the relationships, but for whatever purposes, he helped build and maintain them, and expanded operations successfully into a second area as well with the cooperating teachers. It would seem that Ed's data carried the prediction well beyond its originally stated boundaries. My judgment is that Relator Prediction A, it will be important to Ed that he be liked by the teachers he supervises, is strongly supported by these data.

**Catalyzer Prediction B.** Instances of Ed's offering his own growth-facilitating ideas and approaches to Alice are found throughout the data. This is predicted strongly.
I am providing her with cues and hunches I have, which hopefully will aid her in her effort to construct these student-centered exercises.

I was able . . . to recommend to her several techniques she might try to improve group work operations.

Often I have suggestions that might help . . . [the student teachers].

I also gave . . . [another student teacher] alternative solutions to problems that he had.

We are continuing to explore ways to implement practices which will actively engage students in Alice's classes.

We reviewed the instruction and in the process I think uncovered a more systematic approach to the task.

The above illustrations highlight another texture of Ed's helping, as well: he does not impose his ideas on his student teacher. Rather, he tends to work collaboratively. He either thinks in terms of "we" or offers suggestions which the student teacher may choose to use or not. Ed clearly helps teachers develop their own solutions and supports the use of their ideas.

Catalyzer Prediction B, the appearance of strong evidence that Ed will have ideas of his own which are growth-facilitating for teachers, is not only supported, but the evidence spreads to other facets of the theme, rounding it out to a further extent than originally predicted. Therefore, my judgment is that this strong prediction is supported within its boundaries.

Listening Prediction C. Ed values being a concerned listener to his student teachers. This was a value which
may not have had a cue for expression. There was some clear evidence of Ed's playing out this value (see Listening Prediction D), but there were no data which could be used to support this particular prediction, nor were there data to refute this prediction.

Listening Prediction C, then, valuing being a concerned listener, must be judged not supported for lack of data available.

**Listening Prediction D.** Ed invited his student teachers to phone him at home if they wished, to talk things out. They took him up on it.

Alice called me last evening.

We talked [on the phone] for thirty minutes.

[Alice expressed] her dissatisfaction with her teaching that day.

Yes, we talk . . . regularly. They call me on the phone quite a bit, although I don't solicit comments.

They think that I'm willing to spend time with them. And I did, spend a lot of time with them.

Significantly, one of the cooperating teachers turned to Ed for support for herself.

I knew she was having some problems and sometimes when she would call me and talk about Warren, she was really calling me to talk about herself.

**Listening Prediction D,** Ed's giving his time and his energy to be a listener, was supported within the boundaries drawn.
Performance Orientation Prediction E. Ed will set goals for himself. This came easily for Ed. For instance, even before we had worked together, Ed wrote,

I have general objectives, rather nebulously formed.

Ed's and Alice's objectives were linked together.

My major . . . single objective was to help a particular student teacher carry out, develop, a series of procedures whereby she could effectively use small group instruction in the classroom—in a school where there's hardly any small group work.

My objectives in a sense simply mirror Alice's major goals. We are both working to diversify classroom routine, with an emphasis on small group work.

Both . . . [observation and conference with Alice] related directly to my specific objective.

Ed reported Alice's progress toward using small groups many times. Three entries specifically tie this to a formal objective, in response to the standard log question, Can you relate this interaction to your specific objective?

Alice continues to hone in on her goal of injecting purposeful small group work into her classes.

I think she has met this objective satisfactorily.

I want her to not lose sight of her goal of experimenting with Moffett and Wagner.

Performance Orientation Prediction E appears supported by these data.

Performance Orientation Prediction F. Ed will work with teachers to refine and extend their goals based on their interests. There are some very clear data applicable
to this. I wrote in my notes after a talk early in the quarter,

Whereas I had suggested it as a possible growing edge, Ed already helps his teachers set goals.

Ed looked back upon this facet of helping and commented in his debriefing interview,

I think also I helped individual teachers reach particular goals they had set up for themselves.

In the followup interview, Ed detailed clearly how Karen's objective was set and followed through.

At the first meeting, we talked about what objective-writing would amount to. . . . I wanted something specific enough . . . [to] gauge. . . . So I gave them some examples. . . . It was clear that Alice was committed to some of . . . [Moffett-Wagner's] principles. So I inquired which ones. . . . Well, group work for example, and . . . making a smooth transition from a conventional classroom. . . . So I immediately latched on to that.

So we looked at possible steps together. She wrote them up and I reviewed them.

She went ahead and did it. I observed it. She reflected on it in her journal. I commented on her journal and then she followed it up. [She owned] the objective. She initiated it.

Performance Orientation Prediction F, Ed's working with teachers to refine and extend their goals based on their interests, is well supported by a few clear and on-target excerpts.

Work Orientation Prediction G. Ed will prepare extensively for the day ahead as a function of his intense involvement in his work. Specific data about this kind of evidence were lacking. However, two statements in his
debriefing interview would suggest this is indeed part of his work ethic.

Most of them understand a little better [now] than they did [then] why it's necessary to be so thoroughly prepared before you go in the classroom.

They are forced to understand that in face they do have to be incredibly well prepared to get through a day.

Additional data build a picture of a supervisor who is very generous with his time, and serious about his responsibilities.

Alice drove me down to her placement site . . . I then observed her for the entire fifth period (45 minutes) . . . I met with Alice and her cooperating teacher immediately after the class (for about 40 minutes). Then I went home with Alice at the end of the day, spending an additional 30 minutes or so discussing her work at . . . [the high school].

I observed Alice's 5th period Journalism class . . . Later in the day I conferred with Alice.

I observed Alice in her film class, paying particular attention to her discussion skills.

I saw some good classes.

I called [Warren] . . . to see if he was able to get the resources that he needed. If not, to provide him the information as to where he could secure them . . . I had to [call him] in order to insure that he got through the experience.

I have worked assiduously to help this student along . . . this student teacher seems to be doing fine now.

Ed's interest and involvement in his work with all his student teachers is played out. Work Orientation Prediction G seems supported by the data.
Ambiguity Tolerance Prediction H. Ed will make decisions deliberately. Data is scarce. There were no data to the contrary. One statement from the debriefing interview might relate to Ed's getting the input of those involved in making an important decision. This occurred at their final luncheon.

I recounted to [the cooperating teachers] . . . I thought it was real important to lay the problems out very early on. Not to just pedal around in circles to get to it.

It would appear that Ambiguity Tolerance Prediction H, making important decisions deliberately, lacks complete and sufficient support in the evidence available. In my judgment it is weakly supported.

Group Enhancer Prediction I. Ed will support his student teachers. This is a quality for which there seem to be applicable data.

I think . . . that I supported her in some meaningful ways.

I encouraged her to pursue her notions of innovative discipline technique.

It seems as if I am offering . . . [the four student teachers] the support they need.

I frequently tell them I think they did this well, and I like it also.

I usually tell them. Just outright. . . . I will say to Alice . . . it makes sense that you're trying to do small group work. You came into the class the fifth or sixth week and the students didn't even know one another's name. . . . [T]o say that . . . is just very reassuring to her.
I told her [that she possesses all the qualities of a good teacher] in so many words.

I try to [give feedback] immediately.

I just sit right down and talk about it.

All the research shows that if you wait too long, you're not going to have any effect as an evaluator whatsoever. So I tell them right after my observation.

Besides frequent, in-depth, individual conferences, Ed structured his weekly seminars so they functioned as support groups.

We talk[ed] about their successes during the seminars . . . the atmosphere was such that the student[s] . . . would support one another.

We'd start with a discussion of what had gone well. What was significant they had accomplished they could cite during the course of the week. That seemed to set a decent tenor for the whole seminar.

[I asked them to] identify something good that had happened. And that seemed to be fairly effective.

Group Enhancer Prediction I, Ed's generous, individual, and personal support of teachers appears to be well supported by the data.

Ed's Reflections

By the time Ed had enrolled in the seminar, he had worked with his four student teachers, met their cooperating teachers, and experienced the chilly climate that characterized his initial interactions in the school. Feeling constrained by the setting, he wrote,

My role is in great part defined by the school system in which my student teachers have been placed. This system, I sense, minimizes active involvement on my behalf.
Ed reflected further in the debriefing interview upon his understanding of supervising, ten weeks earlier.

I didn't have any clear conception of what I was supposed to be doing as a university supervisor.

Since I didn't have a clearly defined idea as to what I should be doing as a supervisor, I was open to almost any approach.

At the followup interview, Ed commented upon his including the cooperating teachers and working with them as a group.

I hadn't focused on [that] before. I didn't even consider it, really. . . . I do see it as an important facet of the supervisory [role].

During the course of the quarter, his ideas about supervision developed.

I have quickly discovered that supervision is a helping profession (helping relationship).

Supervisor-supervisee relationship is a helping one.

Now I'm pretty clear as to what I have to do to be effective, both in terms of what the university expects and the schools themselves as well as what I need as a supervisor.

I've come to see it much more as a helping kind of profession as I mentioned in the course evaluation. I think that it helps me, I didn't have any framework at all, really. I was just relying on common sense, and common sense sometimes just is not enough.

That the whole experience ended much more successfully than anyone might have predicted from his initial "welcome" at the school, is evident from foregoing data, previously considered. At quarter's end, Ed said,

I enjoy it. It's fun. . . . I'm fairly comfortable with it. I like it.
I also feel that, Yes, I can do this. If I were an English educator, which is what I want to be at some point . . . I can go in and do this and be effective and feel good about my work.

Relative to the way he sees himself operating as a supervisor, Ed made several observations.

In assuming the role of helper, I can very easily . . . use what counseling skills I've picked up over the years through education [and] even more informally.

The seminar helped me considerably in looking at one role carefully, of help-giver, trying it out and experimenting with it and toying with it and seeing how effective it would be for me.

It has made me see that being confronting and [being] really anxious to push conflict is not as advisable as I thought it was originally. Although I still see value in doing that. I didn't . . . [confront] very much because I thought what I was hearing in class and what I was seeing through the role plays made sense to me.

Asked to reflect upon the extent to which his Positive Portrait was congruent with the way he saw himself working as a supervisor, Ed said,

I think much of . . . [the Positive Portrait] is accurate. Certainly your description of the helping behaviors . . . characterizes the way I operate.

I think that my performance is pretty directly related to what you've described here. It's nice to see.

I have a definite sense of growth. I'm very conscious about that whole dimension of education--personal development.

A look at his future in supervision prompted these observations by Ed.

I'd like to hone my skills as a help-giver, to be tactful, supportive.
[My helping skills can take me] ... into the professional role I see myself as assuming, as a classroom teacher consultant who is involved in supervision of student teachers, teacher education which is what this is all about.

Completing the picture of Ed's experience as a supervisor, are a series of log entries which followed Alice's progress throughout the quarter. Selected notations follow in chronological order.

Alice resisted the temptation to scold or scream at students. She is searching for a more reasonable method of control.

The demands of new content material are beginning to pressure Alice slightly.

She appeared grateful [for reassurance that the problem of her personal life suffering] was a common one.

Her initial effort in ... [small group work] was unsuccessful.

Alice appears to me to be projecting somewhat; she now claims that her cooperating teacher ... relishes ... [her] failures because it proves ... that the cooperating teacher's approach (traditional) is superior.

She has painstakingly moved through the initial stages and now seems on the verge of a full-fledged success.

All indications are that she successfully managed the small group activity.

At the debriefing interview Ed reflected further about Alice's accomplishments.

I finally read the papers that the students produced. Fortunately she took my advice and graded them rather leniently to reinforce the whole experience. Although not outstanding by any means, they were good and certainly high caliber compared to most of the writing that goes on in that school.
I think she was unquestionably successful. She had other teachers, as a matter of fact, that came in to observe what she was doing.

Most important, Alice recognized this as success and is now committed to using it again.

**Researcher's Reflections**

Ed's debriefing interview revealed a facet of strength which was not predicted from the original interview. There was not sufficient evidence present at that time to suggest completely how Ed would respond in a situation where two other parties were experiencing difficulties with each other. When Ed was recounting at the end of the quarter the crisis of the fifth and sixth weeks, it became evident that he had indeed dealt with just such a situation. In Ed's words,

Student teachers and cooperating teachers weren't talking to one another. They were all calling me, using me as kind of a clearing house for their problems. And I had to serve as a kind of arbiter, mediator. What I finally did was to meet with the individual students, then students as a group, and individual cooperating teachers, then cooperating teachers as a group, then bring them together. And I wasn't even there for that and that worked out fine.

His willingness not only to intervene but to work toward student teachers and cooperating teachers finally getting together to communicate indicates a facet of strength belonging in the Audience Sensitivity theme. This theme is different completely from those from which Predictions A through I were taken.
In spite of increased personal comfort with his supervisory capabilities, Ed remains puzzled by one aspect of the profession.

I still wonder finally about the role of the supervisor relative to educational change.

There are just real serious problems in those classrooms. As a teacher educator, do you have responsibility somewhere along the line to make some changes, to do that overtly. And I am still wrestling with the problem relative to the supervisor's role.

I'm still perplexed, very puzzled, by the role of the supervisor in educational change.

One other part of supervision in the helping relationship framework also troubled Ed.

And I finally don't understand how that model deals with . . . the I'm OK--You're OK syndrome. Because in fact there are student teachers that just should not be teaching. They're not very good.

When cooperating teachers were hostile initially, Ed appeared resigned to the hostility, but determined to persevere so they would interact and work with the student teachers and give feedback to him. It is clear that a drastic shift in teacher attitudes did occur, not so much through deliberate relationship-building efforts on Ed's part, but from his sense of responsibility to his student teachers and holding himself accountable for a good experience for them.

Ed's reported value shifts included the following, as he reflected in December upon a complex ten-week experience:
(1) From accepting parameters from the school for his role as university supervisor, to proactively defining the role as he preferred it.

(2) From a vaguely-defined notion of supervision to viewing it as a helping profession.

(3) From neutral affect about supervision to positive affect.

(4) From viewing conflict as stimulus to teachers' growth, to trying on the role of helper and facilitator.

In addition, unreported as an area in which growth was personally sensed, (5) Conflict management which involved two other parties, not originally predicted.

Three of Ed's four reported value shifts—the second, third, and fourth items in the above list, may all well belong to his Mission theme. His awareness and perhaps commitment to making a positive impact upon teachers were reportedly enhanced, as was his clarified understanding of how he himself might fit into supervision as a helper, assuming responsibility for generating a facilitating atmosphere. Another intriguing possibility is that these three areas are functions of Ed's Work Orientation theme.

The first item represents Ed's whole successful winning over of the cooperating teachers and including them in his advocacy. An excerpt quoted earlier from one of his logs states,
I was concerned [about the teachers' hostility] but was determined I would prevail.

When I was first dealing with this statement and trying to place its meaning for Ed, two possibilities presented themselves to me, each of them quite reasonable in the total context: (1) That Ed meant to have his student teacher proceed with small-group work even if the cooperating teacher didn't approve of it, or (2) That Ed meant to persist in building relationships with the cooperating teachers. Getting clarification on this point from Ed was done at the followup interview. I asked him what he meant by that statement. Ed's meaning was neither one of the two I had projected, but a third one: he was determined that the cooperating teachers "cooperate," that is, give feedback to the student teachers, observe them as they teach, and interact civilly with Ed when he came to the school to visit. This understanding helps us relate the value shift listed first, to an appropriate theme, probably Work Orientation. It is my judgment after hearing Ed elaborate a little more, that his personal concern, preparedness, competence, interest and investment in the student teachers--that is, his own Work Orientation--so impressed the cooperating teachers initially that they capitulated. Admittedly, building rapport with them was not Ed's intention early in the quarter. However, the dynamics that spun off were Relator dynamics. Ed, who was clear about the desirability of good relationships with his student
teachers, began to include good relationship with the cooperating teachers as part of his focus. This may be an example of one strong facet "bringing along" another one which had not yet developed.

Ed's deliberate management of the mid-quarter communication crisis between cooperating teachers and student teachers appears to be a facet of his Audience Sensitivity theme. Regrettably, further inquiry into his motivations or purposes for expending all that effort to get the two non-communicating groups together, was not made of Ed. I can only offer a hunch: that his Work Orientation theme again generated this behavior, which spilled over into Audience Sensitivity.

Summary

Nine predictions were made for Ed from an array of seven themes. Eight of the nine were supported, and one was not for lack of data. Of the eight predictions supported by data on hand, one seemed weakly supported, one strongly supported, and six were supported within the boundaries drawn, including one strong prediction. See Figure 3.

The four value shifts reported by Ed might reasonably be aligned with two themes--Work Orientation, for which there was one prediction, and Mission. It is also entirely possible all four relate to Work Orientation.
The unpredicted conflict management behavior aligned, at least by appearances, with Audience Sensitivity.

**Synthesis of Supervisory Style**

Ed's sense of responsibility toward his job and toward his student teachers helps account for a task-orientation in his style, manifesting in generous and frequent school visits, regularly spending time with them to discuss their student teaching progress, an open offer of a listening ear at the other end of the telephone, initiating interactions with a reluctant student teacher, and insistence that his student teachers prepare thoroughly for the teaching day. This particular quality of Ed's serves him well. The cooperating teachers were particularly responsive to this dependability. It was likely the original key to their acceptance of him personally and professionally. Ed's positive experience with the cooperating teacher relationships certainly signals a growing edge for him. As noted earlier, it may have risen from their admiration of the seriousness with which he took his responsibilities, but it progressed to an expanded view of himself as a relator-to-persons.

Several dimensions of Ed's supervising could be read by the student teachers as quite affirming to them as individual persons. Some examples are, his willingness and help in having them set growth objectives in their own
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prediction not Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Weakly Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Supported Within Boundaries</th>
<th>Prediction Strongly Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction B*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity Tolerance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Enhancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strong prediction

Figure 3. Summary of extent to which predictions for Case Study One were supported.
interest areas; being there with ideas and materials when they need them, but supporting the student teacher's own ideas as first priority; and the willingness to listen—even if by phone. One might speculate that these individually affirming behaviors have a rapport-building spillover, too.

Ed does what he sees must be done. Likewise, in certain important areas, he has no need to push his views or preferences onto student teachers. His same strong sense of self makes it natural for him to operate from the student teacher's perspective. A before-and-after comparison of Ed's supervision compels the conclusion that he is moving in certain areas. Work Orientation is a theme to watch.

Case Study Two

Estelle D., in her early thirties, was a classroom teacher with ten years' experience. This was her second year in a rural school district, the first year she had taught students as young as fourth graders. She had taught junior high school math the previous year in the same district.

Estelle's Planned Field Experience centered around Sharon M., the first student teacher ever assigned to Estelle.

Estelle was pondering a professional move in education at the time of the study. Having ruled out administration, she was seeking certification in supervision to
meet her criterion of an education-related change from the classroom. She was hoping to be able to effect greater changes in education through working with adults. She had just begun her certification coursework the quarter the study began.

Three of Estelle's themes were selected for follow-through in her case study analysis. The eight predictions about her helping potential made from these three theme areas, follow.

**Helping Potential Predictions**

- **Listening Prediction A.** There will be evidence of Estelle's belief in the helpfulness of caring, non-judgmental listening.
- **Listening Prediction B.** Estelle will judge her own helpfulness as a listener by evidence from the person who is talking.
- **Listening Prediction C.** Estelle will take time to listen in a helpful way to others.
- **Listening Prediction D.** Estelle will use her listening talent to help others speak freely in order to work through their concerns.
- **Performance Orientation Prediction E.** Estelle will specify goals for herself.
- **Performance Orientation Prediction F.** Estelle will help teachers set goals based on their interests.
Performance Orientation Prediction G. There will be strong evidence that Estelle will look for student growth as a way of identifying teacher success.

Work Orientation Prediction H. There will be clear indications of keen, personal engagement by Estelle in her work as a supervisor.

Supportive Evidence

Listening Prediction A. The best evidence of Estelle's belief in how caring, non-judgmental listening can be helpful, came from three of the weekly Reaction Cards written and collected after each seminar session. After the fourth class Estelle wrote in reaction to the structured conference,

It also helps to know you have someone to talk to, to keep you motivated, and who will provide assistance in terms of time, ideas, moral support, whatever.

After the fifth seminar, in response to the cue, What concept about teacher growth have you found validated?, Estelle wrote,

Someone who listens, cares, and is knowledgeable.

After the sixth class, Estelle noted with exceptional clarity the effects of her usual freeing responses to others.

In most cases . . . [leading statements] get the other person talking, and you listening. It also stimulates thinking on their part about the situation which can lead to associated ideas.
These data support well Listening Prediction A, Estelle's belief that caring, non-judgmental listening is helpful.

**Listening Prediction B.** The diverse data-generating situations built into the study brought forth only one unit of meaning which clearly supported the second listening prediction that Estelle would judge her helpfulness as a listener by evidence from the person who is talking. Responding only to the debriefing interview cue, Can you illustrate how you used listening with Sharon?, Estelle explained,

> Usually in our conferences, Sharon did at least 50% of the talking. And in many cases, since she's very verbal, she did a whole lot more than 50%. I would ask a question or two and she would talk for the rest of the time. So I would say I spent about 80% of my time listening. . . . So she did an awful lot of the talking.

Although this excerpt relates clearly to the prediction, the lack of other data underscores the prudence of judging Prediction B to be weakly supported by data which was available.

**Listening Prediction C.** Data pertaining to Estelle's taking time to listen in a helpful way to others, are apparent throughout the data sources. Soon after the quarter had begun, the topic at Estelle's feedback talk turned to Sharon's having been observed by her university supervisor the previous Friday. She had been criticized for
what we both felt was "style." This added stress to an otherwise already tense and chaotic day. I wrote in my notes after my conversation with Estelle,

[Sharon] was so upset at the end of the day that she and Estelle talked a long time about it.

There were several allusions in the debriefing interview to Estelle's being approached to be a listener.

She felt she could come to me with problems that she had and discuss them with me.

And she, many times, did seek me out to discuss problems, that I did not see as problems but which she saw as problems.

I think Sharon felt that I was someone that she could come to, to talk to, freely. Initiate conversations.

A lot of the things we discussed were things that she brought to my attention that she wanted to discuss.

The data appear to warrant supporting Listening Prediction C, Estelle's taking time to be a listener.

Listening Prediction D. Estelle will use her listening talent to help others speak freely in order to work through their concerns. There appear to be several units of meaning pertaining to this. A field trip produced some discipline problems. Concern about this whole arena led Sharon to seek out her cooperating teacher.

Sharon herself saw this as a problem (which I have been waiting for)... We talked briefly after school about discipline problems Sharon encountered on the field trip. This led into a discussion of discipline in general.
As their relationship developed,

I did most of the listening and I think that was good because I think she needed a lot more direction at first than she did toward the end.

And then after she would get out whatever it was that was bothering her [that] she wanted to work on, then we would sit down together and discuss ways of solving whatever it was she brought up.

Listening Prediction D, using listening to help others speak freely in order to work through their concerns, seems adequately supported by the data.

Performance Orientation Prediction E. Estelle will specify goals for herself. This was addressed at a conceptual level on two Reaction Cards.

[The example of] "Developing an integrated language art program" is a monumental goal that can discourage anyone from even beginning. But broken down into manageable steps and taken piece by piece, it does seem less threatening. The structured conference can help to do this and provide a feeling of accomplishment at each step.

In the second class, Estelle responded to the Reaction Card cue, Please react to relationship-building efforts in your particular setting.

I would like . . . [our relationship] to develop to a more personal level and need to work toward that goal. I need to make more effort in that direction.

By the mid-October feedback talk, Estelle's judgment was that her first objective, creating a non-threatening relationship with Sharon, had been well met early in the quarter. At that time she stated she was ready to set a second one, and suggested "improving [Sharon's] instructional
techniques." We discussed the specificity necessary for objectives and Estelle named realistic time limits, an easily measured objective, and what we termed more realistic content density, to be measured subjectively by Estelle. All logs asked the question, Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives? Logs through the third week of October carried comments on the progress and quality of Estelle's and Sharon's relationship, while the October 30 log noted Sharon's satisfactory progress on the second objective.

The evidence seem to support Performance Orientation Prediction E, that Estelle would specify goals for herself.

**Performance Orientation Prediction F.** Estelle will help teachers set goals based upon their interests. This parallels the previous prediction. The following two log entries include goal-setting purposes.

The purpose was to help her set more realistic goals in terms of time and also the number of concepts the children could deal with at one time.

We met again by mutual agreement after she had time to observe me teaching a social studies lesson, and to visit another classroom for the same purpose. . . . Realistic objectives were set both in terms of time and the students.

A later log entry noted her goal convergence.

I feel Sharon is becoming accustomed to adjusting for time limits and to planning more realistic goals. It seems to be falling more into place for her.
It was already clear that Estelle was a proponent of goal-setting for both herself and for Sharon. A question which occurred to me was the extent to which Sharon had input into her own goals. In referring to her own Positive Portrait at the reconstructed debriefing interview, Estelle herself brought up this very item. I asked her to describe the goal-setting process she had carried out with Sharon.

I more or less pushed her into it when I refused to do it. . . . I don't think it was that big of a step for her because she would bring up ideas and suggestions and bring concerns to me and it was a start at goal-setting anyhow. . . . She would usually come to me and say, This really bothers me, what can we do about it? And there were many times I think she would have liked me to set goals. . . . And I just would not answer. And I'm sure that was frustrating for her in many respects because she really did want me to set a time limit. But she came up with her own time limit finally and she met it. I think she was much more satisfied than if she felt she had to meet a deadline I had set.

Regarding the previously noted discussion on discipline problems which surfaced for Sharon on a field trip, Estelle wrote,

Although discipline was not one of my specific objectives, I do see it as one [for Sharon].

In light of the obvious goal-setting activity, plus the resolution of the question of whose interests were acted upon--Sharon's--Performance Orientation Prediction F appears well supported.

Performance Orientation Prediction G. Estelle will look for student growth as a way of identifying teacher success. This is a brave prediction. On the basis of
original interview responses, this is a "strong" predic-
tion. I have pulled data in this regard. All italics are 
mine.

I feel good that she was able to see so quickly how 
to change her lesson plan to achieve better results 
with the students.

I am disturbed I am not seeing more progress in de-
velopment of lesson plans in terms of variety of 
technique and interest of children.

She is concentrating less on technique with her 
lessons (now that she feels more secure) and is be-
coming more aware of the children's responses to 
her methods.

Her way of relating to the students, I think I con-
tributed to.

And also in her lesson plans she was more creative 
with the things she did so the children would be 
more interested.

She allowed them to have more flexibility. She 
wasn't so afraid for . . . [the children] to be 
out of their seats.

She was having trouble breaking down all the inform-
ation that was in the textbook into something that 
she could do with the children that wouldn't be just 
reading the textbook and answering questions.

She made some drawings and the children did drawings 
of what they saw under the microscopes. . . . They 
really had a good time.

About seven weeks into the quarter, Estelle videotaped 
Sharon's teaching. This was under some protest by Sharon, 
and with much expressed anxiety. But Estelle held out and 
"just rolled the equipment in" on the targeted day. They 
viewed the tape together at the end of the day. Sharon 
not only liked much of what she saw but wanted to try it
another time. Estelle, who was doing the taping, controlled the shots, literally. Her recollection of this applies to Prediction G. Again, italics are mine.

I not only concentrated on what she was doing but also the children's reactions to what was going on. I would zero in on specific kids so that she could see their reactions to what was happening and what they were doing while she was conducting a lesson.

The data applying to Performance Orientation Prediction G, the presence of strong evidence that Estelle will look for student growth as a way of identifying teacher success, are both abundant and clear. The strong evidence leads to Prediction G's being accepted within the boundaries originally drawn.

Work Orientation Prediction H. Estelle's work as a supervisor will be characterized by her personal and intense engagement with it. This is a "strong" prediction. In searching the data for these indications, one might look for evidence of work activities spilling out of the normal work day or work week, a vigorous interaction with work, as well as the tendency to carry it with her mentally beyond the confines of the school day. There is logged evidence that Estelle and Sharon worked beyond school hours.

The meeting took place in the classroom after school.

This occurred after school in the classroom.

We talked briefly after school.
I spent much time after school and occasionally some suppers discussing things that she wanted to discuss or if she was very upset. I remember the one night that she was very upset when her supervisor came in. We went out to dinner after that and discussed it.

The very logs themselves reflect Estelle's thorough and serious approach to Sharon's "becoming."

When I make a suggestion, it is taken seriously and an attempt is made to deal with the problem.

At one point when they had not talked for awhile, Estelle's sense of accountability was nudging her.

I feel some of the problems have arisen due to a lack of guidance on my part and assuming too much. . . . I assume the responsibility for being so involved in parent-teacher conferences [that] I did not do much guiding.

Had Prediction H been a straightforward one, it would have been well supported by these data. In light of the strong prediction, however, it is my judgment that Work Orientation Prediction H, clear indications of Estelle's keen, personal engagement in her work as a supervisor, is weakly supported by the data available.

**Estelle's Reflections**

Gauging her own attitude changes about supervision over the two-and-a-half month span of her first supervision experience, Estelle first recognized her changed view of supervision itself.

I guess I see it more as helping than as directing.
This contrasts with her professional experience to date with supervision.

My experiences had not been very numerous because the school systems I was in, they did not have supervisors. They relied on the county to come in. And they would come in maybe once a year. And they'd spend some time in your room. And it was more or less like being viewed by the principal. They'd come in, and they'd watch for awhile, and they'd write all sorts of things down and then you'd talk to them later and they were gone for another year. You didn't really get much help from them. It was just another observation where they would evaluate your teaching. You would see them at workshops. Of course, they planned the workshops... [but] you never saw them, that I can remember, in any kind of one-to-one helping type of situation.

She expanded upon her current, evolved notion.

I guess I view... the primary objective of supervision now... [i]s to get with teachers or small groups of teachers and help them with the things they feel they need or want help with.

Reflecting on what she actually did as a supervisor,

Estelle commented,

The one thing I learned was to just sit back and watch and wait a little bit before saying anything. And see what she came up with.

Her sense of personal growth came from the realization "more than anything in working with Sharon" of how she used her listening skills more effectively.

When... [the relationship] first started, I did most of the talking. But toward the end, it was just the opposite. I did most of the listening and I think that was good.

Asked in her followup interview how consciously she worked on growing in listening as a supervisor, Estelle recalled,
I began to see that dealing with Sharon was very little different from dealing with the students in my class. And I felt I should approach it in exactly the same way, and then I started doing more listening and supplying less answers. It didn't hit me for a long time. I guess I felt working with adults was so much different than working with children and now I . . . think there's hardly any difference.

I became aware of that as a technique in working with just people in general because it works so well with kids.

Estelle continued to view listening as an important medium for her own learning although no prediction was made for this particular facet of listening because, as a sole function of listening, it fell outside the parameters of the helping framework. She summed up her sense of growth in listening, with clarity.

Although I always felt I had learned to listen, I think even with Sharon I learned more to listen and not to jump in so quickly with a solution. More or less let them wrestle with their own solutions for awhile and come up with their own. And to ask, maybe, more questions than to really provide any answers. See what they come up with.

I think . . . [my helping skills] helped me with the kids in many ways. The experience of learning to listen a little bit more.

Estelle's reflections on herself as a supervisor turned to Sharon and their relationship.

I don't feel I had any trouble establishing rapport with Sharon. Part of it was Sharon. She was very open herself, plus she and I just seemed to be on the same wave length so it was very easy in that regard.

Her attention shifted to Sharon's professional growth.
I think I finally did get across that better teachers have better relationships with their students. At first Sharon basically ignored the relationship between the teacher and the child. She concentrated mostly on method. I think toward the end she did realize that the most important thing was your relationship with the child and that's where she gave up the lecturing [to discipline] . . . If you have . . . [a good relationship] you can accomplish a whole lot more than if your relationship is not very good with the child. . . . She solved some interesting problems that she ran into with some of the students.

I think she learned that teachers' effectiveness is reflected in student growth.

Continuing her focus on Sharon, she said,

I just wish she could have stayed longer. She was growing so rapidly it was just a shame that student teaching is so short.

Asked to judge her own goal convergence, Estelle was specific about each of the two objectives she set for herself.

I think we definitely established an open, non-threatening relationship. I don't think she felt threatened at all. She did improve her instructional techniques. Her time limits improved considerably and she was able to narrow down her lesson plans.

When asked in what direction she wanted to continue growing, she replied,

I still feel that I forget to listen, sometimes. . . . You have to keep remembering what your priorities are constantly.

Another area of desired growth was mentioned.

I would still like to grow in dealing with parents. Especially the parents that I deal with now. . . . You have to explain things very thoroughly.
Working with Sharon, too, sometimes I would assume she knew what I was talking about and really she didn't. I found that taking things slowly and one step at a time was much more productive.

Followup interview reflections touched on Estelle's suppositions about what might have happened, had she and Sharon had longer to work together.

I could have helped her further realize how important her relationship with the children was. . . . She just started to get into that when student teaching was over. I felt that was a shame because . . . that was the most important thing and we had just gotten to it at the end.

**Researcher's Reflections**

While Estelle's original interview showed theme strength in Performance Orientation, there was no interview evidence present at that time upon which I could base a prediction about her view of success as a supervisor in relation to Sharon's growth as a teacher, as an additional facet of Performance Orientation. There was, however, an apparent playing out of such a belief. Estelle's logged comments are profuse with references to Sharon's skills, attitudes, and growth. It would appear that her concept of herself as a helping supervisor is both a reflection and a function in great part of Sharon's success, achievement, and growth. A few of the many examples follow.

She realized herself that the lesson covered too much material for one day.

I feel good that she is so receptive to improving.
She shared ideas she had seen in the other classrooms and had many of her own.

Other lesson plans besides social studies have also improved as she is applying more realistic expectations in those areas also.

She also is making great strides in becoming more independent of me and doing more planning on her own with her own ideas.

The fourth open-ended log question asks, What is going on that you feel good about? Estelle almost invariably responded with a comment about Sharon's progress rather than about her own. For example,

I feel good that she was able to see so quickly how to change her lesson plan to achieve better results with the students.

She feels so free to ask for my help when she feels a need for it.

I feel [Sharon's] independence growing.

She's doing better at admitting to herself that she likes what she sees.

The abundant and on-target evidence about this additional facet of Estelle's Performance Orientation theme, considered with all previous evidence for the same theme, makes her strength in this area quite solid.

Estelle's Teacher Advocate Interview brought out a point about relationships which was not a part of the case study analysis per se. She saw a teacher's relationship with her students as crucial, and in her view, the one quality indicative of better teachers. At the same time, while she saw a supervisor's relationship with a teacher as
desirable, it did not carry the same import in her value system as the parallel teacher-student relationship. At the followup interview I checked my reading of these two meanings with her and she agreed they were accurate. I asked her, What do you think now about this [supervisor-teacher] relationship? She replied,

I think it's very important . . . I don't know if I would put it on an equal level as that between teacher and child because we don't work with one another every day. But I still think it's a very, very important thing . . . [T]he degree to which the two of you are able to accomplish things together is very much affected by the kind of relationship that you have, from the teacher's point of view. If she feels she can trust you and that you're helpful, I think you can accomplish a whole lot more than if they feel threatened.

Whether or not Estelle's conceptualizing about the two parallel relationships has shifted at all, is a moot point. As her developer, I would watch this area as a possible growing edge, and be ready to affirm or move forward in it.

Estelle's perceptions of her own changes, either in behaviors or in values, during the course of the quarter include the following:

(1) Growth in helpful listening

(2) Changed understanding of the nature of supervision itself as a profession.

(3) Learning to sit back and wait for clues to Sharon's perceived problem areas.

In addition, (4) Clear evidence, not predicted, that Estelle judges her success as a supervisor by Sharon's
The strength of Estelle's Listening theme is apparent throughout. Not only did she identify this as the area of most perceived personal growth, but it cropped up as the most helpful to her in working with her own students. Listening was also the area in which she wanted most to continue growing.

The changed understanding of supervision is a value shift which is difficult to place with complete assurance, into a theme. At first glance, one might assume this belongs in the Mission theme. However, in Estelle's case, there is no compelling reason to call it Mission. Rather, a look at her Discriminator theme raises the possibility that this altered belief may belong there. In her original interview, Estelle said,

I liked it much more when I found out . . . [supervision] was . . . as helping a profession as being a teacher is.

This fits better conceptually with Estelle's Discriminator theme than with her Mission theme. Her value system, the essence of the Discriminator theme, is strong, well-articulated, and humanistic. Estelle has Discriminator theme strength. My best judgment is that her altered view of supervision as a profession fits coherently into that part of her belief system.

Estelle's self-perceived growth in learning to sit back and wait for clues to Sharon's felt problems is also
not completely clearcut on the surface, when one tries to locate it in a theme. We have seen that Estelle easily helps teachers work in their own interest areas when setting objectives. We have also seen that as a listener, she makes it possible for the other individual to continue to own his or her problems and to work through them. Estelle elaborated at my request in her followup interview on the meaning of her "sit back and watch" statement quoted previously. It meant to her that she was waiting for Sharon to feel a need.

I wanted her to see it as a problem and I didn't feel that she did right away . . . that it was not working.

She enlarged further on additional meanings for the same "sit back and watch" reference.

Instead of me launching into what I felt were the good things she did and the things she needed to improve, I turned it around and put the burden basically on her. What did you like about the lesson? What did you feel from your point of view you'd like to work on . . .? And that worked a whole lot better. I think she improved a lot more quickly, too, because she had the responsibility of evaluating rather than me.

I changed my role from one of what I felt was evaluating . . . to one of being the person maybe that was the catalyst to get her to evaluate herself.

[She often resisted]. Many times she did not know even where to begin at first. So I would have to ask more direct questions like, How do you think So-and-so was responding?

This description by Estelle of how she worked with Sharon on Sharon's terms tags onto a thread that derives from very similar facets of several themes: Ambiguity Tolerance,
Catalyzer, and Performance Orientation. My best judgment is that it fits best with Estelle's Performance Orientation theme. It is not unlike her working with Sharon to set goals in Sharon's areas of interest. Working with teachers on their terms implies a working and psychological proximity. Estelle's bridge to this proximity with a teacher is her Listening strength. She "waits and watches" rather than reaching out, but her Listening is so strong that it draws the teacher to her, thus bringing about the proximity necessary to learn what another's terms are.

As previously discussed, another facet of Sharon's Performance Orientation was played out by her looking for results of successful supervision in Sharon's growth.

**Summary**

Eight helping predictions were made for Estelle D. from three themes: four from Listening, three from Performance Orientation, and one from Work Orientation. All eight themes were supported by data available, two of them weakly supported and six of them within the boundaries drawn. One of the weakly supported predictions was a strong prediction, as was one of the group of six supported within their boundaries. See Figure 4.

Estelle's three reported value shifts lie in Listening, Discriminator (probably) and Ambiguity Tolerance (probably). The first two add to strength themes.
The third may illustrate the spilling over a strength (Listening) into growth in another theme. An unpredicted helping strength was clearly Performance Orientation-related.

Synthesis of Supervisory Style

The part that certain specific theme strengths play in Estelle's supervisory style is quite evident. One such strength is listening. She knows she listens well; she has cultivated these skills deliberately in working with kids; and she articulates clearly how it works for the persons she listens to. An important event in Estelle's growth during this supervisory experience was her realization that Sharon might profit from listening just as much as students do. Estelle herself wishes to be an even better listener. This is a dynamic, growing theme, one to facilitate and possibly one to watch for spillover into other areas.

Estelle has a strong sense of the "long haul" in supervision. By this I mean, she does not stop short with, nor is not unduly preoccupied with process, but keeps her focus fixed ahead on visible results. This is evidenced by her personal goal-setting and her helping her student teacher do the same. Strength in this theme is strikingly demonstrated by her continuous attention to how students react or learn. She does not let her efforts become lost or diffused somewhere between herself and the student.
teacher. Rather, she looks both for teacher growth and ultimately for student growth. Estelle's Performance Orientation theme strength is a steadying direction and focus for her supervision.

In spite of some personal restlessness associated with classroom teaching, Estelle is generous with her time, both that spent with Sharon, and time devoted to her own work. A lot of the extra time Estelle spends is listening time. Her own efforts are directed toward thorough preparation for the day ahead, as well as thoughtful consideration of how she can best facilitate certain individual students that particular day. Estelle's Work Orientation clearly supports her listening. It also supports her strong sense of accountability for student growth.

Estelle has strength in her Discriminator theme, although predictions were not made in this area. This theme is solely attitudes and values. For related behaviors, one must look to other theme. Her very strong focus on desirable outcomes for students is paralleled in Performance Orientation. Other facets of her belief system center on teachers' relationships with students, especially, and other human relationships in general. That these are not valued equally, as has been mentioned before, is mirrored in other parts of her profile.

There is a certain "matter-of-factness" about Estelle's style, with listening being her most effective
bridge to the person of her supervisees. Her values allow her to give generously of herself; like a boat with a good rudder, she has a good fix on what should be happening with students, through the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prediction not Supported</th>
<th>Prediction weakly Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Supported Within Boundaries</th>
<th>Prediction Strongly Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction C</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction D</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction E</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction F</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction G*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction H*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strong prediction

Figure 4. Summary of extent to which predictions for Case Study Two were supported.
Case Study Three

At the beginning of the study, Wesley J., in his early forties, was starting his second school year as a music supervisor in an urban school district. He brought 18 years of successful classroom teaching to his new position. He took the job with the understanding that, as he was able to do so, he would work on his supervisory certification as required by the State Department of Education.

The demands of Wesley's supervisory position were heavy. He was supervising music personnel in all junior and senior high school buildings, some 45 in number. He managed a complex budget, warehoused and dispensed quantities of equipment and materials, and attended school programs all over the city, to name but a few of his other responsibilities. It was a concession to the seminar that he was able to focus on as few as three teachers for his field experience, because ordinarily he would not be able to see any given teacher more than once in a ten-week period.

Andy D. was a first-year teacher in his twenties, assigned to a junior high school. Beth L., in her early thirties, was beginning her second year in one of the senior high schools, although her training had prepared her for teaching elementary music. She had been an elementary music teacher until she was staff-reduced and she was assigned to a high school. Carolyn E. was an experienced
music teacher, having taught 8 years at the junior high school level. Wesley logged his visits with all three teachers, although he was able to see Andy oftener than the others.

Seven themes supplied eight predictions for Wesley, two predictions coming from Human Resource Development. The Catalyzer prediction is a strong one.

Helping Predictions

Human Resource Development Prediction A. There will be evidence that Wesley will relate his success as a supervisor to teachers experiencing success themselves.

Human Resource Development Prediction B. Wesley will work for teachers' success.

Relator Prediction C. Wesley will understand and be sensitive to teachers' feelings in stress situations.

Catalyzer Prediction D. There will be strong evidence that Wesley will have specific ideas which will facilitate growth.

Group Enhancer Prediction E. Wesley will let individual teachers know they are accepted and appreciated.

Discriminator Prediction F. There will be evidence of Wesley's having a strong value system.

Performance Orientation Prediction G. Wesley will identify professional goals for himself.
Work Orientation Prediction H. Wesley will actively seek out experiences which will help him be a better supervisor.

Supporting Evidence

Human Resource Development Prediction A. Wesley will relate his success as a supervisor to teachers' successes. Evidence for this prediction appeared in his logs. Regarding Andy, he wrote,

I am pleased that Andy is interested in building and continuing a successful program. He is conscientious and is obviously trying hard.

It's not the fact that my particular suggestions are being tried but that Andy is seeking to improve his work. I am please Andy (a first year teacher) is working out so well. He is super talented.

About Carolyn, he noted,

I think she truly desire to be a top notch teacher. I'm pleased with her work even though we are in disagreement regarding some of her methods.

[Her students] had [learned] their parts really well, so that was good.

There were numerous other instances of Wesley's mentioning the good qualities of all three teachers. For the purpose of identifying data which specifically support Human Resource Development Prediction A, only those excerpts were used which combined mention of a teacher's perceived good points with Wesley's expressed satisfaction about it. Prediction A appears to be supported by these data.
Human Resource Development Prediction B. Wesley
will work for teachers' success. Data from all three of
his teachers support this prediction. About Beth, he noted
some specific experiences he would like her to have.

I want her to continue on. I want her to take
advantage of some workshops to know what good
choral sound is. And good literature.

I stressed that I expect to see her attempting some
of the things which we mutually agreed upon.

I'm still looking for improved teaching techniques
which I feel will occur.

Wesley likewise expressed his confidence to Carolyn that
she could and would do well. He told her,

You're able to take them beyond the parts stage and
the normal junior high stage and do a little bit
more with them, [while] some . . . are still fighting
to get the kids independent enough to hold
parts . . . I think [your students] . . . could go
beyond what they're doing and polish [their musician-
ship] . . . since [you've] . . . done so well.

About Andy's prospects he logged several observations.

I feel that I am really supporting and encouraging
him [in developing the kind of program that he
wants].

I know that he will develop into an outstanding
teacher--because he cares.

He is really going to be a fine teacher.

Wesley's logged comment about an observation and dis-
cussion with Andy, summed up his expectations beautifully.

This is, of course, the very type of situation that I
want with all my teachers--the development of a
successful teacher plus an excellent rapport with
them.
These data provide sufficient support for Human Resource Development Prediction B, that Wesley will work for his teachers' success.

Relator Prediction C. Wesley will understand and be sensitive to teachers' feelings in stress situations. This prediction has carefully drawn boundaries. Data were looked for which reflect Wesley's recognition and awareness of the feelings of teachers with whom he worked. I also looked for data which would suggest Wesley's responses to these inner states--modifying his behavior and/or allowing for the stressed state of the teacher in his expectations. Not included in the prediction was his dealing directly and specifically with a teacher's feelings. There are numerous references which seem to apply to Prediction C.

After interaction with Carolyn, he wrote,

Carolyn seemed almost threatened when we met last fall. . . I handled this first meeting very carefully, trying not to come on strong with my personal opinions, but just reinforcing my position with facts with which she agreed.

I didn't intimidate her at the beginning . . . right away she was defensive. . . I said, "Well, we have many ways of doing things . . . How are you doing it?" . . . I didn't say it was wrong . . . even though it wouldn't be my approach.

At the meeting I tried to talk to her about other things.

Wesley's sensitivity to the feeling states of others is clearly illustrated by his interactions and observations about Beth. Wesley's response pattern is to recognize,
to understand, and to deal with feelings indirectly by diverting or compensating, and by being considerate.

She appeared nervous to the extent that she had a colleague also sit in on the discussion. . . . I was direct but friendly and informal which I feel helped her very much.

As I entered the room I could see she was having a bad day. . . . Having also gone through these projects as a teacher, I was able to completely understand . . . I told her that I would return on a more normal day.

Because of her emotional condition I was able to calm Beth down by asking and talking about the project. She showed me the merchandise. As a result, I ordered some of the items. I think she was very appreciative.

My order was mixed up and I received only part of . . . [it]. Naturally, I had to phone her when I discovered the mistake. She was most embarrassed, seemed relieved when I told her not to worry about it '(I even went to school to pick it up).

While there were no logged interactions with Andy which might be applied to Relator Prediction C, Wesley commented in the debriefing interview about his commitment to treating others with consideration.

[Treating] people [appropriately can be delicate]. Because you can ruin . . . a whole relationship for good with a teacher like that where they just become totally negative and unwilling to cooperate.

I don't expect to walk in and expect everything's going to be just marvelous because that isn't the way it always is. . . . It may be a bad day.

That's one thing I can really do, is understand with them when there's problems. Because there are problems. Lots of problems. Lots of little outbursts in class. I mean, I had the same thing. I know and I like to think that they'll feel kind of comfortable with that.
I don't like walking in on a teacher the last period of the day or on Monday morning. Usually the heat's just been turned on and they're freezing in the wintertime and sometimes they're not maybe as organized as they would be. I would just add to their misery.

I often call upon my own teaching experience to not only console but encourage my teachers.

Evidence that Wesley is able to understand and be sensitive to the high feeling states of others is ample. Relator Prediction C seems to be well supported within its stated limits.

**Catalyzer Prediction D.** Wesley will have specific ideas which will facilitate teacher growth. This is a strong prediction and requires strong evidence in order to be supported. There were numerous references, written and spoken, to ways in which Wesley assisted teachers. We must infer what some of these might have been. Examples of these follows.

I promised to help as much as possible and left him with some solutions and suggestions.

He told me that he has tried many of my suggestions and materials.

I feel that she is willing to talk to me about problems and include other opinions and suggestions in her thought processes.

[I want] to be involved with all the teachers [to give] help and assistance, and some of them just to support them.

Wesley instituted a regular newsletter for his teachers soon after taking his new position. It serves to keep the
teachers informed about programs and concerts, and is a good medium for public recognition of individual and school musical achievements. He also had plans to use the newsletter as a vehicle for passing along helpful suggestions from current music journals, which he did do twice in the months following the seminar. He keeps a file of newsletter ideas and plans also to invite teachers to be guest contributors. There were various specific areas with which Wesley had experience and freely offered his expertise to his teachers.

[I helped Andy with] how to seat 60 people, where they would best work. . . . Physical things to do with the room. . . . Suggestions on music.

So we talked a lot about performance techniques in order to develop a little more mature sound, or how to go about rehearsing a group.

She asked me to take her class, work with her boys. . . . There are some things that I can show them which she [as a woman] can't demonstrate and that's what she wanted.

I returned with teacher material (song ideas for 7th grade general music) and a record player.

I gave her many tips on rehearsal techniques, literature, and basic choral information which she seemed to want.

This observation provided me with an opportunity to discuss the ways in which seating could be arranged to hinder talking and promote a more workable atmosphere.

I have promised to help [in improving rehearsal and performance in her school].

To help him with his struggle at the piano I offered to play so that he would be free to conduct.
He's becoming a little bit more discriminating in his listening [for balanced sound] and I think this is important as a music teacher.

We worked on some vowels, some pronunciations and some ways to do it, and a little bit on breathing.

Clearly, catalyzer Prediction D, a strong prediction, appears to be well supported by these data, within the boundaries originally drawn.

**Group Enhancer Prediction E.** Wesley will let individual teachers know they are accepted and appreciated. The foundation upon which evidence of this nature is built lies in the fact that Wesley makes such an organized and concerted effort to see each of his teachers individually. He makes appointments, spends a generous time on site, holds discussions after each observation, and follows up with further visits or materials. He certainly creates the context and the opportunities for demonstrating his acceptance and appreciation of each teacher as an individual. Specific data follow.

It was not until another visitation (which I initiated also) that Carolyn began to warm up. I feel that my interest in her teaching program has been a definite chance to help her.

I tried to be as complimentary as possible; as a matter of fact, it was not difficult because she has a lot going for her--very talented, good looking, good rapport with children.

He seemed to need encouragement at this particular time. I was glad I had stopped by.

[I talked] with him regarding many of the things I had seen (especially the positive qualities which, by the way, were in abundance).
I was able to compliment him on some fine teaching.

I tried to build her confidence by discussing her good qualities (excellent discipline).

She's got a pretty good program going, really. She's very competent and I've told her this.

They had their parts really good so that was good. That gave me a chance, that's what I pointed out to her.

One of our very strong teachers said, "Some of us that know we're doing a good job, we know we're having success, we don't necessarily need any tremendous assistance from you. But . . . it's just nice to have you here to know what we are doing."

There were a number of instances in the data available, of Wesley's making written logged references and oral comments about qualities which he appreciated about a given teacher. Because including these as data to support Prediction E would require inferences about his actually telling teachers of his recognition of these characteristics, they are not cited. Group Enhancer Prediction E, Wesley will let individual teachers know they are accepted and appreciated, is well supported by the data which were specific as they stood.

**Discriminator Prediction F.** There will be evidence of Wesley's having a strong value system, including valuing the worth and dignity of students. This was a conceptual prediction (as were several others). If one submits low-inference data only, the supporting data are few. For example, he commented in the debriefing interview that
he felt it was important

[to] deal . . . with them as human beings, and not
[be] some sort of a dictatorial type of individual.
Also, regarding the supervisor questionnaire he decided
gainst handing out,

I didn't want them to think [that they were subjects].
If one should include high-inference data, there are many.
Every act of consideration for a teacher, and there were
many instances, might qualify. For example,

Certainly I would never go in and talk about the
wrong things that they're doing that they've
been taught. If they are wrong we just have to
approach it from a way that suggests they were
taught wrong.

There is certainly a likelihood that the above excerpt is
a reflection of a value system which includes human digni-
ty and worth. However, the inferences would be higher than
appropriate for supporting predictions. Therefore, it seems
wise to consider Discriminator Prediction F weakly suppor-
ted, recognizing that this may be another instance where
there were simply few occasions calling for explication of
values.

Performance Orientation Prediction G. Wesley will
identify professional goals for himself. Early in the quar-
ter, Wesley had drawn up two objectives to which he contin-
ued to relate his logged interactions with Andy, Beth, and
Carolyn. The two objectives were (1) To help each of my
teachers (particularly the new ones) to initiate, develop
and continue a successful music program in their particular assignment; and (2) To establish a rapport with each of my staff which promotes confidence, understanding, and mutual respect. Although there had been some focus in the seminar on objectives-setting, and on the advantages of fairly short-term objectives, Wesley had a personal preference and purpose for his quite general ones. My own decision immediately was to honor his judgment in specifying long-term goals.

I purposely made them that way [on-going] because I'm in the job and I feel like I have to have a goal that keeps going on and on. Because I don't think one ever reaches a point where they can stop . . . and say, "I'm there and nothing can ever be improved."

Completing the objectives picture, Wesley also had fairly specific intermediate goals in mind which were expressed verbally but were not written down. For example,

I have the goal before Christmas to see everybody and I'm just about there. I try to spend at least two to three periods a day [seeing individual teachers].

Within the boundaries of the prediction as drawn from interview evidence, that Wesley will identify professional goals for himself, Performance Orientation Prediction G has adequate support.

Work Orientation Prediction H. Wesley will actively seek out experiences which will help him be a better supervisor. This prediction was somewhat harder to support
with data on hand. One log excerpt refers to a technique introduced in the seminar which Wesley adapted to his use.

I was able to use some of the questions on the listening interview (especially those relating to goals) which I think helped her to actually take stock of her own teaching and [see] in what direction she is heading.

In his debriefing interview, Wesley elaborated upon his recognized disposition to seek out growthful experiences for himself.

I try to keep track of things that I hear and things I think would always be good ideas. And I try to use [them].

I try to go to as many things as I can.

I'm going to do more of that, now that I'm in this job, more for others than just myself because before I was in just my own world, teaching ... While now, I've got to pick up things that are going to work for elementary, junior high and senior high.

I still like to keep up on things ... and that's one reason why I like to judge, because then I get to hear numbers throughout the state. Good things. And then I'm aware of those.

There was a paucity of cues within this study to trigger generation of data applicable to Work Orientation Prediction H, Wesley's actively seeking out experiences which will help him be a better supervisor. Even so, there seem to be sufficient data to warrant supporting Work Orientation Prediction H.

Wesley's Reflections

Asked in December how his views of supervision might have changed in the two-and-one-half months just
past, Wesley saw his views more as confirmed than altered.

It hasn't changed . . . it's been something that I've done normally along for the past year.

I don't feel that much different because I felt this way all along.

It has made me very conscious of a positive [approach] but I've always tried to be that way with teachers . . . . It just further shows me the importance of . . . dealing with [teachers] as human beings.

His view of supervision after two school years on the job, was expressed at the followup interview.

Each day brings something new . . . desegregation . . . middle school curriculum . . . closing 14 schools . . . financial problems . . . unfilled positions . . . I've learned to hang loose.

Many administrative aspects of his job he just "fell heir to," doing them out of necessity. But,

Naturally, I'd like to spend as much time with teachers as possible.

Referring to some supervision positions which have a major focus on curriculum, his comments again reflect his wish to do a good job and to keep current.

[With a job being totally curriculum] I think you lose contact with the students and the teachers. And you forget very quickly if you don't get out, just how workable or how non-workable [a curriculum] might be. So it is really important to stay in there.

The seminar itself may have been less useful to Wesley than to some others because, as he put it,

What actually has happened to me [on the job] and what I see [do not concur with] what you say ought to be. Or it isn't that way for me.
One facet of the Planned Field Experience which may have had a little utility to Wesley at the time was the process of keeping a regular log on his three teachers.

Because they were pinpointed [it] made us more aware.

I think I thought more about the particular cases I was going to do. I thought a little bit more about how I was going to handle [them], maybe thinking who I wanted to use as examples. Caused me to be a little bit more aware of the personality.

Since I focused in on three . . . it makes one aware that if they did this with everybody, it probably would be very valuable.

Although he highlighted his work with just three teachers, he expressed hope that he'd been able to be equally helpful to ten others in an equal amount of time. The time necessary to log interactions prompted Wesley to add, too, that its value might be dependent upon time available to log everyone being supervised. He suggested,

In a smaller school system if you were able to do it more often, it would be really, really good.

Wesley's goal statements were, as previously discussed, of a general nature so that closure after ten weeks would not be a reasonable expectation. However, he kept close track via the logs, of what he was about. Excerpts from four logs, selected from a three-month span, illustrate this.

This is a basis for the development of both objectives.

Since my objectives include improved teaching and improved programs I feel that discussions such as these are beneficial.
This interaction, again, relates beautifully to my objectives.

At this point I feel that part of my objectives have come into reality.

At the debriefing interview, he confirmed the degree of his goal convergence.

With these [three teachers] I've come closer to my two [objectives].

Looking ahead to his future as a supervisor, Wesley expressed a desire to grow
the way I'm doing. I would just like to continue that.

His stated goal for the future, posed two ways, is
to earn the respect and have everybody feeling very positive towards you.

and,

I want to feel that every teacher trusts me from the standpoint of not considering me a threat in any way or feeling really uncomfortable.

This translated in a pragmatic way to,

I think if I could get to the classroom more frequently there would be a lot of people I wouldn't make as nervous.

Summing up his attitudes about supervision after more than a year on the job, and looking back on the seminar experience, Wesley was candid.

My feeling toward supervision is still that teaching is more fun! I've been at it now going on a year and a half and I still enjoy teaching. I'm not all that certain that it's always as rewarding as teaching. . . . It's a more individual type of thing where you're really by yourself. You're on your own more than as a teacher. You've just got to learn to live with that.
Researcher's Reflections

While the seminar itself may not have contributed significantly to a sense of growth on Wesley's part, Wesley's participation and contributions in the seminar were viewed very positively by the other seminar participants. His experiences and his position afforded them a window onto supervision that they could look through for a glimpse of "reality." Wesley brought to class for discussion a number of supervisory dilemmas extracted from his day-to-day work, which class members especially enjoyed discussing. It is quite possible that supervision as Wesley experienced and shared it so generously, was very close to what supervision was "really" like for the class.

Wesley and I looked at supervision through two different perceptual screens. My own, vis-a-vis supervision, has been outlined elsewhere. Wesley's was the product in turn, of not only his experiences as a teacher being supervised in certain ways for 18 years, and two years in a job which demanded "administrative" supervision primarily, but also supervising teachers who themselves were accustomed to supervision carried out in particular ways.

The seminar and related experiences did not cue any cognitive dissonances, nor provide basis for any reported value shifts. In some areas, the seminar and some of its assumptions were viewed by Wesley as quite congruent with the way he typically worked with teachers. The importance
of non-threatening relationships, a "positive" personal approach, and recognition of teachers' own ideas are examples of areas of perceived congruence. On the other hand, there were other areas which were seen as incongruent, which could not be assimilated into Wesley's value system or cognitive structure. Two illustrations are the disproportionate focus in the seminar by the instructor on teacher growth and "consultative" supervision, and also use of a frame of reference which centers in the teacher rather than in the supervisor. The last interchange in the December debriefing interview illuminates this somewhat. I asked, "Occasionally in seminar I thought we were at different viewpoints. Did you not?" Wesley responded,

Well, maybe, but not really. I didn't think it was different. . . . It [just] isn't that way for me.

I replied,

I didn't want us to leave . . . feeling that we were at odds, because I really appreciate the way you operate with teachers. It's just clear, even from ten pieces of paper that they warm up to you, they read you wanting to help, [and] you are very directly helpful.

Wesley rejoined,

As much as my time will allow, I'm happy to do it. When they call, I'm happy to do what I can do. I feel like that's the whole key to it. . . . I would feel awful if [I were criticized for not being involved in the field].

Summary

Eight predictions were made for Wesley from seven different Teacher Advocate themes: Human Resource
Development, Relator, Catalyzer, Group Enhancer, Discrimina- 

tor, Performance Orientation, and Work Orientation. The 

Catalyzer prediction was a strong one. It and six others 

were well supported within the boundaries of their original 

statements. Only one was weakly supported. See Figure 5. 

There were no reported value shifts in Wesley's per- 

ceptions.

Synthesis of Supervisory Style

Wesley's work as a supervisor is characterized by 

several observable qualities. He is remarkably uncomplain- 

ing about his work load, job expectations and ambiguities, 

or even that he still likes teaching better compared to 

supervising. He feels a sense of accountability to do the 

best he can under not-perfect circumstances. A large part 

of that is considerable personal effort in getting around 

to his 45 schools to make contact with teachers, when it 

would certainly be easier at times to stay in the office. 

Possibly some of his keeping in touch with the field is 

part of his Work Orientation theme, because he does contin- 

ue to seek out professional experiences which continue to 

enhance his own growth and effectiveness as a music edu-


cator.

Wesley displays an unselfish quality in his real 

appreciation and enjoyment of teachers' accomplishments. 

He has no ego need to take away from their successes; in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prediction not Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Weakly Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Supported Within Boundaries</th>
<th>Prediction Strongly Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalyzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction D*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Enhancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strong prediction

Figure 5. Summary of extent to which predictions for Case Study Three were supported.
fact, he feels successful when they do well. Considerateness and awareness of teachers' feelings are a natural part of his style. He is constantly sensitive to their feeling states when visiting and modifies his actions accordingly, knowing the importance of doing so, to continued, productive interactions with the teacher.

Wesley's personal storehouse of information, techniques, and suggestions is an integral part of his supervisory style. Because of music classes being conducted without textbooks, there are fewer such resources for a teacher to fall back upon, and they have come to expect that Wesley will both have and offer ideas for their classroom use. He is both generous with these and genuine in his wish to be responsive to his teachers.

Case Study Four

Steve K. is a junior high school teacher in an urban system. He had assumed the chairman's responsibilities for his academic department in the building at the beginning of the school year. His seeking certification in supervision was part of a larger plan for upgrading his professional credentials as he was also working on his administration certification at the University. Increasing employability in an erratic local job market, as well as professional growth, were Steve's reasons for pursuing the supervisory avenue.
Steve, in his early thirties and holder of an earned doctorate, supervised a first-year teacher for his field experience. The young man, Bill D., began the school year in Steve's department, teaching on permanent substitute status. In the course of one of their casual conversations at the start of the school year, Steve explained his need for someone to supervise for a course requirement and asked Bill if he would be willing. Bill readily agreed and the supervisory alliance began.

Nine predictions were made from three themes for Steve, four Relator, two Group Enhancer, and three Performance Orientation predictions.

**Helping Potential Predictions**

Relator Prediction A. It will be important to Steve that teachers be relaxed, not feel threatened in their relationships with him, and like him.

Relator Prediction B. Steve will build relationships confidently and purposefully.

Relator Prediction C. Steve will involve himself personally with teachers.

Relator Prediction D. Steve will initiate relationships with teachers.

Group Enhancer Prediction E. Positive public support will be shown by Steve for individual teachers.

Group Enhancer Prediction F. Steve will recognize
teachers personally, individually, and generously.

Performance Orientation Prediction G. Steve will set goals for himself which will enhance his effectiveness as a developer.

Performance Orientation Prediction H. Steve will regard his success as a supervisor to be linked with, and reflected in, teachers' improved teaching.

Performance Orientation Prediction I. There will be evidence of Steve's belief that teachers should be held accountable ultimately for students' growing.

Supporting Evidence

Relator Prediction A. It will be important that teachers be relaxed, not feel threatened, and like him. This seemed to be well-addressed in the weekly logs. Early in his relationship with Bill, Steve was monitoring the interpersonal climate outside the classroom. They were meeting to talk over lesson plans before Steve ever joined Bill in the classroom. Steve noted in his first log, He does not appear to feel threatened.

The first classroom visit produced some anxiety in Bill, however.

I had intended to merely observe, to deflate the threat of my presence, to make no subsequent comment.

Steve sensed the situation called for more than that and quickly altered his plans from quiet observation to giving
some reassuring feedback. He wrote in his log following this event,

I can't be too helpful until Bill is rather relaxed when I'm there.

Steve regularly logged his observations of and reactions to the developing relationship.

I enjoy the openness; I think Bill sees this as a learning opportunity for both of us.

He made . . . eye contact with me, which he had previously avoided.

I was spontaneously invited to enter his class. . . . This kind of invitation makes me feel good.

I'm glad he was able to be so open.

He must be rather comfortable with me to admit such an (on the surface) damaging situation. I like that.

We are really sharing.

I like the openness between us. He is no longer gun-shy of sketching an idea he has not yet fully developed. . . . I take this as a sign he is not at all intimidated by my help.

I like the give-and-take of our almost daily after school meetings.

From abundant evidence which pervades Steve's logged notes from beginning to end, it would appear that Prediction A, the importance to Steve of teachers liking him, being relaxed, and not feeling threatened with him, is well supported.

Relator Prediction B. Steve will be confident and purposeful in relationship-building. Early in the quarter he wrote,
This [praising] was to help establish that [relaxed] climate.

The following week he observed,

But I don't feel I'm getting to know him very well yet, and hope to move more into that this week.

By mid-October Steve wrote,

What we need to do now is become less "business oriented" and develop a deeper personal relationship.

The data available are not abundant and they relate more to Steve's purposefulness" than to his "confidence." Furthermore, they appear to be values and intents rather than played out behaviors. For these reasons, my judgment about Prediction B, Steve will build relationships confidently and purposefully, is that it is weakly supported by these particular data.

Relator Prediction C. Steve will be personally involved with Bill. This appears supported by numerous clues in the data. Five successive logs chronicle regular one-to-one interactions.

Our usual private meeting was joined by another teacher.

We are communicating nearly incessantly now--joint class planning, etc.

We are spending almost 30 min. a day now in discussing various aspects of teaching.

An hour's chat after school, 1/2 in private, 1/2 with a mutual friend teacher.
We talked after school for quite awhile about some ideas he has for future lessons, reviewing the hazards and benefits of his plans.

Relator Prediction C, Steve's personal involvement with teachers, seems well supported by the data available.

**Relator Prediction D.** Steve will initiate relationships. This is a little harder to support. For instance, although the first entry in his first log suggests a chance meeting, and a notation five weeks later in the log has much the same ring, Steve explained at the followup interview that their first meetings were indeed preplanned. Classroom observations seem to have been arranged in advance by formal agreement, usually early in the day of a projected visit.

By appointment, I was in the classroom to observe Bill in action today.

I talked with him in the hall outside his class and he explained what he planned to do that day in class.

By appointment, I observed Bill in his classroom. By mid-October, the formal arrangements seemed to have ceased, being replaced with more personal, more spontaneous interactions. Furthermore, Bill now seemed to be the one initiating discussions.

Bill was anxious to have me see his lesson.

At his specific invitation, I had observed his class today.

We met briefly after school at his request.
He invited me to join him in a team teaching situation so that he could "rub elbows" with my style.

He certainly is open now about asking for aid. This disposition on Bill's part to seek Steve out, Steve also recalled at the debriefing interview.

He knows where I am when I'm not on duty and he comes to me. And I seldom leave where I am. I have a little cubbyhole up on the second floor and he comes to me, to talk, to suggest, to do this or that.

I set it up with him initiating it. Almost always. Because that way I'm sure he's receptive ... he has the time. ... He knows where I am.

Steve clarified this further in his followup interview.

I stopped asking because I wanted him to turn it around. I wanted him to call me in ... when he wanted to show off something good.

Bill's inclination to seek Steve out appears to be the payoff of the comfortable relationship that Steve valued and helped build earlier. Asked five months later to reflect on that good relationship, Steve attributed it to [being] pretty open with each other, we were both floating free. I think neither of us felt under any great pressure to make it work and therefore it did.

Relator Prediction D, initiating relationships with teachers, is in my judgment, weakly supported by these data and their clarifications.

**Group Enhancer Prediction E.** Steve will show positive public support for individual teachers. This seemed to be played out in Steve's relationship with Bill. Bill's
initial employment as a teacher in this school was based on permanent substitute teaching status. So, in addition to the commonly felt pressures of first-year teaching, Bill was working under the uncertainty of his contract being continued. It was entirely possible, and he knew it, that his substituting contract could be terminated at any point before he had completed the 45 continuous days required for issuance of a limited contract which would go to the end of the school year. The possibility of missing school because of illness added to this risk. In addition, there was some home-related stress which increased Bill's anxiety. These were some of the conditions through which Steve supported Bill those first tense weeks of the school year.

What he needed at this point was somebody to pat him on the head. His lesson, he felt, was a disaster (it was not). He was ill but unable to stay home for fear of losing his job.

Steve rose to the occasion.

It gave me a chance to be supportive.

I called him at home at 9:00 a.m. He was absent which meant he was truly ill. I called because I noticed an envelope in his mailbox and thought I recognized it as a contract. After I asked his permission, I opened it and was able to tell him it was, in fact, his contract. . . . I thought this would help--it sure did.

While he does not like . . . [being unprepared], his reasons justify his lack of preparedness, and I made that point.

I . . . am supplying him with more materials to use in his classroom.
I go out of my way to say stuff about people that I have learned to respect. . . . I remember back in the beginning, discussing Dave with the vice principal and saying that I thought he would be strong in time, that all he needed was some more experience. So yes, I have [told them]. Deliberately.

Prediction E, Steve's showing positive public support for teachers, seems adequately supported by the data.

Group Enhancer Prediction F. Steve will recognize teachers personally, individually, and generously. This seems supported by log and interview data. Many times in the logged notes, Steve made generous references to qualities he saw and admired in Bill. Some of these follow.

I find his willingness to seek suggestions from me and all his colleagues refreshing, unusual, and praiseworthy.

He has followed up on a couple of my previous suggestions.

Just a little occasional suggestion plus his growing time-on-the-job is really shaping him.

I also admire the way he consults just about anyone who can help him.

He did some things with them I wouldn't have attempted with any students. There's an incredibly boring chart in one of our textbooks dealing with temperatures in different places in the world. . . . I completely omit . . . it. And when I was in the room with him, I realized what he was actually teaching them was not the information on the chart. It was simply chart-reading skill that he was mastering. . . . I would incorporate that into my own teaching. I just hadn't seen that until he did it.

From the above it is clear that Steve found much to admire in Bill and felt very positive about him. To support the prediction, the data, I believe, should also extend to
evidence of Steve's recognizing Bill and affirming his good qualities in a personal way. Such evidence was found. After the first classroom visit, Steve wrote,

I found much to comment favorably about, and so used the opportunity to pass on some praise.

From the following debriefing interview comment we might infer that praising particular aspects of Bill's performance was usual.

[I gave him] suggestions in the midst of other positive remarks.

I asked Steve at the followup interview if he ever shared what he admired with Bill. He explained,

Oh sure. . . . I'd sit down, especially when he was looking glum and tell him something good I had just seen him do.

I remember one day he was out in the hall and some kids were talking to him. I went up to him afterwards and said, "Kids don't stop and talk to you like that unless they like you." And just went right on walking. Little things like that.

I can remember walking in specifically looking for things to say, nice things, and finding them without having to stretch too much.

I remember the first several weeks, at least, I didn't say a single negative thing except one pet\-

The data appear to be adequate support for Group Enhancer Prediction F, Steve will recognize teachers personally, individually, and generously.

Performance Orientation Prediction G. Steve will set goals for himself to enhance his effectiveness as a
developer. By the mid-October date when I shared Steve's profile with him, he had already identified and put into writing two objectives for himself, relating to his work with Bill. Together we narrowed them slightly; Steve had measurements already in mind for his first objective—helping Bill develop his self-confidence. He selected some indicators for the second objective—helping Bill polish some specific instructional skills. At this time we agreed that achievement of the goals was reasonable and likely by the end of November. Steve's personal orientation to an objectives approach is illustrated by his response to a question at the debriefing interview about meeting his objectives.

Oh, I think we met them. . . . we set them up in such a way that they [were] . . . demonstrably successful. There is great room for improvement which also can be measured, which is why I think they were so beautiful. . . . I think they were . . . effective.

Within the boundaries drawn, Performance Orientation Prediction G, personal goal-setting, seems supported by the data.

Performance Orientation Prediction H. Steve will link his success as a supervisor to teachers' improved teaching, seems to have been addressed nearly every time he responded to the open-ended log question, Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives? Examples of his looking at end results for evidence of his own success,
follow.

Bill sees most of the obstacles inherent in his plans. As he realizes that he has seen them and taken them into account, his self-confidence is increasing. He is so intent on doing a good job that I think his self-confidence will be a function of his experience.

He was . . . teaching material I had judged would be boring for his class--it was not.

As he masters the art of planning and yet retains flexibility within his target area, he is becoming more competent.

He has gained much self-confidence and is working on classroom competence.

Steve valued Bill's improvement in several explicit areas, and linked them to suggestions Steve had made. These included noise control, freer teacher movement in the classroom, and use of specific information on students' reading abilities vis-a-vis the printed materials. More intangibly, Bill learned to risk a lesson failing. Steve also recognized and appreciated growth in Bill which may have occurred outside Steve's direct influence, such as the temperature chart incident recounted earlier.

As Steve's clear and expressed focus on teacher outcomes seems well supported by the data, Performance Orientation Prediction H. appears to be a viable one.

Performance Orientation Prediction I. There will be evidence of Steve's belief that teachers should be held accountable ultimately for students' growing. References
applicable to this prediction are less numerous and somewhat
general, the following being the only ones mentioning stu-
dent outcomes specifically.

He was . . . teaching material I had judged would
be boring for his class--it was not.

[Bill's ideas] are good and his class is responding
well.

His kids were not prepared and did not do well.

Students can . . . hear him, where before they
could not.

He wanted [the students] to read a particular ar-
ticle and I recognized that the vocabulary was far
beyond them. I would not know that simply because
he doesn't have that much experience dealing with
these particular kids.

These data focusing on teachers' accountability to
their students seem only sufficient and specific enough to
warrant the judgment that Performance Orientation Predic-
tion I is weakly supported.

Steve's Reflections

At the end of the quarter, Steve looked back and
commented upon his original attitudes about supervision.

I walked in with the expectation that I was to
criticize. And I mean that in a helping manner, but
nonetheless, criticism. I was there to pick out
what they weren't doing correctly and to suggest
corrections.

Comments made during the debriefing interview reveal some
apparent value shifts.

It can be fun. I hadn't realized how much I was
going to learn.
Now I realize this is . . . much broader than [criticism]. It's also to know their strengths . . . and building from [them].

My view of how my supervisor does his job is not compatible with what I've learned here. My supervisor, while a very fine man . . . does not have anything to do with supervising me as a . . . person . . . . Were I the supervisor, I would be in the classroom as much as possible.

I didn't realize I was going to learn by seeing things . . . I don't want to do, and seeing things . . . that I want to do . . . I think [I'll always grow]. If you become a teacher, by your students you'll be taught.

Steve also owned a changed understanding about responses to persons with problems. Previously he would have said something like, "Well, things will get better." He now calls this kind of response "erroneous prophecy" and believes that it is wasting my breath and . . . treating his feelings as something less than genuine.

This freeing-binding response construct apparently held some promise for Steve. He expanded further,

I hadn't thought about that before, but I have since last week's class. It isn't what I think about it that counts. It is what he thinks about it. If he thinks it's green, and it's really red, it doesn't make a whole lot of difference what the correct color is. He's got to operate out of his parameter.

Asked to compare his Positive Portrait to the way he saw himself working with Bill, he observed,

I think the profile says things about me that I don't keep consciously in front of my mind. I may be doing these things but I don't think I'm all that conscious . . . that this is what I'm doing.
He saw no incompatibility between his working with Bill and his Positive Portrait.

It's just, like anything else, not foremost in my mind as I'm in the real life situation.

As he mused further, the possibility of a contradiction between portrait and actions opened up to Steve.

I should think there would be [inconsistencies] simply because human beings are inconsistent.

Looking forward, Steve turned his focus to an admired teacher in his building, wondering how he might use who he is to build a relationship with her so that

I can come in her room and not only am I not a threat but I'm not a disruptive force.

Researcher's Reflections

There is some evidence in Steve's original interview that he valued a supervisor's being sensitive to and dealing with a teacher's feelings. There was no interview evidence at that time, however, to suggest just how Steve might behave empathetically, and no prediction was made for this study.

In practice, Steve seemed often to note in his log when Bill was "down" or "nervous" or "comfortable." It was not unusual for Steve to invite Bill to talk over a problem with him. Steve's "griev[ing] with him over it" seems to be a playing out of the empathy he values in his belief system, one which was not predicted. Further, his own
reflections on working from a teacher's "own parameter" rather than making "erroneous prophecies" suggest the possibility that lived out empathy may be a growing edge in Steve's development as a helper.

In Steve's first log, he noted a dilemma in working with Bill.

I am trying not to have so much to say that I can't hear him. So far, that's hard, because he asks such good questions that my tendency to smother him with useful responses is aroused.

This is an interesting awareness on Steve's part. In a helping framework, it relates to letting others continue to own their own problems while being supported in trying to resolve the difficulties themselves; it relates to a supervisor's willingly shelving his or her own ideas in favor of helping the teacher implement his or her own; it also relates to a supervisor's helping a teacher set goals and objectives based on the teacher's interests. In short, I believe we are talking about several of the faces of teacher autonomy.

In line with Steve's personal inclination to set goals for himself, he values goal-setting for teachers as well, and would help them accomplish this. This intention was logged early in the quarter.

Next I'll try to turn the topic to short range goal setting.

Upon Bill's return to school after being ill,

He asked if I would help him set some objectives (as we had mentioned briefly earlier).
Steve elaborated on Bill's goal-setting as he clarified some points in the followup interview.

We procrastinated for quite awhile but finally we did. The ones that he set were very long-range and very difficult to measure and I made him turn them back down. I said, "Let's go back to something smaller that we can measure success towards." I remember picking about three.

The extent to which Steve felt it appropriate to support teacher ideas and direction, as opposed to his wish to bring his own perspective and expertise to bear, was touched upon at our feedback conference. I centered in upon what I thought was a growing edge--Steve's moving toward letting Bill select the instructional area Bill wanted to work on. Steve's judgment at that time, early in October, was that Bill wouldn't be able to do that yet.

The next time this whole notion of teacher autonomy surfaced for discussion or reflection was in the debriefing interview at the end of the quarter. At this time, Steve's reflections on this issue suggested some "cognitive dissonance."

I was steering him in some ways without him realizing that we were using my ideas to get to his conclusions.

Both sides of the issue came out in two statements.

I was manipulating his mind--to some extent--and to some extent just generally letting him go where he wanted to go.

[I was] . . . coaching him . . . without being excessively blatant about it. And at the same time, listening to what he wanted to do and working with that.
The same basic idea of teacher autonomy came in for further discussion about giving whole or partial lesson ideas to Bill. Steve recognized the value of Bill's owning the plan himself.

I don't want to give him more than the skeleton because I want to see him develop it.

I'll give him a main idea of how I might handle it . . . [Sometimes Bill says he can't handle it that way].

And after Bill had worked with the plan,

But it's becoming his. It isn't mine.

Steve did not seem to press his lesson plan preferences on Bill. Once he reported telling Bill,

Fine. Go teach what you want.

At the same time, Steve continued to recognize and wrestle with his personal pull both ways.

I am . . . letting him do his alternative lesson, but I'm sure the recurring impression is, My way is probably better.

I would venture that if I had to look for a place for myself to be inconsistent, I would probably say I would like Bill to do his own thing but yet I imagine that however subtly, I am molding him in my own image and likeness.

If I had to pick anywhere where I would think that might be a problem, or anywhere I would think something I do would be inappropriate, I would pick that area. Simply because I would have the tendency to say, My experience and my long years of service and all that kind of hogwash, therefore I am better. But I really don't believe that.

A review of Steve's reported value shifts suggests four which occurred over the course of the study.
(1) From viewing supervision as centered on criticism, to seeing it as a helping process, building upon teacher strengths.

(2) From neutral affect about supervision to positive affect.

(3) From office-bound supervision to classroom- and teacher-focused supervision.

(4) From "erroneous prophecy" responses to teacher problems or distress to freeing responses which accept the teacher's definition of the situation.

The first two value shifts, which speak to attitudes and understandings about supervision, may relate to the Mission theme. The third and fourth shifts appear to belong to the Relator theme. Steve's original Teacher Advocate Interview suggested strengths in his Mission theme. Predictions were not made for the study from this theme because the boundaries of the study needed to be kept manageable, and Mission theme predictions would tend to be conceptual in nature rather than behavioral, and might not lend themselves as well to being discerned when played out. When one recalls that another of Steve's themes with strength was his Relator theme, it is apparent that his value shifts seem to have occurred in two of his strength themes.
Summary

Nine helping predictions were made for Steve K. from three themes, four predictions from his Relator theme, two predictions from his Group Enhancer theme, and three predictions from his Performance Orientation theme.

All nine predictions appeared to be supported by the data available, although the evidence was, in my judgment, weak for three of the predictions. See Figure 6.

If the four expressed value shifts could be placed with reasonable assurance into a theme, they would likely be aligned with the Mission and Relator themes, two of Steve's themes which demonstrate strength.

Synthesis of Supervisory Style

Steve builds relationships with teachers deliberately. He knows what he is about in doing so; he reaches out and makes the first moves; and his personal involvement with teachers is likely to be quite personal. Steve not only has relating strength now, but shows evidence of growing still further in relationship-building as well. The previously-discussed empathetic behavior with Bill is an example of a facet that, as it develops, will further round out Steve's already-functioning Relator theme. The view of supervision presented throughout the seminar as a more helping process than it is often seen, was readily incorporated into Steve's value structure. His inclination
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prediction not Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Weakly Supported</th>
<th>Prediction Supported Within Boundaries</th>
<th>Prediction Strongly Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction B</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction C</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Enhancer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Summary of extent to which predictions for Case Study Four were supported.
toward relating to teachers personally makes this way of supervising a reasonable one to him.

Steve has a good view of both what he holds himself accountable for, and what he sees as teachers' ultimate responsibility. He's a goal-setter, himself, and is likely to draw up goals that are related to teachers' teaching better. In turn, he holds teachers responsible for students' learning and making sense of it.

A term for Steve comes to mind which in one respect characterizes his Group Enhancer theme, and that is "generous." He looks for aspects of teachers' teaching, or other behaviors, which he can honestly affirm. He may go out of his way to recognize a teacher's accomplishments, sharing the recognition directly with the individual teacher. Furthermore, he is not only very supportive in material ways, but is generous with public support of a teacher as well. His focus on teacher growth (also reflected in part of his Human Resource Development theme) underlies his generous, personal support of teachers. This in turn strengthens his relationships he is building.

There are growth dynamics at work with Steve. When he resolves for himself his personal dilemma about how he will best balance using his ideas, with teachers' using theirs, then movement may be noticed in other areas of his supervisory style.
Case Studies as Persons

During the ten weeks of the seminar, the four participants who were to become case studies were not singled out from the other six other than as the unique individuals that all ten were. In fact, the final decision about exactly whose data to analyze was not made until after the course had ended.

At that point, transcriptions were typed of both the original taped interview and the debriefing interview for each of the four, to enable more exacting analyses to be made. Handwritten logs were transferred to typed form as well, to facilitate the repetitive reading and coding necessary in the analysis.

During this transcribing process, continuing with each analysis, culminating with phone calls and a final meeting for a followup interview, the individual persons behind the case studies continued to emerge in their human complexities and singularities, like a colored photo developing before the eyes. If at course's end I felt fairly well acquainted with them as persons and as supervisors, my perceptions were sharpened by the processes of analysis and by further personal association beyond the class. Yet it should be emphasized here that this is incomplete understanding. No human being is a completely open book, or needs to be. Some pages are not for the stranger to read. Other pages remain unopened even to oneself. But of those
pages of the personal book I was privileged to read, the settings were credible, the characters multi-dimensional, the story lines creative--and the reading intriguing.

Five to six months after our association through the course, I met again with each case study supervisor to clarify minor points, check for accuracy, and to have each one read his or her own case study. Their individual reactions add to the credibility of the analyses.

After reading his own case study, Ed C. said,

That's an accurate reconstruction, very much so. It's revealing to read. Just seeing it in these words and in this context makes it coherent. . . . This accurately reconstructs what happened. I know, because I lived it.

Estelle D. commented briefly,

It's fine with me. . . . Yes, it does [feel authentic].

Wesley J.'s reaction was,

It's been long enough . . . that I was more or less reviewing what I had done. I would say that you certainly had a lot of work.

Steve K. elaborated,

That strikes me as entirely valid. It reflects accurately all the information you had to pull from. I find myself recognizing things in there that I said long ago that I realize I must have said because I agree with them now. And I'm sure you could show me on the original paper that I said it. There is nothing in there that I don't agree with. . . . I accept all of it as something that I did say and you have molded it into a logical and coherent picture. And that's pretty good when you're dealing with things as irrational as human beings. . . . When you read those [snippets] you say to yourself, they're incoherent. But now when you're quoting myself to myself, that's
fascinating.

I invited each person as he or she read, to make any corrections, large or small, considered necessary for accuracy. Aside from two transposed words in Steve's copy, no other corrections were suggested by anyone.

At one time I asked Wesley and Steve their personal reactions to being a case study. Wesley responded,

No, [I don't have any reactions], not really. Because I didn't feel that way about it. It was also a class that is a requirement for certification. So while you learned something from it, I also did. It was fine as far as I was concerned.

Steve's reaction came out of similar personal experience.

Oh, I'm all in favor of it. When I was doing my research, I used to just dance when people said, when I asked, Can I publish this? and people said, Sure.

Ed, Estelle, Wesley, and Steve are real persons. The "data" used to construct their individual case studies passed through their individual perceptual screens, and through my own, many times. Data may have been colored by fatigue, wondering where I stood on an issue, wishing to be helpful, striving to tell it like it is, boredom with repetitive questions, or countless other meanings attached to the events. Certainly, methodological skepticism is warranted concerning data which is necessarily gathered by such "contaminated" processes as interviewing, and reporting in written form. McCall (1969) responds to both critics and users of participant observation (of which interviewing is one mode) by identifying and explicating the
major contaminants of such data. He points out that many of the contaminating effects may be located in either or both the researcher-interviewer and the interviewee.

McCall cautions that each interviewee is first an observer, not only of external events but introspectively as well, and therefore is vulnerable to failings in that role. Having observed, he is a reporter, and again vulnerable along several dimensions. It is clearly appropriate to look at McCall's limitations on interview data (1969, pp. 133-135). He names six major ones. Each will be discussed as a possible contaminant of the data for this study, particularly for the case studies.

Knowledgeability

A researcher should look at the personal "credentials" of each interviewee as an observer: his or her likelihood of having valid, direct, and firsthand knowledge; his or her alertness, objectivity, reliability, and sensitivity; his or her ability to be introspective. All four supervisors were intelligent, very well educated, responsibly functioning professionals. The areas in which they were reporting were part of their own experiences and their own "turf" about which they have the best knowledge. It would appear that knowledgeability would not loom as a major contaminant to these data.
Reportorial Ability

The interviewee needs not only to be knowledgeable, but to have the ability to report what he knows. One needs to consider the reliability and specificity of the interviewee's memory, his or her capacities for self-expression, recounting details, and making explanations. Can he or she withstand probing questions? Again, persons such as the four case study subjects, are in professional positions requiring articulateness and verbal facility. In my judgment all were self-confident individuals. With one possible circumstantial exception, their reportorial abilities are judged excellent. Let me explain the exception. Interview tapes were transcribed as needed when a given case study was to be analyzed. Early in May, five months after Estelle's debriefing interview, I discovered that the tape from her December interview was completely and inexplicably blank--ninety minutes of silence. Her interview schedule was readily located and she agreed to repeat the debriefing interview, responding "as if" it were the week the course ended. The resulting taped interview was rich with data and the analysis proceeded "as if" hers were an immediate reaction to the course. At the followup interview several weeks later she could think of no changes she would make in her reconstructed interview responses. Neither interviewer nor interviewee will ever be
completely certain how much data were lost or how much they varied from what was recalled five months later. The conditions under which Estelle reported were not as favorable as those for the other three for one segment of data, a fact to be kept in mind.

Reactive Effects of the Interview Situation

The researcher's comments, expressions, reactions, and status may affect interview responses. One looks for combativeness, tendencies to sound out or convert the researcher, and hesitancy, as well as attentiveness to the researcher's reactions or consciousness of her status. As an experienced interviewer, I am accustomed to minimizing these kinds of reactive effects by listening well and non-judgmentally, and otherwise creating a comfortable context. It is my experience that interviewees very soon, within three to five questions, forget the tape recorder and just talk. They frequently comment that the time goes quickly. I have no reason to think my "status" was ever an issue, having been called by my first name from the start. I believe relationships were quite comfortable. My judgment is that reactive effects of the interview situation were minimal for three of the four. Steve has a streak of "irreverence" which crops out occasionally. He stated once that he was going to distort his logs to foul up my research results. I didn't take him seriously then, nor do I now,
never having detected the first instance of such. The statement, however, is reported.

**Ulterior Motives**

An interviewee's motives for slanting responses in certain ways need to be examined. Would he or she have reason for making things less prosaic, exposing someone, rationalizing a distasteful fact, or sidetracking the researcher? An underlying motive for all persons who are responding to interviews such as the Teacher Advocate Interview, and keeping written logs about one's activities, is presenting oneself in a favorable light, even to oneself. Maintenance of self is a basic motivation. Our needs for self-esteem never cease. This is one contaminant we can be sure operates to some degree in all of us. But there are at least three factors in this study which possibly help balance some of this natural tendency: (1) The open-ended nature of the interview itself tends to promote free verbal expression. The freer the expression, the less one tends to be on guard; (2) Interview responses which remain at the conceptual level are distinguishable by trained perceivers from those which suggest behavior, i.e., those who give lip-service tend to talk differently from those who behave on those values; (3) The need to "put up a front" may be lessened by the focus on supervisor strengths. Supervisors were using and reporting on
the best parts of themselves, lessening the need to white-wash. The human need to present oneself well is acknowledged. There is no reason to believe these four persons were any more disposed to this tendency than anyone else, however. In fact, there are several factors suggesting there might be less contamination by it than otherwise.

Bars to Spontaneity

The social contexts of interviews should be examined for reasons which might constrain the interviewee, such as embarrassing others, or exhibiting anxiety about others overhearing. Deleterious effects from his limitation should be low. All interviews and conferences except one were in private offices; logs were strictly confidential; information seemed to be freely given.

Idiosyncratic Factors

These are transient features of the interviewee's life history which induce uncharacteristic moods or states. Moods such as depression, elation, anger, animation, or obsession should be noted, as well as drinking or fatigue. Perhaps the key word is "uncharacteristic." No factors were observed relating to any of the four supervisors to suggest that they were experiencing emotional or physical states any different from those experienced by them in a normal day.
McCall cautions that data can suffer from "distortions of omission" (1969, p. 135), as well as from the six sins of commission outlined above. Three of the limitations in particular suggest likely kinds of null items: reactive effects, bars to spontaneity, and idiosyncratic factors. Contamination by these particular limitations might be indicated by reluctance to discuss a topic at a deep level, skirting a topic altogether, or "choking up" emotionally. None of these indicators was evident to me, with any of the four.

Judgments about the possible effects of these contaminants is subjective. Conclusions about the interviews and log reports, major data sources for this study, are that the most likely limitation for all four is ulterior motives, although there are possibly certain mitigating factors working. Reactive effects might have been greater for one subject than for the other three. In another instance, reportorial ability may have been taxed because of time lapse.

It is important to remember that there are likely other, unnamed contaminants; that judgments about the data using these guidelines are useful more for data collection quality control than for "post hoc data quality evaluation" (McCall, 1969, p. 140). Certainly the soundness of data upon which conclusions are based is less assured.
Case Studies Discussion

The case study analysis process appears to have justified at least three of the assumptions which were understood at the outset of the study. One assumption was that a supervisor's helping potential is identifiable. The Teacher Advocate Interview served as a tool to identify helping potential for each supervisor. These configurations were the bases for Positive Portraits and also for specific helping predictions for each case study. There was a very high degree of acknowledgment by each supervisor that his or her configuration was congruent with the helping ways in which he or she saw him- or herself functioning, both at the beginning of the quarter and at the end after having worked with a teacher and reflected many times upon the experience. The Teacher Advocate Interview used by a trained perceiver appears to be one useful tool for identifying a supervisor's helping potential.

A second assumption was that a supervisor's helping potential can be mobilized by means of planned experiences which constitute facilitating conditions. From data of several kinds about the course itself presented in Chapter IV, the understanding is that facilitating conditions seem to have been fairly generally experienced. Evidence from case studies suggests that the supervisors were often using the best of themselves as they functioned. The process of finding facets throughout the
ten-week helping experience helps support the assumption that supervisors' helping potential could be mobilized by planned experiences.

A third assumption, that a supervisor's helping potential so mobilized can be studied may be self-evident. Certainly, there are diverse ways in which studies of supervisors' helping potential might be carried out. The design of this study represents one scheme in which the nature of the phenomenon and the purposes of the study might come together. It appears that this study in tandem with this course provided one kind of opportunity which enabled research on the helping potential of a small number of supervisors to be carried out. In the instance of this study, then, the prior assumption that supervisors' helping potential can be identified, mobilized and studied seem to be supported.

With case studies to illuminate four supervisors' use of their helping potential, certain patterns or regularities suggest themselves. One needs to keep in mind that the patterns or regularities discerned are partly a function of the researcher's perceptions, and that their identification at this point is just that—a pattern or a regularity. Propositions stemming from these perceptions, as well as implications and recommendations for further research will be presented in Chapter VI.
(1) Although helping facets co-exist with "blind spots" or incomplete facets of a theme the effects of a supervisor's helping are discernible in the helping experience. None of these supervisors' configurations of helping potential includes even one theme complete with all the facets possible as defined by the interview. Yet each case study carries multiple illustrations of the positive effects of the supervisor's using the helping potential he or she does have. To what extent this is a function of the facilitating conditions within which the supervisors worked and reported cannot be sorted out from these data. In like manner, the following pattern may also be a function of facilitating conditions operating.

(2) There appears to be an "ease" with which supervisors activate their helping potential given facilitating conditions. Each case study supervisor had qualities which seemed to surface readily. The supervisor's work was often characterized by these qualities. Specific instances from the four cases which illustrate this pattern are Ed's task orientation and sense of accountability, Estelle's listening and student focus, Wesley's profusion of techniques and ideas, and Steve's affirming positive qualities of a teacher. Each supervisor seems to be able to call upon these qualities easily from his or her repertoire.

(3) Helping potential seems to be characterized by stability, hence predictability, over ten weeks when
activated and studied in a context of facilitating conditions. In four case studies a total of 34 helping predictions were stated from response evidence in the original Teacher Advocate Interview. Of the 34 predictions, 26 or 76 percent were either strongly supported or supported within boundaries drawn. If all three degrees of support are grouped together, 33 of the 34 predictions, or 97 percent, are judged supported. Predictiveness in this study is demonstrated by data available that a helping facet is manifest as a supervisor works. If an attitude, value, or intent, for example, is stated its being predicted does not imply it will be lived out but only that it will be apparent as an attitude, value or intent. If a behavior is stated, however, its predictiveness rests with evidence of its being lived out by the supervisor.

Several points need to be kept in mind as one attempts to make sense of the apparent high degree of predictiveness found. (a) Soon into the course, participants were well aware of its strengths focus. Intent of the interview, actual feedback and profile, and class discussions and activities sharpened this understanding. (b) Many overall indicators suggest that as a group, their individual strengths were indeed activated. On the other hand, (c) log instructions, written or verbal, did not ever specify strengths. Supervisors were asked to log their interactions with their teacher for their own record and personal
focus and so I could best determine what parts of the course filtered through into practice or proved most useful in the field. In other words, it is important to keep in mind that supervisors were not expecting a strengths-specific analysis of their logs. Indeed, the exact nature and mode of analysis did not evolve until two months after the course ended. (d) Open-ended log questions did not direct attention to or invite response about specific strengths. The cue questions related only to what was occurring, the meaning to the supervisor, its relationship to objectives, and what he or she felt good about.

It seems reasonable to state that the high degree of prediction support apparent in the four case studies may be a function of, first, activation of individual strengths, and second, supervisor reports tending to reflect that activation, rather than the supervisor's trying to please the researcher or writing what was "wanted." It does appear from evidence permeating the study that the helping potential of four supervisors, identified by the Teacher Advocate Interview, demonstrates a high degree of stability, hence predictability, over a period of ten weeks.

(4) If facilitating conditions are provided, discernible changes may occur in some persons' values, attitudes, intents, or behaviors in ten weeks' time, and some knowledge may be gained about these which provide cues to
in-progress development. The developmental nature of this study has been stated in Chapter III. For example, new states of being for individuals were hoped for but not specified; autonomy of the participants was honored in helping them work toward convergence on their own objectives; participants were not "subjects" but worked in a near-partnership capacity with the researcher. When debriefing interviews had occurred and in some instances after case study data were analyzed it was apparent that as many as thirteen possible areas of change or development could be isolated for three supervisors. It would appear that ten weeks is sufficient time, given facilitating conditions, for changes to occur not only in some values, attitudes, and intents, but also in some behavior, in some persons.

(5) A supervisor's areas of apparent development can be associated with his or her capacities or areas of strength or helping facets. This is a statement for which case study evidence is just tantalizingly suggestive. To develop this point I shall briefly review for each case study supervisor, his or her possible growth areas, self-reported or observed, and relate them once more to that individual's capacities (or potential, or "working" areas already identified). Steve, for example, reported changed viewpoints from supervising-by-criticism to building upon a teacher's strong points and from neutral to positive feelings about supervision. From his explanations these
appeared to be Mission-related, a not-predicted but existing area of theme strength for Steve. His new regard for teacher-centered rather than office-bound supervision, and non-predicted playing out of empathy could plausibly relate to his already functioning Relator theme.

Estelle perceived herself growing in listening, certainly easily traceable to her clearly identifiable Listening theme strength. Her not-predicted but clear disposition to work for measurable teacher growth rounds out considerable already existing theme strength in Performance Orientation. Newly-activated waiting for the teacher to identify her own problems is similar to working on a teacher's terms, as in Performance Orientation. Her new definition of supervision sounds like Mission—in fact, for Steve it seemed to be that. But Estelle's Mission theme is restless, i.e., grade-level changes and summer job hunting hint of this, and her new perception does not fit well here. Instead, Estelle's Discriminator theme with its theme strength seems more likely to be the capacity to host her new view of supervision.

Ed reported four changes and I perceived another: better relationships with the cooperating teachers, supervision as helping, along with a more positive view of it personally, facilitating rather than confronting, and non-predicted but observed conflict management. I feel comfortable with the plausibility of suggesting that his winning
over the cooperating teachers was a function of his Work Orientation theme, as discussed in his case study. It is entirely possible that each of the other four growth areas mentioned above is also a function of Ed's Work Orientation, clearly a "working" area for Ed. These are less clearly placed, three of the four looking deceptively like Mission.

Some of the above illustrations are more clear-cut than others. Yet, thirteen possible areas of development were isolated for three supervisors. A "ground" or "host" area was located for nine of the thirteen fairly unequivocally. Four are placed with less certainty, although with higher inferences one may place these in a supervisor's helping facet also. It would appear that with varying degrees of inference, an individual's areas of apparent development or change may be able to be associated with his or her capacities.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Restatement of the Study

Supervision was placed into a helping profession context in Chapter I. Of the study’s three stated objectives, the first was to examine the varied individual experiences of supervisors who are using their helping potential to facilitate teachers’ development, in order to answer the question,

If facilitating conditions can be provided, how do supervisors mobilize their own unique helping potential in the development of teachers?

A second, enabling objective was to create a setting for, and to set into motion, some ways to help supervisors mobilize their own helping potential so such a study could be carried out, and to answer the question,

What are the processes, content, and organization, as well as problems encountered, in a seminar which provides planned experiences to help supervisors mobilize their own helping potential?

A third objective was to use findings from the first two, in order to answer the question,

What are the emergent, tentative propositions suggested by this study, which might appear to have value as leads for future research?
Literature reviewed in Chapter II illustrated the supposition that some of the current supervision literature as well as contemporary thinking about supervision rests on theory X-soft, rather than theory Y, assumptions. This study is linked with the latter. Several studies which appeared to be based on theory Y assumptions were reviewed in detail.

Guidelines for an alternative to a traditional research design, taking into account the requirements of this study, were developed in Chapter III. The resulting design, responsive to the developmental nature of the phenomenon being studied—supervisors' helping potential at work--included a natural setting as context, with the researcher as an integral part of events. Participants' as well as researcher's perspectives were used as original data which were analyzed primarily qualitatively. The context was a supervisory preparation course designed and taught once, in which ten participants had opportunities to increase their substantive knowledge about supervision as a helping profession, to experience one model of helping supervision, and to supervise a teacher themselves. The phenomenon of supervisors' helping teachers was studied in detail in its variations within four individual supervisors. Supervisors' responses to the Teacher Advocate Interview provided reference points from which each supervisor's helping potential
was derived. Other data relative to the context and/or to each supervisor's experience generated from weekly supervisory logs, weekly participant reaction cards, instructor's logs, course evaluations, debriefing interviews, and follow-up interviews.

The course-as-context was described in Chapter IV. An overarching purpose of the course was to intensify and multiply participants' experiences with helping. Five basic points were highlighted: relationship-building, identifying strengths, basing development on strengths, objectives-setting, and cultivating attitudes and behaviors which contribute to goal-convergence. A process which pervaded the course was affording frequent and regular opportunities for participants' making personal sense of these events. These same five salient features became the structure of a sort of spiral curriculum as they were addressed repeatedly in each of the three strands of the course: instructor-supervisor interactions, supervisor-teacher interactions, and shared group experiences. Participants' reactions to the course suggest it was for them an overall positive experience. The specific reported ways it was positive differed sharply among them. Also, the experience seemed to carry some degree of impact for nine of the ten participants. From the instructor-researcher's perspective, the course seemed to fulfill its primary purpose: to enable supervisors to become more aware of, and to use their own
helping potential, as well as to see results from its use, and to reflect, make sense, and integrate these experiences.

Data generating from four supervisors' experiences in helping were content-analyzed in individual case studies and presented in Chapter V. These analyses appear to support the prior assumptions that supervisors' helping potential can be identified, mobilized, and studied. Five patterns or regularities were perceived from the case study analyses: (1) The effects of a supervisor's helping are apparent even though "blind spots" co-exist with helping facets; (2) Each supervisor appears to be able to activate readily from his or her repertoire, qualities which have been called helping potential; (3) Helping potential appears to be marked by a high degree of stability, hence predictability, over ten weeks; (4) Changes in values, attitudes, intents, or behaviors may be discernible over ten weeks' time, and knowledge gained about these may provide cues to in-progress development; (5) A supervisor's areas of apparent development may be associated with his or her capacities.

Conclusions

A detailed description of the course as designed and taught one time for the study, as well as perspectives of students and instructor, provide data which relate to the first question,
What are the processes, content, and organization, as well as problems encountered, in a seminar which provides planned experiences to help supervisors mobilize their own helping potential?

The "processes, content, and organization," presented in detail in Chapter IV, overlap, complement, and are oftentimes hard to distinguish from each other. That the three were at times also indistinguishable from the study itself may be one indication of the lack of distortion and the preservation of the essential qualities of the natural setting.

"Problems encountered" compiled from participant feedback were relatively minor for seven participants. Two would have liked further substance about certain aspects of helping, and one found the course somewhat irrelevant to his needs. The overall positive tone for all ten participants suggests, however, that problems were not experienced as unduly constraining.

Instructor-owned problems were also of relatively minor import, consisting more of adjustments in some ways the course might be taught another time. Programmatic issues need not be of concern here, as the course's relationship to existing program was a one-time occurrence. The relationship of the course to the study, however, was of prime interest because it was to provide a context which might be characterized by "facilitating conditions."

Various indicators suggest that such conditions were likely
experienced by the participants. Participants' evaluations were positive and impact may be deduced for most of them. Implementation of the course appeared congruent with its conceptualizations. One might reasonably suppose that this enabling objective was accomplished. The contingency expressed in the second objective, "if facilitating conditions can be provided," seems to have been met for this study.

From the patterns and regularities suggested by the case study analyses, I have stated a set of propositions, answering the question in the third objective,

What are the emergent, tentative propositions suggested by the study which might appear to have value as leads for future research?

The following statements have been designated as propositions rather than hypotheses. An hypothesis is a presupposition or an assumption. It is a tentatively adopted theory for explaining certain facts and for guiding investigations. A proposition, on the other hand, is an expression of anything capable of being believed, doubted, or denied. It is a verbal expression which is either true or false; it is a point to be discussed. In practical terms it is a means for getting an idea on the table for examination.

Proposition one: facilitating conditions (attending upon the supervisor) have a positive and strong relationship to a supervisor's using his or her helping potential readily and easily in the development of a teacher.
Proposition two: given facilitating conditions, a supervisor's helping potential as operationally defined by the Teacher Advocate Interview, can be expected to be fairly stable over ten weeks' time, and hence predictable over that time.

Proposition three: given facilitating conditions, a supervisor can manifest change or development in ten weeks. Knowledge by another person about these changes can be gained not only by observing behavior but also by inferences from cues about a supervisor's meanings, attitudes, values, and intents.

Proposition four: given facilitating conditions, there is a positive and strong relationship between a supervisor's areas of change or development and his or her specific capacities.

Implications of these findings are limited to the extent to which these propositions might be found to stand up under vigorous testing in the future. If one can assume this for a few moments, one can begin to gain a sense of the changes that could generate for helping supervision. Some of the implications relating to the preparation of supervisors might be:

(1) We may be able to tell much more accurately than we have been doing what qualities a supervisor has that will lend themselves to helping supervision.
(2) A set of facilitating conditions which intensify and multiply a supervisor's experiences with helping may have utility beyond studying the phenomenon: development may be a feasible outcome to expect.

(3) Supervisor preparation curricula might include components which more effectively facilitate the development of individuals as supervisors, to complement the present emphasis on knowledge acquisition.

Some changes in common supervisory practice might logically be critically examined in light of findings of this study. (4) Avoiding the person of the teacher; making judgments about a teacher by classroom observation only; isolating instructional behaviors for focus for change; a supervisor's deciding what in a teacher's teaching needs to be changed or improved; a supervisor's offering "constructive criticism" or telling a teacher how or where to change; using checklists to compare supervisors.

(5) A critical values issue arises: if supervisors grow from strengths, then the biggest payoff may come from developing the best supervisors as opposed to giving equal time or "shoring up" the weakest ones.

(6) If development is a generic process the implications of the propositions may extend to teachers, students.

(7) Methodologically the study illustrates one way to study often-neglected supervisory helping process.
Recommendations

As is indicated by the exploratory nature of this study, the propositions generated and presented here should be submitted to rigorous testing. Some areas for further research may be suggested by the following questions:

(1) What other kinds and combinations of planned experiences for supervisors constitute facilitating conditions?

(2) To what extent do different helping settings activate the same or different helping behaviors in supervisors?

(3) To what extent are predictions stable, hence predictable, past ten weeks? How long?

(4) To what extent does development continue over time as a result of facilitating conditions previously experienced?

(5) To what extent, or how, does the process of reflection facilitate development?

(6) Does more supervisor development occur in instances where facets are clustered within themes?

(7) Does more supervisor development occur with supervisors who have a greater number of themes with strength?

(8) How does development occur transactionally?

(9) How do these propositions about growth and development apply to teachers? To students?

(10) What could be learned by studying development
over longer periods of time?

(11) When do developmental changes begin to register in the Teacher Advocate Interview?

(12) How does a significant other person facilitate the development of a supervisor?

(13) What is the exact nature of the proposed relationship of development with capacities?

In addition to the above questions, I would make one basic, strong recommendation: continue to study and search for supervisors who seem especially or outstandingly able to effect teacher development.

Two concluding observations may help effect closure on this study. First, in spite of all that came into focus and fell into place for me as a researcher in the area of supervisors' development, in the process of conducting this study, I continue to be awed by the exquisite complexity of the human personality. I am more than ever inclined to trust the native dispositions and wisdom of the developing individual. And second, my respect is confirmed for the remarkable capacity of one human being to be instrumental in helping another human being to expand and extend his capacities for living.
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SAMPLE TEACHER POSITIVE PORTRAIT
TEACHER ADVOCATE POSITIVE PORTRAIT
for Velma

HELPING BEHAVIORS

Velma will be helpful to teachers because she...

- Has specific ideas which would facilitate teacher growth.
- Will demonstrate positive, public support for individual teachers.
- Sets specific objectives for herself.
- Is intensely interested and involved in her work as a teacher.
- Is able to understand and respond to teachers' feelings.
- Is sensitive to teachers' feelings in stress situations and would deal directly with those feelings.
- Judges her effectiveness as a listener by the responsiveness of the speaker.
- Will directly involve herself with children in order to know what they are thinking.
- Would help teachers write objectives for themselves based on their own interests.
- Integrates successfully her personal and professional life.
- Has several ways of tapping into parents' viewpoints and opinions.
- Would make teachers' accomplishments known and appreciated publicly.
- Builds relationships purposefully.
- Has confidence in her ability to build relationships.
- Does not take sides in a problematic situation, but hears both viewpoints.
- Supports teachers with personal, individual, and generous praise.
- Would initiate relationships with teachers on a personal basis from school-year preparations on.
- Would involve herself in a personal, friendly way with teachers.
- Would tend to support the initiative of teachers and students.
- Would give specific help to a teacher who was having difficulties.

**SUCCESSES**  Velma feels successful when...
- Helping new teachers become familiarized with the curriculum.
- Problems are taken care of one at a time.
- She and other teachers share ideas.
- Having been sought out in a friendly way by a staff developer.
- Praised for an accomplishment.
- Having adapted mastery teaching to a curriculum area.

**VALUES AND BELIEFS**  Velma believes...
- Being a staff developer would allow her to work for children through teachers.
- Success as a developer of teachers is in part reflected by their growth.
- A good listener helps the speaker by listening, and doesn't problem-solve for the speaker.
- Teacher growth is facilitated when teachers help each other.
- It is important to be honest and fair with teachers.
- Teachers each have their strong points.
- She can be most helpful to teachers by being thoroughly acquainted with the curriculum at all levels.
- Empathy is a strength in a teacher developer.
- School priorities should be built upon what is good for the school and what is good for the students.
- Teacher performance can be assessed in part by the responses of the students.
- Important decisions are sometimes made deliberately after weighing both sides of a problem.
- Most teachers are dedicated and are motivated by an inner drive.
- Praise should be deserved, appropriately and generously given.
- A strong value system is important.
- Friendships, intimate relationships, good judgment, organization, and personal goal-orientation are highly valued by her.
- Teachers are accountable for individual achievement, to the extent the children can progress from where they are.
- A staff developer should take part of the responsibility for teachers' success.
- A teacher developer should be up-to-date professionally, and should be supportive of all persons involved in the program.

GOALS AND ASPIRATIONS  Velma wants to...
- Help teachers work toward their own goals for bettering themselves.
- Keep a materials file, and build a professional library, as a staff developer.
- Be supportive of teachers.
- Be positive toward teachers, and be available to them.
- Be a staff developer who gets more involved with people, with less focus on testing and curriculum.
- Develop very comfortable relationships with teachers.
Planned Field Experiences
Educational Foundations and Research

COURSE SYLLABUS

Course Background

Students who are developing their supervisory certification programs at The Ohio State University have a wide variety of course offerings from which to select. Their coursework must be "well distributed" over six areas. A student meeting other basic requirements will typically enroll in ten courses, totalling 30 hours, and be recommended to the Ohio State Department of Education for certification at the completion of his or her program. Despite the latitude possible in putting together a program, there may be few opportunities for a supervisor to address his or her own style, strengths, and capabilities as a supervisor. This particular course is designed to help fill that possible gap in a supervisor's certification program.

Basic Assumptions of the Course

The course has been designed upon three basic assumptions: (1) Supervision takes its place rightfully as one of the helping professions. (2) The supervisory relationship is of utmost importance, is essentially personal and one-to-one. (3) A teacher's effectiveness can be enhanced or limited by the quality of his or her supervision and relationship with a supervisor.

Course Description

The course has three strands. First, students will meet as a seminar group weekly (with three exceptions). Seminars will be informal, and will be used to process participants' field experiences as supervisors as they wish. In addition, several specific approaches will be presented, tried out, and explored which relate to supervision as a helping profession.

In another dimension of the course, each student will interact individually with the instructor at convenient out of class times, first by taking a Teacher Advocate Interview—a strength-seeking, relationship-building process. When the responses to the interview have been organized by the instructor, each student will receive a written Positive Portrait at an informal feedback talk
with the instructor, focusing on the student's unique helping potential. Further individual interaction with the instructor is open-ended and certainly encouraged.

In still another dimension, each student will focus upon one person with whom he or she has a supervisory relationship, with whom he or she likely will or can interact weekly. On the basis of strengths and "growing edges" brought out in each student's Positive Portrait, each student will set one or more achievable objective(s) for him- or herself in terms of his or her field experience.

These three strands, then--shared group experiences, one-to-one student-instructor interaction, and a supervisor-teacher relationship, will be occurring somewhat concurrently throughout the quarter. Each can enrich the other. The instructor intends to help provide the most facilitating conditions possible.

The Course as a Study

Because of the unique nature of the course, and the implications imbedded in it for supervisory curriculum planning, a study is being made of this approach. Several kinds of data will be helpful in order to look back at the course after it is over.

Students who consent to participate will:

(1) Use the Positive Portrait resulting from the Teacher Advocate Interview to write one or more objectives.

(2) Keep a simple log of interactions in terms of the field experience relationship.

(3) Write brief anonymous reactions to each seminar.

(4) Fill out a questionnaire about the instructor near the end of the quarter.

(5) Have his or her field experience teacher fill out the same questionnaire.

Spontaneous reactions to any phase of the course will be most welcome as well.
This course doubling as a study, as it were, may require more effort on the part of students than is usual. If so, it is expected to be offset by the following:

(1) Out of class interviews and feedback talks scheduled at student's convenience to the fullest extent possible.

(2) Seven meeting times instead of ten to help balance above item #1.

(3) Five hours' credit can be offered if desired.

(4) Unique opportunity to identify the personal qualities one has which are most facilitating to others' development.

(5) Opportunity as a professional to contribute to and help generate new knowledge.

(6) Opportunity for personal and professional growth through shared group experiences and on an individual basis.

Course Requirements

(1) Attend and participate in seminars.

(2) Generate the five kinds of information outlined in The Course as a Study. This implies that each student will have a field relationship of some nature in which he or she has supervisory kinds of responsibilities.

(3) Readings are optional. The basic list is for your information only. Relevant additions are solicited from students, too.
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HUMAN SUBJECT CONSENT FORM
RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
CONSENT TO SERVE AS A SUBJECT IN RESEARCH

BEHAVIORAL AND SURVEY RESEARCH FORM

I consent to serve as a subject in the research investigation entitled: An Exploratory Study of the Helping Potential of Teacher Supervisors

The nature and general purpose of the research procedure have been explained to me. This research is to be performed by or under the direction of Dr. Charles M. Galloway, who is authorized to use the services of others in the performance of the research.

I understand that any further inquiries I make concerning this procedure will be answered. I understand my identity will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, video-tape, photograph, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue participation at any time following the notification of the Project Director.

Signed (Subject)

Date
Time

Witness - (Auditor)

Investigator

PA-027 252
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SRI PERCEIVER ACADEMIES
TEACHER ADVOCATE THEMES
TEACHER ADVOCATE THEMES

MISSION
Mission is represented by one's personal commitment in terms of making an affirmative impact upon the lives of others, especially the lives of staff members. This teacher advocate believes staff members can grow and develop. This person is primarily concerned with a cause that can be of benefit to others.

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT
Human resource development is indicated by the teacher advocate's ability to receive satisfaction from the personal and professional growth of staff members. This person helps staff members experience success and finds fulfillment in the achievement of each person's goals.

RELATOR
The relator theme is evident when the teacher advocate desires positive personal relationships with others and has strategies to build relationships with the staff. This person expresses feelings and thoughts openly and encourages others to do likewise. This teacher advocate is committed to an extended and enduring relationship of mutual support.

CATALYZER
The catalyst is a teacher advocate who can stimulate the performance of teachers through searching out and encouraging the creative and innovative ideas of teachers. This person is open with personal ideas and builds enthusiasm about positive changes.

LISTENING
The listening theme is evident when a person spontaneously listens to others with responsiveness and acceptance. Listening is viewed as beneficial to the speaker.

AUDIENCE SENSITIVITY
An audience sensitive teacher advocate spontaneously assesses the thoughts, feelings, proposed actions, and actions from the viewpoint of patrons, faculty, and students. This person remains sensitive to this awareness and uses such insight in the decision-making process.

GROUP ENHANCER
Group enhancers hold the view that their particular staff has great potential. This person looks for the strengths in individual staff members and has a positive perspective toward them. This teacher advocate builds pride through the accomplishments of staff and plans ways to maintain a supportive group climate.

DISCRIMINATOR
The discriminator is a teacher advocate who differentiates according to a well-defined value system which focuses on the worth and dignity of human beings... especially students. This person is characterized by an ability to identify priorities.

PERFORMANCE ORIENTATION
The performance orientation theme is observed in a teacher advocate who is goal directed. This person's goals are stated in terms of specific "practical" outcomes for self and others. This person uses criteria for measurements, has definite objectives, and is interested in measurable results.

WORK ORIENTATION
A teacher advocate with work orientation is intensely involved in work and is almost continuously thinking about it. This person tends to rehearse and review activities related to work, family and special interest commitments. Such a teacher advocate has a life style which integrates these areas of priority into his/her actualization. This person possesses a great deal of stamina and ordinarily is actively involved for long days and weeks.

AMBIGUITY TOLERANCE
The teacher advocate displays a tendency to suspend judgment until as much evidence as possible is available from involved parties. A high tolerance for ambiguity is seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Much restraint is placed upon impulsive decision making.

*Perceiver Academies, Selection Research, Incorporated
P.O. Box 6439, Lincoln, Nebraska 68506
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SAMPLE SUPERVISORY LOG
SUPERVISORY LOG

Objectives:
1. ____________________________________________
   ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________

General directions:

1. Make an effort to have at least one interaction weekly with your supervisee so you may have a weekly log entry of significance to you. (Additional interactions and entries will be even more productive).

2. Please address these points as you reflect in writing on your interactions with your supervisee:

   (a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

       (For example, Initiated by whom? For what purpose? Topic of discussion? Outcome? Physical setting? etc.)

   (b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

       (For example, Were there new elements in this interaction? Frustrations? Getting somewhere? What emotional tone? What may have been left unsaid? Surprises? Anything from seminar that did or didn't apply? Does anything puzzle you? How do you feel about this particular interaction?)

   (c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

       (For example, Do you feel you are closer to meeting them? Evidence? or, What kept you from growing toward meeting them? Do your objective(s) still seem appropriate?)

   (d) What is going on that you feel good about?
(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?
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COMPLETED SUPERVISORY LCG
Log #1

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

I initiated the conversation with Wanda after a student described his apprehension about an upcoming reading quiz, which he knew he could not pass. The objective was chosen because I believe this teacher, who is trained and very skilled at teaching specific reading skills, was not taking into account other areas of deficiency in her students (other than reading deficiencies) when she planned the reading program/activities for her students.

The initial conversation was a very generalized discussion about some of the work completed by Fred.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

The teacher was very happy to discuss Fred's work. She did seem concerned about his reading problems, which are many, and related several accounts of his reading failures within the past few weeks. My personal feeling is that she was willing to discuss Fred's work, but more from a "negative" point of view—what he can't do, rather than what he had succeeded at.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

The objectives seem a long way off. Wanda is apparently unaware of some of Fred's other problems and academic deficiencies and has given him exactly the same worksheets and activities to do as the rest of the group.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

The teacher is very willing to discuss Fred with me and share stories of the problems he is obviously having in her class.

Log #2

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

I initiated the conversation with Wanda to tell her of one area of success which Fred had achieved in social studies. She was agreeably surprised and mentioned that she had not tried the activity with any of the reading students. (It was a verbal activity in which Fred described an artifact seen at a museum and the rest of the class was asked to guess what it was).

She commented that she wished his reading skills were half as good as his verbal skills.
(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

The teacher is still very willing to discuss Fred with me. She did appear to have increased her very low assessment of Fred and his academic abilities.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

The teacher was made aware of one area of Fred's achievement in another class and was willing to accept the idea that he could indeed accomplish an activity satisfactorily in at least one area (verbal).

Wanda's activities with Fred have apparently not changed, however; he is still failing at reading worksheets/quizzes in her class, and he is still discouraged.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

Wanda was apparently very pleased to hear the account of Fred's success in social studies class. I believe she is beginning to think of him as an individual rather than as a thorn in her side.

Log #3

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

Wanda stopped me in the hall to tell me about a reading activity she had done with her class, in which Fred had orally summarized a paragraph just read aloud by another class member. She was very pleased and excited about Fred's ability to capsulize the main ideas of the short story, and his ability to relate them orally. She commented that if he could grasp the main idea of a reading passage that quickly, his comprehension skills were much better than she had thought.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

Wanda, as well as Fred, felt success because of this reading activity. She was delighted to share it with me and seemed pleased when I commented on her expertise in drawing Fred out verbally. I believe we are closer as a result of this shared success.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

The objectives are still a long way off, but don't seem as insurmountable. For the first time, Wanda has seen Fred in a success situation, instead of a failure situation. She indicated her changed low opinion of Fred's comprehension skills and inferred that she was willing to change her teaching tactics to account for Fred's particular deficiencies (and proficiencies).
Part of the second objective was achieved in that the teacher did vary the reading activity somewhat to allow Fred to verbalize what had been read aloud.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

This was a giant step forward: First, because success was achieved for Fred and for Wanda; second, because she was eager to share the news with me; and third, because she has begun to see Fred in a new light.

Log #4

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

I initiated this session with Wanda, asking her to take a look at some of Fred's social studies written assignments which he had completed in class. I asked for her observations of how, if at all, his reading skills have improved over the past several weeks, or what particular skills she is working on with him at the moment, and that I could also reinforce in my class.

She reported that because of time limitations, she has few opportunities to work with Fred as far as oral reading activities and continues to use reading worksheets and similar materials, and asked if I had suggestions on ways she could increase his verbal reading time. We each agreed to think of some ways we could help each other work with Fred.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

We have begun to really empathize with each other and the problems we share with this mutual student. Wanda has come to the point where she feels comfortable about asking for help and/or ideas.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

I feel confident that we are making progress on my one primary objective: that Wanda begin to see this student as more of a "whole person" rather than a set of reading deficiencies. She has asked much more about the student, his background, attitudes and relationships with other teachers.

Though the teacher continues to give Fred and the other students the same handout sheets and assignments, I am hopeful that because of several successes with very individualized reading assignments, she will begin to plan and work toward more individualization in her reading class.
(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

Our building professional relationship wherein we are feeling free about asking and giving help.

Log #5

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

Wanda asked my assistance in helping to evaluate Fred's progress and give a 9-week grade. She discussed the daily and/or weekly grades earned by this student, mostly D's and F's on handed-in written work. She indicated personal frustration because she could not see progress, at least so far as written grades in the grade book. She said she would make a decision about his grade later.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

Wanda, still happy to discuss her work with Fred, seems to be feeling "locked in" with using her traditional grading system with this student. Hopefully she will begin to think toward alternative ways of grading.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

Yes, definitely. The teacher has reported and knows Fred can achieve, orally, though he does poorly on written assignments. She has begun to see another facet of his school performance (successful oral reading).

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

She is still relating well, even to the point of admitting frustration and uncertainty over grading this student.

Log #6

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

Wanda invited me to a conference with the school guidance counselor and herself over this student's 9-week grade (she gave him a D). The guidance counselor will call in the parent to discuss specific learning problems of this child. Wanda summarized successes and failures rather fairly, I thought. The guidance counselor will report back to her after a parent conference is held.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?
Wanda is seeing her own interaction with Fred quite objectively. She is obviously not blaming the student for being "dumb" and seems to be thinking of the ways the child has succeeded in the past.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

Wanda did remain somewhat rigid in her grading system to give the child a D. While she is still talking of other methods of assessing him, as yet this is not being done.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

She is still open to suggestions and conversations about this student.

Log #7

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.

This was a real step forward! Wanda bounded across the hall to my office, bubbling with enthusiasm, to tell me of an oral reading quiz she had given her class (we had talked of this kind of quiz the week before), and Fred had scored a legitimate A. She was very pleased and I can imagine how thrilled Fred was.

She continues to do nearly all group work (everyone doing the same thing with her class) but Fred fit in well in this activity because of his good verbalizing skills.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

This incident again reinforced Wanda's positive evaluation of Fred's skills in at least one area. Again, she was willing and indeed could hardly wait to share it with me.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

Not too much. She did change the activity to one that Fred could do satisfactorily, but not for him alone, so it was not an individualized activity.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

Wanda's continued enthusiasm about successes with Fred and her increased willingness to try different methods.

Log #8

(a) Briefly summarize or recount the particular time with your supervisee.
Wanda and I were discussing lesson plans, in general—how to plan for individual differences (my words, not hers). She admitted she didn't plan different activities for different students, but usually planned one group activity per day per reading period. (This is where Fred usually did poorly). When she asked me about lesson plans, I showed her some examples. She looked at a couple of them, noting that it didn't seem to take much extra effort to note that such and such a student was to do XX that day, while the others did XXX. She didn't say she would begin to do that kind of planning for Fred (or anyone else) but she didn't seem to be all that turned off about it, either.

(b) At your own personal meaning level what seems to be happening?

She is still open, friendly, willing to share ideas and methods. Also, she seems to be thinking about ways she could plan for individual instruction in her reading classes.

(c) Can you relate this interaction to your specific objectives?

Definitely. She is at least thinking about individualization and since she did not state that she is violently opposed to the little extra planning involved, I think she is receptive to the idea.

(d) What is going on that you feel good about?

She asked me to share my ideas and lesson plans with her; she was interested and inquiring about ways to individualize the lessons, and seemed impressed at the little extra time actually involved.
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CONTENT ANALYSIS CATEGORY
INDICATORS
Indicators for Category One: To bring one's helping potential to one's own AWARENESS

+ 
1. Names a particular helping strength he/she has.
2. Expresses belief that a particular owned strength will be helpful to teachers.
3. Intends to apply a specific talent, strength, or potential.
4. Expresses belief that his/her influence can be multiplied through teachers (to others, to students).
5. Expresses belief in a basic internal motivation of teachers to grow.
6. Expresses belief that a supervisor can make a difference.
7. Recounts a previous time or event in which he/she was helpful to a teacher.

- 
1. Mentions own deficiencies.
2. Doubts that a particular owned strength will be helpful.
   OR
   Mentions owned quality which he/she believes will inhibit teacher growth.
3. Unclear about how to proceed (therefore not using strengths).
4. Speaks of own needs met, vs. others' growth.
   OR
   Doubts he/she can extend influence to students through teachers.
5. Doubts teachers can grow.
   OR
   Believes he/she needs to structure, motivate, "keep after" teachers.
6. Doesn't see or value a supervisor's being helpful to a teacher.
7. Refers to previous time or event in which he/she was not helpful to a teacher.
Indicators for Category Two: To bring one's helping potential into USE

+  
1. Initiates interactions with teacher. Involves self in a personal way with him/her. Works with teacher individually.

2. Enjoys interactions. Likes teacher. Supervisor and/or teacher seek each other out more to interact.

3. Takes time to be a facilitative listener.


6. Sees growth and positive change in relationship with teacher: increased empathy and understanding; relaxation of roles (more person-to-person); increased openness; enjoyment of relationship.

7. Purposefully applies a particular skill, or helping talent, or potential.

8. Expresses hope or vision for teacher's growth.

9. Has ideas him/herself to implement, which facilitate teacher growth. Models growth.

10. Spontaneously seeks viewpoints and feelings of teacher, to hear both sides of a problem. Works toward no-lose solutions.

-  

2. Interactions are uncomfortable. Dislikes teacher. Interactions are fewer, perhaps avoided.

3. Doesn't listen. Dominates the interaction verbally.

4. Uncomfortable with feelings of teacher. Overlooks, denies, or doesn't acknowledge feelings.


6. Relationship static or unsatisfactory: misunderstandings, role-focus, defensiveness.

7. Stymied in applying potential, specific or general.

8. Has no confidence in teacher's growth potential.


11. Helps create ownership in teacher for ideas for growth.

12. Supports teacher and teacher's ideas. Seeks out teacher-generated ideas to support. Helps teacher develop his own solutions.

13. Plans for and works with the teacher's success in mind.

14. Works from teacher strengths.

15. Helps teacher set objectives. Helps set objectives in areas of teacher's interests or choices.

11. Imposes own ideas on teacher.

12. Does not encourage or allow teacher-generated ideas. Dominates solutions.

13. Does not expect teacher to grow, or work to help success occur.

14. Focuses on teacher weaknesses.

15. Thinks objective-setting by teacher is not important or helpful, may be too difficult. Imposes own preferences for objectives on teacher.
Indicators for Category Three: To PERCEIVE that one's helping RESULTS in development or effectiveness

+  
1. Notes specific positive qualities of teacher. Sees growth or gains in teacher.
2. Recounts ways he/she was helpful at a practical level with teacher. Notes positive results from use of new ideas, approaches, or self.
3. Praises teacher's achievements, recognizes teacher as a person.
4. Brings teacher's achievements to the attention of someone else.
5. Helps solve problems with no-lose solutions.
7. Teacher reports growth in self.
8. Teacher reports student growth.
9. Teacher mentions supervisor's general helpfulness, or specific help, skill, or approach.
10. Supervisor notes student growth or positive outcomes.

-  
1. Notes negative qualities of teacher. Sees no growth or gains in teacher.
2. Supervisor's efforts not helpful. Suggestions not made or taken. Not getting results. Ideas don't work. Personal strengths not applicable, or applied.
3. Criticizes teacher professionally and/or personally.
5. Arrives at win/lose or lose/lose solutions.
6. Doesn't enjoy teacher's successes. Is wary of authenticity of the success. Considers own performance the criterion of his or her success.
7. Teacher reports no growth in self.
8. Teacher reports no student growth.
9. Teacher mentions supervisor's unhelpfulness, or disliked or unhelpful characteristics.
10. Supervisor notes no student growth or positive outcomes.
Indicators for Category Four: REFLECTION on one's experience of helping

+ 1. Speaks of new or sharpened awareness of own helping—general or specific. Self-understanding.

2. Speaks of new or sharpened awareness of supervision as a helping profession.

3. Evaluates for him or herself the effects on self, of helping.

4. Evaluates for him- or herself the effects on teachers, of helping.

5. Evaluates for him- or herself the effects on students, of helping teachers.

6. Increased sense of growth from the helping experience: more openness, inner strength, enjoyment.

7. Expresses intentions regarding helping in the future, integrating new meanings.

8. Differentiates what elements of the helping or learning experience had meaning to him or her.

9. Speaks of accomplishment in meeting objectives, or learning something specific. Used new learnings.

- 1. Refers to habitual modes of operating which clearly do not incorporate awareness of potential, or connote no change.

2. Speaks of supervision in terms of functions, advice-giving, judging.

3. Sees no effects on self, or makes no meaning, of his or her helping experience.

4. Sees no effects on teachers or makes no meaning of his or her helping experience.

5. Sees no effects on students or makes no meaning of his or her helping experience.

6. Has no sense of personal growth from the helping experience.

7. Expresses intentions for the future which do not integrate new meanings (or there are none to integrate).

8. No meanings made. No differentiations made.
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