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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose

Four million children under six years of age are presently enrolled in early childhood programs.* This figure is expected to reach seven million by the end of the 1980s (Dearman and Plisko, 1980). While the educational philosophies, the settings, and the funding of these programs vary widely, the most important component in all of these programs is the teacher (Soar and Soar, 1972). The teacher is vital because young children, particularly before the age of six, strongly identify with adult role models (Minuchin, 1977) and because the educational program for preschoolers is mediated and implemented through adults (Soar and Soar, 1972). If the teacher is, in fact, the most important aspect of an early childhood program, it follows that the most effective way to improve the quality of preschool education is to improve the preparation of early childhood teachers.

*Programs for children from birth to six years of age.
A significant aspect of teacher preparation which allows students to develop the skills, attitudes, and values of effective teachers is the supervision of practicum teaching experiences such as student teaching. Competent supervision of teachers at both the pre- and inservice level is one way of not only facilitating the improvement of educational instruction but insuring the continuity of these improvements through the continued professional growth of teachers. Since few undergraduate teacher preparation programs include supervisory training, the way in which student teachers are supervised will probably be the way in which they in turn will supervise themselves and others.

Because there is no agency in the United States responsible for collecting data on daycare and preschool personnel practices, the nature of early childhood teacher preparation is largely unknown. It seems inconsistent that so little attention is given to the investigation of early childhood teacher preparation when the importance of the teacher in early childhood programs is so readily acknowledged.

There is, however, a body of teacher preparation research conducted in public school settings (Blumberg, Amidon and Weber, 1967; Blumberg and Cusick, 1970; and Blumberg, 1974) suggesting that the effectiveness of
supervisory encounters such as student teaching depends on the nature of the interactions among the supervisory participants rather than the acquisition of specific teaching techniques.

Although the ultimate goal of educational supervision—to improve the educational setting—is shared by supervisory participants, the methods of operationalizing supervision are not generally agreed upon. Many teachers, preservice as well as inservice, view supervision with hostility and contempt (Blumberg, 1974).

The ability to collaborate successfully with others in a supervisory endeavor depends on several factors, one of which may be thinking style or conceptual level. There is evidence in the teacher preparation literature of a relationship between an individual's conceptual level and his/her teaching and verbal behaviors (Hunt and Joyce, 1967; Murphy and Brown, 1970). Traditionally, the sole criterion for selection of classroom student teaching supervisors has been effective teaching ability with children, but Cogan (1973) and others believe that effective supervision of adults requires specialized training and skills.

Supervisory skills are most evident during supervisory conferences. Conferences are the major face-to-face
interactions between supervisory participants which sharpens the participants' understanding of their professional selves. Supervisory style during these conferences has been associated with perceptions about the supervisor's style as well as supervisee morale (Blumberg and Weber, 1968). The effectiveness of such conferences can be evaluated by supervisees in terms of productivity and the quality of the interpersonal relationships among the participants (Sirosis and Gable, 1979). Conferences are a good indication of the nature of the supervisory process as it exists for the participants.

Any investigation of supervision during early childhood student teaching must consider the nature of the process: that it does not take place in a vacuum and that it is interactive in nature and thus depends on a variety of environmental and interpersonal factors. Because of this unique nature of the process and the lack of descriptive data, the present investigation utilized both a quantitative and a qualitative approach to investigate the nature of supervision during early childhood student teaching. Quantitative research methods were used with a sample of 25 student teaching triads in order to identify some of the factors that contribute to successful supervision. The qualitative approach utilized ethnographic methods to describe the student teaching process through the eyes of one group of supervisory participants (student
teacher, cooperating teacher, intern supervisor, and university supervisor). In addition, daily journals written by student teachers who were experiencing the process at the same time were analyzed in order to enrich the ethnographic description.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation was therefore (1) to examine certain demographic variables of the participants, (2) to examine the relationships of supervisory style, conceptual level, and certain demographic variables to the perception of supervisory conferences; and (3) to describe in depth the supervisory process for one student teaching group as perceived by the participants.

Quantitative Research Questions

1. Will the cooperating teacher's
   a. educational background
   b. years of experience
   c. conceptual level
   d. teaching behavior
   be related to supervisory style?
2. Is the concurrence between student teacher and cooperating teacher conceptual scores related to their perceptions of supervisory conferences?

3. Which of the following
   a. cooperating teacher's supervisory style
   b. cooperating teacher's years of experience
   c. student teacher's conceptual level
   d. cooperating teacher's conceptual level
   e. university supervisor's conceptual level
   f. cooperating teacher's age
   g. cooperating teacher's teaching style
   are related to the cooperating teacher's and the student teacher's perceptions of supervisory conferences?

**Null Hypotheses for Quantitative Component**

The following hypotheses were posed for investigation:

**Null Hypothesis 1.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level, and social behavior.

**Null Hypothesis 2.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's years of experience and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level and social behavior.
Null Hypothesis 3. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level and social behavior.

Null Hypothesis 4. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's teaching style and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level and social behavior.

Null Hypothesis 5. There is no relationship between the concurrence of conceptual level scores between the student teacher and cooperating teacher and their perceptions of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 6. There is no relationship between supervisory style and the perception of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 7. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's years of experience and the perception of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 8. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level and the perception of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 9. There is no relationship between the student teacher's conceptual level and the perception of supervisory conferences.
Null Hypothesis 10. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's age and perception of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 11. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's teaching style and perceptions of supervisory conferences.

Null Hypothesis 12. There is no relationship between the student's grade point average and perception of supervisory conferences.

Assumptions

Several assumptions were made in designing the study:

1. The perception of supervisory outcomes for the conferences will be consistent with the perception of outcomes for the entire supervisory process.
2. The tape recording of conferences will not affect supervisory style.

Limitations

Results in this investigation may not be generalized to supervisory encounters beyond pre-service supervision since student teaching may be a unique supervisory situation. Furthermore, results may not be generalized to other student teaching populations since the sample populations may not be representative of all participants in the
student teaching process. Another limitation may be the introduction of some reactivity into the supervisory conference with the tape recording of these conferences. However, the reactivity is believed to be less than if videotaping were used and unfamiliar experimenters were present.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms have definitions specific to this study:

**Early Childhood Programs** - Programs for children birth to six years of age.

**Cooperating Teacher** - A teacher in an early childhood program who has a student teacher assigned to his/her classroom and who has the day-to-day responsibility for the student's on-site training during student teaching.

**University Supervisor** - The supervisor who represents a university or college student teaching program in early childhood education and who is responsible for the coordination of the student teacher's university program and his/her on-site student teaching program.

**Student Teacher** - A student who is enrolled in supervised student teaching in either a half-day nursery school or day-care setting. This experience may involve teaching half-day or full-day sessions.
Supervisory Style - In this investigation supervisory style was defined as the way in which student teachers and cooperating teachers verbally related to one another in conferences. It included two factors—directness and time use. A heavy concentration of certain supervisory behaviors such as giving information, criticism and suggestions characterized more direct supervisory styles while behaviors such as asking for information and listening characterized more indirect supervisory styles. Time use style was defined as the amount of conference time spent in supervisor talk vs. student talk. In addition, qualitative measures such as maintaining interpersonal relations and extended time spent on student ideas were also used to describe supervisory style.

Conceptual Level - Written responses to open-ended statements provided the basis for assigning subjects in this investigation to a conceptual level. Conceptual level was defined according to Hunt, Butler, Noy, and Rosser's (1978) Paragraph Completion Method. Four conceptual levels were identified as characterized below:

CL-0: Undifferentiated response, over-generalized exclusion of negative input, and lack of affective control.
CL-1: Categorical judgments, over-generalized and unqualified acceptance of a single rule, and recourse to external standards.


CL-3: Simultaneous consideration of alternative viewpoints, evaluation coordinated with differential response.

Teaching Style with Children - The cooperating teacher's teaching behavior with children was an assessment of observed teacher behavior along nine dimensions as defined by McDaniels (1976):

- **Warmth** - the extent to which the atmosphere of the class is relaxed and the teacher maintains positive interpersonal relationships with children.

- **Enthusiasm** - the enthusiasm expressed by the teacher and children during class activities.

- **Clarity** - the clarity of communication to the children

- **Variety** - the extent to which the teacher uses a variety of materials and activities.

- **Individualization** - the degree to which the program is individually tailored to the child.

- **Feedback** - the extent of communication to the child—adequacy, acceptability, completeness, and correctness.
Cognitive Demand - the level of intellectual activity that the teacher expects from the child. Freedom - the degree to which the teacher facilitates independence and freedom. On-Task Activity - Amount of child activity directed toward the accomplishment of instructional objectives.

Perceptions of Supervisory Conferences - Outcomes of supervisory conferences were defined along two dimensions: relationships and productivity. Relationships were based on the interpersonal climate of the supervisory conference as well as the participants' perceptions of their relationships with each other. Productivity was based on the participants' perceptions of the learning and productivity resulting from the supervisory conferences (Sirois and Gable, 1979).

Plan of Study

Twenty-five student teaching triads involved in early childhood teacher preparation programs in Ohio and New York were subjects for this investigation. The purposes of this investigation were: (1) to examine the relationship of educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching style to
the cooperating teacher's supervisory style; (2) to examine the relationship of supervisory style, conceptual level, and years of experience, age and grade point average to the perception of supervisory conferences; and (3) to describe in depth the supervisory process for one student teaching triad as perceived by the participants.

Information concerning demographic variables, such as years of experience and educational background, were obtained from a survey administered to the participants. The cooperating teacher's teaching style with children was identified through the use of the Observer Rating Scales (McDaniels, 1974) after a 30-minute observation of the teacher's classroom. The participant's conceptual level was assessed through the use of Hunt's Paragraph Completion Method (1978) which required the subjects to respond in paragraph form to sentence stems.

Midterm and final conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher were tape recorded and analyzed according to the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System (Blumberg, 1974) in order to identify the cooperating teacher's supervisory style. During the last weeks of the student teacher quarter participants completed a rating scale (Blumberg and Amidon, 1965) in order to measure perceptions of supervisory conferences.
One student teaching group was observed extensively during their ten-week student teaching period in order to solicit the viewpoints of these participants about the student teaching process.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data in order to determine which factors correlated with the cooperating teacher's supervisory style. Analysis of variance methods were employed in order to determine if matching on conceptual level would influence the cooperating teachers' and the students' perceptions of their supervisory conferences. An analysis of variance and an analysis of covariance was performed on the data in order to determine if conceptual level, supervisory style, teaching behavior, and certain demographic variables correlated with the students' and cooperating teachers' perceptions of supervisory conferences.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The literature reviewed for this study focused on the theoretical and empirical evidence for numerous factors related to the supervision of student teaching. The review is of necessity limited to a concise discussion of each factor. Because an ethnographic approach was employed for part of this investigation, the review includes a description of the ethnographic approach and relevant issues.

The literature review is summarized in four sections. The first section is concerned with a discussion of supervision in educational settings. The majority of the research discussed in this section will involve supervision in public school setting because supervision in early childhood settings has seldom been investigated. The next two sections identify variables believed to be related to effective student teaching in early childhood settings: supervisory style, conceptual level, teaching behavior, and certain demographic characteristics of the student teaching participants. The last section is devoted to a discussion
of ethnography and issues surrounding quantitative and qualitative research methods.

**Supervision in Educational Settings**

**The Changing Nature of Supervision**

The nature of the supervisory role in education has changed through the years. Prior to the 1900s supervision in public schools was controlled and executed by superintendents of schools in order to keep teachers performing at certain levels. Teachers were mainly perceived as untrained and in need of assistance. During this period administrative ability was more highly valued in supervisors than teaching ability or communication skill (Glanz, 1977). The 1950s and 60s were characterized by a growing emphasis on human relations skills and an avoidance of conflict. This trend caused a lack of direction and an inability to respond to teachers' needs. The 1970s saw a growing demand for better educational programs and accountability for teachers (Harris, 1977). The thrust of supervision for the 80s seems to be collaborative leadership rather than sole reliance on administrative skill. One hundred supervisors in educational settings interviewed by McClain (1977) unanimously expressed the view that the biggest change they noticed in their role of
supervisor was to interact more directly with people than they ever have in the past. The change has been from an authoritative style of supervision with much "snooper-vision" to a more democratic style involving consultation and communication with the supervisee.

Supervisors still feel frustrated, however, because they lack the time away from administrative duties to engage in this type of collaborative interaction. In addition, establishing a helping relationship is often difficult. Furthermore, the recent emphasis on accountability may entice supervisors to return to the evaluation emphasis of traditional supervision rather than to try a more collaborative approach (Goens, 1976).

Despite conflicts inherent in the supervisory process, teachers themselves are asking for help from supervisors for instructional problems (Nasca, 1976); however they still place low value on the administrative tasks that the supervisor might perform. Recently educational supervisors have been in a "power limbo" unsure of their status. They are neither on the line as teachers nor are they considered staff. The contemporary role of the educational supervisor has been that of an agent who functions to provide effective human interaction so that the supervisee can learn or change (Markowitz, 1976). Supervisors are now
encouraged to be aware of and sensitive to language, aware of the individuality of the supervisee, and aware of the supervisory process as a time of shared influence and dependence. They are exhorted to take a new perspective--that of the teachers with whom they work (Abrell, 1978).

Supervisors tend to view their job in a way inconsistent with a collaborative approach to supervision. Forty-eight supervisors interviewed by Blumberg (1974) mentioned that the most favorable experience for them as supervisors was the need to influence methods and attitudes of teachers. They wanted to be perceived as sources of help with the supervisee in the role of helper. Unfavorable experiences for supervisors resulted when their influence was rejected. Furthermore, communication of feelings and attitudes played only a minor role in the supervisor's perception of his/her major tasks. Thus perception and implementation of the supervisory role is not always consistent among the supervisory participants. Though supervisors have rejected the traditional threatening role, they have not completely given up the superordinate and subordinate relationship with the supervisee (Koehn, 1977). Supervisees, on the other hand, want supervisors who will give them not only suggestions and insight but will deal with the emotional aspects of the supervisory process.
A human relations approach to supervision may also result in greater job satisfaction for the supervisee. A study involving 164 clinicians in the mental health field demonstrated that subjects who had humanistic supervisors had greater job satisfaction than those who had laissez faire or authoritarian supervisors (Cherniss, 1977). Perhaps the main difference between traditional supervisory practices and more democratic styles of supervision is not just the change from hierarchical roles to collegial roles but a difference in the goals of supervision. The ultimate goal for the individual in collaborative supervision is self-supervision. Supervision is viewed as a learning process which results in the development of an introspective attitude toward one's work. The entire process is based on trust and thus the supervisee is open to the interaction with the supervisor (Scott, 1976).

The Participants' Views of the Supervisory Process

Even though almost no data have been gathered about supervision in early childhood settings, data do exist concerning supervision in public school settings. In reviewing this literature, problems with supervision became readily apparent. One of the major problems is teachers' negative reactions to supervision. Blumberg
(1976) identified two major factors that account for these negative reactions. The first factor is that supervision tends to be associated with evaluation even when its function is supportive. Secondly, he feels that the quality of supervision as it is currently being practiced leaves much to be desired.

In a study undertaken by Blumberg and Amidon (1965), 166 inservice teachers were asked their perceptions of supervisory conferences. A sizeable percentage of the supervisees reported that the time spent with their supervisors was "utterly wasteful." On the other hand in a study conducted by Blumberg, Amidon and Weber (1967), supervisors viewed the productivity of their conferences in a positive way and few felt their work was wasteful. Blumberg (1977) attributes these differences in perceptions of supervisory conferences to the interpersonal relationships among the participants.

Supervisory conferences give a good indication of the nature of the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. Blumberg and Cusick (1970) analyzed fifty tape recordings of supervisor-teacher conferences and found that supervisors gave information five times more than they asked teachers for information. In addition, supervisors tended to ignore any tension that existed in
the conferences and adopted a policy of non-engagement. Supervisors, in this study were highly direct in their supervisory style while supervisees were mainly inactive.

Blumberg (1974) has characterized supervision as a ritualized, sterile process that bears little relation to the classroom. In his investigations teacher talk about supervision is characterized by complaints about the supervisor's insecurity, his/her concern with triviality, the artificiality of the process, and the lack of involvement in the supervisory process that teachers feel. On the other hand, supervisor talk about teachers reveals a lot of their frustrations. Supervisors talk about the powerlessness they feel when it comes to the solution of problems, the inflexibility of the teachers they supervise, the lack of communication and insecurity of the teachers, and the naivete of the teachers in their attempts to solve problems. Supervisors also indicated that the issue that concerns them most is not curriculum but the area of human relations.

This distance between supervisor and supervisee is best illustrated by an imaginative study done by Blumberg (1976). He asked teachers to fantasize about the houses that their present supervisors would tend to live in and also to fantasize about the houses of their future
supervisors. The present houses differed from the future houses in terms of several dimensions. Present supervisors' houses were envisioned as closed, distant, neat structures characterized by a sense of coldness and rigidity. Future houses were comfortable, accessible, and warm. In essence, the teachers viewed their present supervisors as removed from day-to-day experiences and as rigid people who distanced themselves from others. Future or ideal supervisors were perceived as warm, approachable helpers.

Despite the differing perceptions of supervisors and teachers concerning the supervisory process, many teachers express a desire for supervision and evaluation in their schools. A survey of elementary teachers in western New York revealed that 82 percent of the teachers were in favor of supervision while 87 percent wanted to actively participate in the evaluation and supervision process themselves (Heichberger and Young, 1975). Not surprisingly, 70 percent of the teachers still viewed supervision as potentially dangerous. This survey reveals the conflicting attitudes that most teachers have regarding supervision. Teachers see a need for supervision but do not feel comfortable with it. As it presently exists the teacher supervision process is at best harmless. "Teachers are better left alone," says Cogan (1973), "than merely
Supervision in educational settings may be more important than supervision in other occupations because of the nature of the work setting. Woodward (1958) has identified three kinds of work technologies: single unit, assembly line, and continuous process types of work. Blumberg (1974) identified teaching as a single unit type of work technology. The single unit type involves a single person or small group that sees the job through from beginning to end. Because teachers have almost total control over their work, Blumberg sees supervision of this type of work as having the greatest potential for increasing productivity and improving the system.

Supervision in Early Childhood Programs

Part of the problem of supervision in early childhood programs lies with the nature of the field. Preschool programs encompass not only a wide range of educational philosophies, qualifications for personnel, and funding strategies, but they take place in a wide range of settings. The educational philosophy may vary from a behaviorist approach that emphasizes skill learning to a humanistic philosophy that emphasizes enhancement of self-concepts as the core of the curriculum. Educational qualifications
for personnel may vary from a high school diploma to a Master's degree (a requirement for lead teachers in university laboratory schools). Funding for programs varies from federal funding (e.g., Headstart Programs) to private funding (e.g., church preschools). The programs may take place in a residential setting (e.g., day-care home), on a university campus (e.g., laboratory school), or in an occupational setting (e.g., Federal Women's Day Care Project). Thus a coherent picture of early childhood programs in the United States does not exist. This confusion is reflected in the supervision of early childhood personnel. Supervision may be ongoing, sporadic, or non-existent.

Supervision for inservice, as well as preservice teachers, in early childhood programs has been primarily of two types (Spodek, 1972): supervision-inspection and supervision-curriculum. Since nursery schools and day care centers operate outside of the public school system the most formal system of supervision has been through the licensing agency—usually in conjunction with the state department of social welfare. These supervisors may play a dual role: that of regulation—making sure the program is in accordance with state laws—and that of consultation—insuring continued improvement in the program.
The curriculum type of supervision, which involves supplying resources to the teacher and monitoring classroom practices, is mainly practiced in public school or laboratory settings (Spodek, 1972). In some centers the director may perform some of these functions but since there is no descriptive data on supervision in preschool settings, it is unclear just what types of supervision are taking place. Consultants affiliated with outside agencies, such as a university, may perform some aspects of supervision, mainly supportive and resource functions, if they are using the center for student teaching purposes. Though little information is available concerning student teaching in early childhood settings, some aspects of both supervision inspection and supervision curriculum may be part of the process. A university supervisor may engage in inspection when s/he makes on-site visits to insure that both the center and the student are fulfilling the university's student teaching requirements while supervision curriculum may occur during joint curriculum planning with the cooperating teacher and the student.

Supervisory Style and Outcome

In previously cited research (Blumberg and Amidon, 1965), teachers were able to discriminate among a variety
of supervisory behaviors. Certain patterns of these behaviors indicated either a direct or indirect supervisory style. Blumberg and Amidon's (1965) investigation indicated that style and outcome are linked together. An indirect supervisory style resulted in more favorable reactions to the supervisory encounter by the supervisee while a direct style of supervision produced unfavorable reactions from supervisees.

A survey involving Western New York elementary and secondary teachers (Heichberger and Young, 1975) revealed the kind of relationship teachers desire with a supervisor. Sixty-two percent desired a helping relationship while only one percent desired an evaluator relationship with their supervisor. Seventy percent of the teachers agreed that the best way a supervisor could help improve instruction was through collaboration with the teacher.

A democratic approach to supervision which is characterized by a collegial relationship between the supervisory participants has been recommended for the past twenty years but the research suggests that the traditional style of supervision with its hierarchical system is still very much in operation. In the traditional approach supervisors are authoritative, perceived as
threatening, and in control of the supervisory process while supervisees are viewed as blank slates passively accepting the supervisor's advice and direction (Reavis, 1978). Traditional supervision fails to recognize the teachers' actual problems and supervisor concerns dominate in traditional supervisory encounters. Present research supports the hypothesis that more open, collaborative and non-defensive interactions between supervisors and teachers will result in greater teacher satisfaction within the supervisory process (Blumberg and Amidon, 1965). Unfortunately, seldom does this collaborative atmosphere exist. Blumberg and Cusick's analysis (1970) of fifty conference tapes between teachers and supervisors demonstrated that supervisors gave information five times more than teachers sought it, they told teachers what to do seven times more than they asked teachers for suggestions (an average of 2.2 minutes of asking teachers' opinions during six hours of conference talk), and supervisors spent the majority of conference time on procedural problems rather than the teachers' legitimate concerns.

Clinical supervision methods, along with systems for analyzing interactions in instructional settings, have offered insight into what behaviors comprise a collabor-
ative relationship between teachers and supervisors (Flanders, 1976). The clinical method of supervision focuses on both teaching behavior and the learner's response to it. In clinical supervision a partnership develops between the supervisor and the teacher. The teacher takes the major responsibility for supervision and is the one who initiates the analysis of his/her own teaching. Thus conferences are used to set objectives, analyze behavior, and plan strategies for the future (Cogan, 1973).

There is support for the theory that changes in behavior will occur more readily when the person himself perceives the need for change (Vukovich, 1976). Blumberg (1974) suggests that if supervisors are viewed as change agents they can become facilitators of teacher self-evaluation and thus affect instructional change. There are additional bonuses if the supervisee is involved in evaluation and the process is collaborative. Self-evaluation and a positive self-concept were related to a more indirect method of supervision in Vukovich's (1976) study of student teachers. In addition, positive self-image was related to more accurate self-evaluation.

In Blumberg and Amidon's (1965) study, teachers rated their supervisor's style as direct or indirect using an adaptation of Flander's interactional analysis instrument.
Four supervisory styles were identified: (1) high direct-high indirect (supervisor engages in a great deal of evaluating and telling behavior, and also engages in a great deal of asking and listening behaviors); (2) low direct-low indirect (little evaluation and telling; little asking and listening); (3) high direct-low indirect (a great deal of evaluating and telling; little asking and listening); and (4) low direct-high indirect (little evaluating and telling; a great deal of asking and listening). The results indicated that teachers perceived conferences as more productive when the supervisory style was high direct-high indirect.

The four supervisory groups in this study not only differed in supervisory style but also in their perceptions of supervisory productivity. Even though much of the literature is favorable towards an indirect style of supervision, characterized by listening and asking, this was not enough for supervisees in this study. Teachers also wanted feedback (evaluating and telling) about their teaching. The supervisory style that produced the most defensiveness on the part of the teachers was the high direct-low indirect (much telling and criticizing; little asking and listening) style. This style was also rated the lowest in terms of productivity and supportiveness by the teachers. Teachers viewed the
conferences with the extremely passive supervisory style as more productive than conferences with an overwhelmingly direct supervisory style. Blumberg also discovered that supervisors who characterize themselves as more indirect in their supervisory style also viewed themselves as more productive than the direct style supervisors. Teachers who characterized their supervisors as either extremely direct or extremely passive in their style had a greater discrepancy between perceived supervisory behavior and desired supervisory behavior than the other groups whose supervisors had more indirect styles.

In this study, teachers were able to discriminate among supervisory styles. In addition, certain supervisory styles received consistent types of reactions from supervisees. The interactive nature of the supervisory process seemed to determine the supervisee's perceptions of outcome.

Research in the field of supervision suggests that the teacher's progress will be most affected if there is compatibility between preferred patterns of learning and in-service training procedures for teachers. Teachers made the most improvement in a study done by Garman (1971) when their preferred teaching style was indirect and the training given them was also indirect. A comparison of the two groups in general revealed that teachers who preferred
a direct teaching style and who were given direct treatment in the training group exhibited less improvement in their teaching behaviors than the group who preferred an indirect style and were given an indirect teaching style.

Reavis (1978) has also demonstrated the positive effects of an indirect style of supervision. He compared two methods of supervision: the clinical method which utilizes indirect supervisory behaviors to move the teacher to self supervision and the traditional method which involves a great deal of inspection and prescription. Using Blumberg's 15 categories developed for analysis of supervisor/teacher conferences, Reavis found that clinical supervision reached significance on the category "accepts and uses teacher's ideas." Flanders had previously demonstrated that this behavior in teachers was significantly related to pupil achievement. Reavis hypothesized that this behavior on the part of supervisors might also influence teacher achievement in a supervisory encounter. In addition, clinical supervision rated higher than traditional supervision in the category "asks for opinions." Blumberg's research (1974) is consistent with these findings. He found that the supervisee's learning is directly related to his/her level of independence in the supervisory process.
As previously mentioned the various participants in the supervisory process may view the roles of the participants differently. How the participants view these roles may influence the outcomes of supervision. One problem with supervision is the lack of clear role concepts. Esposito et al. (1975) polled 468 Virginia supervisors and identified tasks that these supervisors felt were the major component of the supervisor's role. These tasks related to one of two categories—helping or administrative roles. Esposito suggests that problems arise when the participant's perceptions of the supervisor's role are incongruent with the supervisor's behavior. For example, if the student teacher envisions the supervisor's role as helping and the supervisor mainly performed administrative tasks, conflict is bound to arise.

Summary

The participants in educational supervision have different perceptions concerning the process. The supervisee usually has very negative reactions to the process while the supervisor views it in a more positive light. Both supervisors and teachers complain about the limitations of each other. The research suggests that there is a cold war between supervisors and teachers but supervision may be more effective in improving conditions in educational
settings rather than other settings because of its impact on the individual teacher who has almost total control over his/her work.

Research concerning supervision indicates that teachers are able to identify the style of their supervisors and that teachers prefer a helping relationship rather than an evaluator relationship with their supervisors. The literature also suggests that a more indirect style on the part of the supervisor as exemplified in clinical supervision strategies correlates with the teacher's perception of higher productivity, higher satisfaction, and better human relations during the supervisory process than teachers who are supervised in a solely direct manner. Teachers do want some direction, however, because the most successful supervisory style is not only high on indirect behaviors but high on direct behaviors as well.

The development of interactional measures has enabled researchers to analyze the interaction of participants in supervisory conferences. Present research suggests that the traditional style of supervision characterizes the majority of supervisory encounters. Perception of the supervisory participants' roles seems to affect supervisory outcomes. The history of supervision reveals that the nature of supervision is becoming more collaborative.
None of the research cited was done in early childhood settings, indicating a scarcity of data concerning supervisory style and outcome in preschool settings.

**Components of Educational Supervision**

**Student Teaching**

**The Supervisory Encounter.** Supervision in many educational settings exists outside supervised student teaching (Weller, 1971). This seems unfortunate since it is generally agreed that the purpose of student teaching is the ongoing development of the professional role (Kontianen, 1973). Self-supervision is a vital aspect of this ongoing process. The Association for Student Teaching gave this definition of student teaching in 1954:

"Student teaching is the period of guided or supervised student teaching when the student assumes increasing responsibility for the work with a given group of learners over a period of learning experiences" (Barrows, 1979, p. 1).

In summarizing the student teaching literature Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) suggest that while student teaching is a critical period for preservice teachers, it is a largely unvalidated segment of professional education. Teacher preparation research suggests that student teaching, instead of opening trainees to actualizing their own
emerging philosophies of education in reality, socializes them into existing school patterns (Weller, 1971).

Katz (1977) views student teaching in early childhood settings as a process of socialization in which the student teacher develops a professional identity. This identity includes such components as one's ethics, attitudes, ideological position, occupational self-image, reference group membership, and commitment to teaching. The emphasis in Katz's approach to student teaching is less on the training of skills and techniques and more on the student teacher's understanding of the situation and his/her dispositions toward it (Katz, 1978). Furthermore, Katz (1977) hypothesizes that there is a problem with using prescriptive types of supervision in which the supervisor has the role of evaluator and director. Katz finds prescriptive supervision inconsistent with the ways in which early childhood educators have traditionally been taught to view the educational process. Early childhood teacher preparation programs are imbued with the idea that in order for learning to take place the learner must be active in his own learning, the learner must be dealt with at his own stage of development, and the relationship between learner and teacher must be carefully considered since the strength of attachment influences the educational process. According to Katz, a teacher training
program for early childhood professionals must be consistent with these principles. They must be functionally related to what good teaching is. To nurture humaneness in schools means first to nurture humaneness in those who work in the schools.

It is generally accepted that student teaching is a critical event in the life of an educator. Conant (1963, p. 8) states, "the one indisputably essential element in professional education is practice teaching." What the practicum experience might provide is "the opportunity to observe the broad spectrum of behavior unrestrained... by someone else's bias. The student may learn to see in context those critical behaviors which theoretical constructs and environmental designs have stripped clean for purposes of clarity" (Bowman, 1974, p. 21). The student teacher is plunged into a reality about himself and his chosen field and may proceed through several phases ranging from anxiety to loss as s/he develops a professional self (Caruso, 1977).

The quality of the interpersonal processes to which student teachers are exposed during their practicum experience correlates with their own interpersonal functioning in the classroom. Hefele's (1971) research with 16 students assigned to 15 cooperating teachers as super-
visor's demonstrated that the cooperating teacher and the student teacher had a definite impact on each other. Their ratings on interpersonal skills tended to approximate each other more closely during the 6-week period. In turn the quality of the interpersonal process between these two people correlated with pupil achievement. It has been demonstrated that the student teaching experience has a profound effect on not only the program preferences but the basic beliefs of preschool student teachers (Cohen and others, 1976). Basic beliefs of 75 undergraduates assigned to one of four models of early childhood education changed in the direction of the philosophy of the program to which they were assigned. This was especially true of the cognitive developmental program and the responsive environment program. Even if the student had rejected the basic philosophy of the program prior to the practicum experience, there was a positive change towards the program beliefs after the six-week practicum. The effect was the same for both beginning students and advanced level students.

Student perceptions of what constitutes good teaching may also change with the student teaching experience. Henry and Saad (1976) found that students prior to student teaching felt that good teaching was more highly related
to techniques and instruction while after student teaching they felt good teaching was related to effective skills. Teacher preparation literature is consistent with the view that student teaching has a profound effect on the attitudes and behaviors of student teachers though in some cases these are not always positive. The possibility exists that student teachers may become more authoritarian, rigid, impersonal, bureaucratic, and custodial (Glassberg and Sprinthall, 1980). What latent effects the practicum experience has on teachers is largely unknown (Zeichner, 1978).

The Student Teaching Triad--Problems and Issues. The interpersonal skills of both the supervisors and student teachers in Hefele's study (1971) were affected by the interaction the individuals had with one another. The impact of one group on the other was reciprocal. Weller (1971, p. 8) in his book, Verbal Communication in Instruc­tional Supervision, says that for too long we have "looked at the supervisor as an isolated person or supervisors as a homogeneous class of professionals and both views are terribly unrealistic." In reviewing the student teaching literature, major problems do not center around instruc­tion skills and techniques in the classroom but rather the interpersonal relationships of the student teacher,
university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and the pupils (Kontianen, 1973). Commonly the triad of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor is hierarchical in nature with the cooperating teacher (supervisor in the field setting) and the university supervisor in the superior roles while the student teacher is in the inferior role. The student teacher finds him/herself caught in a dilemma between the university supervisor who gives the final grade and the cooperating teacher who has the day-to-day responsibility for his/her practicum experience (Diem and Schmitz, 1978).

The tripartite partnership is anything but smooth as revealed by the literature. Student teachers may perceive themselves as competing with the cooperating teacher for the children's attention and affection. They often perceive the cooperating teacher as unwilling to give up control of the class, as having less commitment to a child-centered philosophy, of being authoritarian in their dealings with student teachers, and as being less committed to teaching (Campbell and Williamson, 1972).

In informal observations Nance (1977) found that cooperating teachers in secondary school settings did not have realistic expectations of student teachers and in many cases had the expectation that students would initiate the establishment of new programs in their schools. The
cooperating teacher continually rated the student teacher lower than the student teacher rated himself (Soar and Soar, 1972). Dyer (1976), after interviewing a group of public school student teachers, found that student teachers perceived the cooperating teacher to be jealous, unaccepting, and sterile in his/her approach to the classroom.

The university supervisor also did not fare well in Dyer's interviews with the student teachers. The university supervisors rated the student lower on teaching performance than s/he rated himself/herself. In addition, both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor were suspicious of the other's area of proficiency. The university supervisor was viewed by the cooperating teacher as peddling a new method of education and as being unrealistic in his/her expectations. All three groups seemed to perceive one another in a stereotypic fashion.

Barrows (1979), using a case study approach, found the cooperating teacher to be the most powerful person in the triad with the university supervisor readily accepting the assessment of the cooperating teacher in his evaluation of the student. Painter (1979) suspects that gaps between the university supervisor and cooperating teacher are due to the increase in field experiences at locations away from the college campus.
The very structure of the student teaching triad as it presently exists may indeed facilitate conflicts. Peterson's (1977) study of elementary and secondary student teachers and their supervisors revealed differences between the university supervisors and the cooperating teachers with the student teacher in the middle of the conflict. The student teacher and the cooperating teacher were more oriented practically in their view of discipline than the university supervisor who was more oriented towards general, abstract issues about teaching. The student teacher was in agreement with the university supervisor on general issues, such as the learning of general principles, but was consistent with the cooperating teacher in giving less weight to knowledge of subject matter and more weight to learning practical skills. The student had to tread a line between the practical orientation of the cooperating teacher and the academic orientation of the college supervisor. The most successful student teachers were those who accommodated both views. However, even these students were extremely concerned about the conflict between the school and university authority.

Recently the role of the university supervisor has been questioned because increasingly practicum experiences are taking place away from the college campus. Malikail (1970) suggests that the university supervisor is still
important because s/he imparts the system of knowledge which forms the foundation for anyone entering the profession of teaching. Each year brings more advanced knowledge which the university supervisor can pass on to the schools through his/her student teachers. The research, however, has been clear and consistent in the finding that the cooperating teacher has a tremendous impact on the attitudes and behavior of student teachers (Zeichner, 1978). Flanders (1976) suggests that supervisors as well as teachers go through steps of learning in the supervisory process. A partnership approach between the cooperating teacher and the student enables them to compare intriguing alternatives to educational problems and he believes this collaboration allows them to develop more effective solutions.

The Impact of Supervisory Style on Student Teaching.

Just as a collaborative approach to supervision proved overall to be more effective with inservice teachers, this approach can also benefit student teachers. Using a sample of 44 cooperating and student teachers, Pace (1976) found that the collaborative supervision groups were better able to perceive helpfulness in the other participants in the process than the group with traditional supervision. The
collaborative group was also more positive in their attitudes toward one another and receiving help from others. These student teachers reported less anxiety, more satisfaction, and a feeling of more responsibility when supervised with the collaborative style. Kontianen (1973), in his review of 1500 supervisor/student relationships, discovered that the behavior of the supervisor had a powerful effect on the personal development of the student teacher including the student's style, methods, self-knowledge, and self-confidence. If the supervisory role is chiefly controlling, then the student teacher mainly engages in behaviors to please the supervisor rather than developing his/her own professional self-concept. Supervisors who had a positive effect on their student teachers were non-authoritarian in their attitudes, not emotionally involved with their students, clear in their perceptions of their role, as well as relevant and impartial in their evaluations. Supervisors who were perceived to have negative effects on their student teachers were unsympathetic or indifferent to student problems, unstable in their role behavior, superficial about their work, and unwilling to deal with the students as individuals. The successful supervisor was more "a senior colleague than authority or friend."
Summary

It is generally agreed that student teaching is a critical time for the development of the educator's professional self. The experience is so powerful that it has been shown to change even the belief systems of early childhood education students. While there is a lack of data concerning the process of student teaching in preschool settings, the research from public school settings reveals conflict in the traditional triad of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. In the traditional hierarchical system the student is caught between the theories of the university and the realities of his practicum experience. Several research studies suggest that the supervisory process affects all participants and that collegial supervisory methods hold the most promise for positive student teaching outcomes for all participants.

Conferences

Cogan (1977) considers the supervisory conference an integral part of the supervisory process. He considers what happens in the conference to be so important that it affects the whole social network of the school. Within the framework of the conference, teachers and supervisors identify objectives, achieve understanding of student behaviors, identify critical incidents, and help each other
to become more competent teachers and ultimately self-supervising. Goens (1976) visualizes a type of supervision in which there is shared analysis and decision-making between the supervisors and supervisee. Conferences are used at the beginning of the process to identify needs, objectives, and strategies. Later conferences are used for examining and analyzing the data, analyzing and developing conclusions, and defining implications. Though Blumberg's (1974) research gave insight into the verbal behaviors of supervisors and the reactions to them by teachers, little is really known about the topics of conversation in the conferences, how evaluation is actually given, or the nature of supervisory conferences in early childhood programs.

Diamond (1978) analyzed the evaluative comments in 50 public school supervisor/teacher conferences. She found that shorter conferences (10 minutes) contained the same proportion of evaluative feedback as longer conferences (30 minutes). The lesson just taught was the most discussed topic; however, there was little specificity in discussing that lesson. General descriptive comments like "it went very well" provided the bulk of the conversation. Consistent with Blumberg's (1974) findings, the supervisor initiated evaluative comments four times more often than the supervisee and they had a difficult time giving well-
rounded evaluations that included both positive and negative comments. Three-fourths of the evaluations were positive. When negative evaluations were given, they were usually non-explicit and often in these incidences the verbal and non-verbal behavior of the supervisor seemed to be in conflict.

Teachers at different levels may have different perceptions of what are the most effective behaviors for supervisory conferences. Gordon (1976), in his study of 362 secondary and elementary teachers and supervisors, found that elementary teachers rated the supporting behavior of the supervisor as more important than secondary teachers did. Supervisors with less experience placed greater emphasis on listening and information gathering than more experienced supervisors. Teachers on the whole see supervisors as being most effective in conferences when they are being supportive.

Byers (1975) summarizes the importance of conferences when he says, "good conferences can and will contribute to the later association of teaching with being a very satisfying experience. The opposite can and will happen through failure to have the appropriate meaningful conferences that are needed to develop a competent teacher" (p. 116).
Summary

The supervisory conference has long been the primary face-to-face encounter between supervisor and supervisee in which the participants communicate about the learning process. With the development of instruments that enable one to analyze human interactions, the verbal interaction of the supervisor and supervisee has been analyzed by researchers. It was found that supervisees can identify their supervisor's style of interaction as well as evaluate the outcomes of supervisory conferences. Supervisees' perceptions of conferences correlate with their supervisor's style. Though contemporary philosophies of supervision suggest equal roles for the supervisory participants, current research suggests that the supervisor still dominates the verbal interaction in the conference—with the supervisee initiating very little of the communication. Few investigations have been conducted dealing with supervisory conferences in early childhood programs. The nature of these conferences is largely unknown.

Conceptual Level and the Supervisory Participants

Underlying Theory. Supervision of student teachers does not occur in a vacuum. The central beliefs of the participants, whether they are the university supervisor,
cooperating teacher, student teacher, or child, provide the basis by which these individuals relate to the events they experience.

Conceptual Systems Theory emphasizes a cognitive developmental approach in the explanation of interpersonal behavior. Harvey, Hunt, and Shroeder (1961) hypothesize that there are central concepts which direct the individual towards keeping the world congruent with one's self system. These individual self-systems differ in structure and content. They predispose the individual to function in certain select and direct ways which in turn determine the kinds of events and people that the individual is open towards. If the individual experiences congruence in his/her interactions with the environment the self-system will be confirmed and s/he will feel successful and positive towards self and others.

Concreteness-abstractness is the major dimension characterizing the organization of self systems. A series of studies concerned with conceptual level (Miller, 1978) identified the characteristics of concrete conceptual styles as opposed to abstract styles. A more concrete conceptual style is characterized by:

1. A simpler cognitive structure with the individual making fewer differentiations among the events in his/her life
2. More polarized and extreme evaluations (good-bad, etc.)

3. Greater dependence on authority figures for guidelines

4. A greater intolerance of ambiguity

5. A greater need for cognitive consistency

6. Greater stereotyping in the solution of problems

7. Less creativity in the solution of problems

8. Greater insensitivity to subtle cues and thus greater susceptibility to false cues

9. Poorer ability to take another's role

10. Stronger opinions

11. A higher need for structure

12. A greater tendency to form impressions from highly incomplete information

Harvey made the assumption that there is a high correlation between an individual's level of abstractness and the content of his/her conceptual system. Four self-systems have been identified in the literature (Miller, 1978):

System 1 (the most concrete system) - characterized by high superstition, high religiosity, high absolutism, high dependency on representatives of authority (e.g., God and institutional
authority), and high conventionality
System 2 - characterized by uncertainty, distrust of authority, and rebellion
System 3 - characterized by a concern for establishing friendships, intra-group consensus, and avoidance of feelings of helplessness and isolation
System 4 (the most abstract system) - characterized by a high task orientation, information seeking, risk taking, and independence. Problem-solving is engaged in for intrinsic rather than extrinsic needs.

These levels proceed in a developmental sequence with structural and motivational differences at each stage. An example of how individuals at different conceptual levels react to the same situation is demonstrated in Harvey's (1964) experiment concerning judgment of distance. Subjects were asked to judge the distance between pairs of dots with a falsely scaled ruler. Only System 4 individuals (the most abstract system) did not rely solely on the ruler to make their judgments. System 1 people came to their judgment by excluding any conflicting inputs such as their own conception of distance and relied solely on the ruler.
Hunt, Butler, Noy, and Rosse (1978) developed a semi-projective method to assess conceptual level. An individual's response to certain conflict situations such as, "When I think about rules..." provides the basis for the individual's rank of 0-3 on conceptual level. The individual was scored on how s/he thinks not what s/he thinks.

The authors identified four characteristic styles of thinking underlying the four conceptual levels:

Level 0 - The individual reacts impulsively to situations in a negative unsocialized manner, or s/he reacts defensively by withdrawing, ignoring, or blaming.

Level 1 - The individual is concerned with behaving in a socially acceptable way and exhibits polarized thinking and behavior.

Level 2 - The individual is open to others' ideas but s/he is very much concerned with his own struggle for independence. S/he is more tolerant of ambiguity.

Level 3 - The individual considers and weighs alternatives then decides upon the best solution for that problem.
Conceptual Level and Teaching Behavior

Conceptual System Theory appears to be a useful variable for predicting teacher style. Murphy and Brown (1970) applied Harvey's Conceptual Systems to teaching styles and hypothesized about four teaching styles analogous to conceptual systems:

System 1 teachers - These teachers see themselves as status persons. Searching for unknowns by the students is deemed inappropriate and unnecessary. Pupil conformance is rewarded.

System 2 teachers - These teachers are inconsistent and uncertain. They use inconsistent criteria in rewarding student performance.

System 3 teachers - These teachers are characterized by conditional dependence. They have high affiliative needs and are susceptible to group influences. Pupils are encouraged to theorize and express themselves. Their supportive comments to pupils are general in nature.

System 4 teachers - These teachers are cognitively complex. They believe that knowledge is tentative rather than absolute. They are open to new experiences and have a respect for
doubt in their pupils. The seeking of solutions on the part of the students is more rewarded than the finding of solutions.

In Murphy and Brown's study (1970) the subjects, 136 student teachers in home economics, were assessed in terms of level of conceptual system and teaching style. The results indicated that as abstractness of the teacher's conceptual system increased the proportion of information handled by helping students to theorize and to express themselves increased. Questioning students for precise answers decreased as the teachers' conceptual level increased in abstractness. In addition, student self-expression increased as the abstractness of the teachers' conceptual level increased.

Murphy and Brown (1970) identified four teaching styles based on their findings. A teacher was felt to exhibit a certain style if more than 60 percent of his/her verbal interactions on three 20-minute audiotapes were judged to be in certain behavior categories. For example, a lecturing teaching style consisted mainly of delivering information behaviors, while a recitation style consisted of numerous instances of asking narrow questions which elicited single word or short phrase responses by the pupils. A third pattern was labeled "amplified recitation" and consisted of narrow questions by the teacher, short
responses by the pupil, and sanctions by the teacher. This was followed by the teacher making a few comments and asking another question to begin the cycle over again.

A fourth pattern which was a reflective teaching style was characterized as being high on helping students theorize and helping students towards self-expression. In addition these teachers were also high on "sanctioning search" behavior.

The literature concerning conceptual systems indicates that conceptual level affects a person's interpersonal orientation. The implications for interactions between supervisors and supervisees are great. Goldberg (1974) indicates in his research that perhaps client and counselor should be matched on conceptual level in order to facilitate the counseling process.

Hunt and Joyce (1967) described two exploratory investigations of teacher trainees' conceptual level and teaching style. The more abstract teacher trainees used a reflective teaching pattern and helped children to evaluate information, develop hypotheses, and make inferences. Joyce and Weil (1973) confirmed this relationship between conceptual level and teaching style. They found that the conceptual level of teacher trainees was related to a mastery of a variety of teaching models rather than
just one model. Another finding was that the cooperating teacher's teaching style affected the student teacher's performance very little. The student teacher had few roadblocks to practicing teaching styles divergent from their supervisors.

The previously cited investigations demonstrate that conceptual systems theory can explain some of the differences in the way people react and behave in similar situations. These findings have implications for interactions involving two or more people. Student teaching is one such occurrence in which several individuals, each with their own conceptual system, interact to improve the quality of education. It would be valuable to understand how an individual's conceptual level influences his/her interpersonal relations in a learning situation such as student teaching. Research that considers the conceptual level of the participants could also provide further information about how individuals at various conceptual levels interact with one another in a supervisory situation and how the quality of these interactions influences the participants' perception of supervisory interactions.

Weade (1980) in an unpublished Master's thesis investigated the relationship between conceptual level and the supervisory style of cooperating teachers. Even though verbal behavior patterns did not relate to conceptual
level scores for this small sample, certain qualitative differences in conference behavior were noted. Three supervisory styles were identified: the lecturing style characterized by monologue idea development; the prescriptive style characterized by questioning strategies and rapid movement to new ideas; and the peer-tutor style characterized by shared information and joint resolution of ideas.

Summary

Conceptual systems theory attempts to explain the differences in people, environments and behavior. Each individual is seen to be operating at a certain conceptual level which in turn predisposes him/her to process information about the environment in certain ways. Harvey's research indicated that individuals operating at more concrete conceptual levels were characterized as less flexible, dependent on authority, holding stereotypic opinions, and unable to take another's perspective. Hunt's research indicates that certain conceptual systems are predictive of certain verbal teaching behaviors. He fits four teaching styles into Harvey's four conceptual systems.

Conceptual systems theory has implications for such complex verbal interactions as the supervision of student teaching. Very little research has focused on conceptual
level as it affects the interaction among several participants in a common endeavor. Furthermore, it would be extremely valuable to understand how the matching of conceptual level influences the participants' feelings about the outcome of a joint venture such as teacher training.

Experience and Educational Background as They Relate to Supervision

Blumberg (1974) characterizes the relationship between supervisors and tenured teachers as one of mutual avoidance. Based on his research tenured teachers generally rejected formal supervision. The reason he gives for this is that the supervisor no longer has any rewards for the tenured teacher. Because of the large turnovers of staff in early childhood centers, tenure may come rather quickly to staff members. A teacher in a preschool may have a tenure-like position in the school in just two years because s/he is the longest sustaining member of the present staff. It is unclear whether this quickly earned position makes these preschool teachers more or less favorable to the process of supervision.

Experience may indirectly affect supervisory encounters because it was found to be a factor in a study
of morale done by Bergeth (1970). The subjects were elementary and secondary teachers and the more experienced teachers had the highest morale. Age was not found to be a factor in teacher morale and, surprisingly, salary had little effect.

Educational background and experience have not often been considered as variables in research dealing with supervision. Though elementary teachers rate the supporting behavior of supervisors as more important than secondary teachers (Gordon, 1976) there is much to be known about how educational background and experience affect the supervisory process. Because there is no standardized certification for early childhood professionals and staff in early childhood programs, changes frequently, individuals in the field come from a variety of educational backgrounds and may obtain tenure in a very short time. How experience and educational background affect the supervisory process is largely unknown.

**The Early Childhood Teacher**

The early childhood educator's role is a unique one. The preschool teacher is usually the first significant adult outside the family circle that expands the child's image of the world around him/her. As early as the 1940s the characteristics of the effective early childhood teacher
were identified. Alm y and Snyder (1947) suggested that the teacher should possess physical stamina, world-mindedness, an understanding of human development, respect for personality, and scientific spirit. Unfortunately there is no empirical evidence to suggest that possessing these characteristics makes one a more effective teacher.

Though early childhood education takes place in many settings, a host of experimental studies give credence to the idea that the nurturant adult has tremendous power where the young child is concerned. Research conducted in public school settings reinforces the finding that nurturant adults are powerful influences on children. Davidson and Lang (1960) found that children who perceived that their teachers liked them had better scholastic performance and a more positive self-concept than children without this perception. Eight- and ten-year-old children preferred to imitate a positive teacher's approach rather than a negative teacher's approach when they were asked to teach a doll a geography lesson in a study done by Portuges and Feshbach (1971).

In reviewing the literature concerning preschool education, Katz (1969) found that she could not differentiate between different model programs in terms of teacher behavior because there was more variability in teacher
behavior within the schools than across the different models. Teachers in general did not exhibit the behavior characteristic of their particular school model.

Current research suggests that it is the nature of the interaction between teacher and child that influences the educational process. Day and Sheehan (1974), in attempting to distinguish high quality preschool programs from low quality programs, noted that the adults in the high quality preschools worked cooperatively with children and had longer lasting contact with the children than the adults in the low quality programs.

Combs (1972) in suggesting a "holistic" approach to teacher training adds the following characteristics to the role of early childhood educator: creativity, flexibility, openness, a sense of responsibility for themselves and others, and a sense of being guided by positive goals and purposes. Many of these characteristics have been translated into competencies for the early childhood teacher. The Child Development Associate credential (CDA) was designed to improve the quality of childcare personnel and includes the following competencies for early childhood personnel:

1. Establishes and maintains a safe and healthy learning environment
2. Advances physical and intellectual competence
3. Builds positive self-concept and individual strength

4. Promotes positive functioning of children and adults in a group

5. Bring about optimal coordination of home and center

6. Carries out supplementary responsibilities related to children's programs

These competencies are formal requirements for the credential which is required in at least eleven states (Ward, 1976). The vast majority of these competencies depend on the affective skills of the teacher. Since the nurturant teacher is the most effective model and change agent for young children, the level of his/her behavior on several dimensions that correlate with positive student feelings about self and school might indicate which teachers are the most effective models. McDaniel (1979) describes teaching behavior along nine dimensions that are associated with student positive self-concept. They are: warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, variety, individualization, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on-task activity. In his study these dimensions distinguished high affect classes from low affect classes. More research is needed to determine how these dimensions influence other educational endeavors such as teacher training. Katz (1977) feels that it is important to think of teaching in terms of larger patterns of behavior rather
than just a checklist of skills.

**Summary**

A wide variety of characteristics have been attributed to the effective early childhood teacher. These characteristics range from flexibility to physical stamina. Unfortunately there is little evidence to suggest that these characteristics insure effective teaching. There is support for the implication that nurturant adults are more often modeled by young children and are more effective in changing young children's behavior. These findings suggest that the interpersonal skills of early childhood teachers may correlate highly with effective teaching. It is not clear if success in teaching children insures success in teaching adults in a supervisory situation such as student teaching.

**Summary of Qualitative Literature Review**

Since the preschool teacher is the most important resource in an early childhood program, it is essential that these professionals continue to develop. Supervision is a way of insuring the continued personal and professional growth of early childhood teachers. Blumberg (1974) hypothesizes that supervision can have a tremendous impact on the improvement of instructional programs be-
cause teaching is a single unit type of work in which there is almost complete control of the work environment by the individual.

Though supervision can be a means of improving early childhood programs, it is viewed with contempt by many. A cold war exists between supervisors and supervisees. Research in the field of education suggests that the interpersonal relations among supervisory participants and the supervisor's style are critical variables influencing the outcomes of supervision. Styles of supervision involving a collaborative approach rather than a hierarchical approach tend to promote more positive outcomes.

Teacher preparation research suggests that student teaching is a critical experience in the development of the teaching professional. Supervisory style has been shown to affect the perception of outcomes by the student teacher in the practicum situation. There are many problems with the traditional student teaching triad--university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher. While the student often feels in conflict between the views of both supervisors, it has been shown that the cooperating teacher makes a powerful impact on the student teacher's attitudes and behaviors. The supervisory conference is an important vehicle that aids pre- and in-service teachers in the establishment of their
professional self-concepts. Various interactional systems such as Blumberg's (1974) allow researchers to analyze the communication in supervisory conferences between supervisors and those they supervise.

Conceptual level is a major personality variable that can affect the behavior of individuals in various settings. The major dimension that differentiates one conceptual level from another is abstractness. The teacher education literature indicates that conceptual level can be a predictor of verbal behavior and teaching style in educational settings. Since student teaching is a learning situation involving the interaction of several people each with his/her own conceptual system, it is possible that conceptual level is a powerful variable influencing the outcomes of supervision.

Educational background and experience have not been considered very often as variables in studies dealing with supervision. There is some support for the hypothesis that older tenured teachers look upon supervision with much skepticism. Teachers working with children in the lower grades generally view supervision more positively and seem to have better morale than teachers working with children in higher grades.
Methods of Investigating the Supervisory Process

Quantitative Approach:

Issues

In reviewing the literature on supervision, some serious limitations are obvious. There is a lack of data, even descriptive data, on all aspects of supervision in early childhood settings. Even the studies conducted in public school settings are limited because they are few in number and depend on the participants' opinions after the fact rather than analyzing perceptions of supervisory encounters as they occur. Furthermore, these studies have generally not included the perceptions of all the participants--supervisors' as well as supervisee's. Important variables such as the participants' conceptual level, supervisory style, teaching style, type of training and experience, have not been considered as factors in investigations of the supervisory process.

The present study is designed to address some of these issues. Among them are:

1. If certain characteristics of the cooperating teacher, such as educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching behavior, are related to his/her supervisory style with student teachers.
2. If selection of on-site supervisors should be made solely on the basis of effectiveness with children.

3. If certain characteristics of the supervisory triad, such as conceptual level of the participants, the cooperating teacher's supervisory style and years of experience are related to positive perceptions of supervisory encounters.

Qualitative Research

**Definition of Ethnography.** Ethnography, historically, derives its roots from anthropology. Like anthropology, ethnography attempts to picture the way of life of some interacting group (Wolcott, 1975). While anthropology is a comprehensive discipline encompassing not only the study of one's own society but also the study of man across a variety of cultures, ethnography can be thought of as the description of a single culture.

While the main task for the anthropologist is to describe, classify, and compare cultures (Spradley and McCurdy, 1972), the main task for the ethnographer is to describe a particular culture in terms of the meanings that the participants assign to actions and events.
Culture to an ethnographer is "the knowledge people use to generate and interpret social behavior" (Spradley and McCurdy, 1973, p. 8). The knowledge the ethnographer seeks is the knowledge people have learned as a member of a particular group. For example, if two preschoolers grab each other and fall to the ground wrestling, is this activity viewed as a fight or social greeting by the participants? An ethnographer could hypothesize that this behavior is a form of social greeting because of his/her knowledge of how preschoolers greet each other.

Unlike artifacts and behavior, cultural knowledge is hidden. Symbolic interactionists insist that the meaning of behavior and artifacts in a culture be taken seriously because human beings act towards things on the basis of the meanings these things have for them (Shrauger and Shoenneman, 1979). The preschooler wrestling on the ground knows that his friend is glad to see him. The ultimate goal of ethnography according to Frake (1964) is not just to state what someone did but to specify the conditions under which it is culturally appropriate for the individual to act in this manner.

Ethnography is classified as a type of qualitative research. Differences between quantitative and qualitative research have often been explored in the literature concerning ethnography. Rist (1977) suggests that
putting a value on these differences only hinders research efforts because certain research methods are more effective for answering certain research questions. Kist has summarized the major assumptions underlying the two types of research philosophies.

According to Rist (1977) quantitative research is based on the assumption that human events are lawful. The first task of the quantitative researcher is the verification of generalizations underlying human behavior. The next step is to amass empirical generalizations, refine and restructure them into laws. The final step for the researcher is to weave these laws into a theory. In essence, it is through the scientific method that quantitative researchers develop theories of human behavior.

Qualitative methods, which include ethnography, focus not only on observable behavior but inner thoughts in order to understand people and their worlds. This inner perspective is achieved by the ethnographer's actual participation in the role of the observed person. The qualitative researcher is not removed from the research setting as the quantitative researcher is but in fact is a participant in the culture.

The qualitative research process is inductive whereas the quantitative process is deductive. The ethnographer does not begin with hypotheses, rather from
an understanding of small episodes to an understanding of broader patterns of human behavior. Thus ethnographers can be considered to be in the hypothesis "tailoring" business rather than the hypothesis "testing" business (Overholt and Sallings, 1976).

The issues that have engendered the most controversy between quantitative and qualitative researchers have centered on validity versus reliability, subjectivity versus objectivity, and component versus holistic analysis (Rist, 1977).

Quantitative research emphasizes reliability because a high degree of replicability and consistency will allow the testing of hypotheses. However, some researchers (Cronback, 1975) feel that bowing to Type I error results in a loss of costly "no significant findings" research. On the other hand, qualitative researchers emphasize validity. They support this emphasis when they point to the differences in research findings when subjects are studied in a lab setting rather than a natural setting (Wilson, 1977). The underlying assumption is that when one wants to generalize human behavior to everyday environments, such as school settings, then behavior must be studied in these settings. The environment exerts powerful influences on behavior and, therefore,
must be included in the research process.

The question of subjectivity versus objectivity arises when the differences between qualitative and quantitative research are considered. Proponents of quantitative research contend that traditional empirical research is more objective than qualitative research. For the traditional empiricist objectivity is achieved through such mechanisms as interrater reliability. The experimenter's biases are carefully filtered away from the research through agreement with others upon what was seen or experienced. In contrast, the qualitative researcher is very much involved in what the subjects have experienced. In fact, the qualitative researcher may be a participant observer. Qualitative researchers point out that even quantitative research studies are subjective just by their selection of instruments which are biased towards certain aspects of behavior (McCutcheon, 1981). Qualitative researchers accept the assumption that complete objectivity is impossible. McCutcheon (1981) labels ethnography as "intersubjective" because the audience must understand the ethnography based upon the evidence presented even though they do not necessarily agree with the author's line of reasoning.
Rist (1977) dismisses the whole subjectivity/objectivity difference because both methods have the same goal—prediction and understanding—and the only difference is the number of subjects. Qualitative researchers seek validation of their findings through an intensive case study of a small group of individuals while the quantitative researcher undertakes confirmation with a large group of subjects.

Because qualitative researchers are committed to the view that people and events should be viewed in a total milieu rather than bits and pieces, it is considered wholistic in nature (Wolcott, 1975). The ethnographer looks not only at the interactions between individuals but also at the settings since environment influences behavior. Qualitative researchers cite such classic studies as Rosenthal and Jacobsen's (1968) study of self-fulfilling prophecies. Ethnography comes out of the verstehen tradition which focuses on the meaning of behavior in the context of social interaction (Patton, 1980). Qualitative researchers argue that human behavior is rarely explained by one isolated variable. Recently quantitative researchers are also emphasizing multi-component analysis with such statistical techniques as multivariate and multiple regression analyses (Rist, 1977).
In summary, ethnography has as its main task the description of a particular culture (Spradley and McCurdy, 1972). It reveals what people think and identifies the cultural meanings that this group uses daily (Spradley, 1980). It describes what one needs to know or believe in order to operate in a manner acceptable to that particular culture's members (Goodenough, 1973).

**Purpose of Ethnography.** American society is becoming more and more complex. The need has never been greater to understand how people view experiences in their culture. At the core of ethnography is a concern with the understanding and meaning of people and their activities. The National Institution of Education (Wilson, 1973) has encouraged the use of an ethnographic approach to study educational settings. Wolcott (1973), utilizing an ethnographic approach to describe the role of a principal in a particular setting, was so effective in his description of "the man in the principal's office" that the reader feels as if s/he is walking in this principal's shoes.

An example of the use of ethnographic methods to study a school setting is a project carried out by Pitman (1979). The research team contacted a daycare center to study an area that the center was concerned about. They selected the problem of maximizing the role of student teachers.
The team spent five weeks collecting data in order to document the physical and humane settings in this environment. They followed cooperating teachers as well as students. They conducted interviews with present and former student teachers, the center coordinator, and academic personnel. Finally the team shared their findings with the participants in the center and specific recommendations, such as developing a formal orientation for student teachers were made.

A qualitative investigation might have centered on another issue that this center found insignificant. In this situation the focus of the research came from the participants and thus was quite relevant to their situation. Furthermore the participants were actively involved in the collection of data and were aware of the project's purpose right from the beginning. Ethnographic methods offer much promise in the investigation of specific issues in particular cultures.

Spradley (1980) believes that the day of research for research sake is over and that ethnography should be done in the service of mankind. One way he suggests doing this is to ask informants what research topics are important to them. Some ethnographers believe that the qualitative process can be the basis for implementing
change in society. The ethnographer should pay attention not only when informants say how it is but also how it ought to be (Wolcott, 1975).

**Process.** The methodology employed by ethnographic researchers reflects certain underlying assumptions about human behavior that ethnographers hold to be true. The ethnographer's work is naturalistic in the sense that it is conducted in the field rather than in a laboratory setting. The ethnographer must first decide which mode of inquiry best fits the project (Hymes, 1978). For example, a comprehensive mode would involve study of a whole way of life, such as a village. A topic oriented mode would require one or more aspects of a setting such as "adoption" while a hypotheses oriented mode would orient observations around a hypothesis such as how child rearing practices influence adult personality.

Certain criteria of the setting are important determinants in deciding which type of mode would be appropriate to study (Spradley, 1980). Such criteria as accessibility, unobtrusiveness, permissibleness, and simplicity influence the acceptability of a site. In addition, whether certain activities reoccur and whether the ethnographer can participate in the setting have a bearing on the aspect of the setting which will be investigated.
A wide variety of data is collected in ethnographic research studies. They include: the form and content of the verbal interaction between participants, the form and content of verbal interaction with the researcher, nonverbal behavior, patterns of action and nonaction, records, documents, and artifacts (Wilson, 19/7). Ethnographers do not rely on one method of collecting data. They use a variety of methods including: participant observation, key informant interviewing, collection of life histories, structured interviews, questionnaires, ratings and rankings, semantic differential techniques, projective techniques, psychological research instruments, unobtrusive measures, and technical equipment such as tape recorders and videotape machines (Wolcott, 1975).

The ethnographer's role in the setting has been the cause of much debate. How "native" to go depends partially on the ethnographer's personality and the nature of the setting. S/he must build a sense of trust with his/her informants and continuously safeguard the informant's rights (Spradley, 1980). In ethnographic research the ethnographer is really the method because it is s/he who will be the main instrument for gathering data.

Entry into the setting and the establishment of a role is a crucial point in the study since what people say
and do shapes the social situation. The participant observer is one role Spradley (1980) envisions for ethnographers. The participant observer not only observes the activities, people, and physical aspects of a situation but also tries to engage in activities appropriate to the situation. It is this observer role that distinguishes the ethnographer from the other participants. The ethnographer, depending on the nature of the setting at any given time, may be at varying degrees of involvement in the setting from non-participation to complete participation.

There are advantages as well as disadvantages to adopting a participant observer role. While in the participant role the ethnographer may gain better access to the informants, have a more in-depth understanding of the situation and be more able to cross check what an informant says but may not accurately represent the majority of the people in the setting and thus have difficulty obtaining a complete picture of the attitudes in a whole community (Wilson, 1977).

While a variety of methods may be employed by ethnographers, it is the ethnographer that is the critical method because through his/her eyes all data are collected. Initially the data are collected in an openminded framework from detailed descriptions of situations, events,
people, interactions, observed behaviors, and direct quotations from informations about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts (Patton, 1980).

An important consideration as the data collection proceeds is the safeguarding of the informants' rights and privacy. In 1971, the Council of the American Anthropological Association adopted a set of principles to guide ethnographers when they faced conflicting options. These principles emphasized that informants not be exploited for personal gain. Some information collected during the course of ethnographic research may have negative consequences for the participants. Since there are no specific guidelines for ethnographers it is often left up to individual ethnographers to struggle with these moral issues and arrive at a solution they deem ethical.

In addition to ethical considerations, ethnographers must manage the problem of their own objectivity. Through recognition of one's own personal and cultural biases and the realization of the problems of selective observation and interpretation this goal can be accomplished (Spradley and McCurdy, 1972).

**Interpretation.** While some researchers believe that the ethnographer's role is mainly one of describing a culture and allowing the audience to interpret the results, others feel that it is up to the ethnographer to make sense
of what transpired in the setting. McCutcheon (1981) has defined three types of interpretation: (1) the forming of patterns for the affiliation of separate phenomena to one another; (2) interpretation of the social meaning of events; and (3) the relating of particular occurrences in a setting to external considerations such as history.

Frake (1964) suggests that the formulation of an ethnographic statement depends on the ethnographer's ability to discover the major categories of a culture. These patterns will reveal the underlying order and rules in a society that the informants may not be consciously aware of. It is the ethnographer's job to make these patterns accessible to the audience.

The interpretation of the social meaning of events is a major thrust of ethnography (Ryle, 1973). It involves getting at a "thick description" (Frake, 1964) of a culture. Ryle (1973) suggests that if one divorces what specific people say or do from the whole world, it renders the research vacant. The purpose of ethnography is to uncover the "conceptual structures" of the informants and to analyze them in terms of how observers view the act, how the participants view the act, and how it functions in the setting.

External considerations can also be part of ethnographic interpretations (McCutcheon, 1981). Such consider-
ations as theatrical, philosophical, and historical factors might be considered. For example, early childhood student teaching might be interpreted in light of the financial backing of such programs.

**Adequacy of the Ethnographic Report.** How does one decide if an ethnography is adequate. Wolcott (1975) suggests four criteria for ethnographic research in school settings:

1. ** Appropriateness of the Problem**

   Wolcott's first criterion is appropriateness of the problem. He feels that since no one knows exactly what research may be relevant the ethnographer should be free to discover what the problem is in a given setting. He cautions against predetermined problems that exist only in the mind of the researcher.

2. ** Characteristics of the Ethnographer**

   Appropriateness of the ethnographer is Wolcott's second criterion. He feels that the ethnographer's individual characteristics of sensitivity, physical stamina and flexibility are highly important since the ethnographer is the main research instrument.

3. ** Research Climate**

   Appropriateness of the research climate is the next criterion for educational ethnography. The scope of the project should be such that it is conducted primarily by one person with a great deal of time to devote
to the investigation.

4. Realistic Expectations

Finally, appropriateness of expectations of the completed study is Wolcott's final criterion. He suggests that the adequacy of an ethnography can be determined if conditions are specified so that one knows what to do in order to operate in a manner acceptable to the members of the culture studied.

McCutcheon (1981) states some further criteria for judging ethnographic records and interpretations. She suggests checking if the line of reasoning is sound, if there is sufficient evidence, if there is agreement with other studies, and if the research is significant. In other words, does the research facilitate a deep understanding of the phenomena under study?

Summary

Ethnography is a type of qualitative research that has its roots in anthropology. Its main purpose is to describe a particular culture through the eyes of its participants. A secondary purpose may be as a basis for implementing social change.

Ethnography is a research method particularly applicable to school settings. Though the methodology of the process may involve a large variety of techniques
including interviewing, participant observation, and open-ended measures, the most important research tool is the ethnographer. Researchers agree that the ethnographer's job is to make sense out of what transpired in the cultural setting.

The ethnographer may adopt a variety of roles in entering a particular setting. Spradley feels that a participant observer role gives the ethnographer a deeper understanding of the culture; however, the ethnographer must be careful not to limit his/her view to a small segment of the culture. Ethnographers are regarded as the most important instruments in ethnographic study because it is through their eyes that all data are sifted.

While there is some disagreement about who should interpret the ethnography--the audience or researcher--various authors have suggested criteria for judging the adequacy of ethnographic report. They include: appropriateness of the problem, ethnographer, research climate, and expectations for the completed study. In assessing interpretations of ethnographic data the reader should determine if the reasoning is sound, if the report is in agreement with other studies, if the evidence is sufficient, and if the report facilitates understanding of the phenomena under study.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The study was designed to investigate the student teaching supervisory experience in selected preschool settings. Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed in the investigation. More specifically, the quantitative component of the study was designed to investigate the relationship of educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching style to the cooperating teacher's supervisory style; and to investigate the relationship of conceptual level, supervisory style, and various demographic variables to perceptions of supervisory conferences. The qualitative component utilized ethnographic methods to describe the student teaching experience from the viewpoints of one early childhood student teaching group (university supervisor, intern supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student) in order to identify factors which influenced the supervisory experience for that group.

This chapter includes the following topics: criteria and selection procedure for subjects, a description of the
data collection settings, the design of the study, instrumentation and data analysis. Information for both the quantitative and qualitative components will be given under each topic.

**Subjects**

**Criteria**

The subjects for the quantitative component of the investigation were an available population of student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors. The students were enrolled in supervised student teaching programs through either a midwestern or an eastern university during Spring, Fall, Winter or Summer quarters during the 1981-82 academic year. For their practicum experience students were placed in a variety of centers which served children birth to 6 years of age. While some of the centers were located near the student's university, others were not.

The subjects for the qualitative component of the investigation were an available group, participating in supervised student teaching in an early childhood center through a university or college teacher preparation program during 1981.
Selection

Quantitative Component. Permission to conduct the study was obtained initially from the directors of the student teaching programs. Initial contact with the student teachers and their college supervisors was made at orientation sessions during the first week of student teaching. Once the student teachers and supervisors agreed to participate, the centers at which the students were placed were contacted and permission to participate in the study was sought from the center directors and the cooperating teachers.

Of the 36 student teachers contacted, 31 agreed to participate in the investigation. Of these 31 students, 3 were dropped from the study because their cooperating teachers declined to participate. The major reason given for non-participation was the perception that the student teaching quarter allowed little time for additional activities. Three student participants withdrew from the study once it began because of interpersonal problems with their cooperating teachers. Therefore, the sample for this investigation was comprised of 25 student teachers, their cooperating teachers, and their university supervisors.
Qualitative Component. Participants for the ethnographic account of student teaching were selected on the basis of several criteria. Spradley (1980) suggests that accessibility is probably the most crucial consideration in selecting a culture for ethnographic study if one wants to go beyond studying the accessibility of a site.

The student teaching group selected as ethnographic informants were participants who allowed this researcher to observe, interview, and participate with them during their student teaching experience. Furthermore the participants conducted their student teaching during the 1981 school year—a time when this researcher was available. Most importantly, the participants were individuals who were willing to verbalize their feelings and thoughts as they proceeded through the student teaching process. A final consideration was that these participants were involved in a teacher-training program that was supportive of the research project and they were placed in a center that was open to investigation.
Setting

All data were collected in the student teaching centers. These centers housed programs for children 6 months to 6 years of age. All programs met their state's requirements for licensing as child care centers and college or university requirements for acceptance as teacher-training centers.

Quantitative Component

A total of eleven centers was involved in the investigation. Of these, seven were full-day programs. Four of the centers were geared to developmentally delayed preschoolers. These four centers also contained a broader range of economic levels in their enrollment than those centers which did not specialize in developmentally delayed children.

Philosophically, the centers were consistent with a developmental program model which emphasizes all aspects of child development—motor, cognitive, language, social, and emotional development.

The centers differed in terms of size, funding and location. Some programs were small but more than half had an enrollment of 80 or more children. Funding for the programs varied from church sponsorship to federal
funding. Ten of the centers were located in Ohio, one in New York.

**Qualitative Component**

Though the primary setting for the ethnography was the center where the informants were assigned, occasionally the ethnographer followed the participants to related settings such as student teaching meetings held on a college campus.

The center where the ethnography was undertaken specialized in working with developmentally delayed preschoolers. The group to which the student informant was assigned had twelve children, two of which were considered "normal" models. The handicapping conditions exhibited by the rest of the children included infantile autism, Down's Syndrome, and various motor and language delays.

All of the children in the group were chronologically 3-6 years of age but developmentally they encompassed a wide range of abilities. Though some of the children had participated in an early training group, they had to have obtained some degree of self-sufficiency to be admitted to this group. A good percentage of the children were not talking yet and several were not toilet trained.
Sign language was used extensively in the program in order to get the children to communicate.

The staff consisted of a head teacher, an assistant teacher, and an assortment of college students from various disciplines such as physical education, art, and exceptional education who participated at the center for course credit. In addition, advanced students in various specialties such as speech therapy and dentistry worked with the children on an individual basis in order to gain clinical experience.

**Design**

The design for the quantitative component was correlational in nature; for the qualitative component it was ethnographic in nature.

Data relating to the subjects' educational and familial backgrounds, conceptual level, and perceptions of supervisory conferences were collected through the use of open-ended, scale, or survey-type instruments. Data concerning the cooperating teacher's supervisory style and teaching style were collected through the use of observational instruments. Ethnographic methods—interview, observation, and participant observation—were employed in order to provide a description of the student teaching experience through the eyes of one group in order
to indicate factors that influenced the supervisory experience for that group.

**Quantitative Component**

**Teaching Style.** Sometime during the first three weeks of student teaching, before the student was actually taking over the classroom, a rater blind to the hypothesis of this investigation observed each cooperating teacher in his/her classroom. The teacher was observed for one-half hour during a "free play" period in the classroom.

The student teacher was given the assurance that the observer was not observing him/her but rather was observing the philosophy of that classroom. Immediately following this observation the cooperating teacher's teaching behavior with children was scored along nine dimensions using McDaniel's (1974) Observer Rating Scale. These dimensions included warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, individualism, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on-task activity.

**Supervisory Style.** During the first week of student teaching, students and cooperating teachers were given blank audio tapes, access to a tape recorder, and a set of instructions on how to tape record two supervisory conferences (see Appendix C). Conferences were to be recorded twice during the student teaching quarter: one during
the first week, one during the last five weeks.

Student teachers were contacted again during the fifth week to determine if they had tape recorded at least fifteen minutes of one of their conferences with their cooperating teacher. Again during the eighth week students were contacted and reminded about recording a second conference.

The two tapes were then analyzed by a rater blind to the hypotheses of this investigation. Blumberg's Supervisor Teacher Interaction System (1974) was used in order to identify the cooperating teacher's supervisory style during student teaching conferences.

Demographic Variables. During the final two weeks of student teaching students, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors were given an envelope with three surveys to complete. The first questionnaire yielded information about the subjects' backgrounds, training and familial characteristics. They were to complete the survey at their own convenience during the last weeks of student teaching.

Conceptual Level. The second survey for the participants to complete was the Paragraph Completion Test developed by Hunt, Butler, Noy, and Rosser (1978). This open-ended survey required the subjects to respond in paragraph form to eight incomplete sentences such as
"when I am criticized. . . ." Their responses were scored according to the author's scoring protocol and yielded a conceptual level score for each participant.

Perceptions of Supervisory Conferences. The final survey that the subjects completed during the last two weeks of student teaching yielded information about their perceptions of their supervisory conferences with each other. An instrument developed by Blumberg and Amidon (1965) required the subjects to rate 12 stems describing perceptions of their conferences. The student rated perceptions of conferences with the cooperating teacher, while the cooperating teacher rated perceptions of his/her conferences with the student. The university supervisor rated perceptions of conferences with the student.

Data were collected from the student teaching centers during the last week of student teaching.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were used to collect data for this investigation: (1) the Observer Rating Scales; (2) the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System; (3) the Paragraph Completion Test; (4) Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Conferences; and (5) a demographic survey
developed by this author. All instruments except the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System were pilot tested on a sample of six preschool teachers who taught at a private half-way preschool in the midwest. The Teacher-Interaction System was pilot tested on a sample of four student teachers and their supervisors who were enrolled in an associate degree program during the Spring 1981 quarter at a college located in the midwest.

No changes were made in the instruments as a result of the pilot test; however, it was decided that two 15-minute tapes of supervisory conferences would be analyzed rather than one 30-minute tape. Blumberg (1974) found in his investigations of supervisory style that a 15-20 minute sample gave a good indication of supervisory behavior.

Observer Rating Scales

The instrument used to identify the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children was the Observer Rating Scales (McDaniels, 1974, see Appendix A). This instrument allows an investigator after a half-hour of observation to record teaching behavior along nine dimensions. McDaniels (1974) defines the following dimensions:
**Warmth** - the extent to which the atmosphere of the class is relaxed and comfortable: the degree to which the teacher maintains positive interpersonal relationships with pupils.

**Enthusiasm** - the interest exhibited by the teacher and students during the class.

**Clarity** - the clarity of communication, expectations, and directions relayed to the students.

**Variety** - the extent to which the teacher utilized a range of materials.

**Individualization** - the degree to which the teacher individualizes the program.

**Feedback** - the extent of communication to the student about the adequacy, completeness, acceptability or correctness of his/her response.

**Cognitive Demand** - the intellectual level the teacher expects from the students.

**Freedom** - the degree to which the teacher fosters independence and individual freedom.

**On-Task Activity** - the amount of student activity directed towards the instructional task at hand.

**Validity.** McDaniels (1974) has attempted to achieve construct validity for this instrument by describing each dimension as unambiguously as possible. In addition, he
has provided definitions of behavior for each point along the continuum for each dimension. In this way, subjective interpretations are minimized.

The teaching behaviors that McDaniels selected have been shown to be associated with measures of student achievement (McDaniels, 1976). The Observer Rating Scales were employed in a longitudinal study of elementary school pupils. Eight of the nine dimensions correlated with pupil attitudes towards school and self. Cognitive demand and warmth were consistently associated with school-related feelings and attitudes.

**Reliability.** McDaniels (1974) has computed reliability coefficients for each of the nine dimensions through the use of a set of training films. Each of the four teachers on the film were rated by nine observers on all nine dimensions. Reliability coefficients were obtained as follows: warmth - 95; enthusiasm - .83; clarity - .87; variety - .93; individualization - .91; feedback - .79; and on task activity - .93.

Inter-rater reliability was established for this investigation between this study's rater and the manual's rating of the four elementary teachers on the film. A reliability coefficient for the overall scores for each of the four teachers was obtained. The Pearson product moment
correlation was \( r = .85 \). Since the teachers rated were elementary school teachers and this investigation was concerned with preschool teachers, an interrater reliability coefficient was obtained for overall ratings of five preschool teachers who taught in a private preschool in the midwest. The Pearson product moment correlation was \( r = .95 \).

**Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System**

Supervisory style was measured through the scoring of two tape-recorded conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher with the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System (Blumberg, 1974). Though conferences varied in length, only the first 15 minutes were scored since Blumberg (1974) found that a 15-minute sample was enough to give a good indication of supervisory style.

This interaction system (see Appendix A) has 15 categories that describe the behavior of the supervisor and the supervisee. Ten categories relate to the behavior of the supervisor: (1) support-inducing; (2) praise; (3) accepts or uses teacher's ideas; (4) asks for information; (5) gives information; (6) asks for opinions; (7) asks for suggestions; (8) gives opinions; (9) gives suggestions; and (1) criticism. Four categories relate to the supervisee: (11) asks for information, opinions, and suggestions;
(12) gives information, opinions, and suggestions; (13) positive social emotional behavior; and (14) negative social emotional behavior. One category indicates silence or confusion. This instrument combines the ideas of Flanders and Bales (Blumberg, 1974). It is simpler to record and interpret than Bales' system and it gives more kinds of information characteristic of a supervisory situation than Flander's system. This instrument was developed so that supervisors could gain insight into their supervisory behaviors and the effect of these behaviors on their supervisees.

Validity. Blumberg and Amidon (1965) in their study of 166 in-service teachers demonstrated that teachers were able to discriminate among a variety of supervisory behaviors. In addition, certain types of supervisory behavior produced consistent types of reactions from supervisees. Indirect supervisory behaviors resulted in favorable reactions from the supervisee while direct supervisory behaviors consistently produced unfavorable responses. Blumberg and Cusick (1970) used the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System to analyze 50 tape recordings of supervisor-teacher conferences. The results indicated that the system can discriminate between the amount of supervisor talk and the amount of supervisee talk. Furthermore,
the system also indicates the extended time the supervisor spends on certain areas—building and maintaining interpersonal relationships, for example. How often certain behaviors were engaged in by the supervisee were also indicated.

Reliability. Interrater reliability for supervisory style was established between the rater for this study and an independent rater on four 20-minute audio tapes of supervisory conferences. These conferences were between student teachers and their supervisors who were involved in teacher preparation programs at a midwestern university and a midwestern college. The Pearson product-moment correlation for the amount of time that the supervisor used in the conference was $r = .91$. The correlation for directness of supervisory style was $r = .91$.

Hunt's Paragraph Completion Method

The Paragraph Completion Method (Hunt, Butler, Roy, and Rosser, 1978; see Appendix A) was used to assess the participants' conceptual level. This instrument utilized a semi-projective method which required subjects to respond in paragraph form for two minutes to the following sentence stems:
What I think about rules
When I am criticized
What I think about parents
When someone disagrees with me
When I am not sure
When I am told what to do

The subjects' completion responses are considered to be thought samples about how a person thinks rather than what s/he thinks. These samples are scored from 0-3 depending on the conceptual level they are identified within the scoring protocol.

This instrument is based on conceptual systems theory which suggests that the major dimension in personality variation is abstractness. Individuals at higher levels of abstractness or conceptual level indicate in their responses to conflict situations that they are more flexible, more tolerant of stress, and more capable of finding alternative solutions than individuals at lower conceptual levels.

Validity. Though it would be more convenient in terms of scoring to measure conceptual level with an objective test, the authors of the PCM feel that an objective test would deal solely with content, while a projective test deals with how a person thinks.
Results of over 100 studies have established the construct validity of the Paragraph Completion Test (Hunt, 1978). There has been consistency between the instrument and the theory in numerous studies. For example, Gardiner and Shroeder (1972) demonstrated that high CL scoring subjects showed less divided thinking in solving a strategy game. They also exhibited greater independence of judgment, greater tolerance of ambiguity, and a greater ability to integrate various perspectives than low CL scorers. Performance in this investigation was not related to IQ, social desirability, or verbal fluency.

An investigation conducted by Heck and Davis (1973) demonstrated that higher conceptual level counselors were able to achieve significantly higher levels of empathy with their clients than lower conceptual level counselors.

**Reliability.** Gardiner and Shroeder (1972) reported interrater reliabilities ranging from .80 to .95 after three days' training in the use of the manual. Internal consistency falling in the .60 to .75 range was also reported.

Hunt et al. (1978) summarized interrater reliability for 40 studies which utilized the Paragraph Completion Test. The population studied ranged from elementary pupils to school principals. The median coefficient for these investigations was .86.
For this investigation interrater reliability was established between this investigation's rater and the authors' ratings of 60 sentence stems for ten individuals. The Pearson product-moment correlation for the rating of ten conceptual level scores was \( r = .93 \).

**Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Conferences**

The Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Conferences (see Appendix A) was used to gather data about the supervisory participants' perceptions of their supervisory conferences. This instrument, developed by Blumberg and Amidon (1965), was designed to measure teacher perceptions of supervisory conferences. It contains 12 stems such as "learning about oneself as a person." Subjects are asked to describe the supervisory conferences in terms of that stem on a scale of one (low) to five (high). Sirosis and Gable (1979), in their validity study of the instrument, found that the instrument measured two factors about the conferences—relationships and productivity. The first half of the survey seeks to determine the nature of the supervisor's behavior as directive or non-directive. The second part of the instrument seeks to determine the effectiveness of the supervisory conferences as perceived by the teacher.
Validity. Sirosis and Gable (1979) administered this instrument to 31 in-service teachers, grades k-12, randomly selected from a larger group. The data were subjected to a factor analysis. It was found that the instrument is a two-factor measure—relationships and productivity. Factor 1 appeared to be based on the interpersonal climate of the conferences and the teacher's relationship with the supervisee. Factor 2 has as its underlying constructs the teacher's perception of the learning and productivity resulting from the conferences. However, factors 1 and 2 were highly related (.71) and the authors concluded that this instrument can also be interpreted as a one-scale instrument.

Reliability. Sirosis and Gable (1979) established reliability of the instrument in two ways. First they tested for the reliability of each of the two factors with stems entered on each factor and second they tested for the reliability of a one-scale instrument with stems from factors 1 and 2 combined. The alpha reliability estimate for factor 1 was .91, for factor 2, .88; and for the one-scale instrument, .92.

Modifications. The stems of this instrument were modified so that both the cooperating teachers university supervisors and the student teachers can indicate their
attitudes towards the supervisory conferences. Blumberg (1974) suggests that for too long we have only considered the personal and professional growth of teachers, not the personal and professional growth of supervisors.

**Demographic Information**

Information about the subjects' educational backgrounds, experience in the field, and familial characteristics were obtained from a questionnaire developed by this author (see Appendix A).

**Qualitative Component**

The student teaching group that agreed to participate in the ethnographic study of early childhood student teaching consisted of a student teacher, cooperating teacher, intern supervisor, and university supervisor. They were observed throughout their 10-week student teaching period through a variety of ethnographic methods. In addition, daily journals from six other students who were student teaching at the same time were analyzed to enrich the description of the student teaching process. Data about the group were collected from the following sources:

1. On-site observations (mainly viewed from the observation room) for 45 days of the student's teaching experience
2. Departmental meetings for student teachers
3. Departmental meetings for supervisors
4. Weekly interviews with the student teacher
5. Bi-weekly interviews with the intern supervisor
6. Bi-weekly interviews with the university supervisors
7. Bi-weekly interviews with the cooperating teacher
8. Interviews with the student's boyfriend
9. Interviews with the assistant teacher
10. The student teacher's daily journals
11. The student teaching handbook
12. Joint conferences between the student and her supervisors
13. Planning meetings between the center staff and the student teacher
14. Interviews with the director of student teaching

In addition, occasionally this author participated in the setting as a cohort in order to gain an appreciation for the informant's roles in the setting. Rough field notes were taken from these sources on a daily basis and then expanded within 24 hours of the initial entry.

Notes were made in the margins of each day's entry in order to signal a recurring theme, a methodological procedure, or emerging contrast or conflict. These notes
provided the basis for interviews with the informants. The interviews were used to clarify the participants' perceptions of certain events or ideas or clarify observations made by the ethnographer.

**Treatment of Data**

**Quantitative Component - Scoring**

**Observer Rating Scales.** After a half-hour observation during a free play period a rater, utilizing the Observer Rating Scales (McDaniel, 1974), rated the cooperating teacher on a six-point scale for each of nine dimensions. Each point on the scale was defined by a set of behaviors. For example, in order for a teacher to obtain a 2 on feedback he had to match the following description: "The teacher responds to pupil's written and oral work with a general response, such as 'OK' or 'Good' without going into detail about what is good or bad about it" (McDaniel, 1974). In order to obtain a 6 on this dimension the teacher would have to "use materials or methods which provide the pupil with a constant step-by-step check on whether each response/behavior is right or wrong."

A composite teaching score was obtained for the cooperating teacher when the scores for each of the ten dimensions—warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, variety, individu-
alization, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on-task activity were added together. Since the highest possible score for each dimension was 6, the highest possible composite score for teaching behavior was 60. This score reflects teaching behaviors which have consistently shown an association with measures of student achievement, feelings, and attitudes.

**Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System**

Supervisory style on the part of the cooperating teacher was obtained through the use of the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System (Blumberg, 1976). Audio tapes of two fifteen-minute conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher were analyzed with the system. Supervisor and student teacher behaviors were scored every three seconds and coded into either one of the 10 supervisory categories, one of the four supervisory categories or silence. These tallies were then put on a matrix so that information about the directness of the supervisors' style and the ratio of supervisor talk to supervisee talk could be obtained. In order to obtain the percentage of time the supervisor utilized in a conference, the total number of supervisor tallies were divided by the grand total for all behaviors.
Another aspect of supervisory style that was considered in this investigation was directness. A ratio of indirect behaviors (asking for opinion and suggestions) to direct behaviors (giving opinions and suggestions) was obtained by dividing column sums for behaviors 8 and 9 by column sums for behaviors 6 and 7. This ratio is similar to Flanders' indirect/direct ratio which correlates with student learning (Blumberg, 1974).

Besides these quantitative measures several qualitative measures were used to analyze the audio tapes. Ratios were obtained for two steady state areas. Heavy loadings in the "A" area (behaviors 1 and 2) indicated a concern for positive social emotional behavior on the part of the supervisor while heavy loadings in the "D" area indicated a concern for asking the student's opinions and suggestions. The ratio that was obtained for these areas indicated the amount of extended time that the supervisor spent on these behaviors.

Blumberg found some limitations in his interaction system because it focused on behaviors in conferences not content. Therefore, in this investigation the tapes were analyzed for content. The contents of the 40 tapes were classified into categories.
Paragraph Completion Method

Conceptual level was obtained through the use of the Paragraph Completion Method. Scores range from 0 to 3. A score of 0 indicates that an individual has reacted impulsively, negatively, or in an unsocialized manner to a stress situation. For example, in response to "When I am criticized" an individual at 0 conceptual level might say: "When I am criticized I feel small, and get angry, I feel like beating someone up."

A score of 1 indicates that the individual is concerned with behaving in a socially acceptable way. He exhibits polarized thinking. For example, the individual might say, "When I am criticized I don't take it as an insult. I try to correct myself."

A score of 2 indicates a concern with one's own thoughts and feelings and a striving for independence. There is an increase in tolerance of uncertainty. The individual might respond "When I am criticized I usually take what the person says and try to use it to improve. Some criticism, however, is just meant to hurt."

A score of 3 indicates that the individual can weigh alternatives and decide on the best possible solution to a particular situation for which an individual has a concern.

A total conceptual level score was calculated by averaging the top three out of six responses. Hunt (1978)
hypothesizes that it is difficult for subjects to simulate a higher than appropriate score while lower scores are due mainly to lack of attention. The higher the score the more mature the conceptual level. The highest possible score would be 3 and indicates that the individual reacts securely and independently in stress situations.

**Perception of Supervisor-Teacher Conferences**

Perception of supervisor-supervisee conferences was scored through the use of Blumberg-Amidon's Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Conferences. To score the relationship factor stems 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 were added together. The higher the score the better the interpersonal climate. The productivity factor was scored by adding stems 2, 3, 8, 9, 10 and 12. Stems 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 12 must be reversed scored. A score of 1 was equal to a low rating, a score of 5 is equal to a high rating on a factor. For the reversed stems the opposite was true.

The design of this study and the nature of the variables under investigation dictated the method of quantitative data analysis. Because the sample size was small (N = 25 groups) and because some of the independent variables were interval in nature (e.g., conceptual level) while the dependent variables were either continuous (e.g., supervisory
style) or discrete (e.g., perceptions of supervisory conferences) in nature, analysis of variance procedures were employed.

A one-way analysis of variance procedure was used to test the relationship of a number of variables (educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching style) with several dimensions of the cooperating teacher's supervisory style (time style, interaction style, concern for student opinions, and extension of positive social behavior).

In order to determine if differences in conceptual level among the students and cooperating teachers were related to perception of conference outcomes in terms of human relations and productivity a simple linear regression was performed on the data. The scatter plot was examined to determine if any covariates were operating as a possible explanation for the variation in perceptions of supervisory conferences. An analysis of covariance was then performed on these data.

Finally, several one-way analyses of variance were employed to determine if variability of conference perceptions was related to supervisory style, experience, age, educational background, grade point, and conceptual level.
A multiple linear regression was employed in order to predict variability in conference outcomes in terms of human relations and productivity. The level of confidence established for correlations was .05. Mr. Dick Haller was the consulting statistician.

Qualitative Component

After the data collection process was completed, the expanded daily notes were read and reread for a period of two months. The expanded notes were coded into categories which were put on file cards with references to the expanded notes. These categories or "recurring regularities," as Guba (1978) entitles them formed the basis for the identification of recurring themes. The categories occurred regularly in the observational and interview data.

The following criteria were used in order to test for completeness of these categories (Guba, 1978):

1. The individual categories should be consistent and when taken together they should comprise a whole picture.
2. The set of categories should include most of the data.
3. A second observer ought to be able to verify that the categories make sense and that data are in the right category.
4. The set should be credible to the persons who provided the data.

The following major categories observed in this setting fulfilled these criteria:

1. Role perception and management during the student teaching process
2. Environmental influences on student teaching role management

In the ethnographic record these categories were discussed not only from the viewpoint of the participants but from the viewpoint of the ethnographer's on-site observations as well. These categories were then analyzed in terms of ongoing themes that had meaning in this particular setting. Finally, these themes were woven into an ethnographic report. This report was then submitted to the informants for their reactions in terms of the reliability of the data. These reactions were recorded and added to the final draft of the ethnographic report.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

The purpose in this study was to investigate the supervisory process during student teaching in various preschool settings. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were employed to collect the data. Through the quantitative component the author investigated: (1) the relationship of educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching style to the cooperating teacher's supervisory style in conferences with the student teacher, and (2) the relationship of educational background, years of experience, age, conceptual level, teaching style, and grade point average to the student teacher's and the cooperating teacher's perceptions of supervisory conferences. The qualitative component described in depth the supervisory process for one student teaching group as perceived by the participants.

Presented first in this chapter are the findings related to the quantitative component of this investigation including a descriptive analysis of the content of the taped supervisory conferences. Second the findings related to the qualitative component of this investigation
are presented. For the quantitative section of this chapter, findings are reported for each of the twelve hypotheses tested and discussed in relation to the literature that has been reviewed. Tables are included to show the subjects' demographic characteristics, the subjects' scores for each of the variates under investigation, and the statistical analyses of the data.

The qualitative section of this chapter begins with a discussion of the problem and the methodology employed to collect data. The second section addresses those factors which the participants felt influenced the student teaching process for them. The final section contains the participants' reactions to the ethnography and the ethnographer's comments about the student teaching process.

Quantitative Component

Twenty-five student teaching groups (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) were the subjects of this investigation. Five instruments were used to collect data about the subjects' teaching style, conceptual level, supervisory style, perceptions of supervisory conferences, and demographic characteristics.

The small sample size (N=25) not only influenced the methods of data analyses but also the interpretation of
the findings. Simple linear regressions were initially employed to determine if variability in supervisory style and conference perceptions can be explained by the variables under investigation. After the scatter plots were examined, a series of one-way analyses of variance were performed on the data for those variables which seemed to be the most significant in explaining supervisory style and conference perceptions. Finally, step-wise regression analyses were employed in order to predict variance in conference perceptions.

Additional data concerning the content of the supervisory conferences were analyzed in order to provide a taxonomy of the topics discussed in those conferences.

Demographic Information

Twenty-five student teaching groups (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) provided the data for this study. Originally thirty student teaching groups consented to participate in this investigation; however, five groups withdrew for various reasons. Two groups experienced interpersonal problems and withdrew, one group lost their data, and two groups failed to tape record their supervisory conferences.
The sample for this study was comprised of 25 student teachers, 17 cooperating teachers, and 8 university supervisors who were participating in early childhood student teaching courses through either a university located in the midwest or a university located in the east which conducted a summer student teaching program. Some cooperating teachers participated during succeeding quarters with different student teachers. In the New York sample the cooperating teachers each had three student teachers at the same time. The university supervisors supervised from two to nine students during any one student teaching quarter.

**Student Teachers**

The 25 student teachers were female and ranged in age from 20 to 38 years of age with a mean age of 22.7 (Table 1). Eighty-eight percent (N=22) of the students were 23 years of age or younger. The majority of the students (N=17) were child development majors. However, five students were education majors and three majored in other disciplines such as psychology.

The data concerning the students' familial characteristics revealed that only one student was a parent. All students had siblings; 52 percent (N=13) had two
### TABLE 1

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR STUDENT TEACHING GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Students (N=25)</th>
<th>Coop. Teachers (N=17)</th>
<th>University Supervisors (N=8)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Ranges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average age: 22.7, 38.7, 33.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school and training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child development degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Workshops in One Year</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of workshops: 1.3, 5.4, 9.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Parent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Siblings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of siblings: 2.4, 1.9, 3.2
siblings, 20 percent (N=5) had one sibling, and 28 percent (N=7) had three or more siblings in their families.

In terms of the number of workshops that the students had attended in the past year, 56 percent (N=14) reported not attending any while 36 percent (N=9) had attended between 1 and 4 workshops centering on various facets of early childhood education.

Table 2 contains data concerning the students' grade point average. Fifty percent of the students (N=13) had grade point averages in the "B" range, 16 percent (N=4) had averages in the "A" range, and 32 percent (N=8) had grade point averages in the "C" range.

Cooperating Teachers

Of the 17 cooperating teachers, 16 were female and one was male. They ranged in age from 23 years to 59 years of age with a mean age of 38.7 (Table 1). Fifty-eight percent (N=10) were 20 to 29 years of age.

In educational preparation 47 percent (N=8) held degrees in child development while 23 percent (N=4) held degrees in education. Eleven percent (N=2) of the cooperating teachers did not have a college degree.
**TABLE 2**

**STUDENT TEACHERS' SELF-REPORTED GRADE POINT AVERAGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (3.5 and above)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (2.7-3.4)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (1.7-2.5)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3**

**YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS AND HIGHEST LEVEL OF EXPERIENCE FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND UNIVERSITY SUPERVISORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers (N=17)</th>
<th>University Supervisors (N=8)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Experience</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers (N=17)</th>
<th>University Supervisors (N=8)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While 11 percent of the cooperating teachers (N=2) did not attend any workshop in the field of early childhood education during the past year, 47 percent (N=8) attended between 5 and 20 workshops.

Data concerning the teachers' familial backgrounds revealed that 58 percent of the cooperating teachers (N=7) were parents. In terms of their own siblings 11 percent of the teachers (N=2) had no brothers or sisters, but 52 percent (N=9) had 2 or more siblings in their families.

Table 3 provides data concerning the cooperating teachers' years of experience in early childhood centers and the highest level of experience in the field. Forty-eight percent (N=8) of the teachers had 5 to 10 years of experience and 35 percent (N=6) had less than five years of experience. Only three teachers had more than 10 years of experience in early childhood centers. Of the 17 cooperating teachers only one teacher had ever served as director of a program.

University Supervisors

The university supervisors were female and 75 percent (N=6) were under 40 years of age. All of the university supervisors had earned a Bachelor's degree and all but one majored in child development (Table 1). Fifty percent of the supervisors (N=4) attended between 5 and 10 workshops during the past year while 17 percent (N=3) attended less...
than 5 workshops concerned with aspects of early childhood education.

One-half of the university supervisors were parents. The majority of the supervisors (N=5) had three or more siblings in their families and none was the only child in their families.

Sixty-two percent of the university supervisors (N=5) had between 5 and 10 years of experience in early childhood centers (Table 3). Twenty-five percent of the supervisors (N=2) had more than 10 years of experience. Only one supervisor had less than 5 years of experience in the field. Sixty-two percent (N=6) of the university supervisors were or had been center directors at one time. One supervisor, the one with less than five years of experience, had only achieved the level of assistant teacher.

Analysis of Supervisory Style

Audio tapes of conferences between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher were analyzed through the use of the Teacher-Supervisor Interaction System in order to identify the cooperating teacher's supervisory style. Although 50 audio tapes were to be collected from the 25 student teaching groups, only 41 of the tapes were actually audible. However, since there was at least one tape from each of the student teaching groups and since Pearson Product
Product Moment Correlations across two tapes for three
groups on four factors of supervisory style was strong
\((r=.99)\), one tape was considered to be representative
of supervisory style. Those groups that had two tapes
were averaged for measures of supervisory style.

The cooperating teachers' supervisory style in confer­
ences with the student teacher was measured along two
quantitative measures--time style and interaction style--
and two qualitative measures--concern for the students' opinions and concern for positive social behavior. The percentage of time that the cooperating teacher used in the conferences (time style) ranged from 33 to 85 percent of the conference time (see Appendix B, Table 20). The average percent of time spent in cooperating teacher talk during a conference was 57 percent.

This result was consistent with Blumberg and Cusick's (1970) findings that supervisors dominate the talk in con­ferences. In 68 percent of the conferences the cooperating teachers dominated the talk by taking more than 60 percent of the conference time.

Interaction style, which is the ratio of indirect supervisory behaviors (asking the student for ideas) versus direct supervisory ideas (telling the student what to do) is similar to Flander's ID ratio. A ratio of 1 would indicate that the cooperating teacher expends about equal effort in both kinds of behaviors.
The range for interaction style was a ratio of 0 (the most direct style) to a ratio of 2.5 (the most indirect style). The majority of the conferences (76%) were characterized by an extremely direct supervisory style (.33 or less). The average interaction ratio was .43. These subjects were much more direct in their supervisory styles than the supervisors in Blumberg and Cusick's (1970) study who, though they were also more direct than indirect in their style, averaged an interaction ratio of .65. Perhaps because the supervisees in this study were student teachers rather than teachers with experience as Blumberg and Cusick's supervisees were, their supervisors perceived them as needing guidance and, therefore, the cooperating teachers used more telling and evaluating behaviors with the students than they would supervising an experienced teacher.

Concern for the student's opinions (opinion level) was measured as the percentage of extended time spent in asking the student for opinions or suggestions. The range for opinion level was 0 to 87 percent (see Appendix B, Table 20). Only 24 percent of the cooperating teachers expanded on the students' ideas more than 50 percent of the time. That is, they did more than nod or say "uh hum" when the student voiced an opinion. The average percentage of time
spent expanding students' ideas was 35 percent. This finding was consistent with Blumberg and Cusick's (1970) analysis of 50 conference tapes which revealed that only one-third of the conference time spent in asking for supervisee opinions was of an extended nature.

Positive social behaviors in the supervisory conferences was the amount of extended time spent in supervisory behavior that promoted a healthy climate between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. The percentage of time spent in extending positive social behavior ranged from 0 percent to 64 percent (see Appendix B, Table 20). The majority of the cooperating teachers (72%) showed a concern for positive social behavior in their conferences 20 percent of the time or less. The average amount of time spent in extended social emotional behavior was 16 percent. This finding was not consistent with Blumberg and Cusick's (1970) results which indicated that positive social behavior on the part of the supervisor was extended 50 percent of the time. However, the conferences in this investigation were characterized by very little extended time in negative social behaviors such as destructive criticism. Only one cooperating teacher extended this type of behavior in the conferences.
Findings and Discussion in Relation to Null Hypotheses

The small size of this sample dictates that caution should be exercised in interpreting the findings of this study. Further investigations utilizing larger samples will need to be undertaken in order to generalize these findings to other student teaching populations. The level of confidence established for this study was .05; however, if preliminary scatter plots revealed no meaningful trends, further statistical analyses were not employed.

Null Hypothesis 1. There is no significant relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level, and positive social behavior.

The cooperating teacher's educational background was categorized into the following groups: (1) high school and some additional training; (2) a college degree in an unrelated field; (3) a college degree with a major in education; and (4) a college degree with a major in child development.

To determine the relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and four aspects of supervisory style, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data.
The only significant finding was the relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and the extended use of positive social behavior in conferences. The data were analyzed through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. An F value of 3.33 (df 2.22 - 3.21) was obtained which is significant at the .05 level. Co-operating teachers who had a child development background spent significantly more time in extended positive social emotional behavior such as praise and acceptance of feelings than teachers who did not have college degrees or who had degrees in other fields. The difference among the other three educational background groups was not significant.

When the categories for educational background were collapsed to two groups (child development and other majors) instead of the four groups and a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data an even more significant finding was achieved. The F value obtained was 10.84 which is significant at the .01 level (Table 4).

One-way analyses of variance performed on the data for the other three supervisory style factors were not significant. An F value of 2.63 (Table 4) for educational background and time style was not significant at the .05 level or above. An F value of 2.0 (Table 4) for educational background and interaction style and an F value of 1.18 for
TABLE 4
ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF SUPERVISORY STYLE
BY COOPERATING TEACHER'S EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>10.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.260</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.906</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p .05 = 3.10
** p .01 = 4.94
educational background and opinion level were also not significant at the .05 level or above.

There was, however, a trend at the .07 level for cooperating teachers with less than a college degree to do more talking during the supervisory conferences than any other educational group. Their mean was 69 percent of the time spent in supervisor talk, as opposed to the grand mean of 60 percent. Perhaps future investigations with different educational background groupings and larger samples would lend support to this trend.

These findings indicate that Hypothesis 1 failed to be rejected for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, and opinion level but was rejected for supervisory style as measured by positive social behavior. There was a relationship between the cooperating teacher's educational background and extension of positive social behavior in conferences.

Null Hypothesis 2. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's years of experience and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level and positive social behavior.

Years of experience for the cooperating teachers ranged from 2 years to 16 years with the average years of
experience 8.8 years. Years of experience were also categorized into below 10 years and 10 years or more. One-way analyses of variance provided the following F values: 1.6 for time style, 3.27 for interaction style, .95 for extending the student's opinions in conferences, and 3.57 for extending positive social behavior (Table 5). None of these values was significant. Therefore Hypothesis 2 failed to be rejected. There was no relationship between the cooperating teacher's years of experience and supervisory style.

Null Hypotheses 3. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion style and positive social behavior.

Conceptual level scores could range from 0, the lowest level of conceptual complexity, to 3 the highest level of conceptual complexity. At the higher levels of conceptual level the individual demonstrates a higher level of discrimination, differentiation, and integration in stress situations, as well as increasing interpersonal maturity. Conceptual level scores for this sample of cooperating teachers ranged from 1.2 to 3.0 (see Appendix B, Table 21). The average conceptual level score for cooperating teachers was 2.3. One-way analyses of variance were performed on the data and yielded the following F values:
TABLE 5
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUPERVISORY STYLE
BY COOPERATING TEACHER'S YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.900</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Social Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P .05 = 4.28
**P .01 = 7.88
.001 (time style); .025 (interaction style); .00 (concern for student's opinions; and .175 (concern for positive social behavior in conferences). None of these values was significant at the .05 level (Table 6). Therefore Hypothesis 3 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level and supervisory style.

This finding was not consistent with Murphy and Brown's (1970) conclusions that as conceptual level increased for teachers the proportion of information handled by helping students to theorize and to express themselves increased. In general, cooperating teachers in this sample even though they were at varying conceptual levels dominated the conferences with their verbalizations, and spent little time extending the student's ideas. Perhaps in another type of supervisory situation with more experienced teachers such as a teacher's aide, these cooperating teachers wouldn't be so direct in their supervisory style.

For this study an additional open-ended statement was included in Hunt's Paragraph Completion Test. The cooperating teacher's written responses to "when I think about supervision" seemed to indicate a movement from an egocentric view of supervision with a concern for hierarchy and reactions to negative evaluation to a team approach
### TABLE 6

ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF SUPERVISORY STYLE
BY COOPERATING TEACHER'S CONCEPTUAL LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.155</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Social Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P $.05 = 4.28$

P $.01 = 7.88$
with an active supervisee and a supervisor who takes on a catalyst role. The following statements were representative of the various conceptual levels:

When I think about supervision...

CL score of 1.5 - "I get the heebie-jeebies. I cease to function. My creativity shuts down and I regress back to a first-year teacher.

CL score of 1.8 - "I think about how I can best show and tell someone how I think they can work at becoming a better teacher."

CL score of 2.6 - "I think about assisting student teachers to grow. Guiding them, showing by my example and giving them leeway to try things on their own. Supervision means being there watching and evaluating."

CL score of 3.0 - "I usually will give much information if I have it (maybe more than is required or desired) but I stand back and let the person being supervised have much freedom to perform duties--make mistakes and learn from them. I try to give positive feedback that is critical. I am basically an affirming person."

Even though the majority of the cooperating teachers in this study used direct supervisory style, their written responses displayed a range of supervisory styles. This may
be attributed to their inability to apply what they believe or their perception that student teaching is a particular type of supervision which requires a direct supervisory style.

**Null Hypothesis 4.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's teaching style and supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level, and positive social behavior.

The cooperating teacher's teaching style with children was measured through the use of the Observer Rating Scales. The teacher's composite scores, which measured their warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, variety, individualization, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on task activity with children in the classroom, ranged from a score of 19 to a score of 53 (see Appendix B, Table 22). The average teaching style score was 38.2.

One-way analyses of variance were performed on the data and yielded the following F values (Table 7): .397 (time style), 2.94 (interaction style), .66 (opinion level) and 2.06 (positive social behavior). None of these values was significant at the .05 level. Therefore Hypothesis 4 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children and supervisory style in conferences as measured by time.
### TABLE 7

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SUPERVISORY STYLE BY Cooperating Teacher's Teaching Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Style</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.017</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Social Behavior</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ P \ .05 = 4.28 \ (1,23) \]

\[ P \ .01 = 7.88 \ (1,23) \]
style, interaction style, opinion level, and positive social behavior.

Often the sole criteria for selection of a cooperating teacher is his/her effective teaching style with children. The findings for this hypothesis seem to suggest that effective teaching skills with children do not necessarily translate to effective supervisory skill with adults. Katz (1977) suggests that teacher preparation programs for early childhood education are inconsistent in their philosophy of education for children and their philosophy of education for adults. While training programs foster an interactive teaching philosophy in their approach to children's learning, they foster a direct approach (lecture, evaluation) when teaching adults. In this study cooperating teachers could be rated very highly on warmth in their interactions with children and yet seldom extend positive social behavior in their conferences with student teachers. Teachers could be rated highly on freedom in their child interactions and adopt a very direct style (telling and evaluating) in their supervisory interactions with student teachers.

The findings for this hypothesis may suggest that cooperating teachers can be inconsistent in their approaches to children and adults. Supervision of student teachers
may require special skills that are not necessarily in the repertoire of the teacher who is an effective teacher of young children.

**Null Hypothesis 5.** There is no relationship between the concurrence of conceptual level scores between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and their perceptions of supervisory conferences.

Perceptions of supervisory conferences were measured for both the student teacher and the cooperating teachers. The Perceptions of Conferences instrument indicated how high the subjects' rated the human relations in their supervisory conferences and how high they rated the productivity in their conferences.

Human relations scores for the students' perceptions of supervisory conferences ranged from 8 to 24 with a mean average of 16.4 (see Appendix B, Table 23). The highest possible score was 25. The cooperating teacher's scores ranged from 11 to 25 with a mean score of 19.32. In general the student teachers rated the conferences lower on human relations than the cooperating teachers.

In terms of productivity the students and cooperating teachers had similar scores (see Appendix B, Table 23). The students' scores for productivity ranged from 13 to 26 with an average of 20.4. The highest possible score
was 30. The cooperating teacher's scores ranged from 15 to 28 with an average score of 20.9.

Simple linear regressions were performed on the data to determine if there was a relationship between the concurrence of conceptual level scores for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and their perceptions of supervisory conferences. A moderate relationship \((r = .44)\) was indicated for differences in conceptual level between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher in terms of how the cooperating teacher views the human relations in his/her conferences. Examination of the scatter plot revealed that as the conceptual level score of the cooperating teacher surpassed the student's conceptual level score, the cooperating teacher viewed the human relations in conferences as more positive than if his/her score were lower than the student's. However, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data and an F value of 2.88 was obtained which is not significant at the .05 level (Table 8). There is no relationship between concurrence of conceptual level scores and the cooperating teacher's perception of human relations in supervisory conferences.
Even though the linear regression yielded a correlation of .44 and the scatter plot indicated a linear trend, a one-way analysis of variance proved insignificant. This is attributed to the fact that conceptual level had to be categorized for the analysis of variance whereas for the linear regression it was not. However, categorization of the variable did not achieve significance at the .05 level.

Linear regressions for the relationship between the students' perceptions of both productivity and human relations and concurrence of conceptual level scores both proved to be negligible (human relations $r = .003$, productivity .26) and therefore further analyses were not performed on the data. The simple linear regression for
the relationship between the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference productivity and concurrence of conceptual level scores also yielded a low correlation (r= .26) and therefore further analyses were not performed.

Hypothesis 5 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between the concurrence of conceptual level scores for the student teacher and the cooperating teacher and their perceptions of supervisory conferences. Perhaps further investigations with larger samples may explain the linear trend that was indicated in the scatter plot for the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference human relations and his/her higher level of conceptual thinking when compared with the student.

Efforts were made to see if a covariate could possibly explain some of the outlying scores in this scatter plot. The only viable variation--the cooperating teacher's years of experience in early childhood centers--did not explain this variance.

**Null Hypothesis 6.** There is no relationship between supervisory style as measured by time style, interaction style, opinion level and positive social behavior and perceptions of supervisory conferences.
Linear regression analyses were performed on the data in order to determine if there was a relationship between the cooperating teacher's supervisory style and the student's perceptions of the human relations in their conferences. The following correlations were obtained for the cooperating teacher: time style ($r=.04$), interaction style ($r=.23$), opinion level ($r=.26$) and positive social behavior in conferences ($r=.06$). Upon examination of the scatter plots it was evident that these correlations could at the most explain only 6 percent of the variance in perception of human relations for the student teacher and therefore further analyses were not performed.

The findings for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's supervisory style and the student's perception of conference productivity were very similar. A simple linear regression provided the following correlations: time style (.21), interaction style (.26), opinion level (.28), and positive social behavior in conferences (.25). Again these correlations could, at the most, explain only 7 percent of the variance in the students' perceptions of conference productivity.

For the cooperating teachers the findings were somewhat similar. For the human relations factor the following correlations were obtained in terms of the cooperating
teachers' supervisory style: time style coop (r=-.13), interaction style coop (r=.03), opinion level coop (r=.08) and positive social behavior in conferences (r=.07). These correlations, at most, could only explain 1 percent of the variability in the cooperating teacher's perceptions of human relations in his/her supervisory conferences.

In general, the findings for the cooperating teachers' perceptions of conference productivity were similar to those for the human relations factor. The following correlations resulted from a simple linear regression analysis: interaction style coop (r=.22), opinion level coop (r=.05), and coop positive social behavior in conferences (r=.23). However, a moderate correlation (r=.34) was obtained for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference productivity and the cooperating teacher's time style in the conferences. Teacher time style can explain 12 percent of the variability.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's perception of conference productivity and his/her time style in conferences. The analysis yielded an F value of 1.713 which is not significant at the .05 level (Table 9).
TABLE 9

ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF PRODUCTIVITY IN CONFERENCES BY THE COOPERATING TEACHER AND TIME STYLE IN CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37.543</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>241.097</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P .05 = 3.44

**P .01 = 5.72

Hypothesis 6 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between supervisory style and perceptions of supervisory conferences for either the cooperating teacher or the student teacher.

These findings are inconsistent with Blumberg and Amidon's (1965) results that supervisees view conferences more positively if the supervisor balances direct (telling and evaluating) and indirect (asking and listening) supervisory behaviors in conferences rather than using one style predominately. Perhaps student teaching was viewed by these participants as a situation requiring predominately direct behaviors and student teachers are expected to be passive. A larger sample may indicate a stronger relation-
ship between time style and conference productivity for cooperating teachers. Blumberg (1974) found that supervisors generally do most of the talking in conferences and tend to rate conferences higher than supervisees rate them. As previously reported, in general the students in this study rated the human relations in their conferences lower than the cooperating teacher did.

**Null Hypothesis 7.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teachers' years of experience and the perception of supervisory conferences.

One-way analysis of variance revealed that the students' perceptions of supervisory conferences both in terms of human relations and productivity were not related to the cooperating teacher's years of experience. F values of .32 for human relations and .34 for productivity were not significant at the .05 level (Table 10).

In general, the findings for the relationship between the cooperating teachers' perceptions of conferences and years of experience were similar to the findings for the students. An F value of .14 was obtained for human relations and an F value of .22 was obtained for productivity (Table 10), neither of which is significant at the .05 level. However, examination of the regression analysis for
TABLE 10
ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCES BY THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>397.01</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.170</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>344.590</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.293</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>348.147</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.871</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>260.769</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P .05 = 4.28

**P .01 = 7.88
years of experience and human relation in conference indicated that when years of experience for the cooperating teacher was not broken down into categories (e.g., under 10 years, more than 10 years) a moderate correlation of \( r = .40 \) was obtained. However, the scatter plot indicated that perhaps another variable was operating along with years of experience to explain variance in the cooperating teacher's perception of conference human relations. Since none of the factors in this investigation proved to be covariates with experience, this variance remained unexplained. Hypothesis 7 is rejected. There is no relationship between perceptions of supervisory conferences and the cooperating teachers' years of experience in early childhood programs.

**Null Hypothesis 8.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level and the perception of supervisory conferences.

The cooperating teacher's conceptual level did seem to make a difference in his/her perceptions of supervisory conferences both in terms of human relations and conference productivity. One-way analyses of variance yielded an F value of 5.29 for human relations and an F value of 4.87 for productivity, both of which are significant at the .05 level (Table 11). There is a relationship between the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>402.588</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.536</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>315.224</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.754</td>
<td>71.175</td>
<td>5.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>311.686</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Conceptual Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.743</td>
<td>48.74</td>
<td>4.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>229.897</td>
<td>239.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P .05 = 4.28

**P .01 = 7.88
cooperating teachers' conceptual level and their perceptions of supervisory conferences.

These findings suggest that cooperating teachers who are at higher levels of conceptual thinking view their conferences more positively both in terms of human relations and productivity. These findings are consistent with Hunt's (1978) definition of high conceptual level individuals. These individuals demonstrate flexibility in stress situations and show concern for other's ideas. They are secure in their independence and their relationships with others. They probably would be able to handle the stresses encountered during student teaching conferences.

The students' perceptions of supervisory conferences were not significantly related to the cooperating teacher's conceptual level. One-way analyses of variance yielded F values of .00 for human relations and an F value of 2.52 for productivity (Table 11). Neither of these values is significant at the .05 level. There is no relationship between student perceptions of supervisory conferences and the cooperating teachers' conceptual level. Hypothesis 8 failed to be rejected for students' perceptions of conferences but it was rejected for the cooperating teachers' perceptions of conferences. There is a relationship between the cooperating teachers' perceptions
of conferences both in terms of productivity and human relations and the cooperating teacher's conceptual level.

**Null Hypothesis 9.** There is no relationship between the student teacher's conceptual level and perception of supervisory conferences.

Regression analyses yielded the following correlations for the relationship between student perception of supervisory conferences and the students' conceptual level: human relations ($r=.24$) and productivity ($r=.01$). Neither of these correlations explain a significant proportion of the variance associated with student conference perceptions.

The findings for the cooperating teacher were similar. Correlations for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's perception of conferences and the student's conceptual level were: human relations ($r=.17$) and productivity ($r=.02$). Neither of these correlations explain a significant amount of variability in cooperating teacher conference perceptions; therefore Hypothesis 9 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between perception of supervisory conferences and student conceptual level.

**Null Hypothesis 10.** There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's age and perception of supervisory conferences.
The age of the cooperating teachers ranged from 23 to 59 years of age with the average age 38 years old. The cooperating teachers' ages were significantly related to their perceptions of the human relations in supervisory conferences. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F value of 7.72 which is significant at the .05 level (Table 12). As age increased for the cooperating teacher perceptions of conference human relations became more positive than the perceptions if cooperating teachers were younger. Perhaps because older teachers have had more life experiences and feel relatively secure in their position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age of Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.432</td>
<td>96.43</td>
<td>7.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>287.007</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P .05 = 4.28

**P .04 = 7.88
their expectations for conferences would be more realistic than younger teachers.

Linear regression analyses indicated that for the student, perceptions of conferences were not related to the cooperating teacher's age. The following correlations were obtained: human relations ($r=.14$) and productivity ($r=.17$).

A linear regression analysis also indicated that the cooperating teacher's age was not related to the cooperating teacher's conference perceptions of productivity ($r=.26$).

Hypothesis 10 failed to be rejected for the relationship between the students' conference perceptions and the cooperating teachers' age and the cooperating teachers' perceptions of conference productivity and the cooperating teacher's age. However, Hypothesis 10 was rejected for the relationship between the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference human relations and his/her age in years. As age increased for the cooperating teacher s/he tended to view the human relations in student teaching conferences more positively than younger teachers.

Null Hypothesis 11. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's teaching style and perception of supervisory conferences.
The cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference productivity were significantly related to the cooperating teacher's teaching style in the classroom. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F value of 4.8 which is significant at the .05 level (Table 13). The higher the cooperating teacher was rated on the Observer Rating Scales the more productive s/he viewed the student teaching conferences. Cooperating teachers probably felt successful in the classroom if they were rated highly on warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, variety, individualism, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on task activity with children. This feeling of success may have carried over into the student teaching conferences and these cooperating teachers also felt productive in their conferences with students.

A one-way analysis of variance yielded the following F values for the relationship between the student's perception of conferences and the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children: human relations F=2.88 and productivity F=2.05. Neither of these values is significant at the .05 level. However, the F value for human relations approached the .07 level, suggesting that an effective teaching model may be important to the students' perceptions of supervisory encounters.
TABLE 13
ONE-WAY ANALYSES OF VARIANCE OF PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES AND THE COOPERATING TEACHER'S TEACHING STYLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.56</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>319.00</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34.996</td>
<td>27.49</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>294.764</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.009</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>352.431</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.355</td>
<td>42.35</td>
<td>4.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.815</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P .05 = 3.44
** P .01 = 5.72
The cooperating teacher's perception of conference human relations was also not related to teaching style. An F value of .96 was obtained which was not significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 11 failed to be rejected for the relationship between the student's perceptions of conferences and their cooperating teacher's teaching style but it was rejected for the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference productivity and teaching style. Cooperating teachers who were effective teachers with children felt their conferences were more productive than lower rated teachers.

Null Hypothesis 12. There is no relationship between the student's grade point average and perception of supervisory conferences.

Linear regression analyses were performed on the data and the following correlations were obtained for the relationship between the students' perceptions and their grade-point averages: human relations ($r=.03$) and productivity ($r=.08$). For the cooperating teacher the following correlations were obtained: human relations ($r=.42$) and productivity ($r=.06$). A moderate relationship was shown for the cooperating teacher's perception of human relations in the conferences and the student's grade point average. A one-way
analysis of variance yielded an F value of 3.19 (Table 14). This value is not significant at the .05 level. There is no relationship between the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference human relations and the student's gradepoint average.

**TABLE 14**

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE Cooperating Teacher's Perception of Human Relations and the Student Teacher's Gradepoint Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade point</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.334</td>
<td>43.167</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>297.106</td>
<td>13.505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P .05 = 3.44

** P .01 = 5.72

However, this value is significant at the .06 level so perhaps a larger sample might indicate a stronger relationship between conference perceptions and gradepoint average. Hypothesis 12 failed to be rejected. There is no relationship between perceptions of supervisory conferences and student gradepoint average.
Step-wise Linear Regressions

Step-wise linear regression analyses were employed in order to determine how much of the variability of conference perceptions could be predicted by the variables under investigation. Those factors which appeared to be the most significant after the linear regressions and one-way analyses of variance procedures were performed were used in the analysis in order to predict conference perceptions for both the student and the cooperating teachers.

Human Relations in Conferences

The best predictor for the students' perceptions of the human relations in their conferences was the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children (Table 15). This variable accounted for 23 percent of the variance in the students' perception of human relations. The conceptual level of the cooperating teacher explained 4 percent more of the variance, while the cooperating teacher's years of experience (percent negatively correlated) and age (5%) brought the percentage of explained variability to 33 percent.

The step-wise regression analysis for prediction of the cooperating teacher's perception of human relations in the
TABLE 15
STEP-WISE REGRESSION ANALYSES OF PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE HUMAN RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style (Co-op)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.0988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual level (Co-op)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.9787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience (Co-op)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.4688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Co-op</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.9492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Co-op</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.0623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level (Co-op)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.5405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style (Co-op)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.0806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
conferences had some similarities with the students'. The most significant factor explained the majority of the variability in conference perceptions with the other factors contributing little more. The age of the cooperating teacher explained 25 percent of the variability in the cooperating teacher's perceptions while the addition of his/her conceptual level, teaching style with children and years of experience explained 37 percent of the cooperating teacher's perception of human relations (Table 15).

Though these predictions explain about one-third of the variability in human relations in the conferences for each participating group, different factors were important to different supervisory participants. A good model teacher who is young is important to the student teacher's human relations while being older and having a high conceptual level is important for the cooperating teacher's perceptions of human relations in supervisory encounters.

**Productivity**

Perceptions of productivity of the cooperating teacher's teaching style were most important for the student (Table 16). The cooperating teacher's conceptual level was next, while the cooperating teacher's time style
TABLE 16
STEP-WISE REGRESSION ANALYSES OF PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE PRODUCTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style (Coop)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.1105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level (Coop)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.3748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Style (Coop)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7.4825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Level (Coop)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>3.1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Style (Coop)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>10.0887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style (Coop)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.3735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
<pre><code>                                       |     |      | 6.1427|
</code></pre>
in the conferences added 7 percent more. Taken together the factors explained 25 percent of the students' perceptions of productivity.

For the cooperating teacher's perception of productivity, conceptual level was the most important followed by the cooperating teacher's time style in the conferences and teaching style with children. A total of 33 percent of the variability in the cooperating teacher's perception of productivity was explained by these factors.

Clearly other factors not included in this investigation are operating to influence conference perceptions. Had the sample size been larger, a greater amount of variance in conference perceptions may have been explained by the variables studied.

Content of Supervisory Conferences

The audio tapes of supervisory conferences were analyzed with both quantitative methods as well as qualitative methods.

Blumberg's system of supervisor-teacher interaction (1974) focuses on behavior not content. Blumberg emphasizes that the behavior of supervisors and teachers cannot be fully understood unless one is aware of the content. A frequency count of the type of topics engaged in during
41 student teaching conferences is provided in Table 17. The 13 categories of topics were: assessment of children, child management, classroom management, cooperating teacher, curriculum, evaluation, orientation, parents, personal life, planning, profession, staff, and student teacher role. Frequency counts and percentage of how many of the 41 tapes dealt with this topic are also given in the table.

The most popular topics were: assessment of individual children (44%), the cooperating teacher's general evaluation of the student's progress (44%), general discipline strategies (37%), evaluation of students' group times (37%), evaluation of student discipline strategies with children (37%), evaluation of student's communication with children (34%), and grades student receives for student teaching (31%).

Topics that were present in at least 20 percent of the conferences were: managing an individual child (27%), evaluating the appropriateness of the student teachers' activities (27%), explanation of the evaluation process (20%), general praise of the student (24%), the students' evaluation of the student teaching experience (29%), the student's evaluation of his/her own progress (22%), evaluation of the student's lesson plans (20%), evaluation of the student's maintenance of the professional role (32%),
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Assessment of individual children</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assessment of whole group of children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individual child's home background</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individual child's absences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Discipline strategies (in general)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Managing an individual child</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Managing children during group times</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managing aggressive children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Separation problems with individual child</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Managing passive children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Managing specific interest centers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., rules for art area) or equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Separation strategies (in general)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How to do certain activities (e.g., art)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication with children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conducting group times</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Location and identification of supplies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervision of whole group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transitions in classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Children as classroom helpers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Redirection of children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Routines in classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tone of teacher's voice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Conferences</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperating Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>Comparison of student and co-op teaching philosophy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>Co-op expectations for student teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Co-op's feelings about the process of student teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Student's perception of the relationship between co-op and self</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Co-op's prior experiences with student teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Co-op's letting go of the group so student can take over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Nature of the communication between student teacher and co-op</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Student praise of co-op</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Selection of appropriate activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Identification of curriculum themes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Incorporating a cognitive dimension into activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Level of planned activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Variety in amount of activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Co-op's evaluation of student's general progress (strengths and weaknesses)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Student's discipline strategies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Evaluation of student's group times</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Student's communication with children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Grades and grading process</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Student's maintenance of professional role</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Student's evaluation of student teaching experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appropriateness of student's activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Praise of student (general)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student's evaluation of own progress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Student's lesson plans</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Explanation of evaluation process</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Evaluation of single activity executed by student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Student's evaluation of own personality characteristics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Student's timing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Student's sense of responsibility</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Student's goals for further growth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Student's transitions in classroom</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Student's relations with staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Student's relations with parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Why certain days don't go well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Student's supervision of others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Children's feelings about student teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Evaluation of evaluation process</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Student's organization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Student's creativity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Student's acceptance of criticism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Differences in evaluation between co-op and student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Atmosphere in the classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Student's evaluation of co-op teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Student's self-supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Student's flexibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orientation**

1. Location of materials                                             | 3         |
2. Center goals for children (general)                               | 2         |
3. Field trip philosophy                                             | 2         |
4. Center discipline philosophy                                      | 1         |
5. Record keeping system                                             | 1         |
6. Requisition of materials                                          | 1         |
TABLE 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Conferences</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Parents

1. a Evaluation of parent behavior with child 6 15
1. b Grandparents 1 2
2. Staff relations with individual parents 4 10
3. Reactions parents have to school incidents 2 5
4. Parent's expectations for children 1 2
5. Parent events (e.g., conferences) 1 2
6. Parent occupations 1 2
7. Parent and center differences in philosophy 1 2

Personal Life

1. Health 2 5
2. Own parenting 2 5
3. Home life 1 2
4. Own childhood 1 2
5. Financial problems 1 2
6. Religion 1 2

Planning

1. Explanation of specific activities 4 10
2. Planning for individual children 4 10
3. Special events occurring in the classroom (e.g., outside speakers) 4 10
4. Field trips 3 7
5. Scheduling student take-over days 2 5
6. Scheduling activities in certain areas of room 1 2
7. Coordinating student and center planning 1 2
8. Staff assignments 1 2
TABLE 17 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Conferences</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profession</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student career goals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation of previous practicum experiences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher burnout</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Nature of the profession</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student discussion of supervision of other staff members</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other staff members' teaching styles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staff relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other student teachers at the center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ownership of specific pieces of equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Teacher Role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student establishment of teacher role</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Expectations for student take-over days</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Separation from children at the end of student teaching</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mechanism for conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mechanism for turning in lesson plans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make-up days policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The number of tapes that contained these topics and the percentage of the 41 tapes that contained these topics.

<sup>b</sup>Topics that were present in at least 20 percent of the conferences.
student career goals (24%), the student's supervision of other staff members (non-evaluative) (24%), and students' establishment of teacher role (20%).

As expected, the majority of the topics in the conferences were concerned with evaluation of student activities and discipline strategies to employ with children. Under the specific categories certain topics seemed to be dealt with more often. If the participants dealt with the following topics they generally discussed:

1. **Assessment of Children** - assessment of individual children
2. **Child Management** - general discipline strategies
3. **Classroom Management** - how to do certain curriculum activities
4. **Cooperating Teacher** - (1) comparison of student and cooperating teacher's philosophy of education and (2) the cooperating teacher's feelings about the student teaching process in general.
5. **Curriculum** - selection of appropriate activities
6. **Evaluation** - evaluation of the student teacher's general progress
7. **Orientation** - location of materials
8. **Parents** - evaluation of parent behavior with child
9. **Personal Life** - (1) health or (2) own parenting
10. **Planning** - (1) explanation of specific activities, (2) planning for individual children, or (3) special events occurring in the classroom

11. **Profession** - student career goals

12. **Staff** - supervision of other staff members

13. **Student Teacher Role** - student establishment of teacher role

Though student teachers were very passive in the majority of the conferences as evidenced by measurements of the cooperating teacher's time style and interaction style in the conferences, the students did evaluate their own progress in 22 percent of the conferences. They also verbalized about their career goals in 24 percent of the conferences. While the topic that was most often generated by students was how to supervise other staff members on take-over days, only 7 percent of the conferences centered on the evaluation of the student's supervision of others.

Students seemed to view themselves as passive participants unable to initiate much in the conferences. While cooperating teachers praised the students' general performance in 24 percent of the conferences, the students only praised the cooperating teachers in 2 percent of the conferences.
Some of the stresses of student teaching were revealed in the content of the conferences. Teacher burnout, the cooperating teacher's ability to let go of the class, financial and health problems, why certain days didn't go well, extended talk about the supervision of other staff members, separation at the end of student teaching, and the large number of conferences devoted to discipline problems with individual children indicated that the supervisory participants were dealing with many stressful issues.

Though most of the conferences were mainly evaluative in nature, some were not. Since student teachers averaged only two formal conferences with their cooperating teachers during student teaching, these conferences were probably typical in nature. The first conferences naturally contained more orienting kinds of topics, such as where supplies were located, the cooperating teacher's general philosophy of discipline, while the second conferences dealt with extensive evaluation of the student, especially grading. Student career goals, and how the student would cope with leaving the student teaching center were frequent topics in later conferences. The discussion of this topic revealed that the relationship between student and cooperating teacher was intense. Some pairs openly admitted having separation problems at the student's
leaving at the conclusion of student teaching.

Sometimes in the second conference, which occurred in the last five weeks of student teaching, the student and cooperating teacher realized that they had evaluated the experience differently. These differences were due to either their different perceptions of the student's progress or the students' revelations about a personal crisis experienced during the student teaching quarter which explained their performance, or the cooperating teacher's revelation that the student was their first student teacher and they didn't know what to do. This moment of truth came as a surprise to the participants and they would verbalize their frustration at not knowing earlier. Usually these conferences ended on a less than positive note.

The vast majority of the evaluative comments revealed in the conference tapes were constructive in nature though it was not obvious that the students agreed with what was being said because of their passive role in the conferences. Only two conferences contained an extended amount of criticism. In general, the conferences contained many positive evaluative statements with the cooperating teacher doing most of the talking and the student initiating little.
Problem Statement

Student teaching in early childhood settings can be viewed as a process of socialization for the student teacher during which s/he develops a professional identity (Katz, 1977). This identity is composed of many factors including: ethics, attitudes, ideological position, occupational self-image, reference group membership, and commitment to the profession. It is logical to assume from theories of symbolic interactionism (Shrauger and Schoeneman, 1979) that not only is the student teacher fashioning a professional self-image during student teaching but that the other participants—supervisors and cooperating teachers—are adding pieces to their professional self-concepts as well. Symbolic interactionists hypothesize that one's self-concept is a reflection of not only one's perceptions about self but also the perceptions one has about how others view him/her.

Outcomes of such supervisory experiences as student teaching can have a serious impact on not only the professional self identities of the student teaching participants but ultimately their performance in the field. Certain
factors during the student teaching experience may create an atmosphere of conflict or harmony. The nature of the student teaching process is such that certain phases of the process may be stressful for the participants. Caruso (1977) has identified some of these phases for the student teacher which may range from the initial phase of anxiety and euphoria to a final phase of loss and relief.

Unfortunately the student teaching experience has rarely been described through the eyes of the participants in order to identify those factors which the participants believe are critical influences during student teaching. The goal of ethnography--to identify this unique view of the participants--can be achieved through the description of a particular culture. As Spradley (1980, p. 3) has defined ethnography: "rather than studying people, ethnography means learning from people."

Unlike most investigations of student teaching which focus mainly on the perceptions of the student teacher, the purpose in this ethnography was to describe how the four participants viewed and managed their roles during a ten-week period of student teaching. A broader purpose was to identify recurring themes in order to pinpoint those factors that the participants felt were the most significant in influencing the management of their roles during this
period. The reader should bear in mind that this group may
or may not be typical of a student teaching group in the
field of early childhood education. In fact, this group
may or may not express the same views at another point in
time. This ethnographic report attempts to describe a ten-
week student teaching culture from the participants' per-
spectives in the hope that it will offer a broader under-
standing of the supervisory process and identify strategies
that can be expected to make the process more effective.
The participants' names in this study have been changed.

Methodology

*Initial Entry Into the Setting.* Since I had experi-
ences as a nursery school teacher, a co-operating teacher,
and a university supervisor, I felt that I could enter
preschool settings not only as an ethnographer but a
cohort as well. I began my entry into the setting by con-
tacting the director of student teaching, Dr. Mary Smith.
She was enthusiastic about the project and suggested
I come to the orientation meeting for student teachers on
the first day of the quarter in order to explain the project.
At that meeting, I explained to the supervisors and students
that this was their chance as active participants in the
student teaching process to improve student teaching for
others through the recording of their impressions as they
experienced the process. I further explained that I would like to study one student teaching triad in depth in order to describe the process as a whole. Of the seven student teachers and three supervisors that were present all agreed to participate in the study.

From those that agreed to participate one triad was selected. They were chosen because they were the only group working in an afternoon program when I would have the most time for observation. Once this triad had been selected I discovered that the student teacher would have two university supervisors working with her during her practicum experience. She would have an intern supervisor, who was being trained in supervision, as well as a university supervisor, who was an adjunct professor with the department and the administrator of the center in which the student was placed.

Dr. Smith later remarked that this supervisory situation was unique. Only once before had an intern been paired with a center supervisor. These circumstances arose because the intern could only supervise at centers she could reach on foot and she lacked experience in preschool settings so she needed to be paired with an experienced supervisor. Furthermore, the student teaching program for student teachers such as this student teacher who were
concentrating on preschool programs for exceptional children was still in a stage of development.

The Informants. The student teaching group in this ethnography was comprised of four individuals:

1. Ann, the Student Teacher. Ann was 22 years old, and in her final quarter as an undergraduate. She had maintained a B average for her four years in college and she would be receiving her Bachelor's degree at the end of the quarter. Ann lived on campus in an apartment shared with her fiance. Her hometown was a large midwestern city approximately a two-hour drive from the university. She came from a middle-class family which included three male siblings. Two of her brothers were enrolled at the same university though she seldom saw them on the campus. In addition to student teaching, Ann worked at a local discount store and carried 11 extra hours of classes. Because she was interested in developmentally delayed children, she had had a prior practicum experience in the center in which she was placed for student teaching, though this experience was with an adult group.

2. The Cooperating Teacher--Barb. Barb was the cooperating teacher in whose room Ann was placed for her student teaching experience. She was 28 years old, married, with no children.
Two of her four years of experience as a classroom teacher were in another city. She had the day-to-day responsibility as head teacher for a group of 12 preschoolers, most of whom exhibited developmental delays. She taught an afternoon session in her center (1-3:30 P.M.) and did her administrative work (e.g., home visits and reports) in the mornings. She had a Bachelor's degree in Home Economics and hoped to continue her education in a specialized area such as speech therapy.

3. The University Supervisor--Julie. Julie, the university supervisor, held a part-time appointment at the university and was responsible for Ann's supervision in terms of the university. Because Julie was ultimately responsible for Ann's student teaching grade from the center, Ann turned her written assignments in to her to be evaluated. Julie, who was 35 years old, had eight years of experience in early childhood programs as well as extensive experience in working with student teachers. In addition to being Ann's university supervisor she was also director of the preschool program to which Ann was assigned. Julie was married and had a teenage daughter. She had a Ph.D. degree in Exceptional Education.
4. The Supervision Intern—Darlene. Darlene, the supervision intern, was a 22-year-old graduate student specializing in family and child development. Darlene shared Ann's university supervision with Julie. Since Darlene was an intern her supervision of Ann fulfilled the requirements for a course in supervision. She met every two weeks in a supervisory seminar with Dr. Smith and was to be supervised in the field by another supervisor. Darlene was from a small southern town and was attending the university on a graduate assistantship. She had less than one year's experience in an early childhood center but during the prior quarter she was assigned an independent study in the department's laboratory school. She was single and lived in graduate student housing.

I first contacted Darlene, the intern supervisor, to see if she would participate in the study. She agreed but asked to talk to me again because she was exhausted from an out-of-town trip.

Next I contacted Julie, the center administrator. When we met I explained the field methods I would employ in the study. I told her I was concerned that her center was atypical because it was geared to developmentally delayed preschoolers. She assured me that her center would be an excellent place for this investigation because it would have developmental problems typical of several "normal pre-

school groups. She informed me that observations were to begin in the observation booth because so many specialists were already interrupting the class.

I explained to Julie that I also wanted to interview and observe her. She replied somewhat defensively,

Well, I probably don't observe the student teachers as much as I should but you could meet me twice a week to discuss that I'm doing.

I met Barb, the cooperating teacher, and informed her that I had also talked to Julie. She readily agreed to the project and told me to "observe in the classroom if you don't get what you want in the observation booth." She offered to keep her own journal during the quarter and allow me to read it.

Next I contacted Ann, the student teacher, by telephone and told her that the others had agreed to be informants for an investigation of student teaching. Even though she agreed to participate, little enthusiasm came through over the telephone. She wasn't sure she understood the project and answered my questions with monosyllables. Finally, she agreed to participate and to meet with me during her first week of student teaching. At first, I worried about Ann's lack of enthusiasm but that was dispelled in our first interview. She proved to be not only a very articulate
informant but an open one as well.

Overview of the Setting (Figures 1 and 2). Physically, the setting was very cheerful with lots of windows and bright colors. It was unique because of its observation room and research equipment—microphones and TV cameras mounted inside the room. Play equipment was extensive and in good repair. The emotional atmosphere was as warm as the physical setting. The staff lavished physical affection on the children. One day, for example, Barb was tackled by a child as she entered the room. Barb fell to the ground as she and the child hugged each other. Soon another child tackled the assistant, Valerie, and the floor became a jumble of children and adults embracing, laughing, and rolling around.

The daily schedule for the group offered a balance of individual and group times as well as a balance of quiet and active play:

1:00-1:15 P.M. - Arrival, toothbrushing, and toileting
1:15-1:20 - Welcome group time
1:20-1:40 - Language (individual, small group, large group)
1:40-2:00 - Social play
2:00-2:25 - Art/Individualized instruction in fine motor/cognitive skills
Figure 1

Classroom
Figure II
Playground
2:25-2:35 P.M. - Cleanup/toileting
2:35-2:50 - Snack
2:50-3:00 - Circle group time
3:00-3:05 - Toileting
3:05-3:30 - Gross motor (inside or outside playground)
3:30- - Bus - dismissal

Except for group times specialists entered the room to retrieve a child for special training. Usually this was met with pleasure, but sometimes, the child cried or became angry because of the sudden change. Specialists were students enrolled in such disciplines as adaptive physical education, play therapy, speech therapy, or dental health. Children received training from the specialists based on their Individual Education Plan which was developed for the child when they entered the school.

The first group time, Welcome Group Time, was signalled by turning off the lights. Children were helped to a taped circle line on the rug where they were to sit. Several of the children usually needed to be held on a staff member's lap because of their short attention spans. The circle time consisted mainly of introducing new people to the group, performing finger plays and songs, and discussing the day's plans.
During the next block of time, two staff members pulled children's charts from the bulletin board and worked with one or two children on language, fine motor, or cognitive activities. At the completion of an activity a note was made on the child's card as to his/her level of competence on the task.

Toileting took place frequently throughout the day with the admonition, "Have to go potty?" and hand signing the word "potty." Some of the children were dressed in training pants if they were close to being toilet trained. It was not unusual to make three changes per child per afternoon.

Snack time was used as a language and motor skill time. A contingency method using food as a reward was used with each child. The child had to either sign the word or verbalize to get the food. Some children required an adult to sit right with them because they could not coordinate picking up the food and placing it in their mouths.

The only other group time occurred after snack. During this circle time each child was required to participate when his/her turn came for some sort of cognitive activity such as classifying items by color. Circle times required a lot of endurance on the part of the staff and children to keep children in their places and participating. At times
children would go limp and lie on the floor or engage in some sort of autistic behavior such as twirling.

After large muscle time at either the indoor or outdoor playground, staff members escorted children to buses and strapped them into their seats while other staff members waited for parents to pick up the remaining children.

The staff usually cleaned up at the end of the day while talking informally. They met once a week to plan the activities and decide which staff members would do certain activities. They also met once a week for staffing on particular children and met again every week for special seminars on topics of interest.

The Ethnographer's Role in the Setting. Since I did not know any of the participants prior to this investigation, the role of ethnographer did not often get confused with the role of friend. I asked the questions and, unlike a friend, the informants did not assume that I knew their positions on these items.

At first, I was mainly an observer because all my observations were done in the observation room behind a one-way glass. It felt strange to become so familiar with the staff and children in the classroom and yet not be recognized by anyone because they couldn't see me.
Because student teaching is a somewhat lonely professional endeavor for the student teacher and at times a stressful one as the following record will verify, I quickly had to examine my role with Ann. I found as time went on that there were similarities between the ethnographer's role and a counselor's role. The ethnographer, much like the counselor, is a sympathetic person who is present on a regular basis and listens patiently to the informant talk about himself/herself. One important difference is that the ethnographer leaves when his/her project is completed whereas the client usually terminates the relationship with the counselor. I soon realized that my role with Ann was that of a confidant because she needed to consistently talk about her student teaching experience with someone she felt was empathetic.

At one point Ann asked half-jokingly if I were going to study her in her first year of teaching and at that point I knew she was somewhat dependent on our meetings. I tried to state from then on how many days were left for the project so as to lessen any dependence on these meetings Ann might be developing.

With the other participants, I tried to maintain ethnographer and cohort roles. Since I had been a classroom teacher and a university supervisor, I could usually relate
to their experiences. All the participants expressed several times that they were interested in sharing their views about student teaching in the hope that it would help others in the field and perhaps influence teacher training practices.

Ethnographers such as Spradley (1980) make the assumption that it is important for ethnographers to not only be observers but also to be active participants in the setting so that the informants' roles in the culture are experienced. I moved to a participant role in this setting during the fourth week when Barb was ill and the group was highly understaffed for the outdoor playground. When I perceived what was happening, I simply left the observation room and offered my assistance. Ann greeted me with enthusiasm. As a participant-observer I soon found myself holding a crying child while another child pulled me towards the merry-go-round, and I could understand somewhat what it was like to be a staff member at this center.

That same week, I was a participant again when I went to a supervisor's meeting at the university. I was asked to share some of my ideas about supervision and they were labeled "unrealistic" by one of the supervisors.

Being perceived as having an "ivory tower" viewpoint gave me an uncomfortable feeling at the time, but I soon
realized that individuals sometimes perceive another individual because of the stereotype attached to that role. During the quarter, I also conducted a short workshop for the students at the midtern meeting dealing with a physical approach to science. Later students were to comment on that meeting to the effect that they liked the workshop, but they wished they had more time to talk to their peers.

I also understood somewhat the nature of the university supervisor's role since I had supervised student teachers for six months. In addition, I helped write a handbook on student teaching and knew how frustrating it was to keep the handbook current and relevant to all the student teaching participants.

Primarily my role was that of an observer but occasionally it was one of a participant observer. I visited the center approximately four days per week for the ten weeks of the student teaching period. An average visit lasted two and one-half hours. In addition, once a week I attended meetings and conferences related to this group's student teaching experience.

**Analysis.** The data gathered from this setting clustered under two major headings:

1. Role perception and management during the student teaching experience, and
2. Environmental influences on role management during student teaching

The following report is organized around these two major categories. The first section is devoted to role perception and management. Each of the supervisory roles—student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor is discussed from each of the participants' viewpoints as well as from the viewpoint of this author's observations. Each section includes information about how the participants viewed a particular role and how this role was managed during the ten-week student teaching period.

The next section is devoted to a discussion of environmental influences that contributed to this supervisory encounter. They included: the participants' past experiences in the field, financial considerations, personal relationships, student teaching practices, and the nature of the early childhood education profession.

The last two sections of the report are devoted to the participants' comments about this report and this author's general comments about student teaching in early childhood settings.
Factors Influencing the Student Teaching Experience for These Participants

Role Perception and Role Management

The Student Teacher's Role. The role of the student-teacher was delineated in three pages of objectives in the student teaching handbook that was compiled by the university department. General responsibilities for the student teacher included:

1. Becoming thoroughly familiar with the student teaching course objectives and requirements
2. Doing his/her best to achieve these objectives
3. Providing supervisors with appropriate materials at the right time
4. Continually evaluating his/her growth and performance
5. Devising means for increasing his/her teaching competence
6. Becoming part of the teaching team at the center
7. Being a loyal, helpful and an enthusiastic member of the teaching team

Other categories of responsibilities for the student included orientation, evaluation and professional responsibilities. Under orientation responsibilities the student was required to attend certain meetings, tour the
center, and become familiar with the program. For evaluation responsibilities the student was required to evaluate his/her own performance and attitudes with regard to working with young children and staff in their center. They were to prepare written self-evaluations, confer with their cooperating teacher on a daily or weekly basis, and arrange conferences with the university supervisors.

Professional responsibilities included attendance at center and department meetings, being punctual, dressing appropriately, and protecting the rights of others. Students were advised to maintain confidentiality with regard to problems that arose. The steps for conflict resolution also were included in the handbook.

Within these categories of responsibilities more specific behavioral objectives were stated. For example, under learning to work with staff in the setting was:

  by observing, working with and conferring with other staff members in the center, the student will increase his/her effectiveness in communicating with adults as well as children and in maintaining mutually satisfying arrangements with them.

The handbook listed 61 activities that were the responsibility of one of the major roles--student, cooperating teacher, or supervisor. For this particular student teaching group, 39 percent of these activities were not unanimously assigned to them to a certain role (see Table
Thus, there was some confusion among these participants as to which activities were part of their role.

Less formally, the student teacher's role was usually delineated on the first day of student teaching during the orientation meeting for students and their supervisors. At this quarter's meeting the director of student teaching outlined the goals as well as the students' responsibilities during student teaching. She also stated some of the rewards of student teaching as well as the pitfalls that result from working at outside jobs during the student teaching quarter.

Nine weeks into the student teaching quarter, I interviewed Dr. Smith about the goals for student teaching in preschool/day care settings. She replied that the purpose of student teaching is to train students to be effective teachers of young children--to be prepared for their profession.

She continued,

In addition to professional growth, they should have personal growth, they should gain feelings of self-confidence, a sense of personal fulfillment, and a developing commitment to children--an advocate for children and their families. What I'm saying is occupational growth and personal growth.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities As Listed in Student Teaching Handbook</th>
<th>Participants Who Perceive This Activity as Part of This Role</th>
<th>Activity Observed or Reported in Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meet with center director for orientation</td>
<td>US, IS, ST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tour the center</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss course outline with co-op teacher</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plan for review of lesson plans with co-op teacher</td>
<td>US, ST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plan for conference procedure</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Continually evaluate own performance with regard to children and staff</td>
<td>US, ST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Arrange conferences with co-op teacher and university supervisor</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities as Listed in Student Teaching Handbook</td>
<td>Participants Who Perceive This Activity as Part of This Role</td>
<td>Activity Observed or Reported in Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Teacher Role (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Be present at center and group meetings except in case of illness</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Report absences to center and university supervisor</td>
<td>ST, CT</td>
<td>No to University Supervisor Yes to Cooperating Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Deal with conflicts that may arise in a mature, constructive fashion</td>
<td>US, IS</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Supervisor Role (Includes Intern)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Make sure center staff and students have necessary materials</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make himself/herself available for questions and consultation</td>
<td>IS, CT, ST</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Supervisor Role (Includes Intern) (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities as Listed in Student Teaching Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Help student plan program for children in accordance with goals of center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourage and elicit the student's self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide feedback soon after observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Keep in touch with the head teacher about the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Help student use evaluations to devise ways of changing behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Serving as a model for interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities as Listed in Student Teaching Handbook</th>
<th>Participants Who Perceive This Activity as Part of This Role</th>
<th>Activity Observed or Reported in Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Become acquainted with background of student</td>
<td>ST, CT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review course outline and make sure there is mutual understanding of course expectations</td>
<td>US, ST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review student lesson plans</td>
<td>US, ST</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourage and elicit self-evaluation</td>
<td>US, ST, CT</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- US - University Supervisor
- IS - Intern Supervisor
- ST - Student Teacher
- CT - Cooperating Teacher
The University Supervisor's View of the Student Role

I interviewed Julie, the university supervisor, about the student teacher's role. She stated,

I think the goal of student teaching is to have the student identify his/her own learning needs and find the resources to learn these skills.

While Julie's view of the student teacher role was consistent with the university's view of the student as a "self-learner," there were differences between the two in operationalizing the student teacher role. Julie commented:

I talked to Ann [the student] and modified the assignments based on our program. Well, the department thinks our program is a little strange anyway. [She laughs]...

I told Ann that she doesn't have to write down all the routines [in her plans] but rather the goals and the philosophy underlying the transitions.

The handbook gave a sample plan for routines in which students were to indicate the exact behaviors for the teacher. For example: "At 9:10 A.M., four cups and napkins will be placed on the snack table." Julie commented, "I wonder what other students do on this assignment. It doesn't make sense."

Even though Ann did not view arranging conferences as her responsibility, Julie felt it was mainly the students' responsibility to set conference dates up at the beginning of the quarter: "I know many people who did this during their student teaching and worked out well," she added.
Julie shared a set of student competencies she used to evaluate students in her program that covered three major areas: human relations skills, curriculum skills, and classroom management skills. Under these areas, specific competencies were listed such as "kneels to the child's level when speaking." In discussing these competencies, Julie concluded, "One of the hardest things for students is inter-personal relations. Take-over days where students supervise others are especially difficult."

The Intern's View of the Student Role

One of my earliest interviews with Darlene, the supervision intern, took place in the observation room where we met accidentally. Darlene was observing Ann in order to familiarize herself with the program while I was observing Ann in the classroom. Ann, however, did not know Darlene was observing that day. After Darlene finished taking some notes, we talked for a minute on the roles of the participants in the student teaching process. She stated that: "the student's role is to learn as much as possible the role of the teacher--that is, to care and give to children." She continued by saying that "students generally need training in taking over a class midpoint in the year. Picking up from where the class is." She added that this situation happened to her when she did her
student teaching in home economics and it was a difficult challenge.

The Cooperating Teacher's View of the Student Role

Barb, the cooperating teacher, gave me her views on the role of the student teacher during the fourth week. She mentioned that the student's role is to learn the classroom routine, the needs of the children, and be able to plan appropriate activities. She added that Ann would develop only a simulated Individual Education Plan because the staff had already done them at the beginning of the year. She concluded:

Students should be able to develop a positive rapport with the other teachers. . . here there are a lot of students coming and going so everybody is new and you have less of a feeling of an outsider. They [student teachers] should get the feel of being a teacher through their takeovers and gain confidence in telling people to do things. They should learn to organize a day and really participate in all things.

Barb identified the areas of child management and language development as difficult ones for student teachers. She added,

How to practically apply their knowledge from books is hard. How do you talk with a child with developmental delays? How do you facilitate language development?

Barb also had some goals for the student's first week in the center. They were:
1. Get to know the kids
2. Get to know where the kids are functioning
3. Know what activities are appropriate
4. Get to know the staff
5. Spend a lot of time observing

Valerie, the assistant, described her own experience thus:

Well, I know we need more [student teaching] than we get. If I didn't have the practicum experience and student teaching I would be lost here... I guess you need the theory but the practical experience is the most valuable.

Student teaching helps to get you organized. The writing of lesson plans was OK once you understood it and learned how to do it but then--well, I don't do it now. I thought it [student teaching] was quite a bit of work... I had a stack of papers this thick.... The Individual Educational Plan that we wrote was a really good experience. It was hard and I felt I needed to take a class to do it... I was the most insecure about this assignment.

In student teaching I had to learn a lot of confidence--such as during group time. Supervising other people is hard... My main thought in thinking back about last year is good memories of the place and the kids.

The Student's View of Her Role

Ann defined her role as a student teacher as

a learner and helper--learning the roles of the head teacher, learning how to handle certain situations, and also helping out in the classroom.

Ann felt that student teaching would provide her with specific feedback on her teaching performance: "You need a
lot of feedback. . . . you need directness some times. It can help."

Management of the Student Teacher Role

Even though most of the participants consistently viewed the student teacher's role as a learner, evaluator, and helper in actuality the management of that role was not that simple or mechanical. During Ann's first weeks of student teaching she talked about how she was handling her student teacher role. She began by commenting on her feelings during the first week: "I felt overwhelmed when I saw all those assignments [at the orientation meeting]." She felt confused about what to do with the written work she was doing during the first week.

I am supposed to do three activities next week, but I don't know if I'm supposed to turn them in. I'll have to call Darlene [intern supervisor] and find out.

Journals from some of the other student teachers in this student teaching group also revealed their initial anxiety about the management of their student teacher role in the first few weeks. One student wrote about her first day:

I was nervous about going today. I thought I had given myself plenty of time to get there, but I got the address mixed up and was late. What a way to make a first impression on my first day of student teaching!
Another student summed up her feelings: "The day was a little confusing with all the information that was thrown at me." A journal entry for another student during her first week read: "I felt overwhelmed over the requirements expected of me."

Ann initially expressed some confusion about her role in the classroom. She stated,

At first, I didn't know what I was expected to do. . . . I observed prior to coming and I made up my mind that I was going to do it. The schedule that they post in the room each day telling us what to do--if we do the toileting, etc., for the day--really helped me as far as knowing what activities to do, but I'm unclear about handling child management problems.

She continued, "I wasn't sure, but one day Ian was being disruptive at circle so I put him back in his chair. I wasn't sure if this was right so I talked to Barb about it later."

Other students' journals revealed this initial sense of role confusion. One student wrote:

I felt a little uncomfortable because I didn't know what my role would be today. I found myself backing away [from confrontation with the children] when inside I knew I should do something. I think she [the child] was trying to test my authority as a new teacher because she said that I didn't know what the rules were. I think right now I'm so worried about the children accepting me that I don't want to cause a lot of waves. . . . I guess I'm afraid I'll make a child cry.
Another time this same student wrote,

I told the children that it was too cold to go outside, that they needed to find another activity. Some said I didn't know the rules; that they were allowed to go outside.

One student wrote about her fears concerning comparison with others.

Inside I feel a little worried because I know the student teacher that they had here last spring, and I think they will compare me to her. She was really good. It makes me feel that I want to know what she did, when, and how so that I can do the same or better.

Sometimes a student felt that full professional status was not accorded to him or her:

I have not been given permission to review the children's IEPs yet, so I am still uncertain as to what level they are functioning at. This concerns me because I need to know to plan activities for them.

The student teacher role in the first few weeks seemed to overwhelm even those with experience in the field. One student wrote:

Why I feel so incompetent I don't know.
Three years ago when I had no experience or special education I worked in a preschool, loved it, and did well. Now I'm so upright about being observed that I'm not enjoying myself. I used to get right into everything with the kids and have a great time but now I'm so conscious of everything I say that I find myself dull and dry by asking so many thought-provoking questions. . . . I always thought my child within remained intact. I prided myself on being curious, imaginative,
uninhibited, joyful, and many other childlike characteristics, yet now I feel so... yuck, just blah. I feel as if everything I do and say is seen by a teacher with seven years of experience and two or three kids of her own. Boy, being a rookie is no fun! Seems the older I get the more self-confidence I lose. What's with me? Maybe the anticipation of no more school and the honest-to-goodness real-world confronting me in June has got me all worked up.

At the midterm meeting for student teachers, one student verbalized the confusion that students feel about their roles at first: "It's hard to figure out what is OK at your center. It's hard to figure out what the other teachers would do." Another student added:

They [the children] get away with it the first time. For example, are shoes on or off in the climbing room? The teachers say "no," then I say "no," and another teacher says OK. I feel like a fool. Sometimes I just keep quiet.

Summary

Ann experienced the role confusion that most of the student teachers felt at first. Philosophically, all four participants in Ann's group agreed that the student role was that of a learner--to learn the role of the teacher. They differed, however, in the amount of responsibility they gave to students to learn this role on their own.

There were differences in perception about who should initiate contact in supervisory situations. Julie felt Ann
should set up conferences between herself and her supervisors. Ann didn't perceive this task as part of her role and wondered why her midterm conference was so late in the quarter. Darlene believed all contact with Ann should be initiated by Ann. Ann perceived Darlene's lack of contact with her as non-involvement.

Because of time constraints and the many demands of the children on Barb's group, the supervisors felt that Ann would learn her role primarily through modeling other staff members' behaviors. Ann believed, however, that immediate feedback about her performance would be the major method for her to learn the teacher role. In fact, most of the students' journals revealed that they wanted continual feedback to lessen their confusion about their roles as teachers.

During her first days of student teaching, Ann's supervisors wanted her to adopt the role of an observer so that she could orient herself to the center. However, the reality of the situation was such that there were many demands made on the staff members' time, and they rarely conversed with Ann about what she was observing. Ann quickly perceived that she was needed immediately as a teacher's aid, and it was up to her to find her niche in the group.
Establishing a Role with the Children

in the first few weeks, Ann made many references in her journal about her enjoyment of the children:

Cindy and I had fun sliding down the slide together. . . . It does wonders for your self-esteem to be greeted at the door with hugs. It doesn't make any difference that Lisa hugs everyone--the feeling is still the same. . . . Of course, it helped to be met at the door today with hugs from Lisa and David.

However, as much as Ann enjoyed the children, her initial inability to manage children in certain situations caused her some concern. When a child ran away from her while she was trying to work with him on his language cards, she described her role as "the new kid on the block." She added, "He [the child] probably figures me an easy target." She described her interaction with this child in another journal entry:

He was awake but didn't come to Welcome Group, didn't want to do water play, wouldn't help with clean-up, etc. Part of it could be he is testing me because I'm new. I need to get better at setting limits and letting the children know I mean it.

By week four Ann is still looking at her interactions with the children in a critical way but she realizes she is making progress:

I still need to be more flexible and adapt to what the children do instead of making them adapt to what I want to do--especially true
with cards. It gets discouraging at times to see how far I have to go. I just try to keep on reminding myself how far I've come.

She feels better about her child management when she realizes she's not alone: "I find that everyone is having trouble with Ian and Jim and that makes me feel lots better."

By week six Ann's journal reveals her new sense of competence:

I think I'm improving my child management skills. Jim can be pretty stubborn about doing his work and I am somewhat effective. He didn't want to do his work so I gave him a choice as to where to work. He didn't move so I offered him the choice again. So I let him sit on his truck only if he worked on his cards and he did. I used things in his environment and didn't bother with his box [materials for Jim's language activities]. . . . On the second card he wasn't cooperating so I said, "I'm going to tickle you two times." It worked twice but then he had enough so I let him go play.

Ann's journal in the last few weeks of student teaching revealed not only her confidence in working with the children but her desire to know more about them:

Evan clapped his hands when directed at Welcome Group Time. He did it consistently, too. We were all appropriately excited. I would love to climb inside him for a day to find out what and how he perceives himself and what's going on around him.

Summary

Initially, Ann experienced a sense of enjoyment as she began to interact with the children but as she moved into her
role as a staff member she encountered her first confrontations with children. At first, she believed that the children's misbehavior was due solely to her lack of skill. Gradually, she began to realize that other staff members had problems with the same children and she began to approach the children with more confidence. In the last few weeks of student teaching, she expressed the desire to go beyond the children's overt behavior to an understanding of their underlying causes.

Establishing a Role in Planning

Ninety percent of all written work in this student teaching situation was composed of lesson plans. Lesson plans had to be written and turned in by the third week of student teaching in order for the supervisors to review them. This initially caused anxiety for some students, because they were still in a process of orientation. As one student verbalized:

I sat in a planning meeting with the director and the head teacher. We talked about my activities that I am to carry out next week. They are very helpful, but at this early stage of my student teaching it would be helpful to have more guidance. They say that whatever I want to do is fine, that it's up to me. That's OK but I'm still learning and need a little more guidance. . . . Right now the assignments and expectations for take-over days seem so vague. I feel like I should be planning things and organizing myself but I don't have enough information about the
center's rules for activities, where the things are stored, what kinds of things the children just did, etc. I feel a little lost about what I should be carrying out.

Ann also had concerns about her lesson plan activities. She was worried that her plans wouldn't be at an appropriate level for children who were developmentally delayed. In addition, she worried that the work wouldn't be done on time:

Another student and I compared notes as to how unprepared we were to hand in our mountain of material on Monday. It's nice to be able to complain and cry on each other's shoulders.

Even though Ann was involved in the planning sessions with the center staff every Thursday morning, the execution of her plans sometimes proved frustrating. She explained:

There's a problem with the lesson-plans. The three-day plans are completely changed from what I wrote. It's unrealistic. The staff plans after I've turned in my lesson plans and we change things. . . . We should go from the planning meeting and base the lesson plans on that.

Inadvertently, the writing of lesson plans was the first indication to Ann of a difference in supervisory style between her two supervisors—Julie and Darlene. In her interview for week four, Ann stated, in reply to my question about what interactions she had had with her supervisors:

It's a disaster. I forgot to make a copy of the plans for Darlene [intern]. Darlene told me if I want to get credit for them I'll have to do them over. Julie told me a different way to do the plans since she doesn't agree with the form in the handbook. Julie says not to do them.
over until she talks to Dr. Smith. Darlene says she has to talk to Dr. Smith about this. Julie said my plans were OK but I just need to expand the concepts and organize them better. . . .
I asked them [her supervisors] who's ultimately responsible for my grade. Darlene says she is. Julie says she'll have to talk to Dr. Smith. Right now I'm doing it Julie's way. I'll change if I have to.

The inflexibility of the lesson plan format bothered Ann.

We did it [lesson plans] that way in the laboratory school. You have a little list of the teacher's activities and a list of the children's activities. If the kids don't do what's on this list you don't know what to do. . . .

In an interview with Ann's boyfriend, Michael, towards the end of student teaching, he listed the confusion surrounding the writing and managing of lesson plans as one of the most stressful aspects of student teaching for Ann:

Writing the reports was really hard for Ann. No one had set guidelines. It was misleading. Julie's formula for plans was different from the book. But now Ann just whips them off.

**Summary**

Ann experienced some initial anxiety about planning for children with handicapping conditions, but she felt competent when her first activities were executed successfully. Coordinating her plans with the center's plan caused Ann some frustration because she had to plan so far in advance in order to be graded. Inadvertently, lesson plans were the
first indication to Ann of a difference in philosophy between her two university supervisors—Julie and Darlene.

**Conducting Group Times**

Group times, during which the teacher leads the whole group of children in games or songs, were the first times that student teachers were on their own as teachers. In Ann's program there were two group times—Welcome Group Time at 1:15 and Circle Group Time at 2:50 P.M.

In general, feelings of anxiety were generated by the thought of taking over a group time. This was especially true in the beginning of the quarter. Ann explained one unsuccessful group time:

I forgot the tunes to the one song. The kids were really wound up and seemed that way all day long. Maybe it was the weather—who knows—maybe fate, maybe me. . . .

One of the fears about group time was the thought that you might be evaluated at a time when you had to control the children. One student wrote:

Today my supervisor came out to observe me. I felt really good about the day except for group time when I read a story. It was the first time I had taken over a group time. My story ran a little short because we only had four children and my follow-up activity went quick. I felt sort of like "oh, no, what do I do now."
Ann gained confidence in conducting group times as the quarter progressed. In her fourth week of student teaching, even though she was still working out her group times, she was learning from Barb how to make them better:

Circle group started OK but ended in chaos. The kids got really distracted and things fell apart. Barb suggested it might have been better if I had given them their baskets one at a time and then taken them back so the kids wouldn't have their baskets to fiddle with. Could have been better but I'm relatively new at this. This would be a great book--Diary of a Soon-to-Be-Driven-Mad Student Teacher.

By the end of week four Ann seemed confident in her ability to handle a group time: "I did Welcome Group Time today which went pretty well. I think I was more relaxed this time." At this point Ann had mastered some specific skills but she realized she needed to be aware of the whole group. She stated:

I get so involved in my activity that I don't see what's going on. I suppose it will come with confidence.

She adds, "I would give myself a B so far."

Summary

The thought of leading a group time engendered anxiety in most of the student teachers. By the end of the fourth week, Ann was feeling fairly confident in her ability to handle the children in a group. She soon realized that
that some group times were not always going to go as she planned, especially if someone was there to evaluate her.

**Relationships with Adults**

By the beginning of week four, Ann's feelings of being overwhelmed had lessened quite a bit, and she had established confidence in her ability to manage her role as a student teacher. She felt she could conduct group times and manage relations with the children. She had worked out a compromise concerning her lesson plans by turning in copies to both her supervisors, Darlene and Julie.

Ann commented in week two about the student teaching requirement that she supervise other staff members in the setting:

*It's uncomfortable to supervise others, but I see why it's important. You don't realize all the practical implications until you do supervise. It lets you stand back and see the whole picture. I don't think I'll get any resistance from the other adults. In fact, they'll often anticipate what needs to be done.*

However, it was the area of relationships with adults that caused Ann to say at the end of the fourth week after her first take-over days:

*I went home Thursday and cried. What am I doing here? I'm quitting, I said jokingly to Julie at the seminar. I felt that all my take-over days were a disaster.*
Wednesday of that week her entry read:

I went home and cried I felt so discouraged and so ineffective. I wasn't ready to quit but I was really questioning my abilities. I felt like all my take-over days were disasters but was ready to go back and try again.

On take-over days the student teachers were required to plan all the activities, execute some of those activities, and supervise the other adults who conducted the remainder of the activities. Ann described her first take-over day:

Barb [the cooperating teacher] was sick and it was my take-over day. It was a disaster almost from the word go. Phyllis [an outside researcher] did music. . . . so that put me behind from the beginning. . . . I went outside and directed the children back to Sam [an art student working on special activities with the children]. I told him some of the kids came inside. He said they were all fine out on the playground taking pictures. I should have stood my ground and had either the whole bunch come in and take pictures inside or bring just a few in. I tried to have a child come in because he was swinging and not taking pictures. I did bring another child with me to work on cards. He was very mad at me for bringing him in. . . . I finally got another child in under much protest. By this time Sam had run out of film. The children were all wound up from being outside. I was upset because I felt totally ineffective and Valerie [the co-teacher] was frustrated. . . . The kids were crazy and part of the problem was that there were only three adults.

The substitute asked if she could leave a little early to catch a bus to go home. I said OK but didn't ask what time was "a little early." I assumed she meant 3:15 or 3:30. Boy did I assume wrong! The disaster keeps on going. Jimmy fell down, Evan sat in a puddle and got wet, and had an accident. Ian was tormenting Bobby on the big wheel.
In looking back on the day Ann commented:

Dealing with an adult who isn't regularly in the classroom is hard, especially since I'm not an assertive person. I needed to be firm and stand my ground with him because after all I was head teacher.

Ann talked some more about the problems of supervising others in her fifth week interview:

I'm pleased about today because I had a successful take-over day. Last Thursday was a problem with Sam, the art student. He wanted each child to take eight polaroid pictures and put them in a scrapbook. All the children followed him outside. He wouldn't bring them in. Sam wouldn't take directions from me even though it was my take-over day. He takes direction a little better from Barb. He told me "don't worry" and then refused to bring the kids in.

Ann really felt that the reason some of her take-over days did not go smoothly was because of some of the adults. At week ten she said,

I'm not sure how my take-over days went. Every day Julie observed she said "what a hectic day." Most of it was beyond my control like the music teacher arriving a half-hour early to do her lesson and that one study on imitation being conducted—the teachers and children are getting so bored with it.

Supervising other adults in the setting generated anxiety in some of the other student teachers as well. The assistant teacher at Ann's center, Valerie, said this about her student teaching:

I had to learn a lot of confidence. . . . supervising other people is hard, especially
telling someone who's in their classroom what to do. I was told to be more assertive in telling people what to do.

Excerpts from the students' journals revealed how stressful supervision of adults can be:

I had to remind a student several times to work with the children. I didn't feel as uncomfortable about reminding her as I thought I would. Something really needed to be said and I knew it so I did it.

Today I supervised my first activity. We had a substitute teacher in the room today and she was trying to help out. She added extra soap-flakes to what I had made. She also came over and tried to set limits with one of the children... the girl started to cry. I know that the teacher was trying to help but I thought I could handle what was happening...

I feel that Terry resents me telling her what to do--especially the day Bill [the cooperating teacher] didn't show up. She's been at the center for a year and it's been a while since Bill's had a student teacher in the room. I got this feeling because the only thing she says to me are do's and don'ts. I'll be glad when I'm familiar with the center's rules.

On take-over days everyone looks to you for guidance since you are the person who is in control, so it's like you have to be always thinking--I guess I must not think all the time.

I can just imagine what teacher burnout is after only three take-over days. I feel tired... I think I'm in trouble.
Parents

Parents were a special group of adults that Ann wasn't sure quite how to approach. As one student described the problem of parents in her journal:

I'm not sure how I'm going to get to meet the parents. So far none of the teachers has attempted to personally introduce me, nor have any of the parents approached me asking my name. I know I'm an adult and responsible but in this situation I feel the teachers should be introducing me as the student teacher who will be there for ten weeks.

Ann offered her opinions about working with parents in her fourth week interview:

One area I know nothing about is parents. I've only gone on one home visit. I'm rather shy and non-assertive. It's hard for me. I'm not outgoing. The only role I know as parents is my own parents.

Ann wanted the handbook to deal more extensively with parent relations:

They should list things... like where you should go to read about parent contacts, how to approach parents every day. What to say, not just at conferences, but every day. They need to list resources like in the department library.

While some students exhibited anxiety about home visits ("I was afraid he would run away and hide behind his parents all night") or demonstrated a lack of understanding towards parents ("They said his Mom is planning on holding him back one year and I think that is a terrible shame. I think parents are so dumb"). Other students plunged in and tried
to interact:

Today was the group picnic. . . most of the mothers stuck around together. The parents introduced themselves and I went up to some and introduced myself. They all seemed very receptive to having a student teacher in their child's classroom.

Observers and Researchers

Ann's student teaching setting was somewhat unique because there were numerous observers and researchers from the university who frequented the setting. She perceived these people mainly as disturbances in the program.

It is hard to run a class with people coming in to do one study or another--Barb was busy most of the day with Robbie and Amy. Then somebody was trying to do things with Ian. Two students came in and worked with Jim and Ian. I think the people coming in have a narrow focus and are only concerned with what they're doing and not its effects on the rest of the classroom. It also interrupts the programming we have for them. I wonder if constant interruption does help. I know it hurts the teachers. I feel like everyone's watching, what with all the people coming and going.

Barb, the cooperating teacher, even commented during the fourth week of student teaching about how observers make students nervous: "Ann's really worried about tomorrow because some observers who decide on our funding will be coming."
Summary

While Ann expected to have confrontations with the children, she didn't expect to with the adults. Supervising other staff members was very difficult for her, especially when they didn't respond in the way she wanted. She was tentative in approaching most adults including parents. The other students' journals revealed similar problems in their first attempts at supervising others. Ann viewed researchers and observers as intruders into the classroom.

The Cooperating Teacher's View of the Student Management's Other Role

Barb, Ann's cooperating teacher, found Ann to be very open and inquisitive right from the beginning. She was surprised that Ann came to the planning meeting the first week with some ideas. Barb listed Ann's strengths in student teaching as "having good ideas about kids and anxious to learn." She felt that the first four weeks saw Ann growing in her ability to "assign people to things and conducting group activities." Barb added that "at first Ann wasn't sure of herself but each time she gets better and now she's more comfortable with it [assigning people]." Barb felt that areas of further growth for Ann at week four were "child guidance and management, and confidence in leading group activities." She said: "The
first [group] time she was very timid, but the next time
she was better." Barb felt that Ann was becoming more
relaxed and learning to be more flexible.

In a final interview with Barb, she commented on
Ann's management of her student teaching role:

She is growing; in fact, her areas of greatest
growth are in dealing with disruptive behavior
and communication with kids on their level.
Further areas of growth are being more asser­tive with adults, keeping after them, and
making it clear. It's hard to take over when
it's not your room.

The University Supervisor's View of
the Student's Management of Her Role

Julie, the university supervisor, shared this percep­tion at week nine of Ann's management of student teaching:

She's really improved her skills with individual
children. She fits well into the classroom
routines and volunteers to help. She's improved
in her lesson plans--she plugs in expectations
for individual children. However, she needs
more confidence in directing adults. She also
needs awareness of the whole group.

Julie laughed and added: "But we all need work in
that."

The Supervision Intern's View of the
Student's Management of Her Role

Darlene's comments about Ann's role as a student
teacher were brief because she felt by the fourth week
that Julie was really Ann's supervisor. She reported
during the midterm conference:

I came to observe Ann and we talked on the phone. [She turns to Ann] Do you remember what I told you? I think I noticed mainly that she wasn't smiling at the children. The next time she was smiling more.

Darlene confided at a later time that Ann "was good at attending to the children's needs but she needed to work on her lesson plans--wording, for example."

**Ethnographer's View of the Student's Management of her Role**

Early observations of the classroom were consistent with Ann and the other participants' view of Ann's early role in the setting. She was initially unsure of her role with the children as evidenced by this observation from Ann's first day:

After a while there are no children coming over to Ann's activity on the rug. The activity is a Lite-Brite game in which the child puts pegs into a peg board to form a shape and then it is lit up. Ann asks a child if he wants to play with it. He says, "No." Ann stands with her hands in her pockets. She wanders around the classroom looking at the adults and children engaged in various free-play activities. All the other staff members are either working with the children or busily setting out supplies. Ann avoids these areas where children and adults are interacting. She wanders over to a shelf, picks up a Big Bird puppet and puts it on her right hand. She walks around with the puppet on her hand but no one notices. She takes the puppet off her hand and returns it to the shelf. She goes back to the Lite Brite activity and stands next to it.
In contrast to her first week, Ann looks like this at week two:

After a few minutes Ann looks around and sees Jim in the book corner. She walks over and takes a book off the shelf, sits down on the rug and settles Jim onto her lap. She begins reading the story to him. After a few minutes Jim gets restless and squirms off her lap. She releases him and gives him a friendly pat on the back. She goes over to the bulletin board and retrieves Randy's language cards. Randy spots her doing this and he laughs and runs away to the door. Ann retrieves Randy and leads him to a spot behind the wheel toys. Suddenly Randy springs up and runs away smiling. Ann runs after him and grabs his hand. She leads him to the blackboard. She draws a line and asks Randy to do it. When he does it she lets him erase it. They do this several times with several shapes. She is kneeling at his level and holding him close. Randy leans over to hug her. Ann hugs him back. He leaves the activity and Ann makes notes on his chart.

Relations with the adults in the setting proceeded more slowly. In the first weeks Ann was often observed physically apart from the other staff members:

While Ann checks the daily schedule on the clipboard the other three staff members talk about the dye a child splashed on a staff member's shirt during an art project. They discuss animatedly whether the dye is washable. Ann looks over at them and smiles. She walks over closer to where the group is and looks down at her pants as if checking for dye stains.

Ann agreed with me that she felt apart from the staff at first. She explained, "I'm basically shy and look things over for awhile. I haven't made the effort to interact with them yet."
Although Ann was initially reluctant to initiate social interaction with the staff, she began to join in whenever she could be of assistance (as in this incident from week three):

The assistant, Valerie, lets out a little shriek at the sight of an insect on the floor. Ann immediately comes over with a paper towel and picks it up and throws it away. "Ann to the rescue," Barb announces, and all three laugh together.

From this point on, Ann began to interact with the cooperating teacher and the assistant on a more personal level. During one of her final weeks of student teaching, Ann revealed that the most positive thing about her student teaching experience was her relationship with Barb and Valerie. She added: "They always gave constructive criticism even when the day was a disaster. They were willing to spend time with me."

As Ann reported, parents were a group that she didn't interact with at all. For example, one day during the sixth week while I was observing, a father and grandmother came into the observation booth. The father pointed out Barb as the head teacher and Valerie as the assistant. The grandmother asked who Ann was and the father replied: "I don't know; some student I guess."
Ann attended the group planning sessions and took an active role in offering ideas. Being included in the planning sessions was a very positive aspect of her student teaching experience. Ann stated:

Having a planning meeting is really helpful. It lets me see the whole week and not just isolated activities. It helps to see how the week is going to be ahead of time.

Group times, as Ann stated, continued to improve as the quarter progressed. An observation of her first group time revealed her insecurity in the early days:

Ann begins in a quiet voice, "We're going to talk about ducks today." She begins to sing "Six Little Ducks That I Once Knew. . . ." The other staff members join in and sing, drowning out Ann's soft voice. Following the song Ann begins a poem about a turtle. She begins softly: "I have a little turtle." When it's over Barb suggests quietly to Ann to say it again. Ann repeats the poem and this time looks up and into the children's faces."

However, by the end of the third week Ann confidently leads the group in songs and fingerplays.

In one of Ann's final interviews she talks about her progress as a student teacher:

I think Barb and Valerie perceive me now as more competent. At first they probably thought I was an incompetent ninny. Julie probably thinks I've gotten worse [she laughs]. Really, I think I've improved. Certain things would blow me away at the beginning of the quarter but now I could handle it. This student teaching helped me get a lot of confidence back. . . .
The University Supervisor's Role

The University View of the Supervisor Role. University supervisors were either faculty members or graduate students. The supervisors were to have had experience as day-care or preschool teachers and experience or training in supervision. Basically, these duties involved acting as a liaison between the department and the center and overseeing the student teacher's practicum experience.

The supervisor was required to review, evaluate, and grade the student's lesson plans and activities as well as encourage the student in self-evaluation. In addition, supervisors were to provide feedback to the students, hold conferences with the head teacher and the student, determine the student's final grade for the course, and serve as a model to the student with regard to interpersonal relationships and supervisory practices.

The Student's View of the Supervisor Role

Ann perceived supervisors in an unfavorable light even before she had had much interaction with Julie and Darlene. During the second week she said:

I would like them to be more of a participant. Right now I see them as a heavy rather than being involved. I haven't had much interaction with them. For now they are someone you turn assignments into. Darlene seems somewhat uncomfortable. I think it's because
she hasn't worked in this kind of environment [with developmentally delayed children] before.

At this time, Ann did not know that Darlene was a supervision intern. In fact, she didn't understand the intern program until I explained it to her during the sixth week.

Valerie, the assistant teacher who had done her student teaching nine months before, gave this definition of an ideal supervisor:

A positive person who gives productive feedback. If you're totally off the track about something she'll help you get back without crushing your morale. She should instill confidence. Be open to students' ideas and to their feelings. They should be open to different ways of relating to children because not everyone relates the same way. They should be co-operative and give time to the student. The university supervisor is a good idea because she has time to observe whereas the cooperating teacher can't. It's good to have both. I was really confused when they were talking about the university supervisor, the center supervisor, and the classroom supervisor. I don't know if you need that much supervision. It's confusing to have three supervisors. It's hard too if the university supervisor doesn't come that often. They should come at least two times a week if they are grading the students.

The Cooperating Teacher's View of
The Supervisor Role

Barb perceived the university supervisor's role as mainly an administrative one:

The supervisor's role is the same as my role but she has more of a chance for direct observation. She's involved in grading. Julie is responsible for Ann's grade but she asks me for my ideas of a grade for classroom performance. I give Julie a grade for Ann and she decides. She also does all the paperwork. I like a co-
operative approach with the university supervisor because they're not in the classroom that much and I know more of what's going on.

The Supervisor's View of Her Role

Julie explained that her style of supervision included writing transcripts of her observations and then sharing with the student. She felt that she should observe students more often but she did try to "look at things the cooperating teacher didn't hone in on."

Julie expanded on her role during the third week of Ann's student teaching experience:

I think the goal of student teaching is to have the student identify his/her own learning needs and find the resources to learn those skills. The supervisor's role is to keep tabs on the student to make sure s/he does this. The supervisor may not even interact that much with the student. If the cooperating teacher is doing fine, working well with the student, then the supervisor wouldn't be that active with the student. The role changes with the situation. If there were a problem between the teacher and the student I would step in.

Midway during the student teaching quarter, Julie shared these thoughts about the supervisor's role: "The supervisor is sort of on the outside. She is making sure meetings are convened." She admitted that it was sometimes difficult to juggle several roles at once--that of university supervisor and center administrator:
You're not as objective about the classroom when you're the administrator. You have a vested interest in the classroom. With a new teacher I don't know why she does something. When a student teacher comes to me and says something about a classroom I weigh this with what I know about the teacher. I try to be just as critical supervising at the center even though I know the teacher.

The Intern Supervisor's View of the Role

Since Ann's student teaching was Darlene's first experience as a supervisor, Darlene admitted she was not sure just what a supervisor was supposed to do. "I am having problems with this," she confided. "I'm reading the handbook and getting some ideas but I guess it's trial and error." She also was "skeptical" about supervising at Ann's center since she had not worked with developmentally delayed children.

Before her first meeting with Julie, she hoped Julie would "take the lead and I'll just be helping in Ann's supervision." She mentioned that as an intern she would meet every two weeks with the director of student teaching and the other intern supervisors in order to discuss issues in supervision. During the first week, Darlene offered her definition of the supervisor's role as "one of guiding the student in leadership qualities and giving assistance to the student."
The Intern Supervisor's Role

Very quickly it became apparent that there was some confusion about what roles Darlene and Julie would play in the supervision of Ann. Julie sensed a potential conflict after her first meeting with Darlene during the second week:

Darlene is very enthusiastic but we might have a conflict because we differ over the nature of Ann's written assignments. I don't believe in the student's writing down all those routines. I just want the students to state the goals of the activity, what it is, and how they are going to evaluate it. Writing down all the procedures I don't agree with--it's too mechanical. Darlene wants to go by the book and have the students do it the way it is in the manual. I'm not sure how the co-supervising is going to work out.

In the third week Julie said of the shared supervision of Ann:

There is a conflict over responsibility already. Our roles aren't clear. I talked to Ann and modified the assignments based on our program. Darlene told Ann to do her lesson plans over in order to get credit. I said I haven't even seen the lesson plans yet. I told Ann she doesn't have to write down all the routines but rather the goals and philosophy underlying transitions. I think Darlene is going to talk to Dr. Smith about this and see what her responsibility is. I talked to Dr. Smith about this arrangement before the quarter and I agreed to it. I understand Darlene has had very little teaching experience herself.
I asked Julie if she felt the intern program was viable, and she replied: "Yes. Graduate students can give more time and have more personal relationships with the students."

Darlene during the fourth week gave this account:

At first I thought supervision of Ann was going to be hectic because I had not had any experience with developmentally delayed children other than babysitting. After I observed Ann in the setting I thought this is going to be OK. Then I went to grade Ann's lesson plans and there were parts missing. Dr. James [Julie] gave her a different set of guidelines to follow than the ones in the handbook. I felt, well, I can't give her a grade. But Ann has to satisfy Dr. James as well as me. I then talked to Dr. Smith. She told me Dr. James would grade Ann. I felt relief when Dr. Smith told me this. I'm glad I'll still be going through the motions—looking at Ann's lesson plans and observing her, but I'm not as geared up as I was before now that I'm not giving her a grade. To be frank, it's hard to get geared up to go out there and observe. I hope Ann will take my advice.

During the first few weeks, Ann sensed the confusion about which supervisor she is dealing with for her student teaching experience. She described her relationship with the supervisors as a "disaster." She was frustrated because she had to make two copies of her plans and she forgot to make one for Darlene. She tried to figure out who is in charge:
I ask who is ultimately responsible for my grade? I would think in this situation the center director has ultimate responsibility for me. The only problem is the director's limited time whereas Darlene has more time to spend with the student teacher....

Ann characterizes Julie and Darlene's relationship by week four as one with "a total lack of communication." Ann's only contact with Darlene has been on two occasions by phone. Darlene felt that contacts with the supervisor should be initiated by the student.

"I think student teachers should ask questions. I haven't heard from Ann since Julie took over. If you have more contact you're freer with the person.

Since Ann was not sure of Darlene's role, she was beginning to perceive Darlene as a critical observer rather than a resource person. Ann remarked:

I don't think Darlene has had much experience working with young children. She may have had a lot of experience observing but I think, who is she to tell me to do this stuff? As far as the meeting with the three of us on Monday I sort of dread it. They're just going to sit there and pick me apart. I think Darlene is really ticked off. I don't know why I have to be there.

Ann asked Darlene at the midterm meeting if she felt comfortable supervising in this setting. Darlene replied:

Not really. At first I was shaky as a supervisor because Ann and I were students together in a class last quarter. Now I'm adjusted to it since Julie gives you your grade. I can empathize with students even though I did my student teaching on a secondary level. I worked in the
laboratory school last quarter with the head
teacher and she would tell me what I was
doing wrong. . . .

Coming to grips with the supervisor role was chal­
ling for Darlene. She expressed her difficulties in
this way:

I was concerned about how I was going to function. My other student teacher, Kendra, and I were
students in the same class last quarter. Now I'm her supervisor. On the first day at the
center she pointed out one child as 'bad.' She spelled it out in front of the child. The
child said "I know what that means." I waited
until later and took the student aside and said,
"I never want you to say a child is bad, even
if his behavior is bad." I think I did the
right thing waiting.

As late as the seventh week of student teaching, Ann
was still verbalizing her confusion about Darlene's role:

I don't know what Darlene's role is supposed
to be. I don't think she knows either.
I don't see why she has me as a student. It
might be of benefit to her, I guess.

Darlene and Julie eventually came to terms with their
roles, but at week nine Darlene still felt somewhat uncom­
fortable with it.

Julie and I observed together today. We talked
about different things Ann is doing. It was
helpful because I could see some of the things
the children were doing. . . . I went in to
talk to Dr. Smith because of Julie's taking
over. Since I'm not grading Ann it's a let­
down. I don't have much contact with Ann. At
first I had a little contact with her but now
I have none. I attribute this lack of contact
with Ann to not being able to give Ann a grade.
Ann doesn't perceive me as anyone now that Julie will give her grade.

In retrospect, Darlene remarked,

I talked to Dr. Smith about the need to work with the supervisor and the student in the situation. I'm glad Julie took over since I don't have as much training and experience. In a way I'm glad but then I was just sitting there as an observer. It's different with my other student teacher, Kendra. I sit right in the room to observe her teaching rather than an observation booth and I'm much more comfortable. The way it was arranged for Ann's midterm meeting I couldn't even see Ann's face. It was later suggested that maybe we should sit in a circle. Now I feel kind of awkward about the conferences. Really, I don't see the need to go to the final conference.

She continued:

Supervision interns should have pre-training experience so they know what to expect. It's suddenly thrust on you to grade and observe. You don't know your role or what to expect from student teachers but I'm glad I was in this situation. It has made me look at developmentally delayed children differently. In a way at first I was afraid of the kids. But it was growth-producing. If I had a daycare center with developmentally delayed kids I could work with them but I would need to take more courses. Today even the teachers weren't that confident. They had a new kid and it was kind of hectic even for them.

Grading was one area that Darlene felt particularly uncomfortable about:

Sometimes some of us grad students are expected to know more than their experience. I thought when I was grading student work that Dr. Smith might take more points off. I thought who am I
to take off so many points? It's discouraging to not know how to grade things. We need to know how many points for each thing.

Darlene, however, did mention the positive benefits of intern supervision:

I liked meeting the directors of centers. Maybe they'll remember me some time. It has opened my eyes to new kinds of centers. I've also opened up to different people like Julie. Another benefit is seeing that I can be a leader, I can help someone, I can give advice.

She related an incident where Dr. Smith and she observed together. Darlene said, "We picked up on the same things. She said I picked up on more than she did. We talked together driving back and that was good!"

University Supervisor's Perception of Her Role

Julie confides during the third week that:

This student teaching quarter is different. There are so many demands in this job. I always feel I never have enough time to talk to students or observe them in the classroom. They don't see me as accessible as I'd like them to. It's very frustrating. In the past I had more time.

Ann's journal continually mentioned the need for more time with her supervisors: "We need more on-site visits. There should be more give and take between students and supervisors." By the fourth week, Julie and Barb had not discussed as yet Ann's progress but, as Julie mentioned, she would not expect to hear from Barb unless there was a problem.
In the fifth week interview, Ann commented about Julie's role: "Julie is very realistic and knows a lot about kids. My supervision in the center is really nice because everyone is really helpful." She views Julie at week seven mostly as a resource. "I'm not so much in awe of her [she laughs]. I don't know if she's gone down a notch or two or I've gone up a notch or two."

At the end of the quarter, Ann summed up her interactions with Julie:

Julie was helpful. She told me what I needed to change and how to go about it but her time with me was limited. At first I was intimidated by her but then she made me feel like a real member of the staff.

Even though Ann initially viewed conferences with her supervisors as "more for their benefit than for mine," by the eighth week of student teaching, she made these comments about her conferences with Julie:

I like Julie's supervision. The first time she observed she made specific suggestions for child management. I applied them and the next time you could see they were mastered. I see now why it's important to tell kids specifically how to do things and what they're doing well. I see how it applies to me in student teaching.

Julie gave this feedback to Ann in her midterm conference:
I'm working with you to expand your child management skills. You need to think about it beforehand. You can't always give the children a choice. In some respects it's a necessity to do it this way in a program with developmentally delayed children. That's why they're here. You have to find out which contingencies work with which children. It's different than the lab school--there they had all the choices.

Grading was an important issue for Julie as it was for Darlene. Julie explained at the group midterm conference how she arrives at the student's grade. "This is what happens: I check back with Barb before I give a grade. I had to justify my grade to her once." Some parts of grading were frustrating for her, however:

It would be most helpful if you had a check-list--which skills and technique that students should master by the time they leave the program. The whole department should outline what skills--for example, positive redirection--should be acquired. You should indicate this right at the beginning of the program. This would help multiple supervisors.

Julie stated her feelings about supervision at the end of Ann's student teaching:

I'm frustrated by the lack of time. . . . and not being clear where the students are. . . . I feel student teaching should be a jumping off place to go on your own after early experience training. With some of these students, I'm at the beginning. Also communication is not as effective because we don't have that shared experience as we did in my other program. For example, I used a lot of PET and when I said to a student this would be a good place to send a child on "I message" they don't know
what I'm talking about. . . . I worked with very humanistic people there. They were my models. This is an area that needs more attention. Supervisors have special skills. We need to develop a set of competencies so we know what to expect of students and supervisors know what to focus on. I feel satisfied as a supervisor when I can see a student has gone from point X to Y. I see myself as a facilitator.

Even though, in general, the other students' journals revealed that supervisor visits were anxiety provoking ("her presence made me self-conscious and inhibited"), positive comments from the supervisor were crucial to the student's professional self-concept:

Such a lot of positive support from my supervisor today. . . . what a way to get me out of my ho-hum slump. . . . Nothing about perhaps I could have done so and so to help myself along. What an inspiration for me to only accentuate the positive in situation. . . . it feels so lovely that I'm really going to make a strong effort to look for something good in everything. I want people to feel as good as I did.

"She complimented me. . . . She always makes me feel so good--it'd be great to carry her around in my pocket for instantaneous reinforcement."

**The Cooperating Teacher's Role**

The cooperating teacher's role according to the university consists of the day-to-day supervision of the student in the classroom. A large part of the role consists of creating a friendly, productive atmosphere in which the
student could have his/her practicum experience. The cooperating teacher oriented the students to the classroom, reviewed the student's lesson plans to make sure they are appropriate for his/her group, and gradually allowed the student to assume the role of head teacher. Another aspect of the cooperating teacher's role was to help the student evaluate himself/herself in order that s/he become more effective in a variety of teaching situations. In essence the cooperating teacher was a model teacher of young children for the student.

Ann's second week interview revealed her concept of the cooperating teacher:

An organizer, a teacher for me and for the children. I would go to her first if there were a problem. This is as it should be because the problem would come out of the classroom. She also keeps an eye out for the children--say if a child is known to wander away.

Darlene felt that the cooperating teacher should "aid the student in getting to know the teacher role." She also felt that the cooperating teacher "should have greater weight in the student's grade because she's with her every-day."

Julie felt that there were no clear expectations for the cooperating teacher's role because each one is so different:
They are so giving of themselves. The contribution is from them. Most of them get no compensation. I would hope they would always give the student teacher responsibility but not give up responsibility. I wasn't so good at that when I was a teacher. Hopefully they would guide the students and give them appropriate guidelines for the children. As a supervisor I can't understand individual children, what contingencies to use with them as the cooperating teacher can. I look to them quite a bit for evaluation.

Barb described her own role during her third week interview. She viewed her job as one of:

... providing guidance. After a few years of experience, she [cooperating teacher] has picked up tricks of the trade and can help the student to avoid pitfalls. She should make it a positive experience working together. Not just give the student all the dirty work.

Management of the Cooperating Teacher's Role

Barb revealed her frustration at what she hoped to do and what actually happens in student teaching:

I planned to sit down with Ann and talk after her first take-over day but my purse was stolen. I really bummed out about it and I just wanted to get out of here.

She mentioned that she had had no interaction with Julie so far about Ann and she had only met Darlene once when Darlene came to visit Julie. She felt, at this point, that Ann viewed her as a "resource person--someone you can ask about things--not as someone above her." She wished she
had more chance to observe. I don't feel comfortable yet leaving the room [to Ann]. It's hard to sit back and watch. I know I'd be back in the room every two minutes. It's hard to let go. You have to redirect the kids to Ann. You let her take over more, and, then, you go to the observation room and get a better perspective of what's happening.

Barb felt having a student teacher was of benefit for several reasons: "More manpower and I like working with people from a child development program." She felt, however, "that writing lesson plans was a lot of busy work." She also felt that

Student teaching wasn't progressive. You start out doing a few activities, go up to five days, then you go back to a few activities. It's not logical. You give them more and more responsibility and then you go backwards. The format of the syllabus is a source of confusion to many.

In her final interview, Barb summed up her student teaching experience with Ann:

We've learned to work with each other. I saw some different ways of working with Ann as I got to know her. I wish I had done more talking to Ann after class but lots of times I had just had it and I just wanted to get out of here. I wished we had more informal meetings; maybe it would have helped her more when she had to be head teacher. It's hard to to give a letter grade. There's not much to go on. . . . I'm more comfortable answering questions about students' skills. . . .
The Student's Perception of the Cooperating Teacher's Role

Ann's initial perception of her relationship with Barb was a "boss-relationship." Ann explained it: "It's just that I see her as a head teacher. She's a step above by nature of her experience. She expects me to carry my weight just as she does of herself." From the beginning, Ann felt: "I would turn to her first in case of a problem."

Ann lamented during the fifth week that she hadn't met that often with Barb:

I haven't had a whole lot of feedback from Barb; that's why I asked her for a conference. I just want to know what I'm doing overall, not just about specific activities. I want a pat on the back. I could be doing something grossly inappropriate. . . . I feel comfortable with the staff. Barb and Valerie help in this. They invited me to a party Friday night but I couldn't go.

Ann is surprised at the amount of time Barb gives to her job:

I am amazed at the amount of time Barb puts in every week. To be that good at what you do I guess you have to put in that time. It certainly isn't a 12:30-4:00 thing.

Ann summed up her feelings about a good relationship between cooperating teacher and student: "It should be like mine--going to planning meetings and having lots of interaction between the teachers, not formal conferences--but good communication."
Journals from the other students revealed what happens when the relationship between cooperating teacher and student is strained. As Barb and Julie both mentioned, "letting go of the classroom" is crucial to positive student-cooperating teacher relations. One student's journal revealed what happened to her:

Today was supposed to be one of my take-over days. I started taking over but then my cooperating teacher suggested I wait until another day since it was hectic. I told her it was all right but she insisted. I wouldn't have liked to continue because all of my days that I have taken over have been smooth. . . . I feel like my take-over days are agreed upon and fixed. I mentioned this to her and she said she didn't think they were.

Another student reported:

I must admit I was rather perturbed that Sarah did clown face painting for groups when I had that as the focus for my group on Wednesday and Thursday. Damn! I have to go and write up those stupid lesson plans, turn them in for a grade and plan my day around my ideas and then she goes and steals the show. I seriously doubt kids will sit still for another clown face. . . . and the director's going to be here. How nerve-racking!

However, when student teachers and cooperating teachers click as a team positive rapport and feelings of positive worth result. One student described her relationship with her cooperating teacher in this way:

Although she is the head teacher and responsible for most of the classroom, I feel my role as teacher is just as important in the programming
of the children. She makes me feel like I'm learning a real lesson in working relationships, which is just as important as any of the other things I have learned in student teaching.

Another student wrote:

As I watched Linda today at group time I was thinking about how expressive her face is and how interesting she is to watch. I was thinking that I hope I am as interesting and can capture people's attention the way she captures mine.

Environmental Influences on the Student Teaching Process

According to theories of person-environment interaction, both the environment and human inhabitants exert influences on human behavior (Walsh, 1973). Several factors in this student teaching environment were perceived by the participants as influencing the management of their roles. They were:

1. Past experiences in the field
2. Financial considerations
3. Personal relationships
4. Student Teaching practices
5. The nature of the field

Past Experiences in the Field. Ann attributed her initial insecurity during student teaching to a prior experience when she worked in a children's hospital training for play therapy: "I didn't feel comfortable at
the hospital. Staff members there would eat lunch and not even talk to me."

Ann's boyfriend, Michael, described it this way:

Well, Ann had a really bad experience at a children's hospital. She was bummed off. Her confidence was shot so then if the kids [during student teaching] didn't do something she wanted she'd get real depressed. I kept trying to cheer her up. But she did get her confidence back. Now if something doesn't work out she says, "well, OK."

Ann also felt that her early experience in a university laboratory school influenced her approach to student teaching. She stated,

You don't have anything practical besides the laboratory school. That experience should be done in sophomore year, not just before student teaching. Some of my friends didn't find out until then that they didn't want this field. When you sign up for this major, right away you should get a booklet stating what you need to know in the end [e.g., positive limit setting] so you can emphasize these skills in your classes.

During her third week, Ann remarked,

I feel more comfortable and more flexible now. The laboratory school was so different. I was so scared to do activities there because it was only once a week. Here it's everyday. Randy [another student teacher] and I talked about the lab school and agreed every activity there had to be perfect.

The assistant teacher, Valerie, reinforced the concept that going from the lab school to student teaching was difficult:
The only practicum experience I had was in the lab school. That was my worst class. You're in there one day a week and you don't know anyone—not the kids or the staff. Your whole grade depends on those three hours. I was very nervous there. I didn't get much practice. It's not realistic in terms of a regular school. The radio is one adult to every three children. It's not consistent. You're so worried that your activity is not age-appropriate, etc., that you're not very creative. The same project could possibly be done three times a week.

Ann also shared in her first interview the information that she had done her early experience practicum in a program adjacent to the preschool. The program served older developmentally delayed children and adolescents. As a result, Ann said,

I feel fairly familiar with this program even though I haven't worked in the preschool. It taught me to be much more structured since it was a behavior modification program.

Barb, the cooperating teacher, had positive feelings about her past experiences with student teachers. Valerie was the first student teacher she had supervised, and she remarked that they didn't have any problems communicating. Ann was her second student teacher.

But Barb also carried with her some feelings from her own student teaching experience:

At the time I thought my student teaching was really preparing me, but it wasn't. There were only six children in the class and they had very mild delays. They were very high-functioning Downs Syndrome. I didn't really get enough
specific feedback. The cooperating teacher would say everything is OK but she didn't say, 'well, you could have done this or that.' I wasn't always clear what my responsibilities were. I didn't always take over when I should. I hardly ever saw my university supervisor at all--only once at the beginning and once at the end. But we met weekly--all his students. I thought that was good but he didn't really observe. He used a team approach. . . . he wasn't authoritarian.

Julie remarked that she developed her style of supervision not from courses but from past experiences with "very humanistic people who were my models." Darlene, on the other hand, lamented the fact that she had not had enough experiences in programs with developmentally delayed children or in supervision.

Financial Considerations

By accident one day, I met Ann working in a local discount store. She told me she worked 20 hours per week there as well as doing her student teaching experience. In addition, she was taking 11 credit hours in order to graduate this quarter. She explained that as a student she lived on $5,000 per year, but she said she "was used to it." She continued:

The most I make in a week is $85, the least $60. I probably should have gotten a loan for this quarter but I wanted to do it myself. I go through this every quarter. I take 18 hours of class and work 25 hours a week--this is all nights and week-ends.
She says she felt that the director of student teaching was talking directly to her during the orientation meeting when she talked about the negative consequence of having outside jobs during student teaching.

Darlene, the intern, was also affected by the lack of financial resources:

As an undergrad I never worried about money. Here I've even had to go to my piggy bank. My fellowship runs out in August and then I'll just have to leave. There are so many cutbacks in funding.

Because she received a graduate fellowship at a northern school she had to leave the southern town which was her home. She didn't like the city because of the weather and the fact that she didn't have a car. Darlene continued: "I would rather get a job further south than north because of my long-term goal is to own a preschool."

Not only did immediate financial concerns affect the students in the student teaching triad but the long-term financial concerns about finding a job with a living wage in the field seemed to permeate every level of the teacher training program. One student confronted by the economic realities of the profession on the first day of student teaching wrote:

She says she works five mornings, three afternoons and probably made $3,000 last year--guess that means I'm gonna be a waitress the
rest of my life. How depressing--either
that or marry some rich oil tycoon--what
a drag!

The assistant teacher, Valerie, remarked,

It's kind of cruddy when you went to school for
four years and can't make money. I graduated
and couldn't get a job. I worked at a depart­
ment store in the accounting department.
It wasn't much fun. This [in Ann's center] is
the most fun job I ever had.

Ann's boyfriend, Michael, had these comments about the
field in terms of a living wage:

I was really shocked! At one place she put
in an application, they only offered $3.35
per hour. Well, I guess you have to start
somewhere. She has to get a Master's if
she wants to work in a hospital.

However, Michael philosophically remarked: "Well, my Dad
always said look for the rewards not the money. . . .
Look for the benefits [Ann laughs and says, 'What benefits?]'
He continued: "There are personal benefits if she wants to
work in a hospital."

As the quarter progressed, Ann became increasingly
worried about looking for a job in her field:

I'm not really too concerned about getting a
job, but people keep asking me. I haven't
used the department as a resource to get
jobs. My friends haven't either. Most of them
have either gotten something lined up or are
waiting.

The weekend her mother visited increased her anxiety about
finding a job:
My Mom came this weekend for a conference. She told me everyone has jobs. Everyone's asking me what am I going to do after graduation. . . . I'm worried about getting a job. My father said he will type my resume. . . .

The Director of Student Teaching, Dr. Smith, explained:

In the past parents of college students weren't worried that their child was in the program but lately I hear "my parents won't let me do this." The students are also questioning us earlier: Why are we in this profession? There has been a serious drop in enrollment. We are exploiting those who are trying to provide services for young children and their families. The good ones spend about a year in the program and are gone.

Personal Relationships

The relationship Ann had with her boyfriend was a mitigating factor in her ability to get through the student teaching experience. I asked Ann during the fourth week if her relationship with her fiance had suffered as a result of all the pressures she had been experiencing during student teaching. She replied:

I've lived with him for a year and a half. He is black. My parents are not accepting of this at all but his family is. I'm their only daughter. It was OK when we were only dating but with marriage. . . . My mother says "I was really looking forward to planning your wedding but now I'm sick." There's been a change in my relationship with my boyfriend--it's closer. He is really supportive. We knew how it would be. He really helps me. He even copied over my lessons plans for me.
Michael described his relationship with Ann during student teaching:

Mostly, I was her child. She rehearses her projects on me. On those times, I always try to be negative so she's prepared for the worst. I also play delivery boy when she can't make it--like delivering the Mother's Day gifts--handprints and gingerbread men.

Ann summed up her close relationship with Michael during student teaching in this way:

Valerie, the assistant teacher, goes home and tells her fiance that "Natalie went to the bathroom today" and he looks at her as if she's crazy. Now Michael listens. He's properly enthusiastic. I only hope he can make it through the last few weeks before my graduation. He's sad to not be graduating too now when he sees some of his friends graduating. He just works at a computer lab now. Well, at least he doesn't have to work so much at that damn restaurant. He really helps me.

**Student Teaching Practices**

There were various procedures in the student teaching process that affected the participants to varying degrees. Students revealed their frustrations at the writing out of routines. As one student at Ann's center remarked:

I worked straight for 12 hours on Sunday doing my lesson plans... and I didn't leave it for the last minute. I had everything planned out. I am exhausted. They should not have us repeat everything like at 9:10 the teacher puts two cups down, etc. My cooperating teacher said I did not have to do this. For example, just write once the lead teacher's responsibilities for snack.
The assistant teacher, Valerie, had these views about writing up routines: "The expanded routine part was stupid; you had to write down all the steps for each routine such as toothbrushing. I had a stack of papers this thick."

Several student teachers mentioned the loneliness of their occupation. They wished there were more contact with their peers. During week five, Ann stated: "I wish the student teachers could meet together. I need support. It would be good to hear if someone else bombed." Valerie stated: "You do sort of feel that you're out there on your own.

Though the midterm meeting was supposed to be a vehicle for students to get together and talk about the experience, it didn't turn out that way. Ann said:

I think it would have been more helpful if just the students got together. It wasn't worth much by not letting us talk to each other without the supervisors. It was more for the supervisors than us.

The pressure some students felt during student teaching seemed to come not from one huge crisis but a myriad of everyday hassles that impinged together and were often translated into a lack of physical well-being.

Though Ann came to grips with her role in terms of the children, by the fourth week of student teaching, a
combination of factors left her feeling exhausted (see Table 19). By week five, Ann was beginning to feel very pressured and, by week seven, she was tearful during our interview.

I'm so overwhelmed I just don't do anything. I'm worried about getting a job, getting my IEP done, my log done, working at my job and my other classes. I'm just barely going to make it through. I'm trying not to worry about a job. . . . It's not just the other classes, it's everything. As these due dates come up I'm just overwhelmed. Everything seemed fine until the fifth week--then a crisis. I had a midterm. I just have been pushing and pushing, then I just gave out. I was absent that one day; it was probably exhaustion.

During week eight, Ann was physically exhausted but elated at the progress she'd made as a teacher. She remarked:

I've forgotten everything. My health has hit the skids. My sleeping patterns are off--Michael says it's stress related. I'm going to go with it. I don't know how good my grades will be this quarter but I don't care. The written work is not so great but I've improved so much as far as the teaching I don't care.

However, during week nine Ann resigned herself to the situation:

Basically, I don't care. I feel now I'm just going to get through it. With the kids--I don't feel that way. Now, I feel that some of the pressure is off, and I can enjoy the kids a little more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Participants Who Perceived This Area As Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Philosophy of education</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervision of others</td>
<td>IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal problems</td>
<td>IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional isolation</td>
<td>IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Grades</td>
<td>IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conferences</td>
<td>IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lesson plans</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Orientation</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Departmental meetings</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Department handbook</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sickness</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Past experiences</td>
<td>IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Communication</td>
<td>US, IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Parents</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Salaries in the field</td>
<td>ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of time</td>
<td>US, ST, CT, US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Relations with other adults in the student teaching center</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Outside researchers and observers</td>
<td>ST, CT, US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Participants Who Perceived This Area As Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Children's behavior</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Nature of the profession currently</td>
<td>US, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Others' perception of their performance</td>
<td>US, IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Philosophy of supervision</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Unexpected crises outside student teaching (purse snatching, but breakdown)</td>
<td>ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Obtaining a job in the field</td>
<td>ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Number of adults in classroom</td>
<td>US, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Personal finances</td>
<td>IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Amount and type of feedback about performance</td>
<td>IS, ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Length of student teaching period</td>
<td>ST, US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Preparation for student teaching</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Clarity of division of activities in the student teaching triad</td>
<td>US, IS, ST, CT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a**Perceived as stressful to everyone

**Key:**
- US - University Supervisor
- IS - Intern Supervisor
- ST - Student Teacher
- CT - Cooperating Teacher
The nature of student teaching is such that it is a short term endeavor with a high investment of self. Therefore separation at the end may be too abrupt. Ann initially stated she would handle the leaving the center by "thinking of this as any other 10-week class. Part of my problem is that I don't have a job. This is like a safe secure thing." By her eighth week, Ann said of leaving: "I don't want to think about it--leaving. But I'll cope with it, too. It's going to be hard." She resolved this problem in the end by volunteering to work in the classroom part-time during the next quarter in order to slow down her separation from the staff and children.

Even though the frustrations were plentiful during the ten weeks, each of the participants found rewards in the student teaching situation. Ann expressed her feelings in this way: "This student teaching helped me to get a lot of confidence back." Barb really appreciated "more manpower and working with people with a child development background." Darlene found the experience "growth producing." She added:

I'm glad I was in the situation. It has made me look at developmentally delayed children differently. Julie's enjoyment came from helping a student to go from here to there.
Each of the participants expressed in a different way that they had learned something about themselves which in turn would make them better early childhood professionals.

The Status of the Profession

Most of the participants hinted at the problems as well as the rewards of their profession. Thought of this nature usually came out when jobs in the field were being discussed. However, the present status of the field impinged on all aspects of the profession. The director of student teaching, Mary Smith, talking about training for early childhood educators and why it is so difficult:

One factor which most influences this process is the lack of a clear-cut guiding thought and philosophy. How young children learn and how to facilitate that learning. What we have now is difficult to translate into practice. Piaget, for example, is very difficult to implement. If we don't know what is crucial in an environment for young children to learn, how can we hope to train individuals? . . . We need to list competencies for children and plan our programs to reflect these competencies.

Another area is public policy as it affects children and families. I was just reading this article by Ziegler. The problem is a lack of coherent attention to young children and their families. It has to do with ignorance and isolation. . . . children have no priority at the state, local and federal levels. Funding has been cut. . . . As a result we are not getting the cream of the crop in our program and we're discouraging students.
Student teaching is a very viable teacher-training method; in fact, crucial. However, supervisors are not able to be exemplary because of this lack of taking the theory and developing it for education. . . . There is also a lack of supervisory skills. They don't know how to interact with adults. For example, I saw one head teacher give a marvelous experience to six students but was totally unaware of the rest of the class or the student teacher.

As far as the university system, there is no reward to be coordinator of student teaching. I know my chairman appreciates it. But people with Ph.D.'s are refusing to supervise—in any department.

For the future, I see two things: more and more children will need day care programs. . . . there may be severe damage to children such as a lack of independence, a continuance of the welfare system, or our current endeavors will succeed. The state will continue its commission and it will facilitate good standards for quality programs. New groups will form and funding will come from new sources.

The Participants' Reactions to the Written Report

Ann, the Student Teacher

This [the ethnography] reinforces the value of student teaching but it also clearly points out the need for an expanded experience. It seems strange to see my actions [and others'] in print through the eyes of an observer. It was interesting to read about people's reactions to my actions. I hope that this will help other people involved in the student teaching process. It presented everything accurately. That's the way it was but doesn't necessarily have to be. Hopefully, the student teaching programs can grow and improve the weak points and continue to strengthen the strong points; they're very clearly identified.
Darlene, the Intern Supervisor

Darlene relayed that she had given the student Ann "as much help as she asked for." Darlene said she could not understand how Ann could be afraid "of being picked apart" in her midterm conference since Darlene felt she, herself, was not a critical person: "I always tried to give positive feedback to her." Darlene added that she observed Ann quite a few times from the observation room when Ann was unaware of it.

Darlene felt that once the grading function was not part of her involvement with Ann, she was perceived as "not being important in this learning experience." Darlene felt her role in the process was not fully explained to her. She thought someone should have informed her right away about the changes in assignments for the students at this center in order to avoid conflict between the participants. Darlene's strongest reaction to the report was that she "had no idea Ann was feeling these things about me."

Barb, the Cooperating Teacher

Everything was fair and accurate. I really enjoyed reading this. It gave me a great deal more insight into how the student teachers feel as they go through this process. I also reflected back on my own student teaching days and remembered feeling these same anxieties and tensions and frustrations. I think your study will help me in the future with dealing with student
teachers and perhaps finding ways of making
this experience more comfortable and less
stressful for the student.

Julie, The University Supervisor

I see no particular inaccuracies--in fact, your
description seems pretty close to my percep-
tions... The amount of discomfort Ann experi-
enced was within a typical range. I have
worked with students with a much higher compet-
ce level who felt equally stressed.

I was looking forward to gaining greater insight
into Darlene's role as she viewed it, but got
very little. My perception was that she dis-
appeared for much of the quarter and she must
have done the same with you. I felt Darlene
and I were involved in a power struggle over
Ann's destiny early in the quarter and I was un-
willing to sacrifice my control of Ann to a
person I perceived as having little to offer
either in the way of support or education.
I guess I was almost hoping to be proved wrong,
but that was not the case.

Julie added that she observed Ann four times in the
classroom for extended periods of time, as well as a number
of brief visits. She concluded:

Although I think more could be done in this
area, I believe the combination of the co-op
teacher's almost continuous feedback and these
periodic observations were as much as could be
delivered in the situation [given the constraints
of time and money].
Dr. Mary Smith, Director of the
Student Teaching Program

My first reaction upon reading this ethnography was that this was exactly what is needed. This was my first experience as a participant in ethnographic research, and the value of the method came to me in the first minutes of reading almost as a revelation.

Regardless of our concern for individual students and our efforts to encourage and support them in their personal and professional growth, it is rarely the window to their inner world—to the thoughts and feelings that constitute the reality of their lives at any given instance, are opened to the extent that occurred in this research. I know that the ethnographer must have been very skillful and empathetic in her interactions with the four informants in order to win so completely their confidence and trust. The increased understanding of students that results from reading accounts such as this is different even from the anonymous evaluations that students prepare for us each quarter.

My second reaction as I read the ethnography was one of deep grief. The events described, all of the misunderstandings, role confusions, stresses experienced by the students represented a violation of everything I believed
with regard to interpersonal relationships. How could all of these unmitigated disasters (to use Ann's words) have occurred?

It was extremely distressing to me, of course, to realize that some, if not all, of these problems were the result of errors on my part. I had obviously failed, for example, to communicate clearly with Julie the nature of my request for a "special" supervisory experience for Darlene. Julie had demonstrated great skillfulness in the past in devising undergraduate individualized teaching experiences for student teachers in her program. I had assumed that she, Darlene, and Ann would sit down together and draw up an individualized supervisory plan for this unique group of young professionals. I realize that in the future I must communicate much more clearly than in this case what it is that I hope will occur.

I also know that I must not forget, as I must have done in this case, to urge, as I intend to do in the orientation meetings, all participants to report and ask for help immediately when problems arise. I especially try to let the students and their supervisors know that "I am here," and that it is an important part of my role to help sort out problems such as those that arose here.
My feelings in this situation did not exclude humor. The four cups and napkins bit is a legacy from a previous handbook and because of their relative innocuousness (from my viewpoint!) they have not yet been removed. Energy has been expended on other sections of the handbook such as conducting conferences in such a way more nearly as to put into practice the concept of the student as an active learner--taking an active role in his or her development. We will get to the cups and napkins next time, I hope, and gradually we will move closer to achieving a document that consistently reflects our underlying philosophy with regard to human growth and development.

The opportunity for me to participate in this ethnographic study has been valuable to me as a researcher as well as a supervisor. I now know from personal experience that the disclaimer "This is only one sample, others may be different" is not adequate. There are very real dangers, especially in qualitative research which is so compelling in its effect upon the reader, that the findings may be generalized beyond the sample.

My research often has to do with people from different social classes and cultural groups. I now know how important it is to be more careful than ever in quantitative
or qualitative research, to take extra safeguards such as replicating a study, such as doing everything I can to seek out varying viewpoints, to be on guard less I inadvertently misrepresent a situation or human population group because of a lack of sufficient background to understand the context or causes of their behaviors. The ethnographer in this case is to be commended for actively seeking information that will make her study more accurate than would otherwise be possible.

The role of the administrator in ethnographic research we found to need explicit attention. Both the ethnographer and I initially viewed the administrator as a participant from the outside. In the beginning I believe she was not named as a "character." Yet it became increasingly clear to me as I read the completed ethnography that much of what had happened was directly or indirectly related to administrative policies and procedures, some of which appeared to have been misunderstood by the other participants. I would recommend in the future that the administrator be an informant so that his/her perception of the situations can be examined by the ethnographer right along with those of the other participants.

One of the most valuable aspects of this research is the recommendations made by the ethnographer with regard
to student teaching programs. I am in agreement with all of them and a few at least have already been implemented. We have returned, for example, in the mid-quarter meetings with the entire student group, to a format that includes time for more active sharing of their experiences on the part of the students. We will attempt also, at least occasionally, to continue the mini-workshops that we have instituted at the request of previous student groups.

Others are more difficult to carry out. Lack of adequate financial and administrative support for student teaching programs such as ours is a major handicap. Centers with whom we cooperate unlike public school settings in this area receive no material rewards. Fortunately they value the freshness, enthusiasm and new ideas that our students often bring to their programs. Despite the problems that inevitably arise in complex social settings, the students are viewed by many centers as an important morale booster—a factor helping to prevent teacher burnout.

However, the lack of fee waivers for university courses continues to be of concern to the centers and to us. We cannot, for example, require that teachers receive training in supervision and in any case, we do not have
resources or the time to provide nearly as much as needed. The latest "blow" from my standpoint was learning that my graduate assistant for the coming year would not be able to work with me in planning meetings at centers for their staff (they all come to the university for one meeting a year at the present time).

Getting out to the centers, in their own domains, has long been part of our five-year (ten year?) plan for supervisory improvements, but because of severe budget cuts, a large proportion of the graduate assistant's time will now need to be shared with other faculty. This, in effect, eliminates our beginning to do this at the present. I have what I consider to be a full load of teaching, service and research responsibilities, even without considering the student teaching program, and I'm afraid just keeping the program going will be all I can manage.

It was for reasons such as these that I have been very enthusiastic about the entire study being conducted by the ethnographer. Work such as this is desperately needed if we are to demonstrate the urgency of obtaining more adequate support for our programs.

In conclusion, returning to the area of feelings (we administrators have them, too) participating in the
ethnographic study has been for me, in a personal sense, much like the experiences students undergo in student teaching. It has been stressful but worthwhile. My reaction to the total experience was positive. I have learned a great deal. I wish to thank the ethnographer for asking me to provide this rather lengthy commentary, and I commend her for undertaking such a giant project—her total Ph.D. dissertation has come to be. I believe that her work will make an important contribution to the field, and I hope very much that it will be successful in stimulating further qualitative and quantitative investigations of supervision in early childhood settings.

Comments

All the participants involved in this student teaching experience from the director of student teaching to the student teachers were in agreement that student teaching is vital even crucial to the training of early childhood educators. As Valerie, the assistant teacher, expressed it: "I think the practicum experience is more valuable than anything else I took in school.... I would be lost here without it." However, there were some aspects of the student teaching process that made the participants question
their professional self-worth and temporarily lose their creativity, spontaneity, and enjoyment in their work with young children. Or, as one student teacher recorded in her journal: "I've lost my inner child."

It was interesting that I found none of the traditional conflicts that I assumed would occur as documented in the student teaching literature. Virtually everyone was in agreement with the basic philosophy of education that was employed with the children. There was no conflict between the idealism of the student teacher and the practical orientation of the cooperating teacher—a conflict often documented in the literature. There was also no particular differences in the participants' dedication to the field. Even though these children were extremely difficult to work with because of their handicapping conditions, all of the participants, whether they were supervisors or students, exhibited a deep sense of caring and commitment to the children. Why, then, if the participants were consistent in their philosophy with the children were there feelings of failure, loneliness, and lapses in self-esteem on the part of the participants?

The majority of these negative feelings about the student teaching process seemed to appear as a result of the interactions among the adults rather than interactions
between children and adults. In fact, all the student teachers indicated in their journals that they expected conflicts to arise in dealing with the children but none of them expected conflicts to arise in their relations with the adults. Other than Julie, few of the participants described the student teaching process in terms of growth in interpersonal relations among adults. However, by the end of the ten-week student teaching period all the participants listed adult interpersonal relations as one of the most stressful areas in the student teaching process. In fact, this area was listed as Ann's area of greatest improvement and the area where she needed further growth and development.

Whether it was the student trying to supervise other adults on her take-over day, the intern trying to clarify her role with the student, or the supervisor trying to modify the requirements of student teaching with the intern, the situation was fraught with tension and confusion. The major rewards and satisfactions in student teaching came from working effectively with the children while the stress and frustrations came mainly from interactions with adults. The professional loneliness reported by all the participants attests to the fact that interactions among the adults and institutions weren't as effective as they might have been with training and time.
It has generally been assumed in the field of education that if an individual is effective in working with children they will be equally effective in their relationships with adults. The curriculum for perspective early childhood educators reflects this philosophy since none of the participants reported having any coursework in communication, supervision in early childhood centers, or interpersonal relations. Even though the participants were consistent in applying philosophy in their work with the children. They seemed at times to ignore them in their relations with the adults. While the child's self-esteem was always fostered, the adults' self-esteem was sometimes ignored resulting in comments such as: "I need a pat on the back." While the child was worked with at whatever level s/he was and moved forward, the adults such as the intern supervisor, Darlene, felt they were dealt with at times in a sink or swim manner rather than being allowed to undertake more responsibility as their skills increased. Consistent with Piagetian philosophy, the children were encouraged to be active learners while the adults felt they had little flexibility in modifying the university's student teaching course to fit their own individual needs or the needs of the center.
When the adults were treated in a manner consistent with the way they were taught to work with children, the feelings of isolation and low self-esteem were lessened and these humanistic concepts were made more meaningful to the adults. Ann explained it this way: "I see now why it's important to tell kids specifically how to do things and what things they're doing well--I'm experiencing this myself in student teaching."

The way in which supervisory encounters such as student teaching have been traditionally viewed contributes to strained adult relations during the process. Student teaching has been viewed primarily as a learning experience for the student, not as an interaction process in which all the participants influence one another. Therefore administrative concerns rather than interpersonal concerns have been the primary concern for supervisors and the resulting effect is that teachers view supervision as a cold war in progress.

Because supervisors usually supervise in the manner in which they were supervised, the procedure is usually prescriptive rather than humanistic. Traditionally supervision has not been viewed as a helping profession but rather as Darlene remarked in reference to the supervision that she received as "what I did wrong."
Nevertheless, the training of new teachers and upgrading of intern teachers will take place in some sort of supervisory context. Effective adult interpersonal relations are not only crucial to satisfying supervisory encounters but also to this profession as a whole. Since the profession is concerned with the growth and development of children from infancy to the primary grades, teachers must be able to interact with parents as well as children. In addition, because the profession does not have formalized credentialization of professionals as public education does, early childhood teachers are called upon to work with and supervise a wide variety of auxiliary personnel. There may be parents, volunteers, Ceta workers, students, or others all differing in background and training.

Student teaching experiences can be the ideal times to put into practice human relations skills in an educational setting. However, in order to do this student teaching must occur in a team-like atmosphere with individuals trained in the special skills necessary for productive supervisory experiences. We need to get away from the feeling as Valerie expressed it: "In the pit of your stomach as your supervisor sits next to you taking notes on your performance."
The participants in this student teaching encounter realized quickly that their roles could not be mechanized into lists of competencies in a student teaching handbook; that it was through the person-to-person contact that students and supervisors were socialized professionally. When this contact was effective the teacher training experience was not only individualized to meet the needs of the participants but it also trained the individuals in effective self-supervision, the ultimate goal of all supervisory encounters.

Based on this researcher's experiences as a supervisor, this student teacher situation had its positive aspects which resulted in the students' increased effectiveness in working with children. However, this case study reinforced the premise that if teacher training programs are to maximize the benefits of the student teaching experience in developing the students' professional self-concept, then more attention must be given to adult-adult relationships. This can be observed in terms of the feelings, communication and attitudes expressed by the participants.
Addendum - May 1982

It is advisable to look over an ethnography after some time has passed in order to gain a broader perspective. In retrospect the unique feelings and experiences shared by the participants in the ethnography leave me with an appreciation for the differences in perceptions that individuals derive from the same events.

Because I had access to the journals of the other student teachers in the program that provided the ethnographic setting, I could see that other students perceived similar occurrences in different ways. Some students perceived their student teaching experience more positively than did Ann. Often these differences in perceptions were related to external factors such as financial considerations which were beyond the control of the program.

All the students, whether they participated in the quantitative sample or the qualitative sample, experienced some degree of stress as might be expected in a new situation. However, they were unanimous in their belief that the experience was valuable and one they would repeat, given the choice.

Further discussion with Mary Smith brought out some of the problems inherent in administering a student
teaching program and in guiding the development of graduate student supervisors in a humanistic manner. Darlene's role is a case in point. Darlene had been recommended by her graduate adviser to participate in this supervisory experience and she had been interviewed by Dr. Smith. At the time of this interview, neither the adviser nor Dr. Smith knew that Darlene was a student with special needs. She had come to the university with an academic background that did not adequately prepare her for some of the experiences she would have there. Although she was a very personable, intelligent and fine young woman, she needed a different type of supervisory experience than the one offered through the graduate class.

As the ethnography illustrates, Darlene's experience, though difficult at times, helped her to identify areas for further growth. In this way she began to clarify her professional self-concept. Dr. Smith expressed concern that Darlene's placement in the center might have been unwise, but she did feel "extremely satisfied" in knowing that Darlene viewed it as a positive experience in the end.

As the ethnographer, I recognize that this particular group of informants was unique in many ways, but
I am convinced that their report provided significant insight into the nature of the supervisory process as it existed for them. This insight may be applicable to other student teaching groups, indeed to supervision and helping relationships generally.
Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were used in this investigation in order to study the supervisory process during student teaching in preschool settings. The quantitative component was designed to examine: (1) the relationship of educational background, years of experience, conceptual level and teaching style to the cooperating teacher's supervisory style and (2) the relationship of supervisory style, concept level, years of experience, age, teaching style and grade point average to the perception of supervisory conferences. The qualitative component described in depth the supervisory process for one student teaching group through the eyes of the participants.

Quantitative Component

Twenty-five student teaching groups (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor) who were involved with student teaching in preschool settings either
through either a university located in the Midwest or a university located in the East during the 1981-82 academic year were the subjects for this investigation.

Four instruments were used to collect the data for the quantitative component of the study. Initially, cooperating teachers were observed in their classrooms and rated on teaching style with children through the use of the Observer Rating Scales (McDaniels, 1974). During the student teaching quarter students recorded two 15-minute conferences with their cooperating teachers--one during the first five weeks and one during the last five weeks of the quarter. These conferences were analyzed through the use of the Supervisor-Teacher Interaction System (Blumberg, 1976) in order to determine the cooperating teacher's supervisory style in conferences. At the conclusion of the student teaching experience, the participants completed three surveys. Hunt's Paragraph Completion Method (1978) provided data concerning the subjects' conceptual level. A demographic survey provided information about the subjects' educational background, experience in the field of early childhood education and their familial characteristics. The Perceptions of Supervisory Conferences (Blumberg and Amidon, 1965) instrument
yielded information about how the subjects viewed their supervisory conferences in terms of both human relations and productivity.

Initially the data were analyzed through the use of linear regressions. Examination of scatter plots resulting from the regressions determined which variables seemed to be related to supervisory style and conference perceptions at a significant level. One-way analyses of variance were performed on this data in order to test the twelve null hypotheses. Step-wise linear regressions were employed to determine how much of the variability of conference perceptions could be predicted by the variables under investigation and gave direction to the quantitative component of the study. Each research question and a summary of its related findings follows:

**Research Question 1.** Will the cooperating teacher's educational background, years of experience, conceptual level, and teaching behavior be related to supervisory style?

Analysis of 41 audio tapes of supervisory conferences between the student teachers and cooperating teachers revealed that 68 percent of the cooperating teachers dominated the talk in their conferences with students. Their interaction style during the conferences was
characterized by a substantial amount of telling and evaluating of student behaviors. The average interaction ratio was .43 which indicated a very direct supervisory style. Only 24 percent of the cooperating teachers expanded on the students' ideas during the conferences. The majority of the cooperating teachers (72%) spent little time (20%) in their conferences extending positive social emotional behavior.

Of the variables under investigation, only the cooperating teacher's educational background was significantly related at the .01 level to his/her supervisory style in conferences. Cooperating teachers with a college degree in child development extended positive social behaviors more often in their conferences than teachers who possessed only a high school diploma or who had college degrees in other fields.

Neither years of experience, conceptual level, or teaching behavior were significantly related to the cooperating teacher's supervisory style in conferences with student teachers. However, at the .07 level of significance cooperating teachers with only a high school degree took more time with their talk than the other educational groups.
Research Question 2. Will the concurrence between the cooperating teacher's conceptual level score and the student teacher's conceptual level score be related to their perceptions of their supervisory conferences?

A linear regression indicated that there was a moderate relationship ($r = .44$) between differences in conceptual level scores and perception of supervisory outcomes. That is, as the cooperating teacher's conceptual level score rose above the student's conceptual level score, the cooperating teacher tended to view the human relations in the conferences more positively than those teachers who had conceptual levels lower than their students.

However, when a one-way analyses of variance was performed on the data, the $F$ value was not significant at the .05 level. The $F$ values for the relationship between students' conference perceptions and the concurrence between conceptual level scores also were not significant at the .05 level. Therefore, there was no significant relationship between concurrence of cooperating teacher and student teacher conceptual level scores and their perceptions of supervisory conferences.

Research Question 3. Are perceptions of supervisory conferences related to:

a. supervisory style
b. conceptual level

c. the cooperating teacher's years of experience in school programs
d. the cooperating teacher's age
e. the cooperating teacher's teaching style
f. the student teacher's grade point average?

The cooperating teacher's conceptual level was significantly related at the .05 level to his/her perceptions of not only the human relations in conferences with student teachers but also the productivity of these conferences. Cooperating teachers with higher conceptual level scores rated the human relations and productivity of their conferences with students more positively than the cooperating teachers who had lower conceptual level scores.

The cooperating teacher's conceptual level was not significantly related to the student's perceptions of supervisory conferences nor was the student's conceptual level related to conference perceptions for either the student or the cooperating teacher.

The cooperating teacher's age was significantly related at the .05 level to the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference human relations but not to conference productivity. Older cooperating teachers
rated their conferences more positively in terms of human relations than younger cooperating teachers. No relationship between the cooperating teacher's age and perceptions of conferences for the student teachers was found.

The cooperating teacher's teaching style with children was significantly (.05 level) related to the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference productivity but not to perceptions of human relations during the conferences. The cooperating teachers who scored high on teaching style with children (warmth, enthusiasm, clarity, variety, individualization, feedback, cognitive demand, freedom, and on task behavior) viewed productivity in their conferences more positively than cooperating teachers who had lower teaching style scores. Though cooperating teacher teaching style was not significantly related to the students' perceptions of conferences, it was related at the .07 level to students' positive perceptions of conference human relations.

No significant relationship was found between the cooperating teachers supervisory style and conference perceptions for both the student and the cooperating teacher. Neither was there a significant relationship for the students' grade point average and conference perceptions for either the student or the cooperating teacher.
However, at the .07 level of significance cooperating teachers viewed their conferences more positively in terms of the human relations when the students were in the B range for grade-point average.

Although none of the variables under investigation (supervisory style, conceptual level, the cooperating teachers' years of experience, age, the cooperating teacher's teaching style, or the student teacher's age) were significantly related to the students' perceptions of their student teaching conferences several factors were close to approaching significance. Among these were the cooperating teacher's conceptual level, the cooperating teacher's age, and the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children. However, all of these factors were significantly related to the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conferences.

Step-wise linear regressions indicated that the best predictor among the investigated variables for students' perceptions of human relations in the conferences was the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children. The best predictors for the cooperating teacher's perceptions of conference human relations was his/her age and conceptual level.
The best predictors for conference productivity for the student was the cooperating teacher's teaching style with children. For the cooperating teacher conceptual level and time style in the conferences were the best predictors of productivity. Step-wise regressions explained only 37 percent of the variability in conference perceptions for the cooperating teacher and 33 percent for the student teacher.

**Qualitative Component**

One student teaching group consisting of a student teacher, cooperating teacher, intern supervisor, and university supervisor was studied in depth for their ten-week student teaching period. Ethnographic methods including observation, participant observation, triangulation (i.e., process of cross-checking information with other informants), the reading of journals and interviewing were employed in order to describe the supervisory process from the viewpoint of the participants. In addition, field notes of the investigation were catalogued in order to identify those factors which the participants felt significantly impacted on their student teaching experience.
While all of the participants in this investigation were in general agreement about their educational philosophy for children, their dedication to the field, and their basic belief about the importance of student teaching for professional development, they experienced some stress and confusion during their student teaching quarter. The factors that the participants felt impacted on the experience the most were clustered in two categories: (1) role perception and management, and (2) environmental influences on role management during student teaching.

Not all of the participants viewed their roles and the other participants' roles in the same way. For example, the intern supervisor felt the student should initiate contact with her in order to obtain feedback while the student perceived the intern's lack of feedback as a lack of concern. These perceptions influenced the participants' management of their roles during various stages in the student teaching experience. The student expected to encounter problems with her management of the children, but she was not prepared when she encountered problems in her supervision of adults at the center. Neither had she anticipated the confusion that developed between her supervisors over their supervision of her.
Environmental factors that the participants felt impacted on the experience for them consisted of (1) past experiences in the field, (2) financial considerations, (3) personal relationships, (4) student teaching practices, and (5) the nature of the profession.

Past experiences, especially for the student teacher, impacted on the participants in terms of their professional self concepts. Students, as well as those involved in teacher preparation, expressed concern about the future of the profession. These concerns centered on the nature of the field and financial considerations. Personal relationships such as the student's relationship with her boyfriend were affected in a positive way by the experience. Some student teaching practices such as the writing of lesson plans were the catalyst for the participants' recognition of differing perceptions of their roles.

The participants' reactions to the written report indicated that the report was generally accurate. They admitted that the process was stressful at times, and they expressed surprise at some of the ways others viewed them. However, they unanimously agreed that the student teaching experience was worthwhile, and they wouldn't hesitate to experience it again.
The participants who had substantial experience in early childhood programs accepted the fact that student teaching may be stressful at times, but it was a growth-producing experience. Nevertheless, all the participants had changes that they would like to see made in the student teaching process (e.g., flexibility in the writing of lesson plans) as well as practices they would like to see remain (e.g., student contributions to group-planning sessions).

Conclusions

The supervisory process for student teaching in preschool programs is influenced by both personal characteristics of the participants and the environment in which the process occurs. The quantitative component of this study identified some characteristics of the supervisory participants that influenced their perceptions of supervisory encounters, while the qualitative component identified environmental factors that impact on the process. The small sample size makes any implications derived from the findings of this investigation tentative in nature.

Cooperating teachers dominated the talk in supervisory conferences with student teachers. Very little
conference time was spent in indirect supervisory behaviors such as extending the students' ideas or listening to the student's opinions. However, the cooperating teacher's educational background was related to his/her extension of positive social behavior in supervisory conferences. Cooperating teachers with a college degree in child development went beyond mere acknowledgment responses to the student and used statements that built a healthy climate between themselves and the student. The implication of this finding is that although cooperating teachers generally tend to dominate the conversation in conferences with student teachers, there was something unique in the training of cooperating teachers with a child development background that enabled them to convey acceptance of students in conferences in this study. Identification of the factors unique to the child development curriculum would facilitate improved training for teachers who are involved in supervising student teachers.

Quantitative findings had implications for the selection of cooperating teachers. The cooperating teacher's conceptual level was positively related to perceptions of conference human relations and conference
productivity. If positive perceptions of supervisory encounters is a goal for supervision of student teachers then teachers who are flexible, independent and secure in conflict situations should be selected as cooperating teachers. The cooperating teacher's teaching style with children also contributes to their own positive perceptions of conference productivity. Therefore, another criteria in the selection of teachers to supervise students is that they be effective teachers of young children. An additional criteria is the cooperating teacher's age. Older teachers viewed the human relationship in supervisory conferences more positively than younger cooperating teachers did.

The implications for these findings are that selection of effective cooperating teachers should not be based solely on effective teaching skill with children. Other factors such as the teacher's ability to deal with conflict situations and age should be considered.

Even though participants in the supervisory process may be carefully selected in terms of personal characteristics, no guarantee can be made that student
teaching will be free from stress. The ethnographic findings from the qualitative component of this study indicate that not only do human characteristics such as role perception impact on the student teaching process but environmental factors contribute as well. The participants in this ethnographic study identified the following factors as significant influences on their student teaching experience: past experiences in the field, financial considerations, personal relationships, student teaching practices, and the nature of the profession. The implications for these findings are that the whole person must be considered in the planning for effective student teaching experiences for all the supervisory participants. Environmental factors such as occupational settings, and the nature of the profession must be considered along with human factors such as perceptions of past experiences and interpersonal relationships with significant others as factors impacting on the student teaching experience.

Implications for Practice

None of the participants in this study doubted the importance of the student teaching experience. As the assistant teacher in the ethnographic report stated: "We need more student teaching than we get. If I didn't have
student teaching I would be lost in my job here." Yet the participants in both the quantitative and qualitative studies of preschool student teaching identified some shortcomings in their student teaching experience. Ann, the student teacher in the ethnography, openly expressed her views about the process in the hope that the report would "help other people involved in the student teaching process." The following recommendations are suggested from the findings for this study.

1. Since many student teachers as well as cooperating teachers expressed apprehension at the thought of supervising other adults, courses dealing with supervision in early childhood programs should be developed and added to the teacher preparation curriculum. They should include as many practicum experiences as possible. For example, observation of student teaching conferences, attendance at center staff meetings, and experiences working with parents in cooperatives could provide supervisory experiences.

2. In order to combat the feelings of isolation in student teaching, weekly seminars directed by the students during student teaching could be held. These seminars could focus on the immediate concerns of the students and not have a set agenda. The interns, students and supervisors could alternate being the moderator.
3. Because communication among supervisory participants in preschool settings is often influenced by uncontrollable events such as time constraints, alternate methods of communication between cooperating teachers and students should be explored. Sharing notebooks, lunch conferences, and flexibility in scheduling student teaching hours to allow more time for communication could be used.

4. Because the cooperating teachers in preschool settings have so many demands on their time, the role of the university supervisor should be expanded. The supervisor should observe and meet with the students on a weekly basis. University supervisors should also have direct input into the undergraduate teacher preparation curriculum so that students would have realistic preparation for field work.

5. Since field work experiences in early childhood programs seemed to be somewhat overwhelming when experienced in the final year of the teacher preparation program, they should be gradually introduced throughout the entire course of study. These yearly experiences in the field could possibly be supervised by participants in supervision courses. During each of
these practicum experiences students would have experience in working with whole groups of children from working with individual children to ultimately being responsible for the entire day. One of these practicum experiences could be the setting up of a play group with parents to give students experience with parents.

6. To alleviate some of the student career anxieties, students should have an adviser who will counsel them about job opportunities in the field early in their program so that they will realistically know what opportunities will be available to them. Students should be informed about how to secure positions prior to their final quarter.

7. Since concern about financial limitations during student teaching was often expressed, flexibility in the student teaching requirements would better meet the needs of students in these economically difficult times. For example, student teaching could occur in two quarters on a part-time basis in order for students to maintain their outside jobs during student teaching.

8. Grades and grading procedures were often a source of concern and confusion in the conferences. Grades
should be dispensed with in student teaching and instead written profiles of the student's skills, abilities, and type of position s/he would be suited for should be used. These profiles could be written jointly by the supervisor, cooperating teacher, director of student teaching, and the student.

9. In order to begin to facilitate more effective interpersonal relations among the adults in early childhood settings, courses dealing with interpersonal relations, adult education and communication should be developed and added to the curriculum for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Recommendations for Further Research

Replication of this study with larger samples might indicate stronger relationships for some of the variables, such as student grade point average, the cooperating teacher's teaching style and conference perceptions, that approached significance in this investigation. Replication with larger samples might also indicate stronger predictors for conference outcomes than the ones reported in the study.

Further research to determine if cooperating teachers view student teaching as a unique supervisory experience
might give indications as to why the cooperating teachers were even more direct in their supervisory style than subjects in previously cited studies in school settings. Additional research concerning factors which influence student teacher perceptions of supervisory conferences would also prove helpful in understanding the supervisory process.

Because this study's sample of university supervisors was so small (N=8), it was not possible to test any hypotheses related to these supervisors. Investigations with larger samples of university supervisors would provide information about the unique role of these supervisory participants and how they contribute to the supervisory process.

Further research in preschool student teaching could provide insights into the interactive process of supervision. If implications of this research are put into practice students will then be able to view supervisors not as "a heavy... someone you turn papers into" but rather as "a positive person who will help you without crushing your morale."
APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARMTH</td>
<td>1 cold 2 3 4 5 6 warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTHUSIASM</td>
<td>1 dull 2 3 4 5 6 enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARITY</td>
<td>1 vague 2 3 4 5 6 clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIETY</td>
<td>1 lack of variety 2 3 4 5 6 variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALIZATION</td>
<td>1 not individualized 2 3 4 5 6 individualized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
<td>1 ineffective feedback 2 3 4 5 6 effective feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGNITIVE DEMAND</td>
<td>1 low 2 3 4 5 6 high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREEDOM</td>
<td>1 restricted 2 3 4 5 6 open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON-TASK ACTIVITY</td>
<td>1 low on-task 2 3 4 5 6 high on-task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Teaching Project

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET
(Please check appropriate line)

1. What is your role in the present student teaching process?
   ____ student teacher
   ____ cooperating teacher
   ____ university supervisor

Education

2-a. What is your educational background?
   ____ less than high school diploma
   ____ high school diploma
   ____ high school diploma and some college
   ____ Bachelor's degree
   List major area of study _______________________
   ____ Bachelor's degree and some graduate credit
   ____ Master's degree
   List area of concentration ______________________

b. If you are a student teacher what is your cumulative grade point average?
   ____ 3.5 and above
   ____ 2.7-3.4
   ____ 1.7-2.6
Education (continued)

3. What was the enrollment of the school where you took your highest degree?
   ____ under 200
   ____ between 201 and 500
   ____ between 501 and 2000
   ____ between 2001 and 15,000
   ____ over 15,000

Experience

4. What experiences have you had working in early childhood programs?
   A. Types of programs:
      ____ nursery school
      ____ day-care center
      ____ summer camp
      ____ cooperative nursery school
      ____ other supervised early child experiences.
      List: _______________________________________
   B. Length of time overall spent working in early childhood experiences
      ____ less than one year
      ____ number of years
Experience (continued)

C. Type of work    Years spent in this position:
   ____ Aide    ____ years
   ____ co-op parent    ____ years
   ____ assistant teacher    ____ years
   ____ teacher    ____ years
   ____ director    ____ years

E. Ages of the children you have worked with
   ____ infants (0-18 months
   ____ toddler (19 months-29 months)
   ____ preschoolers (2 1/2-5 1/2 years)

F. In the past two years how many workshops have you attended?
   ____ number of workshops

Familial Characteristics

A. Your age  ____

B. Sex  ____

C. Are you a parent?
   ____ Yes
   ____ No

1. Number of children: Age     Sex
   ____     ____
   ____     ____
2. Do you yourself have brothers or sisters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your position in the family:

____ youngest child
____ middle child
____ oldest child
____ only child
SUPERVISOR-TEACHER INTERACTION SYSTEM

Supervisor Behavior

Category 1. Support-inducing communications behavior. This category includes all statements on the part of the supervisor, with the exception of praise, the effect of which is to help build a "healthy" climate between him and the teacher. Behavior that releases tension is in this category as is that which conveys an acceptance of feelings. Encouragement is categorized here.

Category 2. Praise. This is behavior on the part of the supervisor that connotes primarily the value judgment of "good" in connection with a teacher's idea, plan of action, past behavior, feelings, etc.

Category 3. Accepts or uses teacher's ideas. Included here are statements that clarify, build on, or develop ideas or suggestions by a teacher.

Category 4. Asks for information. This is behavior by the supervisor that is aimed at asking for clarification or orientation about a problem or situation under consideration. It is factually oriented and is not concerned with opinions or ways of doing things.

Category 5. Giving information. This is the opposite of Category 4. It involves the supervisor giving objective information to the teacher, orienting, summarizing, etc.

Category 6. Asks for opinions. This category is meant to describe supervisor behavior, the aim of which is to ask the teacher to analyze or evaluate something that has occurred, is occurring, or may occur in the classroom or in the interaction taking place.

Category 7. Asks for suggestions. In this category are statements by the supervisor that ask the teacher to think about ways of doing things or ways in which things might have been done differently. It has an action orientation, past, present, or future. Category 7 also refers to asking for ways in which the supervisor and teacher might work together.
Category 8. Gives opinions. This category is the opposite of Category 6. It has the same substantive meaning with the exception that the supervisor is "giving" not "asking."

Category 9. Gives suggestions. In a like manner as Category 8, this one has the opposite meaning as 7. The difference is in the "giving" instead of "asking."

Category 10. Criticism. This category includes all negative value judgments about the teacher, his behavior in the classroom, any behavior on the part of the supervisor that can be interpreted as defensive, aggressive, or tension-producing.

Teacher Behavior

Category 11. Asks for information, opinions, or suggestions. This is task-oriented behavior on the part of the teacher. It is the teacher-counterpart of Categories 4, 6, and 7.

Category 12. Gives information, opinions, or suggestions. This category, similar to Category 11, is the teacher, counterpart to Categories 5, 8, and 9.

Category 13. Positive social emotional behavior. This behavior is described in the same way as that in Category 1. It is not task-oriented and helps build the supervisory relationship. Encouragement would probably not be found as constituting very much in the way of a teacher's repertoire in this category. Statements that convey agreement by choice are part of this category, but those that indicate compliance in the face of supervisor power are not.

Category 14. Negative social emotional behavior. Any behavior on the part of the teacher that tends to disrupt the supervisory relationship, produce tension or convey the defensiveness on his part is part of this category. Compliance in the face of supervisory power is defined as defensiveness as is rationalization.
Category 15. Silence or confusion. This category is used when there is silence or both supervisor and teacher are talking at the same time so that it becomes impossible to categorize behavior specifically. An exception would be when there is silence after a behavior on the part of either supervisor or teacher than seems to have the effect of producing defensiveness (either Category 10 or 14, depending at whom the original behavior was aimed).
PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISING CONFERENCES
BY COOPERATING TEACHER

(Please indicate with an X on the appropriate number of the scale the amount of emphasis the following behaviors were given in your supervisory conferences.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your freedom to initiate discussion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning about your behavior as a professional.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning about yourself as a person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student teacher's perceived need to control.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Need to plan your behavior to avoid certain areas of discussion.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student teacher's perceived attitude of superiority.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived tendency of other to assume he has right answer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived empathy by student teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Feeling of being evaluated by student teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your perceptions of productivity of supervising conferences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived amount of talk by student teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discrepancy between perceived and wished for behavior on the part of the student teacher.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE INSTRUMENT
BY STUDENT TEACHER

Blumberg-Amidon "Teacher Perceptions of
Supervisor-Teacher Conferences"

(Place an X on the appropriate number of the scale the amount of emphasis the following behaviors were given in your supervisory conferences.

1. Your freedom to initiate discussion. 1 2 3 4 5
2. Learning about one's behavior as a teacher. 1 2 3 4 5
3. Learning about oneself as a person. 1 2 3 4 5
4. Supervisor's perceived need to control. 1 2 3 4 5
5. (Strategy) Need to plan your behavior to avoid certain areas of discussion. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Supervisor's perceived attitude of superiority. 1 2 3 4 5
7. (Certainty) Perceived tendency of supervisor to assume he has the right answer. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Perceived empathy by the supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Feeling of being evaluated by the supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Your perceptions of productivity of supervisory conferences. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Perceived amount of supervisory talk. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Discrepancy between perceived and "wished for" supervisory behavior. 1 2 3 4 5
**PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES**

**BY UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR**

(Please indicate with an X on the appropriate number of the scale the amount of emphasis the following behaviors were given in your supervisory conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your freedom to initiate discussion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning about your behavior as a professional.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning about yourself as a person.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The student teacher's perceived need to control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Need to plan your behavior to avoid certain areas of discussion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The student teacher's perceived attitude of superiority.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived tendency of other to assume he has right answer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Perceived empathy by student teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Feeling of being evaluated by student teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Your perceptions of productivity of supervisory conferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Perceived amount of talk by student teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Discrepancy between perceived and wished for behavior on the part of the student teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Teaching Project

Hunt's Paragraph Completion Method

Research Number _______________________ Date ______________________

Directions:

On the following pages you will be asked to complete certain phrases with a short paragraph.

On each page, front and back, you will find the beginning of a sentence. Your task is to complete it and add three sentences to it. For example:

I like

When you are given the signal, turn to the first page. You will be given two minutes to work on each page.

After 1 1/2 minutes,
At 2 minutes, turn to the next page.

Make sure you complete your last sentence on each page.

Write as quickly but as clearly as possible.

Thank you.
1. What I think about rules

TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE
When I am criticized.
3. What I think about parents.
4. When someone disagrees with me
5. When I am not sure
6. When I am told what to do
7. When I think about supervision
APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Style %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample - N = 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Conceptual Level Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students (N=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating Teachers (N=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Supervisors (N=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample - N=25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Teaching Style Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample (N=25) 38.2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Human Relations Student</th>
<th>Human Relations Co-op Teacher</th>
<th>Productivity Student</th>
<th>Productivity Co-op Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Sample (N=25) 16.76 19.32 20.36 20.88
APPENDIX C

COMMUNICATION
Dear Fellow Teacher:

Very little is known about the student teaching experience in early childhood centers. You, as an active practitioner in the process, have unique and valuable insights into this learning experience. For this reason you are being asked to share your perceptions through participation in a research project on student teaching.

Your participation in the study will involve the following:

1. The filling out of three brief surveys at the end of the quarter (the total time required should not be more than a half-hour).

2. I would like to study one student teaching group (university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher) in depth. I will ask only the people in this group to keep a brief confidential written daily journal of their impressions of the student teaching process on a day-to-day basis (this will take no more than five minutes per day). In addition, I will need to spend several hours of observation per week of that group's classroom.

All information will be strictly confidential. Identification of the participants, the school, or the geographic location will not be possible since all data will be grouped together. No one involved in the analysis of this data is involved with student teaching at The Ohio State University.

The study will be conducted during Spring quarter under the supervision of Dr. Jean Dickerscheid of The Ohio State University, Department of Family Relations and Human Development. The study is being undertaken in partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral degree.

Your consent to participate in the study will be of great benefit to the overall understanding of preparation of teachers for early childhood programs. I will be glad to share the findings of my research with you when it is completed.

Sincerely,

Susan G. Jakob

SGJ:jhb
Student Teaching Project

Cooperating Teacher

Dear Fellow Teacher:

Very little is known about the student teaching experience in early childhood centers. You, as an active practitioner in the process, have unique and valuable insights into this learning experience. For this reason you are being asked to share your perceptions in a research project centered on student teaching.

Your participation in the study will involve the following:

1. A half-hour observation of your classroom by an observer when both you and your student teacher are present.

2. The tape recording of two conferences between you and your student teacher.

3. The filling out of three brief surveys at the end of the quarter (the total time required should not be more than a half-hour).

I would like to study one student teaching group (university supervisor, cooperating teacher, and student teacher) in depth. I will ask only the people in this group to keep a brief confidential written daily journal of their impressions of the student teaching process on a day-to-day basis (this will take no more than five minutes per day). In addition, I will need to spend several hours of observation per week in this group's classroom.

All information will be strictly confidential. Identification of the participants, the school, or the geographic location will not be possible since all data will be grouped together. No one involved in the analysis of this data is involved with student teaching at The Ohio State University.

The study will be conducted during Spring quarter under the supervision of Dr. Jean Dickerscheid of The Ohio State University, Department of Family Relations and Human Development. The study is being undertaken in fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree.

Your consent to participate in the study will be of great benefit to the overall understanding of preparation of teachers for early childhood programs. I will be glad to share the findings of my research with you when it is completed.

Sincerely,

SGJ: jhb

Susan G. Jakob
Student Teaching  
Student Teacher  
Dear Fellow Teacher:

Very little is known about the student teaching experience in early childhood centers. You, as an active practitioner in the process, have unique and valuable insights into this learning experience. For this reason you are being asked to share your perceptions in a research project centered on student teaching.

Your participation in the study will involve the following:

1. The keeping of a brief (not requiring more than five minutes a day) confidential written daily journal of your impressions of the student teaching process.

2. A half-hour observation of your classroom by an observer when both you and your cooperating teacher are present.

3. The tape recording of two conferences between you and your cooperating teacher.

4. The filling out of three brief surveys at the end of the quarter (the total time required should not be more than a half-hour).

All information will be strictly confidential. Identification of the participants, the school, or the geographic location will not be possible since all data will be grouped together. No one involved in the analysis of this data is involved with student teaching at The Ohio State University. You may withdraw at any time without jeopardizing your student teacher position.

The study will be conducted during Fall quarter under the supervision of Dr. Jean Dickerscheid of The Ohio State University, Department of Family Relations and Human Development. The study is being undertaken in fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree.

Your consent to participate in the study will be of great benefit to the overall understanding of preparation of teachers for early childhood programs. I will be glad to share the findings of my research with you when it is completed.

Sincerely,

Susan G. Jakob

SGJ:jhb
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) a study entitled STUDENT TEACHING IN EARLY CHILDHOOD SETTINGS.

(Investigator/Project Director of his/her authorized representative) has explained the purpose of the study and procedures to be followed. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child). The information obtained from me (my child) will remain confidential and anonymous unless I specifically agree otherwise.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I have signed it freely and voluntarily and understand a copy is available upon request.

Date __________________________ Signed __________________________

(Participant)

(Investigator Project Director of Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant--If Required)

PA-027 (2/79) -- To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research for which an OSU Human Subject Review Committee has determined that the research poses no risk for participants.
Student Teaching Project
Student Teacher

**Recording Student-Teacher Conferences**

In order for me to gain a deeper understanding of the student teaching process, I would like you to tape record two conferences between you and your cooperating teacher. Since my presence may interfere with the confidentiality of your conferences, I am asking you to record them yourselves when I am not present.

These tapes will only be identified by your assigned research number which I will not know. They will be listened to by my research assistant who is not involved in the student teaching program in any way or this department and who does not know any of the participants in this research study.

The conferences to be recorded may be formal (midterm or final conferences) or they may be informal (naturally occurring at the end of the school day). They may take any form as long as they deal with the student teaching situation as opposed to a conversation of a strictly social nature (where you'll spend your summer vacation). One conference should be recorded during the **first six weeks of the quarter**, the second one **during the last four weeks of the quarter**.
I will provide the tapes for the conferences. Tapes will be put in your boxes in the Family Relations, Human Development Office, 315 Campbell Hall, at the beginning of the quarter. If you do not have access to a tape recorder I will provide that also. Just contact me at home (phone: 262-5807).

I suggest the following steps in recording the conferences:

1. Pick up takes in Room 315, Campbell Hall.
2. Set conference time with your cooperating teacher.
3. Obtain a tape recorder, either yours or mine.
4. Record no longer than 30 minutes of the conference. It can be less than 30 minutes but not less than 15 minutes.
5. About one minute into the conference stop and check the recording to make sure that the equipment is working properly and the tape is audible.
6. Label the tape with your assigned research number and drop it off in the box in 315 Campbell Hall with my name on it--Susan Jakob.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Susan Jakob
(Phone: 262-5807)
The Daily Journal

The daily journal is a written record of your day-to-day impressions of the student teaching experience. Do not be overly concerned with grammar, punctuation, or spelling. Just record your feelings and impressions of your days as a student teacher. Do not worry if these impressions are sometimes negative. It is natural to feel less than positive about some things. You should record your observations in a notebook. Entries into your journal should not take more than five minutes per day. If you are having trouble getting started, try listing the student teaching activities that you were involved in for that day and your reaction to them. Some people have found it helpful to make entries into their journals at the same time each day.

Your journal is confidential and will be treated as such. Only your university supervisor will read it. She will not be grading your journal so do not worry about recording negative impressions.

This journal will help your supervisor be sensitive to your needs and feelings. It will be a record for you of your student teaching experience. I will use your journal at the end of the quarter to gain a full understanding of how student teaching affects the participants. I will read these journals without any names attached to them so they will remain confidential.
Ms. Susan G. Jakob  
320 Oakland Park Avenue  
Columbus, Ohio  43214  

Dear Ms. Jakob:

I am pleased that you have decided to use our procedure for observing and rating teaching behavior. I am enclosing a copy of the manual for the observer rating scales.

We have tried to validate the scales against teacher's self ratings and against pupils ratings of teacher's behavior, but without success. I am enclosing a paper in which we made use of these scales within a longitudinal study, but again, our evidence for strong relationships between teaching behavior and other variables was not strong.

Please let me know if I may be of assistance in your work.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest McDaniel, Director
Purdue Educational Research Center

EM:cb

Enclosure
August 12, 1980

Ms. Susan G. Jakob
320 Oakland PK Ave
Columbus, Ohio 43214

Dear Ms. Jakob:

Thank you for your letter of July 28. You will find the information on the supervisor-teacher interaction system in my book Supervisors and Teachers, 2nd ed., published by the McCutchan Publishing Co., Berkeley, Calif. I think it will probably be helpful to you. Check chapters 10 and 11.

I am enclosing a copy of the instrument that Amidon and I used. There is really no manual for its use, but you will find reports of studies in which it was used in chapters 6 and 7 of the book.

I wish you good luck with your study. If I can be of any further help, please feel free to be in touch.

Sincerely,

Arthur Blumberg
Professor of Education

AB/cas
Enc.
20 January 1981

Miss Susan Jakob
320 Oakland Pk Ave
Columbus, Ohio
43214
U.S.A.

Dear Miss Jakob:

In reply to your 1 January 1981 letter, no permission is required to use the P.C.M. The most recent manual can be ordered on the form at the back of the bibliography.

Good luck in your work.

Sincerely,

David E. Hunt
Professor

DEH/m

encl.
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