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ABSTRACT

Within the major framework of "professional development of teachers", this study has addressed the specific issue of "supervision of teachers for professional development". The NSW Department of School Education in Managing the School, 1987 has stated, that "supervision is a positive and integral aspect of staff development". This research asks, "Is supervision really helping teachers?"

The study was conducted in two South Coast (NSW) primary schools over a period of 12 months. Data was collected by interviewing the two parties involved in supervision: teachers and their supervisors. Two levels of questions were asked in this evaluation: firstly, "What happened (with respect to supervision) in the two case study schools over the period of the research and what factors were responsible?" secondly, "What were the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees with regard to supervision?"

Responses to these second level questions revealed that supervisors and supervisees in these two schools have different perceptions of supervision. The participants have identified the factors which they perceive have promoted and inhibited supervision for professional development in each case study school. A model of "supervision" for professional growth of teachers was described uniformly by more than 75% of the supervisees interviewed.

The findings reveal that in two schools, teachers believe that supervision should lead to professional growth. In addition the data shows that experienced teachers in these two schools have definite ideas on how they should be developed. Several emergent issues relevant to supervision were identified by the study.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this evaluation is to investigate supervision in two case study schools and determine the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees with respect to supervision. The intention is to use the case studies as a vehicle through which to explore the issues of supervision.

BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

This research developed out of an earlier study which evaluated the effectiveness of a regional inservice course on supervision (Webb 1989, Appendix 1). Several issues emerged from the first study revealing "supervision" to be a topic warranting further investigation. Far more interesting than the findings regarding the effectiveness of the inservice course were the perceptions of supervision as revealed by the participants. In seven case study schools research data indicated that perceptions of and attitudes to supervision amongst supervisors (school executive in promotions positions) and supervisees (classroom teachers) were often at a variance. For some people supervision had been an extremely threatening and painful process. Some supervisors and supervisees were guarded in their responses. It was evident that I had asked people to talk about something that they were not used to talking about and which some people found threatening.

In addition, several issues emerged from the earlier study indicating that a level of antagonism existed between some supervisors and their supervisees and that some teachers were concerned about supervision in general. The emergent issues of this research strongly hinted that there was something wrong with supervision. Several teachers had questioned the motives for supervision, indicating a lack of trust between supervisor and supervisee. There was evidence in several schools of antagonism over
classroom visits and whether they were an acceptable and useful supervisory practice. Some teachers were concerned by documentation of supervision. One quarter of the teachers interviewed expressed dissatisfaction, stating that their supervision was imposed, rather than negotiated. These factors suggested that all was not well with supervision in the seven case study schools. Questions began to be posed for which I had no answers: "If supervision was supposed to help teachers, then why did so many supervisors and supervisees find it a difficult topic to discuss". This question relates to another similar question, one that led me into the current research: "Why is supervision a contentious issue?"

Clearly there remained many questions to be asked about supervision, though at this stage I was not sure what questions needed to be asked. I had only a "gut feeling" that there was more to know. I had developed a curiosity and desire to find out more about supervision. I wanted to know what those being supervised and those in supervisory roles thought about supervision. These were the people who held the knowledge of "what is supervision and what it is supposed to do".

It was clear that those supervising and being supervised, had a substantial background knowledge of supervision through their experience of it. If I wanted to find out what they knew, I would have to be trusted and would have to ask questions that would open minds rather than close them. The challenge was not only in getting people to talk about a contentious issue, and one which most teachers were powerless to do anything about, but most difficult of all, the study would require participants to talk about their experiences of supervision. This would involve revealing details of their relationships with other members of staff (supervisor or supervisee).

The initial research had revealed personal and confidential taped interviews to be a powerful tool in exploring people's perceptions and beliefs. It was felt that this would again be the best and the least threatening method of
determining supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of supervision. An emergent research design and a grounded theory approach to analysis of data were employed with a view to determining the issues of supervision as the study progressed.

The decision to design a case study approach based on individual interviews with supervisors and supervisees developed not only from the perceived success of this method in the earlier research, but also from the nature of the topic being studied. I had already found that supervision was a contentious issue which some people found difficult to talk about even in a private and confidential interview. It was evident that group interviews or observations of "supervision in action" could be even more threatening for some individuals. The prospect of watching teachers "be supervised" I considered fraught with too many opportunities for creating an artificial situation and the likelihood of getting any participants was slight. I needed a "real" situation, without the threat to participants. I needed a "slice of reality" so that I could attempt to reconstruct the multiple perceptions of that reality belonging to those who had been part of it. As a means to this end I negotiated with two schools to evaluate supervision over a 12 month period, interviewing all members of staff willing to participate. From the beginning, the study was designed to provide two way benefit, information about supervision to the researcher and regular feedback to the participating schools.

RATIONALE

In the current educational and political climate, supervision is a highly contentious issue in New South Wales (NSW) government schools. The introduction of the 1990 Education Reform Act in NSW is evidence of increased legislation in this state with respect to control of schooling. Though mainly concerned with curriculum, there are fears in some quarters that future legislation may concern standards for teaching and prescriptors identifying
good teaching practice. The NSW Teachers Federation has expressed concern (Davy 1990) that senior personnel of the NSW Department of School Education have confused the issues of "supervision" and "professional development" of teachers, presuming the terms to be synonymous.

There is an assumption by the system that supervisors will develop teachers. The NSW Department of School Education in "Managing the School" (1984, revised 1987) has stated that staff development is the responsibility of the principal and the school executive in each school and that "supervision is a positive and integral aspect of staff development". (p.3.1.5)

In addition, regional inservice on supervision has put a clear message to supervisors, in line with system expectations:

i. You will supervise for accountability purposes;

ii. Supervision is an integral part of staff development. ¹

It is an appropriate time to investigate the perceptions of those actually involved in supervision, classroom teachers and their supervisors. The thesis asks, "Supervision : is it really helping teachers?" By asking this question, focus is deliberately placed on supervision in the context of professional development of teachers. The question emerged during the research, when two thirds of the data had been collected. In the course of this study, the issue of whether supervision is helping teachers in two schools is investigated as well as the perceptions of those supervisors and supervisees as to whether it can.

The outcomes of the findings are relevant to current system proposals to develop a "new approach to human resources" as described in "School Centred Education", the 1990 follow-up report to "Schools Renewal" (1989). It is interesting to note that whilst the 1990 document has acknowledged widespread teacher dissatisfaction with personnel management in the NSW Department of School Education, and has allocated ten pages to explaining\
the new directions, there was no mention of change to the supervisory structures or practices which have been implemented by the system for fifty years or more.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this evaluation is to investigate supervision in two case study schools and determine the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees with respect to supervision.

RESEARCH GOALS

1. To determine what was happening in two Case Study schools with respect to supervision over a 12 month period.

2. To describe any changes in supervisory practices.

3. To determine factors which have been influential in both schools concerning supervisory practices and philosophy.

Major Goal

To determine the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding supervision.

THE CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM

The research was developed because of several factors, all of which are relevant to improving supervision in schools:

1. The need for professional development of teachers. (An issue which is well established in the literature.)

2. The contention surrounding the concept of what is "good supervision".
3. Training in Human Resource Management for school executives. (An issue which is deserving of more attention.)

The big issue is "professional development" of teachers; specifically the lack of it in schools and how to do it? The "chewable chunk" addressed by this piece of research is the validity of supervision of teachers for professional development.

**Major Research Questions**

Two levels of questions exist in the evaluation; operational (those used in interviews) and major framing questions. During the course of the research, at both levels, new questions have emerged, evolved and become more focussed as data has been collected and analysed in line with the "Grounded Theory" approach put forward by Glaser and Strauss in 1967.

Some major framing questions which have emerged during the research include:

- Do teachers believe they are being professionally developed through supervision?
- Do teachers believe that supervision can lead to professional development?
- What do teachers and their supervisors perceive as the factors involved in promoting or inhibiting supervision for professional development?
- Should the motives for supervision be questioned? Is it really about control? What are the factors at play?
- Who are the stakeholders in supervision? Who benefits from the present structures? What are teachers getting out of it?
Key operational questions relevant to supervision in each case study school included:

• What direction has each school taken concerning supervision?
• What factors have been influential in either school, in promoting or inhibiting supervisory change?
• What were the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees regarding supervision?
• To what extent has supervision contributed to the professional growth of the teachers concerned?

THE CONTEXT FOR SUPERVISION

The New South Wales Department of School Education

The New South Wales State school education system is one of the largest centralised systems in the world, both in numbers of students and teachers, and in geographical dimension. In 1989 there were reported 2,227 schools, over 60,000 employees (about 48,000 of them teachers) and 758,500 students in an area covering eight million square kilometres. The Department's annual budget in 1988-89 was almost $2.75 billion. (Schools Renewal 1989 p.4) Until the end of 1989, the task of administering the system had been undertaken by a large central bureaucracy and 10 regional administrations, four in metropolitan Sydney and the other six in strategic locations around the state.

In May 1988 a change of government in NSW signalled the beginning of a period of substantial change for state schools. The new minister, Dr Terry Metherell was given considerable media coverage due to his claims that he was going to make teachers work harder. Such claims together with increases in class sizes and controversial changes to the Higher School Certificate Examination requirements in mid year led to teachers, parents and students protesting against the government changes to education and
particularly against the unpopular minister. One of the first changes made by the new government was to call for a managerial review of the system. In June 1989, the management review, directed by Dr Brian Scott was released to the public titled, "Schools Renewal: A Strategy to Revitalise Schools Within the New South Wales State Education System". Commonly known as "The Scott Report", its major recommendation was the decentralisation of the large bureaucracy. The report recommended empowering schools to bring about dynamic grassroots change. It states that the Schools Renewal strategy does this:

By giving schools much greater control over their own resources.
By providing system support for school based development. (p.7)

"Decentralisation" in the context of the above mentioned report however has come to mean the shifting of Head Office responsibilities to the ten regional centres throughout the state, giving schools control of maintenance and casual staffing budgets and increased accountability whilst still retaining essentially the traditional hierarchical bureaucratic control. In "Australia's Teachers: An Agenda for the Next Decade" (1990), the Schools Council (federal) has revealed that the responses they received from recipients of school reform in the various Australian states were largely negative. The report described a general criticism that, rather than more school autonomy the initiatives have in fact reduced the amount of freedom that schools have enjoyed in the past, and increased the amount of work required, especially by school administrators. With reference to "Schools Renewal" in NSW the report stated:
The best illustration of this may come through an examination of the matters over which it is suggested New South Wales schools should have control. These include purchase of equipment, furniture and fittings ... employment of casual and relief staff...that list although lengthy, represents a relatively small component of the total school budget and a great deal of housekeeping compared with the number of educational opportunities it implies. (p.78)

The Schools Council has suggested the new managerialism in NSW has created more work for schools (in terms of housekeeping) but not given schools control over educational factors.

The types and amount of change which state schools in NSW have experienced in the last three years has resulted in a high degree of tension between the union representing teachers and the government. In addition to changes in the management of the system there have also been controversial changes to the promotion and transfer system for teachers, curriculum reform, and an ongoing argument which is yet to be resolved about the creation of a new category of teacher, referred to as the "Advanced Skills Teacher". Recent curriculum changes which have required significant changes in Primary school teaching, were the introduction of the new Mathematics and Language documents, due for mandatory implementation at the beginning of 1990. During most of 1990 the issue of delayed pay rises for teachers in NSW state schools dominated educational debate and was the cause of much teacher dissatisfaction in schools.

In May 1990, during the course of the research, the NSW Teachers Federation published a letter headed "Snoopervision" to members. The letter questioned the motives for supervision and advised teachers not to participate in the writing of goals or anything to do with performance appraisal.
It is in this climate of controversy that the issue of supervision for professional development of teachers has been researched.

**Supervision in NSW Government Schools**

Supervision in NSW government schools is predominantly carried out through hierarchical communication structures. The Department of Education as a whole (along with individual schools) is organised according to the principles of bureaucracy with the principal and executive constituting the supervisory body in each school. The executive is comprised of the heads of departments or faculties (secondary schools) or those occupying promotions positions such as deputy principal, assistant principal and executive teacher/s (primary schools) and it is they who have the power and the responsibility for supervision of teachers. Power is distributed asymmetrically in fixed positions (not elected) such that teachers are at the lower end of the hierarchy or power structure. (This description was adapted from that of Retallick 1990a p.5).

Not every school however fits this picture. It would appear that a few schools have made their own attempts to break down the hierarchy at the school level and have set up their own supervisory structures. Mossip (1990) describes an alternative arrangement for supervision at Warrawong Public School. At this school, people in promotions positions are supervised by classroom teachers. The hierarchy has been turned upside down. Mossip reports on the favourable response of a significant majority of the staff, the high staff morale and exceptional extent of collegiality at this school.

**Regional Inservice on Supervision**

Supervision of teachers has long been a contentious issue. There is a wide range of opinion as to what constitutes acceptable supervisory procedures and much dissatisfaction with the authoritative methods that have been used in the past. Recent models of supervision stress the need to create
a non-threatening environment and for the supervisor to play a different role, acting more as resource to the teacher offering advice and support. The South Coast Region since 1987 has been promoting through inservice programs the "Negotiated Model of Supervision" (Cloak 1988), whereby the teacher negotiates a plan for his/her supervision with the supervisor/s.

**Supervision in the Context of Each School.**

It is the purpose of this evaluation to qualitatively determine what was happening with respect to supervision, in terms of whole school policies and implementation within two Case Study schools (hence School A and School B). In both of the schools the executive and some teachers had attended the South Coast Region's "Primary Executive Teachers Program" (PETP) on supervision, during the period 1987 to 1989 inclusive. In addition both principals attended the "Principals' Symposium on Supervision" in September 1989. The structure for supervision which operated in these two schools was typical of the hierarchical arrangement in many New South Wales Primary Schools, and was directly related to paid promotions positions. Each member of the school executive, deputy principal, assistant principal/s and executive teacher/s (hence supervisors) was allocated, by the principal, members of the non-executive teaching staff (hence supervisees) to supervise. The principal supervised the executive members.

The two primary schools that participated in the research were very different in their location, size, appearance and professional climates. School A was a large school of 23 permanent teachers, with primary and infants departments on separate sites. The core buildings were over 100 years old. It was centrally situated in a large south coast metropolis.

School B was a smaller school, with 12 fulltime members of staff. It was a reasonably new school (built 1977) and was located in a "garden" suburb of a large coastal city.
WHY (AND TO WHOM) IS THE RESEARCH IMPORTANT?

1. The research is important because professional development of teachers is crucial to improvement in schooling. It has been assumed by the system, though not demonstrated, that supervision leads to professional development of teachers. It is an appropriate time to question whether supervision can and does lead to professional development. Teachers' satisfaction with their supervision is relevant to the development of a positive school climate. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) in making a case for human resources supervision, emphasize the importance of meaningful work for teachers and view teacher satisfaction as a critical key to building motivation and commitment and therefore improving instruction.

2. The research is important to the teachers and executive members of the two schools that participated in the research. These are the "owners" of the data. For these people the research attempts to provide a reconstruction of their multiple perceptions of reality. Views of supervision are revealed by both parties, supervisors and supervisees, which they have admitted would not have been revealed otherwise. For these two schools, the research has provided an opportunity for a close examination of supervision in an objective non-threatening manner which may not have been possible if conducted by a member of staff. The researcher, as a teacher and supervisor of teachers, is also a stakeholder in the research.

The research is also important to school executives and classroom teachers in other schools in order that they may become aware of the factors which positively and negatively affect supervision in the context of two schools and the degree to which those factors may translate to their own school culture.
Finally, the research is important to senior educational personnel (in the South Coast in particular, and possibly in the state), who are responsible for implementing system guidelines such as supervision. It is a dangerous practice to assume system doctrines are effective, or do what they are expected to do, without supportive evidence.

WHO IS THE RESEARCHER?

I am a secondary teacher with 17 years experience, including ten years as Head Teacher (faculty head) in a large South Coast high school. At the commencement of the research I was unsure of what “supervision” meant or should be. In the many years I have been teaching I had experienced very little supervision. With the exception of my probationary year and the two times I had requested assessment for promotion (both successful), I had been left very much to my own devices. On these occasions the supervision had only been of the authoritarian variety with the supervisor adopting a superior attitude and observing for the purpose of detecting any faults in my organisation or classroom practice.

I commenced the research unsure of how supervision should operate. I had a number of concerns that I was not able to verbalise. Through lack of supervision during most of my career, I had enjoyed tremendous creative freedom which was highly developmental. However, I would have liked more support, encouragement and ideas from my superiors. I had a “gut feeling” that there was something wrong with supervision in schools and that the hierarchical arrangement was somehow tied in with this. My own experience in secondary schools had shown that people occupying promotions positions commonly did not play an active role in the professional development of teachers for whom they were responsible. Despite this, I had strong beliefs in the importance of good leadership and the need for “leaders” in a school.
As a Head Teacher I had played an active role in supervising teachers on my staff through collegial groups and a teamwork approach. I had found a teamwork philosophy had worked at the faculty level for efficient organisation and which as a consequence resulted in development of all who were part of the team. I did not know if this could work for everybody though I suspected a grander version could work at the whole school level.

This was my tacit knowledge of supervision that I had brought to the research, which was located in a primary setting.

**Researcher's Presuppositions**

In line with Lincoln and Guba's statement "Inquiry is not and cannot be value free " (1985 p.9 ), I include the following presuppositions which I have brought to the inquiry:

- Supervision is an important and contentious educational issue.
- Professional development of teachers is necessary for educational improvement.
- Good supervision should develop teachers.
- No supervision is better than negative supervision.
- Teachers should play an active role in their own professional development.

**AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY**

In the next chapter, within the framework of "Supervision for Professional Development of Teachers ", the issues of supervision are analysed; "What is it? Where did it come from? How to do it? When to do it? Who should do it?" and most significantly, " Why do it? " In the light of this analysis, views on "The future of supervision and teaching ?" are presented.

Chapter three explains how the research itself was conducted at "grass roots" level with a view to reconstructing teachers' and supervisors' views of
reality with respect to supervision. The local level is considered the ideal place to investigate whether supervision is really helping teachers. As Sergiovanni and Starrat have emphasised regarding implementation of policies for the improvement of education, "The proof of the pudding will always be found at the local level. If it does not happen there, it does not happen". (1988 p.432)

In Chapter four the findings reveal that teachers want a say in their development. Teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of the factors which promote and inhibit supervision for professional development are presented. It is interesting that whilst the literature argues about what supervision is and what it should do, teachers do not. There are common perceptions about the purpose of supervision and how it should be done.

Chapter five interprets and discusses the findings within two different contexts; firstly with reference to the context of the case study schools; and secondly, in relation to the major framing questions which emerged during the study, both as a result of data collection and from a review of the literature. An answer to the title question, "Supervision, is it really helping teachers?" is provided. An account of the impact of the inquiry on the researcher is also presented.

In the final Chapter, the implications of the research in the light of contemporary education reform are examined. The possibility of a new role for supervision is discussed.

Notes
1. Extract from researcher's personal notes made whilst attending south coast regional inservice courses on supervision; Principals' Symposium on Supervision September 1989; Secondary Executives' Course February 1990.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In reality, the task of the supervisor is to make sense of messy situations by increasing understanding and discovering and communicating meaning. Since situations of practice are characterised by unique events, uniform answers to problems are not likely to be helpful. Since teachers, supervisors and students bring to the classroom beliefs, assumptions, values, opinions, preferences, and predispositions, objective and value free supervisory strategies are not likely to address issues of importance. Since uncertainty and complexity are normal aspects in the process of teaching, intuition becomes necessary to fill the gaps of what can be specified as known. Since reality in practice does not exist separate from persons involved in the process of teaching and supervising, knowing cannot be separated from what is to be known.

Thomas Sergiovanni (1985)

Sergiovanni has presented a view of supervision and teaching that values "intuition", or what teachers know. He has suggested the "messy situations", "uncertainty and complexity" and "unique events" of teaching practice, as a rationale for a new kind of supervision, which empowers teachers and in which supervisors work with, not on or over teachers. A review of the literature on supervision and professional development of teachers however, reveals there are some who hold a different view, and who do believe there are "uniform answers" to the question of how to improve teachers.
This review of the literature is presented in two parts. The first deals with the "big picture" of education and explores the context for supervision at international, national, and state levels. Theories on management of people are pursued and presented in the light of current argument about how best to improve teachers.

The second half of the chapter presents a more focused view of supervision and highlights the contemporary issues of supervision at the school level. The origins of supervision are traced, theories of "how to" supervise are presented, research on supervision at the school level is examined and factors contributing to "effective" and "ineffective" supervision are discussed.

The conceptual framework for the study and the review of literature is the role of supervision in the professional development of teachers. This focus is derived from a broader theoretical framework of human resource management which includes professional development of teachers. The intention is to create a complex picture, showing that supervision is not an issue which can be discussed with any relevance in isolation from the factors which impinge on teachers and schools at local, national and international levels. The complexity cannot be underestimated.

PART 1: AN OVERVIEW

The 1980's was a period of rapid change worldwide, socially, economically and technologically. There is every indication that the next decade will be a period of even greater change at an accelerated rate. Currently governments in the United Kingdom, United States and Australia are putting pressure on large public organisations to improve their performance and productivity in order to compete more successfully in the competitive world market. Education systems in these countries are also being pressured by government and societal expectations to improve their
outcomes. In the last decade, management of people or "human resources" has emerged as a central and controversial approach to improving the performance of large organisations. Throughout the world of business and education theories on how to develop human resources for the purpose of more effective functioning of the organisation or system are tending to fall into two camps; those promoting the belief "that people (the workers) need to be controlled more", and those promoting the belief "that people should be given more control of their own workplace." (researcher's interpretation)

Whatever the outcomes of the debate, it is clear that "supervision" will play a central role in implementing strategies which affect those at the "chalkface" in the future. Supervisors, as first line managers working at "grassroots level" will be the people responsible for implementing the policy of the system, whether it be a hierarchical form of centralised control or a decentralised system in line with current theories of human resource management. At the school level, supervisors in the future may be expected to play a dominant role in directing teachers to follow system guidelines or they may be required to play a very different role assisting and facilitating teachers in developing their professional autonomy.

THE BIG PICTURE

Economies and Education

1991 is a time of depressed economies in the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia. It is also a period where politicians and business councils in these countries are pressuring for increased legislation with regard to control of education particularly curriculum, student assessment and teacher evaluation. The link between the poor health of the economy and changes to education systems has been made by several sources. In "The Condition of Teaching", the 1989 general report of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), a causal link between the
economy and education is asserted: "A healthy society and economy means a well functioning education system which means an active, motivated and highly competent teaching force." (1989 p.4 cited in Schools Council 1990)

The pressure being put on American education to "lift its game" in the face of economic decline, is evident in the following comment by Linda Darling Hammond (Director Education and Resources Program at the RAND Corporation Washington D.C.). The author states: "As a country we cannot expect to maintain or regain economic and political status in the world while allowing our human capital to fall out however it may. We're in a situation where we simply cannot allow children to fail." (in Meek 1988 p.12) Darling Hammond acknowledges that the changing economic status of America has had a profound effect on education and on teaching.

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) however, are critical of school reforms based on a supposed link between the failure of American business to maintain dominance over foreign competition and school practices which are supposed to be responsible for the declining scores of youngsters: "Proposing economic productivity as the only or even the primary reason for schooling reflects an inappropriately narrow conception of schooling". (p.425)

The School Reform Movement in the United States

Three reports in the last decade have had significant impact on school reform in the United States and have focused considerable attention on the quality of teachers: "A Nation at Risk" 1983, "Tomorrows Teachers" (the report of the Holmes Group) 1986 and the report of the Carnegie Task Force 1986. 1

"A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform," released by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, deplored the mediocrity of education and stated unequivocally that schools as they exist have done a ruinous job on the economy and society. This report is
commonly perceived throughout the literature commenting on educational reform, to have been a major influence on the development of educational legislation throughout the United States in recent years. Glickman (1989) perceives the School Reform movement in the United States to have begun in the 1970's with a neo-scientific view, that if students were not learning and schools were not improving, it was because educators were not using the best available scientific evidence. In his view the bleak picture of public education painted by reports such as "A Nation at Risk", only added fuel to the scientific reductionist view of reform; the need for installing the "best practice in schools". (p.5)

The recurring theme of the reports by the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Task Force is the need to increase the professional status of teaching. In particular they have called for strengthening the career advancement opportunities, the subject matter knowledge and the technical expertise of all classroom teachers. (Shulman 1987, Flinders 1989) The Holmes group has called for extensive and far-reaching changes in the education of beginning teachers and the professional development of practising teachers. Evidence of an implied new role for supervision can be found in the Holmes Group's goals for the reform of teacher education. The fifth and final goal as quoted below refers specifically to the cooperative professional development of teachers that can be attained within the school environment:

*To make schools better places for teachers to work and to learn.* This will require less bureaucracy, more professional autonomy, and more leadership for teachers. But schools where teachers can learn from each other and from other professionals will be schools where good teachers will want to work. They will also be schools in which students will learn more. (cited in Howey 1990 p.3)
Devaney (1990) says, the calls for reform in public education during the last
decade have arisen from widely shared perceptions of the inadequacy of the
public schools to prepare a diverse student population to participate in our
increasingly complex society.

The Two Reform Movements

Two current and contradictory movements for reform in teaching in the
United States are identified by Shulman (1987), Darling Hammond (1988),
Glickman (1989) and Wise (1990); a top down reform including
standardisation of practice and a counter movement, calling for local control
of schools, school-based management, shared decisionmaking, parent
participation and teacher professionalism.

Glickman (1989) refers to the first, and earliest reform movement,
beginning in the 1970's, as "legislated learning". (He acknowledges Wise's
1987 terminology.) Over the past two decades, says Glickman, there have
been increased regulations and tightened external controls over education.
This kind of reform, he states, views schools and local educators as not able
to be trusted with the responsibility of education. Reform based on legislated
learning aims to create excellence in schools through legislative mandates of
statewide curriculum, statewide tests, and statewide teacher evaluation.

The second and more recent reform movement Glickman (1989) refers
to as "empowerment" [of teachers]. In his view dissatisfaction with legislated
learning, less state money than expected to fund legislated mandates and a
shifting political climate, have lead to a more experimental and pragmatic
view of school reform. That view is, he states: "that good teachers and
administrators are the solution to, rather than the source of school problems".
(p.6)
Linda Darling Hammond (1988) says the two very different streams of policy stem from radically different notions of how students learn, how effective teaching is conducted, and how, as a result, education can be improved.

### Dangers of the "Legislative Approach" to School Reform

Lee Shulman, (1987) warns of the dangers of teaching mandates, stating that the policy community hold incomplete and trivial definitions of teaching. He is also wary of those who presume a "knowledge base for teaching" exists, as well as a means for representing and communicating it. The reports of the Holmes Group and the Carnegie Task Force, he says, are based on such a belief. Shulman believes a proper understanding of the knowledge base is needed and that we are still learning what teaching is all about. In questioning what is a knowledge base, Shulman argues,

> We have an obligation to raise standards in the interests of improvement and reform, but we must avoid the creation of rigid orthodoxies. We must achieve standards without standardisation. We must be careful that the knowledge-base approach does not produce an overly technical image of teaching, a scientific enterprise that has lost its soul....the currently incomplete and trivial definitions of teaching held by the policy community comprise a far greater danger to good education than does a more serious attempt to formulate the knowledge base. (1987 p.20)

### The Australian Education Scene

In 1984 Coulter and Ingvarson reported to the Commonwealth Schools Commission (Australia), that the issue of teacher development was central to any plans for improving the quality of education in Australian schools. In their
concluding comments, these authors made the criticism that every enquiry and review over the previous decade had stated that professional development was crucial to improving the quality of education, yet such recommendations had largely been ignored. They stated further that support for professional development had in fact, declined. Their report stressed the need for professional development of teachers as follows:

If there is to be any significant improvement in education in Australia it must be through the enhancement of the profession. If new Commonwealth Government policy is to improve the quality of education in school it must be through what teachers do, how they do it and what it means to them. As the essence of educational change consists in teachers learning new skills, knowledge and attitudes it follows that the professional development of teachers is one of the most important factors related to improving further the quality of teaching in schools. (1984 p.172-173)

Improving the quality of Australia's teachers through professional development, is currently an issue of national concern. Priorities for improving the training of teachers were among the key issues raised by the Federal Minister for Education, Employment and Training, the Hon. J.S. Dawkins in "Strengthening Australia's Schools". (May 1988)

The quality of teaching is central to the quality of our schools.... we must examine means of improving the initial and on-going training of teachers to meet the demands of a changing educational, economic and social environment. (p.5)
In response to this document the Schools Council, one of four councils established by the National Board of Education, Employment and Training (NBEET), determined that the quality of Australian teachers and teaching in Australian Schools was central to school development and improvement and adopted the issue of “Teacher Quality” as one of its major projects. In “Teacher Quality: An Issues Paper” published in November 1989, the Council endorsed the Minister’s statement (as quoted above) and stressed the key role of teachers in improving Australia’s schools:

The Schools Council ... believes that even greater emphasis needs to be placed on the role of teachers in achieving quality education and that the issues of the quality of teachers and of teaching are of prime and national importance. (1989 p.4)

The three main directions of the Issues Paper enunciated in the conclusions (p.63) were as follows:

(i) the quality of a nation’s teachers is vital to the nation’s strength and the maintenance of its educational health;

(ii) the quality will only be maintained by continuing attention to the professional development of the teaching force;

(iii) the professional development needs to be viewed as a continuum consisting of the initial or pre-service preparation of teachers, their induction into teaching as a career and their continuing professional growth throughout their career (INSET).
In "Australia's Teachers - An Agenda for the Next Decade" (December 1990) the School's Council stressed that the quality of teaching in Australia can and should be improved. The need for an effective human resource policy in Australian Schooling is the major thrust of this paper. The report describes suggestions for explicit and better defined teaching as well as systematic professional development accompanied by appraisal of teachers. A "Charter for Teaching" which defines and makes explicit what teaching is and should do, is recommended as a means of producing better student outcomes and as a means of increasing public confidence in schooling. The Schools Council recommended restructuring the work of teachers to enable them to work more efficiently, but stressed that teachers have a major role to play in any changes that affect their work. Chapter four dealt with the continued professional development of teachers throughout their careers.

Further recognition of the current national importance of developing Australia's teaching force is the "National Project on Quality of Teaching" currently being undertaken by the Commonwealth, teacher employing authorities and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. Lyndsay Connors, Chair of the Schools Council of the National Board of Employment, Education and Training, in an interview for "Australian Teacher" November 1990, stressed the central concern of government with respect to education at the current time:

"No group of issues is more fundamental at present than quality of teaching issues". (p.16)

At this point in the review of literature it should be clear that the need to professionally develop teachers is an issue of major concern in the United States and Australia. It is an appropriate time to take a step sideways, into another framework.
Education is part of an even bigger picture - the world of work. Rapid change is happening in the world of work, and the business and industry sector is under similar pressure to improve outcomes. Management theories which dominated in more stable times have been challenged considerably in the last ten years. Traditional hierarchical bureaucratic structures, such as exist in large organisations, government bodies and in particular, educational systems, are increasingly perceived to be unsuited to, and inefficient in, a time of rapid change. (Handy 1989)

MANAGEMENT THEORIES

The evolution of management theory is described by Stoner et al (1985) and Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) early in their books. These authors describe a transition in management thinking from a classic scientific management approach (Owens, Taylor, Fayol, Weber), in the early part of this century, to a behavioural or “Human Relations” approach (Mayo, Maslow) which emerged during the 1930’s, to a more recent renewed interest in scientific management thinking, (referred to as “Neoscientific Management” by Sergiovanni and Starratt). Both groups of authors are critical of the effectiveness of this later model in dealing with the human side of an organisation. A recent trend in management towards a “pluralist” approach, is also described by Stoner et al (1985). This model combines aspects of a number of existing management theories. The authors suggest that in future, managers may find a multiplicity of theories useful to select the appropriate perspective for each situation. 2

Human Resources Management

The most significant change in management in recent years has been the movement to Human Resources Management (HRM), alternatively known as Human Resources Development (HRD) and Human Resources
Supervision (HRS Sergiovanni and Starratt 1988). Calls for changes towards a more "humanistic" or people-oriented approach to management are currently being heard in business, industry and education. Howarth, (1984) in her book "The Way People Work", has encouraged large organisations to focus management strategies on the needs of the worker and to involve the worker in participative decisionmaking for the ultimate purpose of increasing organisational effectiveness and productivity. The concept of the importance of the individual in an organisation has been promoted by prominent writers in the fields of management and education, such as Peters and Waterman (1982), Kanter (1983), Drucker (1988) and Ouchi (1982). There has been a rapid rise to prominence of this field of thought during the last ten years.

Anderson, in the foreword to Sergiovanni and Starrat's 1988 text, captures the spirit of the human resources management theme, when he states:

The resounding message in all of the "best seller" books about corporate management and leadership ... is that people in organisations can perform miracles, when empowered to use their full resources on tasks they have helped to define. (p. xvi)

The need to focus on the individual is the greatest human resource challenge facing every employer today, says Simper (1990). He believes that many people today value freedom and autonomy and that motivation to improve performance of the workforce can be achieved by catering to these personal needs/desires.

Human Resources Supervision

Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) in the fourth edition of their text "Supervision : Human Perspectives", articulate more fully the human
resources theme developed in the earlier editions (1972, 1979, 1983). The authors consider their theory of "Human Resources Supervision", a theory of management with a higher regard for human need, potential and satisfaction than earlier theories such as human relations management. Sergiovanni and Starrat assert that present conceptions and dominant models of supervision are inadequate when literally applied because they do not fit the real world of practice. These authors provide a framework for thinking about supervisory practice founded on the optimistic assumptions about the nature of humankind, central to McGregor's Theory Y.

"Traditional or Bureaucratic" supervision, say Sergiovanni and Starrat, is characterised by little mutual confidence and trust among supervisors and teachers, direct supervision, high control, centralised decisionmaking, detailed rules and regulations, and work operating procedures, top down communications, the routinisation of work and regulation by inspection. In contrast human resources supervision they claim, reflects a commitment to the development of teachers and other workers and is characterised by trust, supportive relationships, goal clarity and commitment, autonomy with responsibility, group decision making, authority more closely linked with ability, teamwork, social interaction and controls linked to agreed upon goals and purposes. (p.46)

Basic to human resources supervision is acceptance of the reality that little gets done in the school without the cooperation and commitment of teachers. Models of management, leadership and supervision which ignore this reality will not work over the long run, stress these authors. Sergiovanni and Starrat analysed Maslow's hierarchy of needs in relation to supervision of teachers. In their view the motivational base for traditional (and to some extent human relations style) supervision is limited and totally inadequate for providing the personal and professional growth opportunities that professionally oriented teachers seek (p.138). They stress, "Human
resources supervision is founded on beliefs about human nature that center on human beings as active, responsible and growing persons. “ (p.432)

The purpose of this section of the review of literature has been to show that theories on human resource management are currently being expounded in the business and industry sector as well as education. The concept of improving the workforce as a means to improving the effectiveness, productivity or profitability of the organisation has been advocated by Martin and Kehoe (1990) and Simper (1990) as essential for success in the 1990’s. These authors also state that the world of work and the expectations of people in the workforce have changed in the last decade. Martin and Kehoe provide evidence for a movement in thinking about how we as Australians need to change the way we view and think about work. These authors say that the language and models of “training” used in this country are outdated. They argue that “lifelong learning” not “training” is the crux of the debate.

The current focus on the needs of the worker and the worker as a learner in the field of business and industry management, parallels the recent focus in education on professional development of teachers.

Having reviewed the changes occurring in the broader spectrum of education and the developments in management thinking in the world of work, it is an appropriate point to review the system statements about supervision within the New South Wales Department of School Education (the context of the present evaluation).

NSW EDUCATION SYSTEM STATEMENTS

In "Managing the School" (1984, revised 1987) the NSW Department of School Education states its expectations of supervisors and supervision:
Supervision is a positive and integral aspect of staff development which is concerned with each teacher's responsibility and accountability....the principal and executive are responsible for planning and applying supervisory practices for monitoring the implementation and improvement of the school's program in its progress towards achievement of stated aims and objectives. (p.3.1.5)

The system is saying supervision is about accountability and staff development. There is an expectation by the system, that through supervision, school executives will play a significant role in the development of non-executive teaching staff. The assumptions of system statements about supervision in "Managing the School" are analysed by Retallick. (1990a) He asserts,

That the underlying belief appears to be that professional development of teachers and teaching should take place through a hierarchical process of control over the actions of teachers....it clearly reflects an ideology of management control over teachers.(p.3)

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the advent of "Schools Renewal" (1989) in NSW government schools resulted in some controversy. One of the major changes affecting teachers, recommended by this document was the introduction of promotion by merit. A follow-up report, "School Centred Education : Building A More Responsive State School System" (1990) begins to detail the department's "new approach to human resources". Under the heading "Developing Priorities to Support Schools Renewal" the system's goals with respect to human resource management are described:
The Human Resource Development Director will have responsibility for collaborating with Human Resource Directors in regions to establish policies and develop a strategic plan. This plan will identify staff development needs and priorities to achieve educational outcomes and administrative performance goals, and professional skill levels designated in the five year regional plans and the Department's overall corporate plan. (p.109)

The document makes it clear that goals for professional development of teachers will be decided by human resource directors (senior system personnel) at state and regional level.

Retallick (1990a) says that supervision in NSW is predominantly carried out through hierarchical communication structures. He suggests that whilst this form emphasises hierarchical control and facilitates bureaucratic accountability, it is problematic as to whether it is an appropriate structure for the improvement of teaching and the professional development of teachers. Allen and Martin (1987), with reference to NSW government schools, say that supervision has long been a contentious issue. They perceive that the problem lies in the fact that there is no real agreement to supervisory purpose, executive responsibility or acceptable supervisory procedure.

In the first half of the literature review the need to professionally develop the teaching force was presented as a current crisis issue. The possibility of a key role for supervision in the context of this issue was highlighted. The second half of the chapter explores the debate about supervision. Theorists, educators and legislators do not agree on what supervision is, how it should be done or more importantly, why it should be done.
PART 2: A FOCUSED VIEW OF SUPERVISION

What is Supervision?

Definitions of supervision published in the late 1970's and early 1980's tend to refer to supervision as being concerned with the improvement of instruction. (Harris 1975, Alfonso, Firth and Neville 1975, Sergiovanni 1982, Sergiovanni and Starratt 1979, Hoy and Forsyth 1986) Typical is Dull's definition:

Supervision refers to the the actions of professional educators that are exercised for the purpose of improving instruction. (1981 p.5)

Literature published in the last five years, however, reveals there is considerable argument about what supervision is and what it should do. Bolin (1987) has outlined the problem of defining supervision in a historical context. "After six decades of discussion, two good questions still remain to puzzle us", states Bolin quoting Willhelms 1946: "What is supervision? What is supervision for?" (1987 p.379)

HISTORY OF SUPERVISION

In contrast to attempts to define what supervision is, there is no argument about the bureaucratic origins of supervision. With reference to supervision in American public schools, in the late 19th century Glanz (1990) states:

The nature and character of supervision were formed then and changed little over the next 80 or so years. Supervision is still important in preserving bureaucratic role relationships in schools.(p.151)
Robert Anderson (in Smyth 1986a) states that much of the early literature on supervision in education was based on practices and theories established in the worlds of work. For at least the first third of the twentieth century ideas on management and supervision were dominated by the theories of Frederick Taylor, Max Weber and Henri Fayol. Even though based in industry, these strict and bureaucratic ideas had a strong influence on school practice. The problems of supervision today are considered by some authors (Smyth 1987, Schon 1983, Sergiovanni and Starratt 1988) to have been inherited from the industrial/managerial model.

Extant models of supervision are still largely based on notions of social engineering and evoke feelings among teachers of impersonal hierarchical processes of inspection, domination and quality control. (Smyth 1987 p.570)

The literature of instructional supervision is one of the youngest in education, even though supervision as a function has a long history in schools. During the last ten years, supervision theorists have strongly criticised the traditional bureaucratic approach and have placed emphasis on the needs of teachers and the development of strategies for human resource management. The actions of educational policymakers, however, reveal quite a different view of how supervision should operate, as described by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988):

Today supervision is clearly the "in thing" in American schooling. What was once a mild renaissance has turned into a revolution. Supervision ranks high on the agendas of both state policy makers and local school administrators. Since 1983, for example, many states have provided mandates for increased supervision. These mandates range from
required "training" in the techniques of supervision and evaluation for principals and supervisors to the provision of comprehensive and standardised state systems of supervision and evaluation. (p.2)

The significance of supervision as a current educational issue is evidenced by the May 1989 edition of the journal "Educational Leadership", devoting almost the entire issue to the topic, "Redefining Supervision".

Challenging the "Traditional" View of Supervision

Lloyd Dull (1981) describes the type of supervision used in American schools between 1910 and 1935:

Supervision consisted of supervising classroom instruction through direct classroom observation and demonstration, with the focus of attention being placed upon the teacher's weaknesses. In conferences with teachers after classroom visits, the supervisor tried to effect improvements in teaching. (p.2)

This "traditional" view of supervision has been criticised on several counts, not least for its failure to positively reinforce the teacher's strengths, but particularly because of the ideology underpinning such methods. The issue of "who is in control?" (who retains the power in the supervisory relationship) is central to the argument about "how supervision should be done". (This argument will be described in further detail later in the literature review.)

Traditional supervision has also been criticised by several prominent writers in the field (Shulman 1987, Smyth 1987, Sergiovanni 1985) on the basis that it presumes a body of knowledge about teaching that is sufficient to prescribe practice. Though admitting we know a great deal to inform practice, these authors consider we are still a long way from possessing the kind of
definitive knowledge about teaching that traditional (and existing) schemes for supervision presume to exist. Smyth (1987) also challenges the legitimacy of the traditional view of supervision, stating that the models on which supervision is based have been developed from knowledge which is now out of date and out of step with what is happening in schools. He suggests Sergiovanni captures the problem neatly with the following comment:

Supervision will not improve much by doing better that which we are doing now. The models upon which our practices rest and the theoretical bases for generating these models ... are the problem. Basic knowledge perspectives will need to be changed before practices will change. (cited in Smyth 1987 p.571)

Similarly Schon (1983) and Handy (1989), referring to professions and the world of work, say that the rules of the game have changed and that claims to professional knowledge are out of step with reality - a new set of rules is needed. Garman (1986) reminds us that we have only to to look to Quantum mechanics to see that a model of certainty does not exist.

**Models of Supervision**

Several models for supervision have developed out of the traditional or bureaucratic model of supervision which was/is based on inspection. By far the greatest amount has been written on Clinical Supervision which originated in the 1950's at Harvard. The definitive volume on clinical supervision is considered that of Morris Cogan (1973), though Goldhammer (1969), Anderson and Krajewski (1980), Acheson and Gall (1986), and Smyth ("Learning About Teaching Through Clinical Supervision" 1986 ) have produced significant texts on the topic.
In contrast to traditional supervision, the supervisor and the teacher in clinical supervision are both assumed to be instructional experts, with the teacher identifying his/her concerns and the supervisor assisting the teacher in analysing the lesson and developing improved lessons. Typically, Clinical Supervision is highly structured involving phases such as the pre-observation conference, observation, analysis and strategy, supervisory conference and post-conference analysis. Bradley (1986) provides a detailed description of an action research project employing clinical supervision, in which the teacher responded positively and the supervisor developed new attitudes and skills that were more responsive to the needs of the supervisee.

Clinical supervision, has been criticised (Reilkoff 1981) for being too time consuming, too rigid, too complex and for failing to consider teachers' growing professionalism. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988) warn that clinical supervision is not for everyone; that it is demanding, can be ritualistic if used continuously and may be too much supervision for some teachers.

In defence of clinical supervision, Smyth (1986) argues that there are two ways of viewing the model: as a way of controlling, disenfranchising or pushing teachers around or alternatively as an emancipatory or liberating process through which teachers assist each other to gain control over their professional lives. Smyth is concerned that the meanings and intents of clinical supervision have become distorted and expresses his view that Goldhammer and Cogan had in mind the emancipatory view in their original conceptualisation of clinical supervision.(p.50) He is supported by Nolan and Huber (1989) and Retallick (1990b) in this view.

Smyth's concerns about the misconstrued implementation of clinical supervision mirror the the current argument about supervision generally and in particular the two contradictory agendas of school reform pervading the literature on education: "should we control teachers more?", or "give teachers more control?"
Cooperative Professional Development is the term used (Glatthorn 1987, Sergiovanni and Starratt 1988, Allan and Miller 1990) to describe a collegial process within which teachers agree to work together for their own professional growth and development. It may take many different forms including teachers working in pairs, groups of three or teams. In an article describing the supervision of counsellor trainees, Holloway and Johnston (1985) make a case for supervision in groups and recommend more research into this area. They state that group supervision is not only an economical use of supervisory time but also provides an opportunity for peer review and peer feedback.

Individualised Professional Development allows teachers to develop plans for their development with a principal or supervisor, but to work alone.

Informal Supervision is a casual encounter by supervisors with teachers at work and is characterised by brief and informal observations of teachers. Writers in the field of management refer to this approach as "Management by Wandering Around". It is discussed at length in Peters and Waterman's 1982 text, "In Search of Excellence". Sergiovanni and Starratt recommend that informal supervision should not be an option for teachers but should be included in whatever model is used.

Developmental Supervision put forward by Glickman in 1981 and 1985 (cited in Glickman and Gordon 1987), aims to match supervisory options to individual needs. The premise is that because teachers operate at differing levels of development, thought, ability and effectiveness, they need to be supervised in different ways. The ultimate goal of supervisors within developmental supervision, say Glickman and Gordon, (1987) is that the teachers take charge of their own improvement. In describing the underlying propositions of developmental supervision, Glickman and Gordon, refer to Calhoun 1985:
If the goal of education in a democratic society is to produce responsible learners, then teachers who are themselves autonomous and independent will be better able to facilitate students' growth towards such ideals. (1987 p.64)

The concept of cooperative goal-setting is the basis of the "Negotiated Model of Supervision" (Cloak 1988) promoted in the South Coast Region Primary Executive Teachers Program. (The inservice attended by most of the executives and some teachers of the two case study schools participating in the research.)

**Supervision: Theory vs Practice**

With respect to supervision there has been and continues to be, a huge gap between theory and practice. The traditional type of supervision described by Dull as "pre -1935 United States", continues to exist both in America and Australia as evidenced by the criticisms of recent authors. (Doll 1983, Goldsberry 1983, Smyth 1987) Goldsberry says that the kind of supervision described in the literature is like a fantasy movie when compared to what is actually happening in schools. Smyth points out that hierarchical supervision (supervisor superior to teacher) is alive and well in schools and is perpetrated by "the notion of supervision as a bureaucratic relationship in which a corrective service is delivered by those of superior wisdom to those who are less experienced". (1987 p.577)

In an attempt to explain how this situation has come about, Sergiovanni (1985) asserts that the dominant "mindscapes" (theoretical bases) for supervision provide an unrealistic view of supervision and for this reason may not be useful for guiding practice. Sergiovanni refers to Hogben's view (based on the research of Friedson) that teachers and other practitioners view their work quite differently than do theoreticians and
researchers. He says Hogben determined that professionals aim at action, not knowledge and in the face of a problem prefer doing anything rather than doing nothing. In this action process, teachers and supervisors are more likely to seek useful knowledge than wait for researchers to come up with truthful knowledge.

Sergiovanni’s view highlights one of the problems of the argument about supervision: that it is essentially a theoretical debate, due to the paucity of empirical research.

ISSUES EMERGING FROM THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Why Supervise?

A recurrent theme emerging from the review of literature is the question, “Why supervise?”. Theorists and researchers such as Sergiovanni (1985), Smyth (1987), Darling Hammond (1988), and Retallick (1990a, 1990b) have questioned the motives behind supervision. “Whose needs are being served?” they ask, “The needs of the system or the needs of teachers?”

An analysis of the various theories on “how to supervise” reveals they are intrinsically related to theories on teaching and learning. A view of supervision is very much a view on how knowledge is gained. Using the metaphors of “mindscapes” (thinking) and “landscapes” (reality) with reference to supervision, Sergiovanni (1985) explains that a person’s view of supervision and evaluation does not exist separate from his or her view of teaching, the nature of power and authority, and how knowledge in supervision is generated and used. An additional determiner of one’s supervisory mindscape says Sergiovanni, is one’s view of knowledge, how it is generated and how it is used in practice. He claims that views of supervision are typically revealed in the language systems and metaphors that supervisors use. He gives as an example Madeline Hunter’s Mastery learning theory which prescribes a specific method of supervision based on
her conception of teaching and learning as something which can be prescribed and delivered.

Like school reform, the views of supervision divide into two main groups: those that view supervision of teachers for professional development as a form of training, whereby knowledge and skills are administered to teachers by those of superior knowledge or skill; or alternately, supervision for professional development is viewed as the responsibility of the individual teacher, with the supervisor playing a supportive encouraging role. In comparing the assumptions of the two education reform movements in the United States, Darling Hammond (1988) refers to a historic ambivalence and indecision on the part of policymakers as to whether teachers are semiskilled workers who only need to follow procedures, or skilled professionals who apply specialised knowledge to meet the unique needs of each student.

Several factors were found to be relevant to the question, "Why supervise?". A brief review of each of these factors (power and control in supervisory relationships, reflection - the validity of what teachers know, the importance of collegiality, and empowerment of teachers) follows.

**Power and Control in Supervision**

Smyth (1987) and Retallick (1990a, 1990b) are critical of the traditional bureaucratic view of teaching which they refer to as "Technocratic Rationality", (a view in which the teacher is seen as a technician who applies proven methods to solve classroom problems). These authors consider such a traditional view of teaching and supervision to be outdated in the complex reality of teaching today. Retallick pursues the argument that the logic of technocratic rationality has become the dominating ideology of supervision in schools today. He says that in practice supervision serves as a control over teachers, that it is disempowering and serves the interests of supervisors. In support of his view, Retallick quotes from the writing of Giroux 1981:
Though the language used by mainstream educators has changed in the last few decades, the technocratic rationality that informs their work has not; it has been simply recycled and repackaged. (cited in Retallick 1990a p.4)

In contrast, Spohn (1987) is typical of those who believe that supervisors merely need to follow the guidelines of a given model to become "good" supervisors. He makes the following claims with respect to the characteristics of good supervisors;

- The good supervisor clearly states expectations.
- A regular data collection process is used by the supervisor.
- An improvement plan needs to be developed by the supervisor.
- The supervisor must be authentic and direct in discussing performance and writing an improvement plan.
- Some very skilled supervisors have failed because they have avoided doing the most difficult task, telling a person in a direct and honest manner that he or she needs to improve. (1987 p.18)

Clearly, Spohn assumes that the supervisor is the person in control in the supervisory relationship. Such a view of supervision is the subject of strong criticism by Smyth 1987, Sergiovanni and Starrat 1988, Retallick 1990a, 1990b, and others. Retallick (1990b) explores the issue of power in supervisory relationships. He refers to Habermas' "Critical Communications Theory", to support his view, that in order for supervisors and supervisees to communicate with understanding and agreement, they must have equal power in the supervisory relationship. Showers (1985), has identified the power relationship between supervisors and teachers as a key issue. The
author refers largely to research on coaching of teachers conducted at the University of Oregon and says, that where supervisors maintain the balance of power, supervision and peer coaching are incompatible.

Supervision in many districts maintains the imbalance of power by placing administrators and other non-teaching personnel in supervisory roles and by combining evaluation with supervision. (p.47)

Reflection: the Validity of What Teachers Know

Donald Schon was one of the first to argue for the validity of "what teachers know" as a rationale for a new epistemology of practice in teaching and supervision. In his book "The Reflective Practitioner" (1983), Schon advocated "reflection in action", (professionals thinking about what they are doing whilst they are doing it). Schon drew attention to the competence and artistry of skilful practice and argued that "learning by doing" is a valid, if not the most valid, method of acquiring knowledge. Schon contrasted his view of teaching as "reflection in action" with the prevailing view of teaching as a "technical rationality".

Smyth in his 1986 text, "Reflection in Action", pursues the concepts put forward by Schon. He explores the nature of professional knowledge as it relates to schooling, its epistemology and how this epistemology informs participants as they reflect upon and seek to change school realities. The limitations of technical rationality are considered alongside the possibility of practitioners generating forms of knowledge that clearly "work for them". He argues that the "embeddedness of knowledge in action" is the basis of a new and emerging paradigm. This view leads the author to state:
Coming to a realisation of the habituated rules, unquestioned conventions and professional myths that guide one's practice is an important precursor of changing them...what is at issue is "naming" and "framing" teaching in a way that permits teachers-as-researchers to become collaborators (in the sense of a community of scholars) in critically inquiring into their own and others' teaching and work contexts. (1986 p.32)

"Reflection" says Noreen Garman (1986), "is a misunderstood and rarely practiced aspect of the educational process". (p.14) Garman suggests reflection as a primary process of enquiry within the teacher's practice and a formal way to generate knowledge. In Garman's view, the role of supervision, if it is to be of any significance in improving teaching, must focus on enhancing teachers' ability to reflect on practice.

**Importance of Collegiality/Collaboration**

In recent years educational literature has literally been swamped with articles and books advocating teachers working together towards professional development. The terms "collegiality" and "collaboration" have come to be synonymous with the concept of teacher interaction for the purpose of professional development. (La Plant 1986, Little 1986, Glatthorn 1987, Leiberman 1987,1990) Cogan's 1973 definition of colleagueship is one of the earliest and most quoted: "The supervisor is neither dominating nor passive but is involved, side by side, with the teacher as a colleague".

"Peer Coaching" has emerged as an alternative term for a similar concept, whereby teachers assist each other for the purpose of professional development. (Showers 1985, Raney and Robbins 1989, Joyce et al 1989)

Smyth's 1986 reference to teachers forming a "critical community of enquiry" is another view of collegiality. This view is developed further by
Retallick (1990b) in a paper developed out of his doctoral thesis. Retallick reconstructs Taylor's 1982 notion of community and suggests that groups within schools and across schools which are committed to the collaborative and critical values of clinical supervision can become critical communities. He comments,

A community might become critical when participants regard their values as objects of examination, interpretation, critique and reconstruction through dialogue. (Retallick 1986b in 1990b p.15)

It would appear that whether these collegial models for professional development are also models of supervision is also a matter of discussion. Because of the controversy surrounding the word "supervision" and the negative picture the traditional view conjures up, some authors refer to collegial strategies as strategies for professional development and avoid the use of the word supervision. The possibility of conflict between supervision and professional development is raised by Showers (1985) who states that peer coaching is not incompatible with supervision whilst ever the persons involved maintain equal power.

**Empowerment of Teachers**

Proponents of this view argue that teachers can be empowered through shared decisionmaking and reflection on their practice. Collegial professional development involving participation as equals is considered one of the most effective strategies. Karant (1989) emphasises the importance of sharing in joint decisionmaking and provides examples to show that supervision and empowerment are not incompatible.
Factors Affecting Professional Development

The common thread of the current literature on supervision (and the overwhelming difference to traditional supervision) is the need for the supervisor to play a supporting, assisting and sharing role rather than directing. (Dull 1981, Sergiovanni and Starratt 1988, Roberts 1984, Retallick 1990a) The need for a non-threatening environment in supervision and joint setting of goals by supervisor and teacher is stressed by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1988), Goldsberry (1983) and other leading writers on supervision. Roberts (1984) says the philosophy of learning and supervision are the same: the learner should share in the decisionmaking process and specify objectives for the teaching learning process. Shared decisionmaking practices are central to Sergiovanni and Starrat’s (1988) theory of human resources supervision. Glickman stresses the importance of shared decisionmaking and asks the reader:

Can we acknowledge that teachers possess expertise, knowledge and concern and will demonstrate a far greater sense of purpose.... when decisions are made with them not for them? (1989 p.8)

RESEARCH INTO FACTORS INVOLVED IN EFFECTIVE SUPERVISION

Nolan and Huber (1989) in a three part paper, draw together the literature on reflective practice as applied to teaching in an attempt to identify effective supervisory practices. In their conclusions these authors list seven requirements which must be in place to encourage reflection in teaching, including: a collegial relationship in which the teacher feels safe supported and respected; teacher control over the supervisory process; continuity in the supervisory process and time for support and collegial interaction (p.143)

Research on the frequency, purpose and perceived value of supervision is described by Chamberlain and Goldsberry (1984) and Levin et
These studies aimed to identify the supervisory behaviours which positively affected rural teachers' perceptions of the value of instructional supervision in improving their daily teaching. Levin et al found that teachers perceived supervision to be most helpful when, the purpose of supervision was to assist them in improving their teaching; changes were "jointly identified with the supervisors"; the supervisor was able to get them to focus on their own teaching and when they felt they had been observed enough. These authors stressed that unless the teacher perceives the supervisory process as helpful, there is little chance of a supervisor assisting in improvement of instruction.

Leddick and Dye (1987) describe research into trainee counsellors' expectations: of the structure for supervision; communication in supervision; and of the supervisory relationship. This research has strong implications for supervisors regarding the importance of interpersonal relationships. The authors state:

Supervision should be highly active, providing large amounts of observation, feedback and instruction....there is a constant heavy demand for a wide range of interpersonal skills.(p.150)

Teachers' perceptions of supervision are revealed in research by Alfonso, Firth and Neville. (1983) They refer to their earlier research, published in 1981, which showed teachers consistently report that their principal source of help is other teachers. The same research revealed that teachers are critical of the quality of assistance they receive from their instructional leaders.
THE NEED FOR RESEARCH

The need for a research agenda in supervision is stressed by Alfonso and Firth (1990). These authors are concerned by the paucity of "serious research" into supervision in the light of claims about its importance. They suggest that, as a specialised function in education, supervision may be the least informed by research. In addition to listing possible topics for a research agenda, the authors state that further research needs to identify the essential skills that supervisors need to possess. These authors argue that such research must occur in the actual school settings, focussing on the "realities of life and work in schools". (p.183)

THE FUTURE FOR TEACHING AND SUPERVISION?

Several prominent authors in the field of education (Sergiovanni and Starrat 1988, Darling Hammond 1988, Glickman 1989, Wise 1990) consider supervision to be at a critical point in its history. These authors perceive that a central role for supervision is emerging in schools. Their shared concern for the next decade, however, is the form supervision may take and its effect on teaching and learning. Two possible scenarios are commonly envisioned by these authors: a view of increased control over teaching and an alternate view of teachers as professionals. The following question posed by Sergiovanni and Starrat(1988) is typical:

Will this "new" supervision for example, provide support for teachers and enhance their roles as key professionals in the practice of teaching and learning? Or will this new supervision result in increased regulation and control of teachers and teaching? (p.2)

Michael Apple (1982) warns that as system control over teachers increases, a concomitant "deskilling" of teachers occurs. (p.140) Apple is
highly critical of the trends towards controlling teachers through legislation. In a similar vein, Wise (1990) warns, professionalise teaching or good teachers will leave. He outlines the problems he perceives facing teaching in the 1990's and states:

A struggle over how to manage schools over the next decade is under way. The outcome of that struggle will determine whether teachers are talented, responsible professionals or low level, closely managed bureaucrats. (p.57)

Linda Darling Hammond (1988, and in Meek 1988) expresses the view that the future for supervision and teaching in American education is dependent on which of the two competing forces of the school reform movement proves the most powerful over the next decade. Of particular concern to this author is the danger of policy makers introducing educational reform without consultation with educators. There is a need for our professional voice to become stronger, says Darling Hammond, or some well intentioned, but misguided ideas are going to hurt children. (1988 p.17) The author stresses that it is the policies that will determine what schools and classrooms will look like in the 21st century:

The outcome depends on whether our professional voice becomes sufficiently strong to convey what we know about the proper education of children to the people who create the policies. (p.17)

Sergiovanni (1989) is similarly concerned about the influence of policymakers on education. He expresses the view that the policy process is political and that scientific research is used selectively to suit the purposes of bureaucrats. He asserts that "scientism" (an ill-informed, improperly
conceived, poorly understood version of science) is deep and widespread in supervision and teaching and as such, constitutes the greatest danger facing education.

CONCLUSION

Whilst ever the debate continues as to whether good teaching is or is not something that can be predetermined, so too will the argument about supervision. The review of literature has revealed that the purpose of supervision is problematic. Central to the argument about supervision is the question of whether it is about controlling teachers more, or about giving teachers more control. Charles Handy, in his thought-provoking book, "The Age of Unreason", challenges those who wish to be part of the future, to look for answers to the questions that puzzle us in new directions with new approaches. Handy perceives that a new world of work requires "upside down thinking" in education.

Things need to change in the world around us if we are to make the most of the new possibilities, if we are not to keep on trying to use yesterday’s answers to deal with the quite different problems of tomorrow. (Handy 1989 p.138)

It is probable that any “useful” answers to the questions about supervision will not come from more theory, of which there is already a proliferation, but from research conducted in schools with supervisors and teachers. What we do not know, are the multiple realities of supervision which exist at “grass roots” level. The next chapter describes an attempt to reconstruct the reality of supervision as perceived by supervisors and teachers in two primary schools.
Notes
1. The three documents referred to were discussed in several secondary sources:


2. In a phone conversation with R. Collins 6.1.91, (co-author "Management in Australia", Stoner, J., Collins, R., Yetton, P., and Head of Australian Graduate School of Management), the contents of the latest edition of "Management in Australia", due for publication 1991, were discussed. With respect to a "new theory for the 90's as hinted in the 1985 edition, Collins replied, "there is no new theory for the 90's. The pluralist or eclectic approach will be the state of the art." He stressed that management for the next decade will need to be flexible and that choosing the approach that is internally consistent, will be the best approach.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The first chapter of this report described the controversial context for supervision in New South Wales government schools and established the contextual framework for the research; supervision for professional development of teachers. Within this focus, the review of literature revealed two very different education reform agendas, with contradictory philosophies about the role of supervision in teaching.

The major purpose of this research was to describe a “slice of reality”. To explore what supervision looked like and what was expected of it by the parties who were directly involved, in two schools. This chapter describes how an emergent research design, using two case study schools, was developed with a view to reconstructing the multiple realities of supervision, as perceived by the teachers and their supervisors, in those schools. Before describing the methods used to collect and analyse data, however, an explanation is given as to why the study is described as evaluative and why a phenomenological/naturalistic approach using Glaser and Strauss’ (1967) “Grounded Theory” was considered the most appropriate methodology for the study.

The chapter concludes with a description of the methods used to ensure rigor and credibility of the data analysis.

METHODOLOGY

A Responsive Evaluation

In this study, the paradigm of inquiry flowed out of the question that motivated the study: “Why is supervision a contentious issue?” The methodology was dictated by the need to be responsive and interpretative. Kemmis and Stake (1988 p.7) have stated that “quality and judgements of
quality are central to any evaluation study". In this research, teachers and
their supervisors in two schools were asked to describe what they perceived
good supervision to be and to judge the quality of the supervision they were
receiving/giving. The study asked "What works? What doesn't work?" in the
contexts of two schools. It was expected from the outset that the two groups of
participants in each school, would agree on some aspects of supervision and
disagree on others. A major purpose of the research was to reveal the
differences and commonality of views of supervision which existed, within the
bounds of the two school cultures. The researcher's purpose in attempting to
reveal the "realities" of supervision as perceived by the parties involved in two
schools, was to demonstrate that if purposeful change in professional
development of teachers is to occur then the perceptions of the humans
involved needs to be considered.

Kemmis and Stake have said that evaluation involves discerning the
nature or worth of something. In this study the nature and worth of
supervision was evaluated, for the purpose of empowering teachers and
supervisors within schools to make responsible decisions about supervision
for professional development. It was anticipated by the researcher that on the
basis of the data, the two case schools and individuals within each school,
would make changes to the supervisory processes employed. The
participants in the study are therefore stakeholders in the data.

Kemmis and Stake (1988) have also suggested that the evaluative
process is a search for understandings - one's own and others. (p.8) This
study has aimed to generate understanding of supervision at a new level by
collecting, communicating and reporting the understandings of teachers and
their supervisors in two schools. In the process the researcher's own
understandings of supervision have been challenged, altered and focussed.
(The impact of the research on the researcher is described in Chapter Five.)
The reporting of the evaluation was organised so that the participants were able to privately and publicly review the "perceptions" collected and to participate in the interpretations of these understandings/perceptions, during each phase of the study. In this manner, the researcher has attempted both responsive and issues centred evaluation. (Kemmis and Stake 1988)

Why a Phenomenological - Naturalistic Framework?

In this study I wanted to know what were the perceptions of the two groups of people involved in the supervisory process, the people supervising and those being supervised. "What were their feelings, values, attitudes and opinions with respect to supervision?" In order to gather such information a flexible and sensitive research design was required, one that would allow issues and questions to emerge over the period of the study. The opinion of each member of staff in either school, was considered valuable data and a methodology was sought which would give credence to the views of individuals, irrespective of their status or agreement with the collective majority. In Goetz and LeComptes' (1984) terms the design required a phenomenological approach, one which would represent the world view of the participants and which would structure the research in terms of the "participant constructs". (p.122)

The case study reporting mode was considered ideally suited to the purpose of investigating peoples' perceptions. In addition a grounded theory approach and emergent design were used to enable the findings to direct the study. Other characteristics of naturalistic enquiry (as described by Guba and Lincoln 1985), such as idiographic interpretation (interpretation of data in terms of local context) and focus determined boundaries (multiple realities determine the focus rather than inquirer preconceptions), were perfectly suited to the purpose I had in mind. The naturalistic approach was further supported by the use of human as instrument, utilisation of tacit knowledge
(researcher and participants), inductive data analysis and the negotiation of outcomes with the participants.

Two conceptual levels of questions were asked during the research:

What happened with respect to supervision at each school?

and, What were the perceptions of the people involved?

In Fullan's (1982 p.4) terms, what is "the small picture and what is the big picture" that we must come to understand? What were the different levels of meaning? Meanings related to supervision were the subject of the research. The questions that drove the research were: "Do the people involved believe that supervision should develop teachers? What do they think its purpose is? What is supervision all about? Why is it a contentious issue?"

Any attempt, therefore to uncover the complex realities and meanings held by supervisors and supervisees at the two schools (particularly within the contextual framework of supervision and its role in professional development of teachers) required a methodology and design which was inherently flexible. In addition the research design needed to be responsive to questions which emerged in each school as a result of changes which occurred over time or due to movement of personnel.

Naturalistic methodology has provided the flexibility to follow the process and "developments" of supervision within each school over a twelve month period, from the perspectives of those supervising and those being supervised. It has also allowed for changes in perspective which may have occurred over this period to be traced. In this research it was my intention to reconstruct the participants' perceptions of reality within the contexts of two school cultures. The research was carried out in the school, in the belief that the context shapes individuals' perceptions and the meanings they construct for their realities.
Case Study Approach

A case study approach was chosen for this evaluation with the intent of gathering "in depth" data on the perceptions and behaviours of supervisors and supervisees within two school cultures. The case study format was chosen as being the most appropriate form of enquiry for this study as it is the primary vehicle for emic enquiry (an insider's view).

Grounded Theory

In this study Glaser and Strauss' (1967) "Grounded Theory" has played a key role both as a methodology underpinning the research and as a method of data analysis. In essence, grounded theory refers to theory which has emerged from (is grounded in) the data. The researcher has no a priori hypothesis or theory and the focus questions of the research, and resultant theory, emerge from the data in a continuous process of reflection and analysis, resulting in generation of "substantive theory". It is particularly useful for situations where theory based on generalisations is likely to have a poor fit to the situation encountered. In this study the researcher has maintained reflective diaries throughout the study for the purpose of reviewing findings, noting personal thoughts and questions, and as a means of tracing the issues which emerged in the data. Glaser and Strauss have described the aim of grounded theory:

"The generation of theory requires that the analyst take apart the story within his data." (1967 p.108)

Lincoln and Guba (1985) have stated that naturalistic researchers prefer to have the substantive theory emerge from the data because the mutual shapings found in a particular context may be explicable only in terms
of the contextual elements found there. Glaser and Strauss have also stated that in order to use this approach, the researcher must be sufficiently theoretically sensitive so that he/she can conceptualise and formulate a theory as it emerges from the data.

Interaction of the Research and the Researcher

Linked to the major purpose of the study, the reconstruction of the participants' view of reality was a secondary function: the possibility of the research being used as a vehicle to facilitate change in the two case study schools. From the commencement of the research, the researcher and the participating schools negotiated the study with a view to two-way benefit; the researcher was granted a source of data and the schools were given regular feedback. Kemmis' (1982) view of establishing a "self-critical community" aptly describes the purpose of the regular feedback to schools.

The research and the researcher, therefore, were not merely passive observers in the collection of data. Not only has the research itself offered the schools opportunities to reflect and possibly act upon those reflections, but the researcher has also interacted with the participants developing relationships built on mutual professional respect, trust and friendship.

CONTRIBUTING METHODS

The following naturalistic/qualitative research strategies were selected in keeping with the methodological philosophy underpinning the research;

Grounded Theory

Glaser and Strauss in their landmark text "The Discovery of Grounded Theory" have described a "Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis". In describing how theory emerges from data, these authors state that as categories and their properties emerge the analyst will discover two
knits: those that the researcher has constructed, and those that have been abstracted from the language of the research situation. They state:

As his theory develops the researcher will notice that the concepts abstracted from the substantive situation will tend to be the current labels in use for the actual behaviours and processes that are to be explained, whilst the concepts constructed by the analyst will tend to be the explanations. (1967 p.107)

Early in the research I found words such as “trust” and “support” were used frequently by the participants in relation to supervision, constituting “current labels in use”. I also noted the existence of a “them and us” philosophy when supervisors referred to supervisees or vice versa. (An explanation constructed by the analyst.)

Through the perceptions of participants and use of Glaser and Strauss’ constant comparative method of data analysis, the researcher has sought to generate theory on the factors which affect supervision in the context of the two case study schools.

**Purposeful Sampling**

Purposeful Sampling (Lincoln and Guba 1985) or Theoretical Sampling (Glaser and Strauss 1967) refers to sampling specific groups. This method is distinct from representative or random sampling which is characteristic of quantitative modes of research. In this study, two schools which were currently “thinking about” supervision were selected for the evaluation in order to collect data on what directions the schools took and what factors were influential. (How contact was made with these schools is described in “Selection of the Cases” in a following section on Research Design.) A third school which had participated in the previous research was
requested to participate, but declined due to involvement in another research project.

**Human as Instrument**

The researcher elected to use herself as the primary data gathering instrument because no non-human instrument existed which could adapt to and interpret the multiplicity of realities that would be encountered. Only the human instrument was considered capable of grasping and evaluating the nuances involved in interactions between other human beings. These nuances were central to perceptions of supervision as effective or non-effective. The techniques of data gathering which employed the “human as instrument” were observation and interview.

**Observation**

On each occasion that the researcher visited the case study schools data was collected in the form of informal observations noted in the research diary. Observations of staff relations, the appearance of each school, comments and asides to the researcher by staff members in their recess or lunch breaks, were duly noted in the diary.

**Interviews**

In this evaluation, the researcher considered that a case study approach using interviews, would be more likely to determine the attitudes and opinions of the respondents in some depth, than any other method. The flexibility offered and depth of information gained give the interview tremendous advantages when compared to surveying by questionnaire. The ability to interview however cannot be taken for granted, as stated by Powney and Watts:
The interviewer needs careful preparation and practice to develop social and recording skills and the ability to analyse and evaluate the data collected. These skills are not innate but need to be acquired, explored and practised. (1987 p.9)

Cohen and Manion (1984) have described the interviewer as a major source of bias. The researcher has aimed to minimise bias in this study, by keeping the factors described by these authors in mind, when designing interview schedules, when conducting interviews, and whilst transcribing, analysing and reporting data.

**Narrative Inquiry**

As a consequence of collection of data by observation and interview, the researcher has employed "Narrative Inquiry" (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990) as the means of reporting the findings. Put simply, I have tried to report in the form of a narrative the results of this enquiry. Connelly and Clandinin have stated:

The main claim for the use of narrative in educational research is that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the way humans experience the world. This general notion translates into the view that education is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories; teachers and learners are storytellers and characters in their own and others stories. (p.2)

It was a central purpose of this study to retell the stories of supervision as told to me by the teachers and their supervisors in the two case schools.
Emic Perspective and Thick Description

An emic perspective is one which provides an insider's view. This enquiry is directed more towards the respondents' constructions (emic) rather than a construction the researcher had brought to the inquiry (etic). Thick description refers to the detailed description of the context which is necessary for any decision regarding transferability (the possibility of generalisation of results). Lincoln and Guba (1985) have stated that an emic perspective and thick description are two of the major advantages of the case study reporting mode. In his text "Cultural Anthropology" Marvin Harris makes the comment that: "The test of emic descriptions and analyses is whether they correspond with a view of the world natives accept as real, meaningful or appropriate." (1983 p.14)

Samples of "thick description" from the data were as follows:

- "The people who trust their supervisor are willing to do that bit more." (Supervisee School A: Phase 2)
- "I am guilty of giving 110% of my time to my class. Finding the time to supervise is still something I have to come to terms with." (Supervisor School B: Phase 2)

The Negative Case

In this research, each school constituted a "case". Within each case school each individual interviewed also constituted a "case". In this second instance, examples of individuals negative about supervision were identified. Their views are revealed in the findings.
RESEARCH DESIGN

Phases

The research took place in three distinct phases. Phase 1 included negotiations with schools and South Coast Regional Office of the NSW Department of School Education to undertake the research, initial planning, the first interviews to collect data and initial approaches to analysis of data. Phase 2 involved collection of data, reporting to schools and more in depth analysis. The third and final stage involved collection of data, verification of emerging categories, analysis of the total data, reporting to schools, a final member check, completion of the review of literature, drafts of each chapter and completion of the thesis.

The design of the research is represented in Figure 1. The diagram aims to illustrate not only the timeframe and the sequence of data collection and analysis procedures, but also to demonstrate the processes of member checking and peer debriefing that were built in to maintain trustworthiness. The role of the literature review in focussing issues in relation to the developing grounded theory on supervision for professional development is shown.

A pilot study was not conducted as the researcher had conducted thirty four interviews with supervisors and supervisees in seven primary schools during a prior study which had evaluated the Primary Executive Teachers Program (PETP), a regional inservice course on supervision (Appendix 1). The initial research was considered a useful pilot study for the current evaluation, not only because of the interview experience for the researcher but in particular due to the issues with respect to supervision which had emerged from the study. A naturalistic enquiry and emergent design had been tried and found suitable for the purpose of investigating supervision.
Figure 1: THE EMERGENT RESEARCH DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>PHASE 2</th>
<th>PHASE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Entrep</td>
<td>PHASE 1</td>
<td>Entrep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>initial research - emergent issues</td>
<td>initial research - emergent issues</td>
<td>initial research - emergent issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>to liaison with regional office</td>
<td>to liaison with regional office</td>
<td>to liaison with regional office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>principals' symposium on supervision</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>principals' symposium on supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>(initial contact with schools)</td>
<td>(initial contact with schools)</td>
<td>(initial contact with schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>executive meeting School A School B</td>
<td>executive meeting School A School B</td>
<td>executive meeting School A School B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>* permission to conduct research</td>
<td>* permission to conduct research</td>
<td>* permission to conduct research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>design interview schedules</td>
<td>design interview schedules</td>
<td>design interview schedules &amp; questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>transcripts - member check</td>
<td>transcripts - member check</td>
<td>transcripts - member check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>draft reports to schools - member check</td>
<td>draft reports to schools - member check</td>
<td>draft reports to schools - member check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>DATA COLLECTION 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>data analysis - diary notes</td>
<td>data analysis - diary notes</td>
<td>data analysis - diary notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>14 categories</td>
<td>22 categories</td>
<td>22 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>reports to schools - member check</td>
<td>reports to schools - member check</td>
<td>reports to schools - member check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>data analysis - pin board analysis</td>
<td>data analysis - pin board analysis</td>
<td>data analysis - pin board analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>33 categories</td>
<td>33 categories</td>
<td>33 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>data analysis - computer analysis</td>
<td>data analysis - computer analysis</td>
<td>data analysis - computer analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>27 categories</td>
<td>27 categories</td>
<td>27 categories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>design interview schedules &amp; questionnaire</td>
<td>design interview schedules &amp; questionnaire</td>
<td>design interview schedules &amp; questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td><strong>THESIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>THESIS</strong></td>
<td><strong>THESIS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PHASE 1**: Emerging research design involving initial research, liaison with regional office, and executive meetings.
- **PHASE 2**: Data collection phase with interviews and analysis of diary notes.
- **PHASE 3**: Design of interview schedules and questionnaires, with further data collection and analysis leading to the final thesis.
Selection of the Cases

Initial contact with principals was made by attending the South Coast Region "Principals' Symposium on Supervision" at Ranelagh House Robertson, September 1989. Permission for the researcher to attend the symposium was gained through liaison with Assistant Regional Director and the Professional Education Officer for South Coast Region in 1989. All principals in attendance were invited to participate in the proposed research project. Two principals expressed an interest with the proviso that their whole staff would have to be consulted and a majority be in favour of participation.

Entre to Schools

The researcher was invited to address Executive meetings in two schools to explain and present the research proposal. Following approval of each school executive the researcher presented the proposal to general staff meetings in each school and gained the agreement of staff to be involved in the research. Initial negotiation of the research with the schools concerned "investigating supervision in the context of whole school change". A holistic perspective was agreed to. A research agreement was developed between the researcher and each school. (Appendix 2). A request approval to conduct research in local schools was granted by the Department of Education South Coast Region in February 1990, following initial approval granted in October 1989.

The Case Study Schools

In 1989, School A was a Class 1 Primary School with 23 permanent members of staff including six executive. The executive consisted of Principal, Deputy Principal, Assistant Principal Primary, Assistant Principal Infants, Executive Teacher Primary and Executive Teacher Infants. The principal and deputy were non-teaching. The school was centrally located in
a large south coast metropolis. In 1989, School B was a Class 2 Primary School with 12 permanent members of staff including four executive. The executive consisted of the Principal, Assistant Principal Primary, Assistant Principal Infants and an Executive Teacher. Only the principal was non-teaching. The school was situated in a middle income residential area of a suburb of a large coastal city.

In each school members of the executive with a class had the same teaching load as non-executive staff but were paid a higher rate of salary depending on the promotions position. The relief from face-to-face (RFF) teaching for supervisors and supervisees was the same, two hours per week. At both schools A and B, the executive (and some staff at school B) had attended the South Coast Primary Executive Teachers Program (PETP) on Supervision during 1987-1989, and both Principals had attended the Principals' Symposium on Supervision. (In term three 1990, a new principal was appointed to School A, from another region.)

It is significant to note that all of the participants in the research were experienced teachers. The average years of experience of fulltime teaching in both schools was 15 years. (Appendix 3) In one school there was only one teacher with less than 10 years experience.

Data Collection

The researcher collected data in each school on three occasions over a period of 12 months; November 1989, March-April 1990 and September 1990. On each occasion that data were collected in both schools, all members of staff, (supervisors and supervisees) willing to participate in the research were interviewed. A large majority of staff in both schools (on average 78% School A and 92% School B) agreed to be interviewed at each data collection, which resulted in a total of 85 interviews. (Table 3:1)
Table 3: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Data 1.</th>
<th>Data 2.</th>
<th>Data 3.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15 (5E,10S)</td>
<td>18(5E,13S)</td>
<td>18 (6E,12S)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>11 (3E, 8S)</td>
<td>12 (4E, 8S)</td>
<td>11 (4E,11S)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* E= Supervisors  * S=Supervisees

Due to changes in school staffing over the period 1989-90 and the absence of some staff through leave at the time of the interviews, it was not possible to maintain a constant population of participants in the research; some “new faces” and “fatalities” occurred. A record of participants is provided in Appendix 4.

A Typical Interview

A typical interview in the first and second phases of the research lasted twenty to twenty five minutes, (though several lasted forty five minutes). By the final phase however interviews lasted only 10 minutes as less questions were asked. The location for an interview varied to suit the person being interviewed. Commonly they were held in a private room made available by the school, but on occasions they were conducted outside in the sun, under a tree or in a teacher’s classroom during their free time. The atmosphere was normally relaxed and friendly as each interview commenced with greetings and informal conversation. Details such as identification of the researcher, the purpose of the research and assurances of confidentiality and anonymity, were revised to set the context for the participant.
The climate of each interview was influenced by the personality of the participant, their feelings about supervision and to some extent their relationship with the researcher. Many interviewees were very friendly and relaxed and also pleased to have the opportunity to offer their opinion on something which affected them professionally. Several participants were relieved to at last have someone to hear their views and talked at length. Some of these were quite emotional and even cried when describing their experiences of supervising and supervision. Though the format remained the same, each interview varied tremendously.

The participant's agreement to allow the proceedings of the interview to be taped and notes made, was gained before commencement. In addition each interviewee was informed that a transcript would be returned for verification. (It is indicative of the trust relationship developed by the researcher with participants, that out of a total of 85 interviews, only once did a participant request not to be taped. However, at the second and third data collections this person was agreeable to recording the interview on audiotape.)

Interview guides were used for each data collection (Appendices 5-10) with the same questions asked of participants in each school. In accordance with Spradley's (1979) recommendations for conducting an ethnographic interview, the type of questions varied from descriptive "grand and mini-tour" to structural and contrast questions. Some questions were focussed but most were open-ended allowing the interviewees scope to elaborate on their views. The last question in each interview always asked the interviewee if there was anything else they would like to add. Every participant was genuinely thanked for their contribution to the research and for giving of their time.
Other Sources of Data

In addition to interviews the researcher also collected documentation pertaining to supervision in each school. Such material included; policy statements, minutes of meetings, and in one school the results of a survey on supervision. These did not prove to be major sources of data, as neither school had documented the planning or process of supervision to any great extent.

During the study, the researcher attended several staff meetings in both schools and was able to informally observe staff relations and responses of teaching staff to school executive members. In addition the researcher mixed freely with members of staff of both schools during their RFF and at recess and lunchtimes. The researcher was generally received warmly and made to feel welcome in each school. The fact that the researcher was a fellow teacher was acknowledged positively by participants. It lent a certain credibility to the researcher, which helped in gaining entre and discouraged being viewed as an “outsider”.

During Phase three, the final stage of data collection, in addition to an interview each participant was given a short questionnaire about supervision with items to be ranked using a Likert scale. (Appendix 11) The purpose of the questionnaire was to verify the existence and importance of categories which had emerged in the data during phases one and two.

On one occasion the researcher accepted an invitation by a supervisor to attend a supervisory group meeting for the purpose of observing the proceedings. It was a very tense meeting and the communication problems which existed between the supervisees and their supervisor were only aggravated by the presence of a third party. This strategy for collecting data was abandoned by the researcher who perceived it as a threat to the positive relationships that were being developed between the researcher and the participants.
Issues Idiosyncratic to the Study

The following issues are those not truly replicative in further research:

• the period in time; August 1989-October 1990
• the climate/culture of each school
• the principals and their effects on the culture of each school
• the individuals who participated and the way they interacted in each school culture
• the interaction of the researcher with the participants
• the climate external to the schools - the period of considerable industrial unrest

The “Ideal” Design

The ideal naturalistic design for researching supervision “in theory”, would have been to observe supervision “in action”. In practice however, the contentious nature of this issue and the fact that it is to do with relationships between human beings, means that any study of the topic must not threaten the participants. Experience in an earlier study indicated to the researcher, that it would be too intrusive to observe directly the formal process of supervision. In addition the possibility of “artificial” behaviours which would invalidate the data was great. In trying to observe a “real” situation the presence of the researcher might create an “unreal” situation.

Limitations of the Study

Not every teacher and every supervisor in both schools was interviewed. Some people did not wish to be interviewed (on average 13% School A, 9% School B). Their views were as relevant as those who were interviewed, but there is no way of knowing whether their perceptions support or differ from the research findings.
The researcher was always conscious of the need to create a friendly and informal atmosphere during interviews to make the situation as comfortable and non-threatening as possible for the interviewees.

DATA ANALYSIS

A grounded theory approach to analysis of data was used. A flow chart of the steps taken in using Glaser and Strauss’ constant comparative method is shown in Figure 2.

Reports to Schools

Following completion of interviews at each phase of the research, transcripts of each interview were made and entered on a database (Microsoft File). Copies of the transcripts were then returned to each interviewee for verification and the opportunity to add or delete information. A sample transcript and a copy of the letter sent to participants regarding verification of data can be seen in Appendices 12 and 13.

On receipt of the participants’ verified data, changes were made where requested, and reports were then prepared for each school by combining the information from each member of staff interviewed. (The “sort” option on the computer enabled speedy manipulation of massive amounts of data.) Data from supervisors was distinguished from that of supervisees. The reports to schools following each phase of data collection consisted basically of summaries of the responses (raw data) to the questions which had been asked during the interviews. A sample report (to school B) is provided in Appendix 14.
In addition to the written report following each phase of data collection, a verbal presentation of findings was made to a general staff meeting in each school. During a half hour presentation, sample responses to the questions
asked during interviews were shown using overhead projector transparencies. During and following each presentation, participants interacted with the researcher commenting on the findings and asking questions. On each occasion the researcher noted observations made in the reflective diary.

The purpose of the "reports to schools" was to give fairly immediate feedback to schools as to what the perceptions of supervision were that existed within each school at that time. This had also been a condition of the initial research agreement. There was minimal interpretation of data by the researcher presented to either school and once presented with the information the schools were left to act upon it in whichever way they saw fit. The additional opportunity for interaction of the researcher with the participants, however, was a valuable contribution to the research. Whereas the data had been collected from individuals in private, it was presented to a collective group of supervisors and supervisees. This created an opportunity for the researcher to observe the relations between the two groups and also to obtain some feedback as to the responses of individuals and the staff as a whole to the findings. After each presentation several individuals remained behind to give personal comments about the findings.

Though minimal researcher interpretation was intended in the reports to schools, clearly these reports constituted the first steps in data analysis at each phase of the research. The presentation made following Data Collection 3 (November 1990) included a review of findings from the earlier phases, with the purpose of giving an overview of total findings. At this presentation the researcher's interpretation of the total data collected was presented. Participants were invited to comment as to whether this was a true representation of their school and whether there had been any surprises in the findings. (Lincoln and Guba 1985 have said that where participants report there are "no surprises" in the findings, the credibility of the research is
indicated.) A questionnaire was also provided so that each person could comment confidentially on the researcher's interpretation. (Appendix 15)

The Steps in Data Analysis

Following completion of the reports to schools (which were summaries and not total data) at each phase, the individual transcripts of each participant were returned to and re-read looking for common themes in the data. A qualitative analysis of the open-ended comments was conducted as follows:

During and following each data collection the researcher had made diary notes referring to key words or issues which had recurred during interviews. Whilst transcribing data and preparing reports to the schools, emergent issues were also noted in the diary. (At the completion of the research a total of five diaries, constituting several hundred pages of notes, had been filled.) Initial categories emerging in the data, were first noted in the diary. Lists of emerging categories as listed in the diary of May 1990, following data collection one and two, are provided in Appendix 16.

A computer printout of the total data for each school allowed the researcher to re-read the data, looking for answers to specific questions asked; key words which were recurring; views, beliefs and trends appearing in the data. The rules for formation of categories are listed in Table 3: 2. A copy of the print-out was then cut up and categories sorted on a pinboard display. Every item of data cut out and selected was coded with three items of information; question number, sequence number in database (to identify the interviewee) and data collection number 1, 2 or 3. Diary notes were cross-referenced with the categories emerging on the pinboard. This pinboard analysis constituted another step in the initial analysis of data. During June - July 1990, following completion of phases one and two, a total of 33 categories was revealed in the data by this process. These categories are listed in Appendix 17.
Table 3: 2

**Rules for Formation of Categories**

- Specific answers to questions asked.
- Key words emerging from the data - repeated by several interviewees
  
  For example; “sharing”, “peer supervision”, “checking up”.
- Phraseology indicating a particular view or philosophy.
  
  For example: “them and us”
- Belief Statements - “I think...”; “I believe...”; “Supervision is...”.
- Concerns - “It is a concern that...”
- Climate - comments about appearance of school, relationships between staff, morale, happiness/unhappiness with the school.

 Returning to the computer for its ability to sort data, the researcher double checked the pinboard analysis by starting with raw data and using the computer's cut and paste options to select, collate and sort data belonging to similar categories. In August 1990 this was completed for 50% of the data which had been collected, with the result that some new categories had developed whilst others had collapsed, leaving a total of 27 categories. Lists of the categories emerging following pinboard and computer analysis are provided in Appendix 18

 With the proliferation of categories emerging in the data, the researcher then tried several strategies for determining a link between the categories and to reduce the data to a manageable size. An attempt to write “summary stories” about the findings did not prove enlightening and tended to expand the volume of data. Through the process of reflective thinking and drawing a conceptual map of the research, the researcher was able to highlight significant issues/categories emerging in the research. This process involved diagrammatic representation of the categories looking for ways to collapse
categories, and to rank them or interrelate them. The conceptual map hinted that a “do and don’t” list was emerging about supervision, (that is a list of factors which promoted successful supervision and a list of factors which inhibited supervision as perceived by those involved). It was decided to test the alleged presence and significance of these factors during the final phase of data collection. In addition to the interview questions, supervisors and supervisees were asked to indicate the factors they considered would improve supervision at their school and the factors they considered least desirable with respect to supervision. A list of 15 choices was provided from which to pick five. (Appendix 11)

Following data collection 3, the final phase, computer analysis was completed for the total data that had been collected. Categories which emerged from this analysis were then cross referenced with categories from diary entries and the earlier pin-board analysis of phases 1 and 2. This resulted in a total of 23 categories (the majority of which had been identified earlier, though some categories collapsed into others and several were deleted. During the analysis on database, data from School A was kept separate from School B; supervisors’ data kept on separate computer files to supervisees, and data from each phase stored and analysed separately. Raw and analysed data occupied 20 three and a half inch (800K) floppy disks, including backup copies.

On 22nd October 1990, following collection and analysis of all data, the researcher identified six major trends in the 23 categories which had emerged. Identifying this link constituted the most significant breakthrough in the analysis of data. The six major categories included: beliefs about supervision; concerns about supervision; descriptions/comments about “how supervised”; positive factors affecting supervision; negative factors affecting
supervision and comments with respect to supervision at the whole school level. Appendix 19 provides a list of the six major categories and the 23 minor categories.

Following the sorting of data into six major categories and 23 coded subcategories, the database had outlived its usefulness. The sorted and analysed data was then transferred to a word processing program (Microsoft Word 4.0) to facilitate the preparation of reports in prose. For each school, a report on findings for each phase, 1, 2 and 3, was compiled. Supervisors' and supervisees' data was reported separately within each report. An overview report for each school was achieved by elucidating the major findings from the reports for each phase. In a similar manner, an overview report comparing the findings from School A to those of School B was also created. A total of nine reports of findings was completed, four for each school and an overview of findings from both schools.

Further analysis of data occurred at the level of report writing, as it was necessary to reduce the hundred plus pages of data to a readable size. Also it was necessary to tally the similar responses within a category. A data reduction process was achieved by counting similar comments and retaining only those most representative. In addition it was necessary to check the source of comments to ensure that individuals had not been over-represented in the tally. (For example, ten negative comments may all have belonged to the one individual.) This check was possible as all pieces of data were coded with three items of information: the participant, the question number responded to and the phase of data collection. The codes were only eliminated after the final draft reports were completed.

Following completion of the reports of findings, the next chapter on researcher interpretation and discussion of results was commenced. A draft of the final report was presented in written and verbal form to general staff meetings in each school during November 1990, for the purpose of member
checking (validation of the findings by the participants). The literature review and thesis were completed between December 1990 and March 1991.

DETERMINING CREDIBILITY AND TRUSTWORTHINESS OF THE ANALYSIS

Triangulation

Primary data about supervisory procedures and perceptions of supervision in each school, was obtained from two different sources involved in supervision: supervisors and their supervisees. It was not a purpose of this evaluation to compare what supervisor A said about his/her supervisee B (a research strategy likely to result in confrontation), but to reveal the perceptions of supervisors as a group as distinct from those of supervisees as a group. In addition to the responses of these two groups a third and minor source of data, school documentation in the form of policy statements and minutes of meetings, was also surveyed.

In addition to triangulating the sources of data, the researcher also used multiple modes of data collection: interview, questionnaire, observation and reflective diaries. The term “triangulation” has been used by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as one of five methods of “improving the probability that findings and interpretations will be found credible” (p.305).

Prolonged Engagement

The research was conducted in Schools A and B over a period of 12 months. During this time the researcher attended an executive meeting in each school, five general staff meetings (including three half-hour presentations of research findings) six full days of interviews (three sessions of two days) in each school as well as several informal visits for arranging interview schedules, data verification and delivery of written reports. This extended period allowed the researcher to observe changes in each school
over an extended period of time and to "get to know" the staff and be accepted. Lincoln and Guba (1985) have stated that if the enquirer is able to observe over a prolonged period, to learn the context, to minimise distortions and to build trust, then it is likely that the results will be found to be more credible.

Peer Debriefing

In an effort to apply an external check on the enquiry process and to explore aspects of the enquiry which might otherwise have remained implicit within the researcher's mind or worse, may even have been ignored, peer debriefing was used regularly throughout the research. In addition to the appointed academic supervisor, monthly meetings were held with fellow postgraduate researchers, for the purposes of sharing and critical evaluation. Progress was also discussed with critical friends and correspondence initiated with several academics and professional researchers.

In addition to these strategies the researcher also sought opportunities to present the developing research in a variety of manners to a range of forums, as a further means of assisting, even pushing, the development of personal focus during the grounded theory approach and to gain constructive feedback. Verbal and poster presentations to research students and academics were made at the University of Wollongong, School of Learning Studies Research Colloquiums in November 1989, July 1990 and November 1990. Seminar presentations at two national conferences on education in Tasmania in October 1990, invited criticism by a wider audience and allowed the researcher to test emerging hypotheses.

Member Checking

Perhaps the most important means of establishing the credibility of the data was the verification of the findings by the participants. In this research,
"Member Checking "(Lincoln and Guba 1985) also termed "Respondent Validation", was used throughout the study and in a variety of ways. Firstly, transcripts of raw data were verified with individuals following each data collection. Following compilation of reports to each school during each phase, a written and verbal presentation was made and participants were invited to comment and criticise. A final member check, through personal interaction and questionnaire (Appendix 15), was undertaken in each school when the final report, with researcher interpretation, was made.

Audit Trail

Throughout the duration of the study, the researcher maintained several research diaries. In these diaries were noted the reflections of the researcher, field notes, queries and issues to be resolved. All entries were dated in order to later identify a sequence of "research events" and to trace shifts in thinking. A calendar of research events drawn from the diaries is presented in Appendix 20.

All of the data collected (raw and analysed) was stored on computer disks. A register of disks and the data located on each (including back up copies), has been maintained in order that the findings are readily available to external examination.

Researcher Interpretation of Data

Interpretation of data by the researcher continued following the final member check in each school (December 1990) during January, February and March 1991 in the final stage of thesis preparation. Participants were not given the opportunity to object to researcher interpretations which had been "fine tuned" during this period, due to the time constraints involved in publication and submission of the document.
It should be noted that the researcher was aware that she had been placed on trust by the participants to present a fair and reasonable account of their views.

On completion of the thesis a copy of chapters five and six (discussion and implications of findings) will be forwarded to each school in advance of a full copy of the report to be presented following the examiners' reports.

This chapter has described "how" research was conducted in two schools with a view to reconstructing the respondents' perceptions of supervision. The next chapter presents multiple views of supervision, each of which is an individual's view of "reality".
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

Findings in both schools from Phase one of the research indicated that whilst the philosophies of supervision reflected by supervisors and supervisees had some similarities, their views of the reality of supervisory practice were often quite different. Several supervisors said that experienced teachers neither needed nor wanted supervision. This view was in direct conflict with what the teachers had to say.

A number of factors emerged from the data as relevant to supervision for professional development of teachers. With respect to classroom visits, supervisors and supervisees expressed very different views as to why this method of supervision should be used and how visits should operate. Program writing and program checking were reported by supervisees as a major "bugbear" in both schools. Teachers and supervisors said they wanted praise, yet little was given in either direction. Supervision and assessment for promotion were often seen as related by both supervisory parties. Breakdown of communication at the school level and between supervisors and supervisees, was reported as an important factor in dissatisfaction with supervision.

This chapter presents individual reports of the findings for each case school, A and B, from each of the three data collection periods, and an overview report for each school for the 12 month period of the study. In the final section of the chapter the findings of the two schools are compared and the results of the final member checks conducted in each school are presented. A view of each school is provided as an introduction to the findings with the purpose of creating a scenario for the reader and as a means of sharing the perceptions of the researcher.
A View of School A

School A was a Class 1 Primary School with 26 permanent members of staff and 571 pupils in 1990. It was a "split site" school with primary and infants departments on separate town blocks. This was commonly mentioned by staff and some executive as a reason for communication problems in the school. It was an old school with some of its buildings dating back to the 1800's. A group of old buildings situated at the rear of the school, which housed third and fourth classes, was commonly referred to as "Siberia" by the staff. One member of staff commented, "The best thing that could happen to this school is a good fire!"

The school was centrally located in a large south coast metropolis. Adjacent to the primary site were the local courthouse and police station. A walk to the infants site from the main primary school buildings took five minutes and involved crossing a busy road, passing a church and the church residence. The main entrance to the school was a small, windowless foyer (on the primary site), which had a sample school uniform on display. The playground areas of the school surrounding the buildings were mainly bitumen with a few large trees. On the primary site, the only "green" areas were well to the rear of the school. On the many occasions that the researcher visited the school parents were observed only as visitors making enquiries to the school secretary.

The staff at this school in the main appeared to be very friendly. The primary staff congregated in the staffroom before school, at recess and lunch chatting and joking informally. The infants and primary teachers did not appear to mix much with the exception of general staff meetings about once a month. Despite talk of it being a K-6 school (Kindergarten to Year six), the two departments operated quite separately according to the teachers.

At the commencement of the 1989 school year a new principal was appointed to School A. During interviews in term four a majority of staff
reported the “new” principal to be doing a “good job”. Members of staff said
the principal had entered classrooms, asked teachers for their views on things
and had generally involved the whole staff in the running of the school.
Several respondents commented on the improvement in school climate. It
was also clear that supervision was an issue high on the principal’s agenda
and many staff seemed keen to be involved.

On return of the researcher to the school at the end of term one 1990, it
was observed that school climate had changed. The principal’s relations with
staff had not developed further as had been anticipated. The principal himself
was more distant and not as keen to involve himself in the research as he/she
had been previously. The staff were aware that the principal had been
interviewed for other positions and the possibility of the principal leaving the
school was having an unsettling effect on school harmony. A fortnight later the
principal took up a new appointment during the Easter holidays.

Several new teachers to the school in early 1990 gave a different
perspective of the school to that of long term staff. In general they were not
happy with school organisation, asking questions such as, “Where are the
resources? Where are the policies? Where are the curriculum documents?
Where is our supervisor?” A decision by the executive to divide the school
into upper, middle and lower divisions received different reactions from staff.
People in the upper group (5th and 6th class teachers) reported improved
communication, however the lower group (which consisted of the Infants
department) said that nothing had changed. The middle group of 3rd and 4th
class teachers (containing several new members of staff) were hostile that
they had been left to their own devices for the first six weeks of the year.
However by term three this same group had become very cohesive and
extremely supportive of each other. They had developed a collegial approach
to their work and seemed very happy with the progress they were making.
The loss of principal at the end of term one had a disastrous effect on school climate, as no decision was made by regional office to replace the principal. The deputy became the acting principal and all other executive members had to move up one step into relieving roles. After five weeks the relieving principal took long service leave and the assistant principal (primary) who had been relieving deputy became the relieving principal. All executive members then moved up a further step into new relieving positions for five weeks. Term two was reported by the teaching staff to have been a time of confusion.

In term three the deputy returned to continue the role of relieving principal. Two weeks later a principal was appointed to the school. At the end of Term three 1990 the researcher met the new principal who had only been at the school for eight weeks. Interviews with staff revealed the new principal had been received very well. Some people were still bemoaning the loss of the previous principal on whom they had pinned their hopes, but most were glad to at least have a principal permanently appointed, having been without a perceived “leader” for more than a term.

A View of School B

In 1990, School B was a Class 2 Primary School with 12 permanent members of staff and 267 pupils. It was situated in an urban area close to the centre of a large coastal city. The surrounding houses and well cared-for gardens indicated a middle to high income area. The school itself was reasonably new, (built in 1977) with open, airy, modern buildings surrounded by trees. The classrooms were light and sunny and provided a very pleasant environment for learning. Several comments were made by the staff with regard to the pleasant environment of the school. Mention was also made that the children came from families where they were well cared for. The school had been well supported by parents, physically and financially. It was a
common sight to find parent volunteers at the school helping in classrooms and in other capacities.

There was a high degree of involvement by the staff and students at this school in "extracurricular" activities such as choral performances, excursions, bike education, musica viva and environmental programs. On arrival at the school the researcher's attention was immediately drawn to the artistic displays of children's work in the foyer and along the corridor leading to the assembly hall. On each visit there were new displays, each arranged with much effort and care, reflecting a genuine sense of interest and pride on the part of teachers and students.

The principal's office was rather different from that expected. The desk was usually a little cluttered with plans in progress and samples of student work. On the wall were hand written plans and goals to be achieved for the year. There was a friendly, non-threatening atmosphere indicating that anyone was free to enter. Students and staff were seen to visit the principal's office in an open, casual manner clearly without trepidation. The principal was obviously well liked by a large proportion of the staff. He/she was always referred to on a first name basis and given a lot of credit by the staff for the positive climate of the school. The principal was often out and about in the school, in classrooms, helping or relieving a teacher. Several respondents reported the principal to be supportive of staff, particularly in encouraging them to try ideas of their own. In 1990 a management system was implemented whereby all members of staff were encouraged to participate in school organisation and decisionmaking via committees. Three committees, Student Welfare, Management and Curriculum operated at the school, each chaired by a member of the executive.

The staffroom was clearly not "off limits" to students. It doubled as a video room and extra classroom with the children sitting on the floor. At lunch and recess, only about half of the staff occupied the staffroom. Several were
on playground duty, one or two were doing lesson preparation and others could be found playing hockey or some other sport with the students. There did not seem any desperate urge to get away from students in the breaks.

In 1989 two teachers at this school developed a model of team teaching. They removed the dividing wall between their rooms and taught the 60 children jointly. Each corner of the room was set up as a laboratory of some kind and a storeroom converted to a dark room for photography. Their positive experience of team teaching was reported to have encouraged other members of staff to try “sharing” strategies. In 1990 teachers sharing programming and lesson preparation was reported as becoming common practice at this school. Staff members reported enjoying the freedom to try things without fear of reprisals. A significant proportion of the staff reported they were very happy at the school. Several participants reported the years 1989 and 1990 as “the happiest they had been in teaching”.

SCHOOL A : REPORT 1

Five (of the six) supervisors and ten (of the 17) supervisees, which represented 65% of the permanent staff, were interviewed in November 1989 during the first phase of the research. (Interview Schedules for Data Collections 1, 2 and 3 are provided in Appendices 5-10.)

Summary of Findings
1. All supervisors reported a reliance on “informal” supervisory practices.
2. Seven supervisees said they wanted more help from their supervisors.
3. Six supervisees said there was no plan for their supervision.
4. Supervisees expressed common beliefs that supervision should be supportive and two-way, involving sharing and participation as equals.
5. Supervisors and supervisees reported the principal as the most significant factor promoting supervision at the school.
6. Both groups recognised executive inservice had promoted supervision.
7. Negative teacher attitudes to supervision were described by both groups.

**Perceptions of the Supervisory Process**

When asked to describe the way in which they had supervised for 1989, each *supervisor* referred to different methods of supervision. Two supervisors described minimal and "informal" supervision for experienced teachers: "I check programs, leave detailed notes. One is extremely competent- desires/requires little or no supervision."; "Both teachers I supervise are experienced. They determine their own needs." One supervisor claimed to supervise informally "due to some inhibitions of the people I supervise". Another supervisor said: "It's [supervision] more or less two way- a lot of sharing of ideas and material."

Seven *supervisees* were critical of the supervision they had received for 1989. Three were positive about the way they had been supervised. Several supervisees reported finding alternate people to help them. Comments revealed that two supervisors were received very positively. Typical responses were:

- "Generally fairly loose - left on my own most of the time to do what I think is fit. X checks programs - no classroom visits - I wouldn't mind some. There is no guidance for my professional development."
- "Very non-threatening. X is very caring wants to help and be involved. It's a two-way process. We sit down and discuss it."

When asked if there was a plan for their supervision, one *supervisor* commented; "We started with a fairly rigid plan, but haven't adhered to it as well as we should." Six *supervisees* said there was no plan for their
supervision. Four supervisees said there was a plan, but two said it had not been followed through.

When asked, "What has been the response of those being supervised?," none of the supervisors described a negative response to their supervision. One admitted to not knowing or asking. Responses included; "I couldn’t say they were fine or happy," and "very few negative comments - I’ve had no confrontations whatsoever." When asked if there were any changes they would like to make to their supervision, seven supervisees said they wanted more help. Two supervisees reported their supervision was adequate and another commented that he/she was "extremely satisfied".

A comment representative of several supervisees was: "I would like a bit more help. It could be a bit tighter, more professionally related, a few demonstration lessons and so on. I would like to see other people’s programs. I don’t think teachers share enough. I am not being professionally developed by the current supervision." One supervisee stated; "I think X is the best supervisor I have ever had. X has made us all part of a team, working together. I think that’s the way to go."

Beliefs About Supervision

In response to open-ended questions such as "What are your views of supervision?", supervisors revealed wide-ranging beliefs about supervision. Comments from each supervisor interviewed were as follows:

• "The most important criteria in supervising teachers is establishing a relationship with the person first."
• "If teachers are competent and committed, supervision needs to be minimal."
• "Essential for development. Teaching is an area of public responsibility. We must ensure the public dollar is spent properly. In many ways a positive thing ...not always effective."

• "It's how you relate to people first, then how you can structure it. “

Growth is an inherent part of school work, you never arrive at a point where it's over.”

• "The establishment of trust, a two-way trust is important."

"My basic philosophy is to do with trust, negotiation, personal relationships."

Supervisees’ responses, indicated considerable commonality in their beliefs about supervision. The most typical response was: "I always think of supervision as a type of guidance. A good relationship with your supervisor is the most important thing." Five supervisees stated they expected to be accountable. The need for supervision was stressed by three respondents, who stated: "Supervision is necessary no matter how long someone has been teaching." Three supervisees said that "class visits are part of effective supervision as long as they are done in a non-threatening way." Other comments revealing the beliefs of supervisees about supervision included:

• "Supervision should be an extremely supportive process designed to improve all parties involved." (two similar responses)

• "You need to find the right approach for each individual."

• "It's [supervision] a two-way process- sharing. Should be equals."

• "It [supervision] should be to help a person, not undermine them."

• "Supervisors need good communication skills."

• "The expectations ...are too high - everyone falls short. “
Concerns About Supervision

Concerns about supervision expressed by supervisors included; the need for a more uniform approach to supervision by the executive at the school, not overloading teachers, and the difficulty of changing teacher attitudes. One supervisor was concerned by the amount of change in schools in the last ten years adding, "there is no retraining."

Supervisees were concerned mainly by perceived poor communication between supervisors and supervisees and the lack of sharing between teachers. Two such comments included: "If I could get on with the supervisor I would enjoy being supervised more thoroughly," and "some supervisors are not so easy to work with."

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe factors which had promoted any recent changes in supervisory thinking or practices at the school, supervisors and supervisees gave similar responses. (Table 4A : 1)

Table 4A : 1

Factors Promoting Supervision in School A : Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=5</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=10</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive inservice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>peer supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>class visits</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class visits/team teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>executive inservice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = the number of similar responses
All supervisors interviewed, described the influence of the regional inservice program (PETP) and the principal as major positive influences on supervision at the school. Supervisees also perceived the principal to have promoted supervisory changes at the school in recent times. Typically: "The new principal has it [supervision] as a priority. There is more cooperative work going on than in the past. It's more personal." Supervisees also described the value of sharing and trust in supervisory relationships. Three supervisees said they were being professionally developed through sharing with fellow teachers.

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe the factors which had inhibited change with respect to supervision at the school, the responses of supervisors and supervisees revealed negative attitudes to supervision as the most significant inhibitor. Table 4A : 2 summarises participants' responses.

Table 4A : 2
Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School A: Phase 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=5</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Responses N=10</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>negative teacher attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>negative teacher attitudes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of praise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>checking up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>recent educational changes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insecurity of supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>insecurity of supervisors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>response to documentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lack of trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>class visits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* = number of similar responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>negative past experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three supervisors referred to the negative attitudes of some teachers; “They [supervisees] see supervision as checking things, not as staff development. There is a mental block about the word supervision, it’s a threatening term. Some use ‘professionalism’ and other terms to build a philosophy as to why they shouldn’t be supervised.” Two supervisees reported that teachers were rarely praised for their work, whilst two others commented, “There’s a lot of fear of the word ’supervision’. People see it as checking on them.”

Supervision at the Whole School Level

Supervisors reported that there had been no significant changes to supervision at the school in the twelve months prior to November 1989. The most typical response was: “There haven’t been real changes yet. We are focussing.” Seven supervisees described changes of varying degrees to supervision at the school during the previous 12 months, including an increased focus on supervision, more cooperation and teacher input. Three supervisees however, said that nothing had changed. One supervisee commented: “Program checking is still the basis for supervision.”

SCHOOL A: REPORT 2

Five (of the six) supervisors and thirteen (of the 17) supervisees, which represented 78% of the permanent staff, were interviewed in March 1990 during the second phase of the study (four months after the first interviews).

Summary of Findings

1. All supervisors reported having seen teachers’ programs.
2. Five supervisees reported supervision consisting of programs being read and/or discussions only. Four supervisees reported an informal and more
supportive approach to supervision. Three supervisees said their supervisor was too busy to help them.

3. Supervisors were not aware of supervisees' response to supervision.
4. Seven supervisees reported they wanted to change their supervision.
5. All supervisees made comments that supervision should be two-way involving sharing, cooperation and support.
6. Both groups expected a supervisor to be a "competent" classroom teacher.
7. Both groups were concerned by a perceived lack of time for supervision.
8. Six supervisees reported the "best" supervision was from their peers.

**Perceptions of Feedback from the Research**

Three *supervisors* said the information provided from the first data collection was useful to the school. One supervisor was disappointed at the apprehensiveness of teachers with respect to documentation of supervision. Six *supervisees* were positive about the findings. The most typical comment being: "It brought some issues out into the open which was good." Five supervisees, who were new appointments to the school, had not seen the report. Several supervisees, indicated that feedback from the research was having an impact on the school; "Things are happening already. The supervision I am getting is a lot better." Reflecting on the data collected, one supervisee stated; "I thought some supervisors sounded uncomfortable with their role."

**Perceptions of the Supervisory Process**

When asked how they had supervised during Term one 1990, all *supervisors* reported having seen teachers' programs. Three mentioned supervisory group meetings and goal setting. A typical response was; "I've been into classrooms informally, looked at kid's books, and spoken in a very general way."
Four supervisees described in a positive manner an informal supportive approach, which included: programs being read, meetings, discussions and informal class visits. Typically: “It’s an informal approach but more supportive than last year.” Three supervisees reported their supervisor was too busy to help them. Five supervisees described supervision which consisted only of the program being read with or without discussions. A typical response was: “It’s been fairly formal. X has checked my program and written a page of notes.”

When asked if there was a plan for supervision two supervisors said they were “trying to develop a plan.” Three supervisees said there was a plan consisting of set meetings and goals which had been negotiated. Five supervisees said they had been asked to set goals for their professional development for the year. One supervisee responded; “X has proposed doing some documentation of supervision. I thought it was taking things a bit too extreme.” Three supervisees reported they were not sure if there was a plan or not. Two supervisees said there was no plan for their professional development, only a plan for the supervision of programs.

Supervisors as a group were unable to describe the responses of their supervisees to supervision. Comments included:

• “Positive I think. Whether they feel that way I don’t know.”
• “It is difficult to say. They have been compliant.”
• “Cautious. I tell them I want them to feel comfortable with me.”
• “Going slowly. I think I am winning; that’s about as sure as I am.”
• “I couldn’t honestly say they are happy with their supervision.”

When asked “Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision?”, seven supervisees said they would like more sharing, some demonstrations, more professional development and classroom visits. “I am being developed, but not as much as I would like. I would like .... to watch
others teach.” One supervisee stated: “I’d like to know what is expected.” Requests for more consistent supervision were made as well as several pleas for more attention from the supervisor: “I’d like to see X take more interest in what is happening in my room.”

Six supervisees said they were satisfied with their current supervision. Typically; “It’s been going well this year. I like these sessions where you feel you can have a say about your way of doing things.”

Beliefs About Supervision

Three supervisors mentioned the importance of relationships in supervision, typically; “I think it is very important to establish a relationship with the person being supervised. That is the first step.” One supervisor commented: “I don’t believe in very tight supervision. Teachers are professionals. Highly skilled teachers don’t want you breathing over their shoulder.” Another stated: “Whilst people don’t resent supervision, without it there is no pressure on them to perform. It protects teachers who are doing the right thing!” Two supervisors stressed the accountability aspect of supervision: “It is the executives’ responsibility as part of accountability to ensure we are working to similar goals and that the program for children is adequate.”

All supervisees made comments indicating that supervision should be a two-way process involving sharing, cooperation and support. Several supervisees said a good supervisor listens, helps, and is approachable. The most typical comment was: “The best kind [of supervision] is support, direction, cooperation and sharing.” Three supervisees said that supervision should be non-threatening. The comment: “It’s [supervision] more to do with getting on with people than anything else,” represented a general view.

When asked, “Do you expect a supervisor to be an excellent classroom teacher?” one supervisor said, “A good performer, not excellent as far his/her
classroom is concerned - but the supervisor really needs to get other people to perform.” Another stated, “You should definitely be striving to be. You don’t have to be perfect.” Nine supervisees said they did not expect a supervisor to be an “excellent” classroom teacher though they did expect him/her to be competent.

Concerns About Supervision

One supervisor revealed a concern about attitudes to supervision and professional development, stating: “There is a perception that staff development is having something done to you by someone else and not initiating.” Another supervisor commented, “I am worried that supervision is going to get tangled up with Schools Renewal and government changes. It will ruin a lot of good work happening in schools.”

Supervisees’ comments reflected a number of concerns including mistrust of supervisors and the system, not enough time for supervision and the need for training of supervisors. Typically:

• “Some supervisors would love to see you take on every new idea in education and throw out every good idea you ever had.”
• “People in supervisory roles in this place, seem to be divorced from the classroom.”
• “There should be supervision, what concerns me is the way it is done.”
• “There is a need for the department to provide courses for supervisors.”
• “I don’t have a clear idea of what they (executive) are supposed to be doing or what is expected of me as far as supervision is concerned.”
• "My biggest concern is being able to trust someone. I have opened my soul in the past and been wounded."

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe the factors promoting supervision at the school, supervisors and supervisees responded differently. Supervisors viewed inservice of the executive, and the efforts of the principal and school executive to be major factors promoting supervision. Supervisees however viewed supervision by/with peers to be the most significant factor promoting supervisory change. Table 4A : 3 summarises the responses of participants.

Table 4A : 3

Factors Promoting Supervision in School A: Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=5</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=13</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inservice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>peer supervision</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>team teaching/sharing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>executive/inservice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Supervisors' comments included; "Inservice..... has made a change to the general perception of the executive about staff development. They now have ....some practical ideas about what to do." Three supervisors commented that guidelines for supervision were mostly initiated by the principal. Four supervisees also stated; "the biggest factor promoting it [supervision] is the principal."
Six supervisees reported the most helpful supervision was from their peers; "A lot of supervision, or I should say help within the classroom comes from teachers next door rather than from supervisors." Several other supervisees praised peer supervision, claiming that because it was based on equality those involved learned from each other. One respondent stated; "They (peers) are the greatest supervisors that you can have." Four supervisees reported "sharing" to be of benefit to them; "This year another teacher and I are sharing a lot more. A third of our week is team teaching. It's great. I'm a lot happier this year than I have ever been." Three supervisees recognised inservice of the executive as having promoted change. They stated; "There has been a push from the executive this year." One comment stressed the importance of relationships in supervision; "The people who trust their supervisor are willing to do that bit more."

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe the factors which had inhibited supervisory change at the school, supervisors commonly perceived lack of time for supervision and negative teacher attitudes as the most inhibiting. In contrast, supervisees' responded to the same question stating that poor communication at the school was the major factor inhibiting supervision. Three supervisees referred to insecurity about supervision on the part of the supervisor as an inhibiting factor. Table 4A: 4 summarises the responses.
Table 4A : 4
Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School A: Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=5</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=13</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>poor communication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitudes/personalities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>supervisor insecurity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criticism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>time/workload</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lack of trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low morale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervisor unavailable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Supervisors’ responses included:
- “The competing demands on teachers’ time and ... demands on my time.”
- “Personalities who will never share and develop a relationship.”
- “There is a strong feeling ‘that I am working hard enough’. There isn't a wholehearted embracing of the idea that everybody needs developing.”

Five supervisees attributed communication problems to the large size of the school and the split site. Several supervisees commented on supervisor attitudes to supervision. Typically: "I think the supervisors are more scared of supervision than teachers. They treat it with trepidation.” Two supervisees referred to teacher wariness of supervision: “Anxiety inhibits things... too many people are too threatened by it.” Two supervisees said they were inhibited most by their heavy workload. Limited access to the supervisor was also identified as a factor inhibiting supervision: "I don’t see X
that much. "There is something to be said for having your supervisor on the same grade as you so you can see them more often."

Supervision at the Whole School Level

Three supervisors stated that guidelines for supervision had been developed by the school executive during Term one 1990. Programming was identified as the major focus of supervision for the term by supervisors and supervisees. Several supervisors and most of the supervisees referred to a changed structure for supervision, describing the creation of junior, middle and senior divisions for supervision. Problems in the middle supervisory group, were identified by several supervisees, (from within and outside the group). Supervisees' perceptions of changes to supervision at the whole school level varied; "There is a lot more help [in 1990] and guidance when we need it." Alternatively; "At the whole school level, the same people are doing the same jobs and heading along the same lines as they have in the past."

At the end of Term one 1990, supervisors at School A generally perceived supervision to have a high priority. Typically; "It is a major issue we are addressing. Definitely higher than it was last year." Supervisees' perceptions were varied:

- "It's fairly high on our supervisor's list." (six similar responses)
- "People see other things as more important."
- "Supervisors are becoming more aware of the need for it. There is a groundswell from the masses wanting or needing supervision."

SCHOOL A : REPORT 3 (PART A.)

All six supervisors and 12 (of the 17) supervisees, which represented 88% of the permanent staff, were interviewed in September 1990, during the third phase of the study.
Summary of Findings

1. Three supervisors indicated they had some difficulty with supervision in 1990.
2. Four supervisees said that they experienced little or no supervision in 1990.
3. Six supervisees said they had not been professionally developed by their supervision for the year. Five described ways it had helped them.
4. Only supervisors expressed major concerns about supervision.
5. Sharing, trust, peer supervision and team teaching were mentioned by supervisees as positive factors influencing supervision.
6. Changes to the school executive was considered by both groups to be the most negative factor affecting supervision at the school in 1990.
7. Program writing was considered a burden by some supervisees.
8. Both groups perceived change was slowly happening and referred to more negotiation and cooperation with respect to supervision in the previous 12 months.

Perceptions of the Supervisory Process

Three supervisors made comments indicating they had some problems with supervision this year. One supervisor described sharing and developing relationships. Comments included:

• "I found it very difficult ...I could not get X to submit programs."
• "Very slackly - the intent is there but I don’t have the time. As far as being a staff developer, I find myself not fulfilling that role."
• "I have gone slowly and worked on relationship things first."

Four supervisees described little or no supervision for 1990. Several described informal supervision with an emphasis on discussion. One
supervisee described setting up a peer supervision group in response to lack of supervisor input.

• "I like it. X has been supportive, available to talk to me. The focus has been on discussion." (three similar comments made)
• "The program has been looked at on a couple of occasions and notes giving some feedback on it. X has talked with me on my goals for the year. That's it."
• "Supervision has become less and less this year - we set goals, but they have sort of fallen by the wayside."
• "I tend to support X more than X supports me."
• "With X very little. We switched over to group supervision with a peer. It's more a sharing situation. I like it."

In response to the question, "To what extent has your supervision contributed to the professional growth of the teachers involved?", five supervisors indicated they were unsure. One supervisor stated; "It hasn't developed this particular teacher." Other responses included:

• "I wouldn't know for sure. They have become a little more relaxed."
• "I'm not sure. Some don't appear to want to move in any particular direction."

Six supervisees responded to the same question stating, "nil" to "not much". Two of these said they were more developed by team teaching; "Nil. I have grown professionally through teaching with another teacher." Five supervisees said they had been developed by their supervision. They described goal setting, peer group support, sharing and "having your judgement trusted" as relevant factors.
• "No one has asked me about my professional growth."
• "The peer supervisory group has helped me, helped me to share."
• "It's [supervision] made me aware of a few weaknesses and motivated to try and fix them."

Beliefs About Supervision

Supervisors revealed the following beliefs about supervision:

• "Supervision, if negotiated properly ....can be a most effective tool. You can make a lot of teachers unhappy though, they call it 'snoopervision'."
• "The greatest supervisors I have ever had ....were people who encouraged me and praised me and made me strive to do better."
• "Generally speaking there is a reluctance to share."

Supervisees’ beliefs about supervision revealed much in common:

• "The purpose of supervision is to make sure what is being done in the classroom is good for the kids. Secondly it is to help the supervisee in their development."
• "To me supervision should be support. Historically it has been checking."
• "It [supervision] should be a developmental process not a checking up operation."
• "Hopefully it is a 2-way process - everyone has ideas to contribute."
• "Having a say in your own supervision is important."
• "It (supervision) takes time and it certainly takes trust. You have to be patient. You can't expect to accomplish things quickly. You have to gain the support and the trust of the team you are working with."
Concerns About Supervision

Supervisors revealed they were mostly concerned by workloads, the changes occurring in schools and negative attitudes of teachers to supervision. Typically:

• "They (teachers) say 'I am overloaded with the things I am doing now so don’t ask me to do any more'."
• "How to supervise the reluctant supervisee."
• "I have a concern with some of the new curricula; if I discard all those things I know work and adopt new strategies that may or may not work."
• "It’s been a difficult year. It’s difficult for supervision to be seen positively in times of great change, pressure and instability."
• "A supervisory program successful in term 1 has foundered in the latter part of the year through difficulties in providing non-teaching executive support."

Supervisees did not express any major concerns about supervision.

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe the factors that had promoted supervision at the school, supervisors and supervisees gave different responses.

Table 4A: 5 lists the responses of each group.
Table 4A : 5

Factors Promoting Supervision in School A: Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=6 *</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=12 *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved communication 1</td>
<td>sharing 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice of supervisor 1</td>
<td>peer supervision 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive/inservice 1</td>
<td>trust 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer supervision 1</td>
<td>team teaching 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support/praise 1</td>
<td>treated as an equal 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing 1</td>
<td>discussion 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Supervisors’ responses included:

- “There’s merit in allowing people a say as to who is their supervisor.”
- “In my supervision group two teachers have done a lot of peer support. It’s a very healthy thing, it’s developing both of them.”
- “This research has helped to keep supervision on the agenda.”
- “You only develop that kind of relationship [team] with people if you really care about them and show it ....like giving them support, praising their efforts.”
- “We probably need to do more, creating opportunities for formal sharing.”

Supervisees’ perceived participation in their supervision as the most positive factor promoting supervisory change. Responses included:

- “Promoting change? Sitting down and talking about ....your professional growth.”
- “Some people would like to see some radical changes made...like peer supervision.”
• "You learn more from a colleague you have chosen to work with rather than someone imposed."
• "Team Teaching... I've learnt more from that than supervision. I think cooperation is the best way to go."
• "You have to have the right person supervising you ... someone you can trust and a person you are not fearful of."
• "Sharing of ideas and working together is the thing to do."

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked to describe the factors that had inhibited supervision at the school supervisors and supervisees gave similar responses. (Table 4A:6)

Table 4A : 6

Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School A: Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor's Perceptions N= 6</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=12</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>internal school change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>internal school change</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>lack of time</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of executive training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>negative attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low morale/a difficult year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>writing programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lack of trust</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external school change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lack of executive development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Federation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>checking of programs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lack of non-teaching executive support</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Supervisors' responses included:

• "Hindering it [supervision] has been the constantly changing executive structure in second term."
• "Time is the biggest constraint."
• "The biggest inhibitor in this school are the people who are not positive about change. They see any change as a threat."
• "It really worries me is that there is not enough development of the executive."

Supervisees’ comments included:
• "The greatest influence on the whole school is the fact that we lost a boss ... there was uncertainty where the school stood as far as leadership." (typical comment)
• "Time is a factor, it’s difficult for the supervisors to get around to help everyone."
• "The program is becoming a burden. We are too busy in the classroom to do all this planning."
• "X wanted to visit our rooms, but was not relieved from class by the non-teaching executive as we had expected."
• "I don’t see the checking of programs as a great way to help people, to make them grow professionally."
• "I can’t trust my supervisor as much as I’d like to."

Supervision at the Whole School Level

Two supervisors described changes to supervision at the school for 1990, stating: "There is a lot more give and take. A lot more negotiated roles. More asking teachers how they wish to be supervised - a lot more cooperation." One supervisor described the traumatic effect of the change of school leadership on the staff: "This is the fourth principal the school has had this year. It has not been fair on the staff. All the lines of communication had to be renegotiated. The school has lost all continuity... it’s too much change."

Another supervisor responded: "I’m not aware of any great changes."
supervisor said that teachers were giving more of their time as a result of the informal, less threatening approach to supervision.

Five supervisees perceived changes to supervision at the school for 1990, including more support, less formality, more cooperation, and a more personable approach. Two supervisees reported positively of the "peer supervision" arrangement in the middle division. Four supervisees reported that other than the change of principal there had been no change at the school. Three supervisees said they did not know if there had been any change.

- "It used to be one way, now it is two way."
- "Supervision is checking at this school! Very slowly it is coming around to more support."
- "The leader has changed several times. The messages coming down from the top are continually changing. Hopefully, something will be done about supervision in Term 4."
- "Nothing has changed dramatically."
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Responses to the Questionnaire (Appendix 11).

1. When asked to indicate, "The five least desirable things with respect to supervision?," supervisors and supervisees selected the same statements from a list of choices, with similar response rates. (Table 4A : 7)
Table 4A: 7

The Five Least Desirable Things With Respect to Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most frequent Responses</th>
<th>% Supervisors</th>
<th>% Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a &quot;them and us&quot; philosophy between executive and classroom teachers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the executive decide how supervision should be done</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor makes the plans and the decisions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisors to play a less supportive role</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor sits and watches you teach</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. When asked to indicate "The five best things to improve supervision in this school?" supervisors and supervisees chose different statements from the choices available. (Table 4A: 8)

Table 4A: 8

The Five Best Things to Improve Supervision in This School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Responses</th>
<th>% Supervisors</th>
<th>% Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a trust relationship with the supervisor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a strategy for encouraging teachers to share</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having your efforts praised</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisors to play a more supportive role</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more discussion of supervision</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor teaches in the classroom with you</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All six supervisors chose "a strategy for encouraging teachers to share" and for "the supervisors to play a more supportive role".
- All twelve supervisees chose "a trust relationship with the supervisor".
At the first data collection, in November 1989, both supervisors and supervisees reported the principal to be the biggest factor influencing supervision at the school: "The principal is keen for the whole cooperative/negotiated approach." The supervisory arrangement in the school was found to be basically hierarchical. Supervisors referred to collection of programs as the major means of supervision, though several described "informal" meetings. Two supervisors stated that their supervisees were experienced and therefore required little or no supervision.

Following Data Collection 1 (in November 1989), it was evident that seven out of ten supervisees desired to make changes to their supervision. Six supervisees said there was no plan for their supervision and the remaining four said there was a plan but it had not been followed through. Supervisees made many statements indicating they expected supervision to develop them but this was not occurring. A significant number of supervisors and supervisees made comments revealing "supervision" was a topic about which they had difficulty communicating:

- "I wish it was my supervisor asking me this."
- "I supervise fairly informally, due to the inhibitions of some of the people I supervise. It is seen as threatening."

By Data Collection 2, (in March 1990) some changes to supervisory practices were being reported. The executive, encouraged by the principal had decided to try to develop a plan for supervision and had agreed to asking supervisees to set goals for the year. The executive had also decided to put an emphasis on programming in an attempt towards uniformity. A format for programming was issued to the staff. An increased proportion of supervisees, six out of thirteen, reported that they were satisfied with their supervision. A
more informal supportive approach to supervision with an emphasis on discussion was described by several supervisees. However, more than half the supervisees interviewed, seven out of thirteen, said they wanted more support, more sharing and more professional development from their supervisors. A significant number of supervisees had turned to their fellow teachers for support and development. These “peer supervision” and “team teaching” arrangements were reported most favourably and were considered more developmental and helpful than the hierarchical supervisory structure.

When data was collected for a third time at the end of term three 1990, the school was only just beginning to recover from a very traumatic period. The loss of the principal at the end of term one and fourteen weeks of uncertainty about a replacement principal had undermined the stability of the school. Several members of the executive and teaching staff had to assume relieving positions which altered the assigned supervisory roles. For several members of staff, supervision was put “on hold” during this period. Some supervisees became relieving supervisors. Both supervisors and supervisees perceived there had been more negotiation and cooperation with respect to supervision across the school in the previous 12 months. One supervisee reported that change was slowly happening:

“Supervision is checking at this school. Very slowly it is coming around to more support.”
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During November 1989 in phase one of the research, interviews were conducted with three (of the four) supervisors and all of the eight supervisees, which represented 91% of the permanent staff. (Interview Schedules for Data Collections 1, 2 and 3 are provided in Appendices 5 -10.)
Summary of Findings

1. Three supervisors reported they had tried peer supervision in 1989.
2. Four supervisees described positively an informal peer approach to supervision. Four were critical of supervision which they perceived as not being helpful.
3. Five supervisees said they would like to make changes to their supervision, namely more support, more sharing, and more input.
4. Supervisees indicated that they believed supervision should be supportive.
5. The principal and inservice of the executive were perceived by both groups as factors promoting supervision at the school.
6. Both groups reported "negative teacher attitudes" and "lack of time" as factors inhibiting supervision at the school. Two supervisees described supervisor insecurity.
7. The introduction of peer supervision was described by all interviewees as the major change to supervision at the school in 1989.

Perceptions of the Supervisory Process

When asked to describe "how they had supervised", each supervisor referred to the use of discussion. All of the supervisors interviewed said they had tried "Peer Supervision". They reported it as: "mainly through meetings and discussions"; "I set up discussions and approaches towards developing a friendly relationship, the idea of peer support". Another commented: "I feel dissatisfied that I have done so little. I had hoped to implement peer supervision, but it hasn't worked so far. We haven't made the time to get together to plan".

Four supervisees interviewed were very positive about their supervision, reporting an informal peer approach, with emphasis on discussion. Three supervisees, however, made negative comments and one reported no supervision. The positive descriptions included: "Fairly informal
classroom visits - more a peer supervision, we work together. X also learns from us - it's a group thing, discussing what we are doing. The classroom is open, there are no problems with X coming in. Three supervisees said their supervision was "very adequate". Typically, "X and I are on good terms - a lot of supervision is done on a discussion type basis - it's non-threatening."

One of the more negative comments referred to the supervision as being "old fashioned" and "a bit frustrating at times". Other descriptions included: "fairly haphazard, not particularly constructive, only collection of program - no feedback. X doesn't see what is happening in the classroom"; and "left to my own devices - nothing really. X has not asked to see programs - no classroom visits".

When asked if there was a plan for their supervision, five supervisees said there was a plan for their supervision in the form of goals set down, whereas three reported there was no plan for their supervision. Comments revealed that attitudes to goal-setting varied. One person commented; "At the beginning of year we were asked for goals for the year. That was fine. I like to have a goal. I like to be supervised too", whereas another forwarded; "I have set down goals - done nothing conscious towards achieving them". Two supervisees stated that the directives for goal setting came from principal.

When supervisors were asked to describe the response of their supervisees to supervision two reported there had been "no negative response" and the third said "mixed reactions".

When supervisees were asked if there were any changes they would like to make to their supervision, five supervisees said they would like to make changes and three said they were quite happy with what they were getting. Several reported they were getting more help from a fellow teacher, than the supervisor. The following was typical:
• "I would like more input from the supervisor, more help. Perhaps classroom visits".
• "I would like it to be more open, more sharing sessions, giving each other support. I don't like the program being taken away. I want to look at it together".
• "I'd like some feedback as to whether I am doing what is expected."
• "No professional development with X, only informally with my peer".
• "No changes needed. I am being helped".

Beliefs About Supervision

Supervisors' responses to grand tour questions (Spradley 1979) such as "What are your views on supervision?", gave an insight into their beliefs about supervision. Personal views of supervision were also volunteered at random during interviews by the three supervisors.

• "You have to develop a relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee ... that is the basis of success. Some very experienced teachers, see it as a comment about their efficiency".
  "Supervision is being able to see teachers are implementing policies, accountability, communication and professional development - it's a way of helping all of us.
• "It [supervision] means making us all more effective in our job. If we are effective in our job then we are communicating and sharing ideas".
• "People see supervision as checking up on you. I think supervision is a far broader thing, it's changing peoples attitudes to things...
  "Supervision is very important. You can get positive feedback from it, but we tend to resist it".
The most common response of supervisees was that supervision should be supportive. Four respondents stressed working together, cooperation and sharing. Four respondents said they expected to be accountable. The following comments were representative:

- "Supervision should be low key, relaxed, not threatening, exchange and share ideas, share responsibility."
- "It [supervision] should be a really supportive thing with a view that everyone's got something to offer".
- "I like to be supervised. You should be accountable to someone. You need someone who can help you work out how you can develop".
- "A good supervisor is willing to work with you, see your class in action- get involved, not sit and watch. A person with patience, someone you can talk to".
- "I want supervision .... to show that I am valued- my opinions matter".
- "It can be a good thing, very rewarding - giving you feedback".

Concerns About Supervision

Expressed concerns about supervision were more often volunteered randomly by supervisors and supervisees during interviews, rather than in response to a specific question. Concerns of the three supervisors revealed at the first data collection were as follows:

- "People don't think the executive need praise." "Unfortunately most people see it (supervision) as a form of checking up."
- "Planning for supervision is lacking from the top down. Supervision is not working at the whole school level."
- "Classroom visits are threatening to some people."
Supervisees’ concerns about supervision were commonly to do with the skills of supervisors. One teacher commented: “I might be better to be supervised by a fellow teacher.” Another observed: “The peer support structure is not as successful as it could be.” Longstanding concerns about supervision were revealed in the following comments:

- “Supervision could do with a whole new name change. Supervisors who consider themselves superior to the classroom teacher are a problem.”
- “I don’t feel 100% about supervision this year. I’ve never been supervised in a really helpful way.”

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked "What factors have promoted changes in supervisory practices at the school?", both groups interviewed responded that that the principal and regional inservice had been influential. Table 4B:1 indicates the responses from each group.

Table 4B:1
Factors Promoting Supervision in School B: Phase 1

| Supervisors' Perceptions N=3 | * | Supervisees' Perceptions N=8 | *
|------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---
| inservice                    | 3 | principal                   | 5 |
| principal                    | 2 | peer supervision/team teaching | 4 |
| awareness                    | 1 | inservice                   | 3 |

  positive attitudes          | 2 |
  staff participation in decisions | 1 |

* = number of similar responses
Supervisors' comments included: “There was a feeling in the meetings held after the inservice that we can help each other” and “The principal introduced the peer support system this year.” Supervisees also acknowledged several other factors as having had a positive influence on supervision:

- “The principal is the biggest factor. He is keen to allow teachers to try new things.”
- “Most of the staff have been to the supervision course ... we ended up trialling the peer support model.”
- “Change implemented arose out of staff participating in discussions.”
- “I like the peer support system, it is a more professional approach.”

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

Both groups interviewed reported lack of time for supervision and negative teacher attitudes as factors inhibiting changes in supervisory practices. (Table 4B : 2)

Table 4B : 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School B: Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors’ Perceptions N=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative teacher attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checking approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses
All three supervisors mentioned problems of time for supervision, particularly for meetings with teachers. Comments included:

- "Attitudes of some members of staff - that they need no advice."
- "Checking spelling or to see what's in the program after it has been done is useless. The teacher only gets feedback after the teaching is done."

Four supervisees mentioned negative teacher attitudes to supervision. Typically, "Quite a few people don't relish being supervised, don't like change." Two supervisees reported their supervisor was having difficulty with supervision: "X is finding it difficult to handle the new approach," and "I think X feels unable to help us." Responses of supervisees included:

- "I don't mind people in the room but I object to the checking up approach."
- "If the supervisor is open and doesn't make you feel threatened by writing your weaknesses down, there's no problem."
- "Time to get together for meetings.'
- "Workload - we are run off our feet."
- "This was another change in a long list of changes over the past few years."

Supervision at the Whole School Level

Two supervisors and six supervisees reported changes to supervision at the whole school level and referred to the introduction of the peer support scheme. Peer Supervision introduced in 1989 was described as a structure where "two teachers would support each other, working with an executive
member”. A supervisor commented, “we still haven’t been able to capitalise on that structure.” Another supervisor observed: “Teachers have been made more responsible for themselves. It [supervision] is more flexible.”

Two supervisees said that peer supervision had been trialled since staff and executive went to the inservice course. Two said they didn’t know how other people were supervised. The changes perceived by supervisees included more negotiation, with less emphasis on program checking and more support: “People are more relaxed and view supervision in a different light.”

When asked to describe the “priority of supervision” at the school, both supervisors and supervisees gave varied responses. One supervisor commented: “More pressing things come in front of it. We are going to spend more time on it next year.” Whereas another supervisor said: “Staff development as part of supervision is a high priority.” The third supervisor interviewed stated: “We investigated various forms of supervision. In term four as the school got busy, the meetings fell off.” Four supervisees said supervision was important to very important, though three supervisees said the priority was not high. One respondent said, “I don’t know.”

When asked, “What are the good things about teaching at this school?” both groups responded with very positive comments about the staff, the students and the climate of the school. Most supervisees’ comments were positive about the kids (participants’ language), the staff and the principal. Several supervisees were positive about being encouraged to try things.

Supervisors’ perceptions of school improvements needed included; “more implementation of the ideas on supervision we have been discussing”; “a less hectic pace of being involved in so many outside things”; “cut down some of the barriers that exist between some members of staff,” and “breaking down resistance to change.” Supervisees’ perceptions of school improvements needed included requests to try the peer support method again and for more professional development. Another suggested, “more
cooperative planning," and two supervisees said, "cut down external things we are doing and keep teachers in classrooms more".
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The whole staff of four supervisors and eight supervisees were interviewed in March 1990 during the second phase of the study.

Summary of Findings

1. All supervisors and six supervisees reported meeting in peer groups.
2. Five supervisees reported positively on increased sharing of ideas.
3. All supervisors said they had a plan for supervision - in their head.
4. Five supervisees said they were very happy with their supervision.
5. Supervisors were concerned by a perceived lack of time for supervision.
6. Three supervisees were concerned about the skills of supervisors.
7. Both groups reported positively on the effects of peer supervision.

Perceptions of Feedback from the Research

All supervisors reported that the feedback had been interesting and very helpful. Two supervisors stated that the findings had led to supervisory changes: "We realised about the peer support structure that there was no real planning as to what those people would do." "It [the research] gave me an insight as to what they [supervisees] want me to be doing."

The most typical comment made by supervisees was: "Seems to be fairly true and accurate - good representation. No surprises." Two supervisees said that it was "good that it all came out in the open" and another that the research had raised awareness- "it has made the person supervising have more empathy and understanding of of what the needs are". One supervisee's comment, however, reveals the underlying contention with respect to supervision:
"I think it is still very hard for teachers to come out and say how they feel to supervisors. It's still a problem".

Perceptions of the Supervisory Process

When asked to describe how they had supervised teachers during term one 1990, each supervisor described group meetings, discussions and sharing. The following comment was typical; “Mainly discussed things with my peer group - sharing ideas as a group - have not checked documentation. So far nothing has been done on a one:one basis.”

Six of the supervisees reported meeting in peer groups and five reported positively on increased sharing of ideas: “There is a lot more sharing going on this year. We meet fortnightly with our supervisor and peer group.”

Three supervisees revealed they were getting little help from their supervision. Typically: “Left to do my own thing again. X doesn’t check up much on what is going on.”

When asked, “Is there a plan for your supervision?”, three supervisors said they had a plan, but it wasn’t written down. Several comments indicated beliefs that there should be a plan: “You should have a plan, but it should be flexible. I have a plan in my head.”; “I am still coming to terms with it.”; “No, and sometimes I feel very guilty about that. Sometimes I would prefer to work it out as I go along.”

One of the strong messages about supervision that had been put to supervisors at regional inservice was that supervision should be documented and that a "plan for supervision" was expected by the system. Proformas for planning supervision were issued at the Primary Executive Teachers' Program on supervision.

When asked if there was a plan for their supervision, most supervisees, however, were not aware of a plan, though four reported they were asked to set goals for the year.
When asked to describe the response of supervisees, two of the supervisors revealed they were unsure as to how the teachers felt about the supervision they were getting. Their comments were as follows: “Fairly hard to describe. The response has been mixed” and “I think they are happier with the peer support. I’m not sure.” Another responded, “I get on very well with the people I supervise”.

In response to the question “Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision?”, five supervisees said they were very happy with their supervision and did not wish to change it. Three supervisees made the following suggestions:

- “Less meetings. I don’t mind the sharing if it’s less constant.”
- “I’d like a bit of feedback, to know if I’m doing the right thing.”
- “I think it is good, but I would like to sit down with people and show my program and share programs - to get ideas how others plan.”

Beliefs About Supervision

In response to questions such as, “What do you consider ideal supervision to be?”, “What are your views on supervision?” and “Is there anything you would like to add on supervision?”, supervisors and supervisees revealed wide-ranging beliefs about supervision. Three supervisors commented that accountability is part of supervision, though an emphasis on teacher growth was evident in the comments of each supervisor, as follows:

- “Supervision is necessary for people to develop. It is a very difficult process managing people, a very slow process....Some individuals don’t like supervision of any kind.”
• "You need a reasonable sort of relationship so you can work together where all parties feel they are gaining something."

• "A supervisor has to have interpersonal skills so that they can relate to others. Ideal supervision focuses on the development of the individual."

• "If we are good supervisors we should be taking the pressure off, not putting the pressure on. A supervisor should find what a person is good at....I think that sharing is the only way to go. People who don't want to share are very insecure within their own being."

Six supervisees described ideal supervision as supportive, encouraging, sharing and working as equals. "It [ideal supervision] is mainly support, encouragement, to listen not make a judgement - to discuss a problem openly. Helping you to clarify or reach the goals you have set." A belief in the need for equality of the two parties was evident in comments such as: "Regular meetings where the supervisor puts himself on the same level as the teacher, and is willing to share ideas and listen to ideas." Supervisees also revealed strong beliefs about supervision with comments like: "It (supervision) is a dangerous power in the wrong hands or a wonderful tool in the right hands," and "If you are going to be supervised you want to get something out of it."

One supervisee reported a preference for supervisor directed supervision, stating: "It's a supervisor's role to supervise and not to take too much notice of what we say, we're just the classroom teacher."

When asked, "Do you expect a supervisor to be an excellent classroom teacher?", all of the supervisors and seven supervisees said "no". Terms such as "competent" or "good" were substituted by the majority of respondents. The comment, "Not necessarily excellent, (I don't think I like that word) but
somebody who is willing to change and keep up with new ideas", is an example of a typical response from supervisees.

Concerns About Supervision

The concerns of supervisors were mainly to do with "how and when" to supervise. Typical of such concerns is the following comment: "The supervisor is in an absolute quandary about which way to move; they have classroom responsibilities and supervisory responsibilities". Two of the supervisors expressed concerns about the ability of supervisors to supervise: "People who focus their supervision on the documentation and not on the practice are a concern," and "There are too many people in supervisory/managerial positions without communication, understanding, human relationship skills. They wouldn't have a clue how to get the best out of their people."

The responses of three supervisees revealed concerns about the skills of supervisors. Typically: "Who the supervisors are is a concern. It's a general concern - are they the right person in all cases? An executive person isn't always more experienced than a classroom teacher." Other comments revealed concerns with respect to personality clashes, lack of time for supervision and the need for more sharing. "We never get to see others' programs. I would like to see the programs of other teachers. It shouldn't be checking, but a sharing process."

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked, "What do you consider to be the influential factors promoting change with respect to supervision at the school?", both groups of participants reported the principal and peer supervision as the most influential. Table 4B: 3 outlines the responses of each group.
Table 4B: 3

Factors Promoting Supervision in School B: Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=4</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Perceptions N=8</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>peer supervision</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peer supervision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inservice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system thrust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>inservice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>positive attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the executive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Comments which were representative of supervisors included; “The principal has made it one of his priorities this year to help the supervisors with supervision” and “teachers see peer supervision as a more worthwhile way of doing supervision.”

Supervisees reported peer supervision as follows: “people are happier with discussion”; “Peer conferencing is more useful. I’m more optimistic, more positive,”; “The biggest thing you get out of it is the sharing of ideas,”; and “It is not nearly so threatening as a peer thing. It is a way of helping you.”. The efforts of the principal were recognised by several supervisees. Typically: “He (the principal) has made a big effort to make supervision non threatening.” Two supervisees commented similarly that the research had raised the awareness of people in the school.

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

When asked, “What do you consider to be the factors inhibiting change, with respect to supervision at the school?” both groups mentioned the
problem of finding time for supervision, particularly time for group meetings.

Table 4B: 4 summarises the responses of each group.

**Table 4B: 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School B: Phase 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supervisors' Perceptions N=4</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supervisees' Perceptions N=8</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative teacher attitudes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>supervisor insecurity/ inability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>checking up/class visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too many meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>program writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>too many meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no choice of supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor insecurity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>negative past experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

Commenting on the pressures on teachers' time, one supervisor said; “There is a sense among staff of being pretty flat out. Time for meetings is a big bugbear.” Comments of two other supervisors with respect to factors inhibiting supervision, indicated a breakdown in communication between supervisors and supervisees: “The individual, their inability to perceive that problems do exist,” and “seeing the need to set goals - one of them I know thinks it is a waste of time.” The problem of the solitary nature of teachers’ work was identified by one supervisor: “The ideal supervision is for teachers to interact, but much of the time they are on their own with 30 kids.” Several comments by supervisors indicated insecurity about supervision on behalf of the parties involved: “I know some people do not like the idea of keeping records on people”; “People who are being supervised won’t tell their supervisors what they think. It says, 'I don’t know you well enough to trust you'
and "I never really feel quite sure that I am doing it right. I would like at this time a definite format to follow as to what is expected with supervision."

Three supervisees reported that "some supervisors are better than others." Conflict over checking of programs and classroom visits was revealed in comments such as: "Nobody liked getting their programs checked in the past," and "I'm against someone sitting in the room and not doing anything." Supervisees' negative experiences, past and present, were revealed in comments such as: "So far we have had meeting after meeting....and we are sick of it"; "People's bad experiences in the past haven't helped"; and "If the supervisor was of my choice, I would choose someone who had more to give me in the way of professional development".

Supervision at the Whole School Level

The development of a peer structure for supervision and regular meetings, was reported by both groups of participants as the major change to supervision at the school in recent times. Supervisors reported more guidance from the principal with regard to the content and structure of supervisory group meetings and the setting of goals. Several supervisees described improved communication during term one 1990. Two typical comments from supervisees were: "The peer tutoring scheme has gone a little bit further. Our supervisors are talking to us in a group situation. We've had to write down our goals this year"; and "It's [supervision] got a bigger emphasis. They [the executive] are working out a way of getting communication through the school - a structure for our ideas and suggestions." Two supervisees said there was more sharing of ideas and another stated that communication was more flexible rather than directed by the supervisor.

The priority of supervision was reported by three supervisors as high, and by five supervisees as, fairly high.
SCHOOL B : REPORT 3 (PART A)

All four supervisors and seven (of the eight) supervisees, which represented 91% of the permanent staff, were interviewed in September 1990 during the final phase of the study.

Summary of Findings

1. More than 75% of supervisors and supervisees reported "peer supervision" as the most positive factor influencing supervision at the school.
2. Both groups reported positively on the use of discussion and peer sharing rather than program collection and checking as the focus for supervision.
3. All supervisors considered that they had contributed to the professional growth of their supervisees.
4. Four supervisees reported that their supervision had developed them to a great extent. Three considered they had received moral support - not development.
5. Two supervisors revealed a high regard for the experience of their supervisees.
6. Supervisors' concerns indicated more could be done to help teachers and that supervisors needed to help each other.

Perceptions of the Supervisory Process

When asked to describe the way in which they had supervised, all supervisors reported the use of discussion in peer supervisory groups as the major form of supervision. Two supervisors said they had not collected programs but had been involved in program planning and program sharing sessions with supervisees. Two supervisors reported meeting with individuals as well as the group. A typical comment was as follows: "It's [supervision] mainly been discussion and people sharing parts of their programs."

Six supervisees described regular meetings of peer supervisory groups. Sharing of programs and the school's new system of report writing
(focused evaluation) were reported by five supervisees to have been major topics of discussion in the peer supervisory groups during the year. The following description was typical: "It's [supervision] been more supportive, peer type supervision where we all get together as a group. We tend to supervise each other, plan together, share our programs and what we are doing. I'm very happy with it."

In response to the question, "To what extent has your supervision contributed to the professional growth of the teachers involved?", all supervisors indicated they considered they had helped their supervisees. One was dissatisfied that he/she had not achieved enough, stating: "I am happy with the way people are opening up in discussions. I have achieved certain things with these people but I still don't feel I have achieved enough." Another supervisor commented, "I hope we have both learned from each other. That's what peer grouping is all about." A third supervisor indicated progress had been made with the comment: "I think it has been significant in that they have started to think like a team, to help each other, fire ideas off each other."

When supervisees were asked, "To what extent has the supervision you have experienced this year contributed to your professional growth as a teacher?" four responded that they had been developed to a great extent. Three supervisees however, reported there had been little, if any, professional development, but added, the sharing had been good for moral support. Two comments which were representative are as follows:

- "It (peer supervision) allows you to grow, to take risks...it's so practical, right down to what we need ...It's much better. We go into each others rooms, our kids go into each other's classes. "
- "Not gained much at all. Mainly moral support. Hardly any development."
Beliefs About Supervision

Supervisors revealed their beliefs about supervision with comments such as:

• "I don't see myself as the most important person in the group. An important element in group work is that you establish relationships first."
• "I prefer the peer approach rather than....checking up. We are often with teachers who are our equal in experience. I prefer to work as equals."
• "Listening is important in management. We should allow them (teachers) to try things, that's where innovation and spontaneity come from. The people I supervise are very competent and experienced."

Supervisees' comments revealed some common beliefs about supervision, including, that it "should be flexible and supportive". The importance of an open and positive approach was stressed by several interviewees:

• "Some teachers are very good at sharing others are not."
• "I like it to be open and free sharing of ideas, freedom to ask for assistance if you need it and .... recognition for what you do."
• "I still associate supervision with the word 'program'. The emphasis in supervision is changing and broadening to personal and professional development."
• "The key to the situation is leadership which allows change to take place. A willingness to let people take risks, discuss and share."
• "There should be more sharing, more helping each other."
Concerns About Supervision

During Data Collection 3 (conducted in September 1990), the comments of supervisors at school B revealed significantly more concerns about supervision than the comments of teachers being supervised. Supervisors expressed concerns about the lack of time for individual supervision and one supervisor stated that he/she felt dissatisfied that not enough was being done to help teachers...mainly because of time. Other stated concerns of supervisors included:

- “There are still some who need to learn to support the team decision rather than their own.”
- “I feel I want to have more direction and have asked the principal for guidelines.”

The concerns expressed by supervisees related to the difficulty of shaking off past ideas about supervision, wariness about supervision and the connotations of the word “supervision”, described as “being looked down upon - of being under a microscope.” Two responses were:

- “Some people are wary of peer supervising. The principal is trying to break down the barriers.’
- “I don’t feel X can contribute anything to my role. I’d rather get someone who could give me more guidance.’

Positive Factors Affecting Supervision

At Data Collection 3, both supervisors and supervisees reported peer supervision (meeting in groups) to be the most influential factor promoting supervisory change in the school. Five supervisees described peer supervision as a meaningful and helpful method of supervision. (Table 4B: 5)
Table 4B: 5

Factors Promoting Supervision in School B: Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisors' Perceptions N=4</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>Supervisees' Responses N=7</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>peer support groups/meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>peer support</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>groups/meetings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff commitment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>positive school climate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive inservice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>principal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>cooperation/working as equals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inservice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar answers

Typical responses from supervisors included: "Promoting change - this year...the commitment to it (peer supervision) has been greater and that has helped to promote it." Another supervisor stated: "I like the peer support type structure. I'd like to see it continue and be extended in the future, in terms of sharing between teachers."

Supervisees' responses about peer supervision included: "It's (peer supervision) definitely the way to go" and "You feel your input is worth something and you feel at ease to be able to do things. Peer Supervision allows you to develop as a professional person more." The influence of the principal was recognised by two supervisees: "The principal ......initiates things and creates a climate so you get a groundswell from the other staff. He is the key to everything." Positive comments about cooperation were revealed as follows:

- "Working together is important. Cooperation in all areas."
- "Let's hope the talking and interaction continues."
"Feeling more comfortable about it is a positive thing."
"We have a structure which facilitates change."

One respondent considered the research to have had a positive effect: "It has made people look at what is going on."

Negative Factors Affecting Supervision

Both groups interviewed identified similar factors as having a negative effect on supervision, specifically: a perceived lack of time for supervision, persons with negative attitudes about supervision and the inexperience of some supervisors. Table 4B: 6 summarises the responses of the two groups.

Table 4B: 6
Factors Inhibiting Supervision in School B: Phase 3

| Supervisors' Perceptions N=4 | * | Supervisees' Perceptions N=8 | *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supervisor inexperience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>negative attitudes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>lack of time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative attitudes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>personality clashes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount of change in schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>supervisor no help</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not enough structure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = number of similar responses

One supervisor commented: "Some people are reluctant to let you know how they really feel. Some people find it difficult to share. Some teachers are scared of being compared." Another supervisor saw the amount of change in schools in recent times as a negative factor affecting supervision: "Teachers see lots of changes and wonder where they are heading to. 'Is the work I am doing now going to be negated in 12 months time?'" In contrast a
third supervisor answered: "Inhibiting factors? I don’t know that there has been any."

Supervisees responses included a criticism of peer supervision for not being "structured enough," and a comment that the "personality clashes you get on staff sometimes" inhibited supervisory change.

Supervision at the Whole School Level

When asked to describe any changes in supervision at the school level in the last 12 months, all supervisors and four supervisees reported that peer group supervision had been more fully implemented and regular meetings established. One supervisor commented that the new reporting system, "focussed evaluation", was a major change which had affected supervision at the school. Another supervisor described the development of a "problem solving cycle" to aid communication. Six supervisees positively described changes they perceived in relation to the implementation of peer supervision, including: more sharing, improved communication, a greater openness about supervision, improved programming and more support. "We were supposed to have peer supervision last year but it never got off the ground. We have gone from supervision which consisted mainly of handing in programs to a much more open and sharing type supervision." Other comments of supervisees, which revealed a positive response to the change in supervision at the school included:

• "Everyone wants to communicate more. I don’t feel threatened by the supervision."
• "It (sharing)is making us better program writers."
• "This year......I feel I am having some input."
• "There seems to be more support this year than last year."
Table 4B: 7

The Five Least Desirable Things With Respect to Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Responses</th>
<th>%Supervisors</th>
<th>%Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 'them and us' philosophy between executive and classroom</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor makes the plans and the decisions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor sits and watches you teach</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the executive decide how supervision should be done</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisors to play a less supportive role</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor teaches in the classroom with you</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being supervised by a more senior member of staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervisors and supervisees responses indicated they were in general agreement as to the least desirable things with respect to supervision.

Supervisors and supervisees chose different statements from the choices available to indicate what they thought were “the five best things to improve supervision in this school”. (Table 4B: 8). All four supervisors chose, “a trust relationship with the supervisor”. All seven supervisees chose “having your efforts praised” and “a strategy for encouraging teachers to share".
Table 4B: 8

The Five Best Things to Improve Supervision in this School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Responses</th>
<th>%Supervisors</th>
<th>%Supervisees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a strategy for encouraging teachers to share</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having your efforts praised</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a trust relationship with the supervisor</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowing supervision by peers</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the supervisor teaches in the classroom with you</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more discussion about supervision</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documentation of the supervision process and goals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCHOOL B: OVERVIEW OF REPORTS 1-3

When data was collected for the first time all interviewees reported that the introduction of "peer supervision" had been the major change to supervision at the school in 1989. Peer supervision was perceived by more than half the supervisees as a positive approach and an improvement on previous forms of supervision. When asked to describe how they had supervised, all three supervisors interviewed said they had tried "peer supervision". Four of the eight supervisees positively described an informal peer approach to supervision, but went on to say they wanted more from supervision than they were getting. Five of the eight supervisees interviewed said they would like to make changes to their supervision, including more support, more sharing and having more input. Several stated that the concept of peer supervision could be improved and developed further. Both supervisors and supervisees described negative teacher attitudes to supervision and lack of time for supervision, as major inhibiting factors.
Following Data Collection two, in March 1990, there was sufficient evidence to suggest that the "Peer Supervision structure" at the school had been developed and further implemented. All four supervisors and six supervisees reported meeting in peer groups. A problem which had not been resolved however, was the pressure of the numerous meetings staff and executive members had to attend. One of the supervisors and several supervisees complained to the researcher about the number of meetings each week. All of the supervisors were concerned by a perceived lack of time to supervise. The data suggested that more supervisees were satisfied with their supervision in 1990, than 1989. Three out of eight supervisees said they would like to change their supervision, including less meetings, some feedback and more sharing. Five supervisees reported an increased sharing of ideas and said they were happy with their supervision and had no wish to make changes. Both groups reported the principal to be a major factor promoting the implementation of supervisory changes at the school.

Following Data Collection 3, in September 1990, both supervisors and supervisees reported a concerted move to peer supervision at the school. The problem of too many meetings was resolved in term three by creating a roster of meetings so that committee meetings, supervisory group meetings and general staff meetings were cycled once every three weeks, before school. This change was received very positively by the staff, though one supervisor commented that not as much was being achieved through meeting less often. Both groups reported that the emphasis in supervision had moved away from checking of programs to sharing and discussion in peer groups. Cooperative development of teaching programs was reported by all members of one supervisory group. Four out of seven supervisees interviewed considered their supervision had professionally developed them to a great extent. Three supervisees, however, whilst in support of "peer supervision" felt little or
nothing had been done to develop them. Both groups reported peer supervision to be the most positive factor affecting supervision at the school.

OVERVIEW REPORT: SCHOOLS A AND B

The context of School A was found to be very different to that of School B. Apart from the physical differences of being a much larger and very much older school, the climate within school A had been disrupted by the changes of leadership during 1989 and 1990. Out of a total of six executive members, three (including the principal) were new to the school in 1990. Four teachers were new to the school in 1990. School B has had a relatively stable staff in recent times, with no changes to the executive 1989-90 and only one new classroom teacher.

A number of similar factors was perceived by both supervisors and supervisees to have had a positive influence on supervision in either school. Following the first and second data collections, the principal was perceived by both supervisors and supervisees in each school to be the most positive influence on supervisory change within the school. Participants in both schools reported regional inservice on supervision to have stimulated thinking about "what is good supervision" and "how to supervise". School B participants reported they adapted the model of "Peer Supervision" implemented during 1989-90 from choices presented at the Primary Executives' inservice course.

"Peer Supervision" (described by participants as meeting, planning, sharing and discussing supervision on an equal basis, often in groups), was described by supervisees from both schools as an effective and developmental method of supervision. Supervisees from both schools referred positively to peer supervision throughout data collections 1, 2 and 3, whereas supervisors from either school did not report the positive effects of peer supervision until later in the research.
The perceptions and beliefs of supervisees in either school concerning factors which positively affected supervision, had much in common. Supervisees commonly reported sharing, praise, a trust relationship with the supervisor, being treated as an equal, having input into their supervision and for the supervisor to play a supportive role, as the factors necessary to supervision perceived as helpful.

Supervisors and supervisees in both schools were in general agreement as to the factors that most negatively affected supervision. Negative teacher attitudes and a perceived lack of time for supervision were the most commonly reported factors by all interviewees. Supervisees in both schools reported insecurity of supervisors and use of a "checking up" approach to supervision as the factors most inhibiting the development of effective supervision. Approximately half of all supervisees interviewed said they were not being professionally developed by their current supervision.

During the course of the research participants reported changes to supervisory philosophy and practices occurring in each school. School A was reported to be slowly changing from a model of supervision where the emphasis was on checking of teaching programs, to a more supportive style of supervision. Supervisors and supervisees in 1990 met in groups, though not always on a regular basis. One group of supervisees had set up their own peer support group and several others had developed team-teaching and cooperative planning arrangements with fellow teachers. School B was reported to have made a concerted move into peer supervision, commencing in 1989, with further implementation in 1990. The decision to move in such a direction involved the whole staff. Several supervisees reported that the involvement of all staff in the decision to adopt the peer supervisory model, had resulted in a greater commitment to the change. Both supervisors and supervisees at School B referred very positively to the change to peer supervision.
Results of the Final Member Check

In late November and early December 1990, following analysis of all data collected the researcher returned to each school to present written and verbal reports for each case study. At a general staff meeting in each school overhead transparencies of the findings for each phase of the research were shown and the researcher's interpretations of the data expressed. Throughout the presentation the audience (not all were participants) was invited to comment and ask questions. The researcher's familiarity with each schools staff developed over the length of the study enabled an informal and non-threatening atmosphere to prevail, despite the contentious nature of the topic of the study.

Persons present at each staff meeting were asked if the findings and interpretations presented were a reasonable account of their school. A questionnaire was provided to enable confidential and anonymous responses. (Appendix 15) In both schools the response to the member check was 100% supportive. Two thirds of respondents in each school said they agreed that the report was a reasonable account of their school, and one third said they strongly agreed. There were no requests for deletions or additions to the report. When the researcher asked if there were any surprises in the findings the respondents said "no", as they had been kept informed throughout the study.

Further interpretation of data by the researcher occurred during the final months of thesis preparation (January to March 1991) which was not verified by member checking. As mentioned at the end of chapter three, this was due to time limitations. Copies of the discussion and implications of findings chapters will be forwarded to each school immediately the report is completed. A full copy of the thesis will be presented to each school following examination.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Within the major framework of "professional development of teachers", this study addresses the specific issue of "supervision of teachers for professional development". The system (NSW Department of School Education in Managing the School, 1987)) says supervision will develop teachers and assumes it does. This research asks, "Is supervision really helping teachers?"

In order to answer this question the research has been conducted at the level of the school, with the two parties involved in supervision; teachers and their supervisors. Two levels of questions are asked in this evaluation of supervision: firstly, "What has happened (with respect to supervision) in the two case study schools over the period of the research and what factors are responsible?"; secondly, "What are the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees with respect to supervision?" Responses to these second level questions has generated "theory" on supervision for professional development of teachers.

SUPERVISION IN THE CASE STUDY SCHOOLS

Data collected in response to first level questions reveals the two schools to be approaching supervision with different strategies and as a consequence the effects in each school have been quite different. The data indicate that in School A, the executive (supervisors) decided how supervision would operate with little or no consultation with classroom teachers. A major goal of supervisors at this school in 1990 was uniformity, with an emphasis for supervision, on teachers' programs. The loss of the principal at the end of term one 1990 destabilised school climate and supervision was reportedly "placed on hold". Pockets of team teaching and
peer supervision are emerging in this school as teachers, some with their supervisors, search for and establish their own means of professional development. Late in the study, participants report the school is slowly moving towards a more supportive model of supervision, involving input from classroom teachers.

Data collected in School B reveals a concerted move towards a model of peer supervision during the 12 month period of the study. The structure consists of a supervisor and two to three teachers meeting to plan and discuss supervision. Over a period of seven school terms the concept has been developed and further implemented to the extent that during term three 1990, regular supervisory meetings once every three weeks (before lesson time) were placed on the school calendar. The decision to introduce peer supervisory groups followed attendance by the executive and some staff members at the Primary Executives Teachers' inservice course (PETP). Participants report the involvement of the whole staff in the decision to be a major factor in the acceptance of and commitment to peer supervision. Peer supervision is reported very favourably by teachers and supervisors at School B.

Perceived barriers to supervision for professional development within the context of School A include: a lack of time to supervise, poor communication supervisor to supervisee and between executive to staff, insecurity of supervisors, use of checking up methods, negative attitudes about supervision, lack of trust and a failure to praise people for the work they had done. Both supervisors and supervisees consider time to supervise is a major problem. Finding the time to meet and discuss professional development issues is reported as difficult. "So many other issues have to take priority." In School B, participants report, negative teacher attitudes, insecurity of the supervisor and a lack of time for supervision, as the major factors inhibiting supervisory change.
Patterns of successful supervision which are emerging within the contexts of School A and School B include: peer supervisory groups, team teaching situations and the development of "informal", sharing and collegial approaches to supervision. A significant number of teachers have turned to working in a cooperative arrangement with their peers (50% School A, 62% School B) sharing ideas, planning units of work and writing programs together. These arrangements have been found to be more helpful and to have more developmental outcomes than the "traditional" form of supervision where collection and checking of programs is the basis of supervision. Those supervisors who have been able to adapt to the needs of their supervisees and who are perceived as working as equals and are non-threatening, are those perceived to be effective supervisors.

In School B, at the commencement of the research, supervisors and supervisees report the factors having the most positive influence on supervisory change at the school, to be the principal and regional inservice on supervision. By Data Collection 3 however, both groups report peer supervision to be the factor having the most positive influence on supervision in this school. In addition, the commitment of staff is recognised by supervisors to be contributing to the success of peer supervision. Supervisees report that the positive attitude of staff and school climate, are having a positive influence as well as increased sharing and cooperation amongst members of the peer groups.

A significant proportion of supervisees in School A (70% Phase 1, 55% Phase 2, 50% Phase 3) report they are not being professionally developed by their current supervision. A similar proportion of supervisees in School B (62.5% Phase 1, 37.5% Phase 2, 43% Phase 3) perceive that their supervision is not professionally developing them.

The significant decrease in supervisee dissatisfaction with supervision that followed feedback from Data Collection 1, indicates there has been a flow
from the responsive evaluation. However, it is not possible to determine the extent. Several supervisors told the researcher that the data fed back to the school had given them some insights into what teachers want from supervision. Approximately 30% of supervisees in School A and 87% of supervisees in School B made comments that the study was proving beneficial to the school. The most common observation was that the research had made the topic of supervision more "open to discussion". In School A several supervisees revealed they had expected the research to make a difference to supervisory procedures at the school once their opinions had been voiced. Three such comments were:

- "There is a lot more help and guidance when we need it. It (the research) has made life easier.... the supervisor is more personable."
- "More could have been done with what you have found so far. I think they [the executive] have missed an opportunity"
- "It brought some issues out into the open which was good."

In both schools the influence of the principal and inservice education of the executive are perceived as major factors promoting changes to supervision at the school level. In School B a positive school climate is reported as conducive to changes at the whole school level, despite the contentiousness of supervision and the controversial broader educational climate. Both schools perceive negative teacher attitudes to supervision and lack of time for supervision and professional development, to be major factors inhibiting supervisory change. Insecurity of the supervisors with respect to supervision, is reported by 25-30% of supervisees in both schools.
PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISION

A major finding of the research is that teachers in these two schools believe supervision should develop them. However, approximately half of all the teachers interviewed in School A and School B say they are not being professionally developed by their current supervision. The supervisees who report their supervision as helpful are those who are involved in collegial relationships with their supervisor and other teachers and who describe a positive relationship with their supervisor based on equality and trust. A significant number of teachers say they are being developed more through "informal" arrangements such as team teaching and cooperative planning with a fellow teacher. Supervisees overwhelmingly say they want the supervisor to play a supportive role. These are all experienced teachers.

In response to the question "Supervision: Is it really helping teachers?", the research data answers: "Yes and no, it depends on certain conditions." Teachers in the two case study schools report a positive professional relationship with the supervisor is necessary for supervision which is perceived to be helpful. The significant propositions emerging from the study relate to the factors which are perceived to promote or inhibit supervision of teachers for professional development. The following factors are reported as important:

- teachers have input to their supervision (supervision is two-way)
- teachers and supervisees participate in supervision as equals
- there is a trust relationship
- there is a sharing of ideas
- people are praised for their work
In particular, meeting, discussing and sharing in peer supervisory groups is reported very positively. In addition, team teaching is reported very favourably by those who have tried it.

Conversely, the research data shows that supervision is not helping teachers when it is based on unequal power arrangements. Factors reported as inhibiting supervision for professional development included:

- hierarchical supervision (the supervisor = superior)
- the supervisor employs checking up approaches
- there is a lack of trust between the individuals concerned
- a professional relationship has not been developed
- a perceived lack of time for supervision

In Spradley's (1979) terms, these are the tacit rules of behaviour with respect to supervision, belonging to teachers and their supervisors in the two schools. It is evident that supervision is a topic supervisors and supervisees find difficulty talking to each other about, though supervisees have definite (and fairly uniform expectations) of supervision. The ideas, beliefs and concerns (perceptions) of supervisors interviewed in the two schools reveal mixed views about supervision and how it should operate. Half of the supervisors state that a positive professional relationship with the supervisee is needed for effective supervision. The data shows, that whilst some supervisors are able to espouse the virtues of collegiality, they have difficulty in establishing collegial relations with teachers.

The data provides support for the views of Smyth (1987), Goldsberry (1983) and others, described in chapter two, who have stated that there is a significant gap between the theory and practice of supervision. The data however, conflicts with the findings of Pajek (1989 p.148) who states, "No serious gap seems to exist ... between those who study and write about
supervision in education and those who actually practice it." The discrepancy between the findings of the two studies may be due to the sources of data. In attempting to identify and verify proficiencies associated with effective supervisory practice, Pajek and his co-researchers sought information from 1629 persons who had been identified as outstanding instructional leaders (supervisors), but sought no data from supervisees.

EMERGENT ISSUES

Interpersonal Relations

The data highlights the significance and complexity of interpersonal relationships in teacher development. The need for individuals to relate to each other in a positive and non-threatening manner is reported by more than 75% of supervisees as necessary to supervision which is perceived as helpful. The findings provide support for research conducted at the University of Georgia (Pajek, 1989) which aimed to determine the dimensions of supervisory practice and criteria for supervisory proficiency. This study reports that: "Supervision in education is a very personal activity. It requires knowledge and skills, to be sure, but the human element is paramount." (p. 146)

Accountability

Accountability does not appear to be an issue with supervisees in the case study schools. Half of the supervisees in School B and several supervisees in School A report that they expect to be accountable and accept it as part of the job. What is at issue is the way supervision is done and methods used in the name of accountability. A "checking up" approach with respect to teaching programs and classroom visits is uniformly considered with derision by those being supervised. The major reasons given are that
these measures are not professionally developmental to teachers and are seen to be threatening.

**Trust**

Trust is extremely important to supervisees. Supervisees in particular and a minority of supervisors report the parties involved in a supervisory relationship must trust each other fully for it to be helpful. Supervisors do not report the same emphasis on the need for trust. It is significant that in Phase three of the study, 100% of supervisees at School A chose "a trust relationship with their supervisor" as one of the five best things to improve supervision at this school. Twenty five percent of supervisees in the study have confided to the researcher that they feel they cannot trust their supervisor. The importance of trust in relationships between supervisors and supervisees is stressed by Stoner et al (1985, p.610-615) in the chapter titled, "Interpersonal and Organisational Communication". These authors also make the comment that managers who want relationships based on trust with their supervisees, must work hard to prevent their rank getting in the way.

**Communication**

The ability to discuss and communicate about supervision is still a problem for some supervisors and supervisees at these schools, as identified by the following comment from a supervisee in School B: "I think it is still very hard for teachers to come out and say how they feel to supervisors. It is still a problem." When asked "What has been the response of supervisees?", the majority of supervisors said they were unsure. Responses from both groups indicate that to some people supervision is still a contentious issue. Several supervisors made the comment that, "teachers are defensive about supervision." The importance and complexity of interpersonal communication in organisational effectiveness is stressed by Stoner et al (1985).
Insecurity of Supervisors

There is data from almost a third of supervisees interviewed indicating that some supervisors feel threatened by supervision. The following comment is typical: "I think the supervisors are more scared of supervision than teachers. They treat it with trepidation." Supervisors, in the main, do not readily admit to this.

Espoused Theories of Supervision vs Theories in Action

This study has collected data from supervisors with respect to their "espoused theories" of supervision and has triangulated that data with supervisees' perceptions of the "theories-in-use". Argyris and Schon (1974 p.7) have referred to espoused theory as the answer a person gives when asked how he/she would behave under given circumstances. These authors also describe theory that actually governs a person's actions as theory-in-use. Though it was not the purpose of this study to examine the perceived effectiveness of individual supervisors, data was collected which revealed the espoused theories of 25% of the supervisors were incompatible with their theories-in-use. As stated by Argyris and Schon, the individuals may or may not have been aware of the incompatibility of their two theories. The data suggests that supervisors who espouse collegiality and human resources supervision, but practice traditional supervision based on "checking up", have poor relationships with their supervisees and are not considered helpful.

Sharing

Data from participants in the two schools reveal a continuum exists for the various meanings attached to the word "sharing". The continuum relates to personal experience and how far the individual has progressed in working with others. The researcher has observed that the three supervisory groups in School B have progressed at different rates, each group developing their own interpretation of what peer supervision and sharing mean. In one group, sharing means "showing the others what you have done." (That is, showing
others work completed individually.) Participants of another supervisory group report "sharing" to mean telling each other about ideas for teaching programs and units of work, planning, developing and cooperating together. (Units of work are developed as a group.) This same group also "shares"; students, responsibility for teaching strands of the Mathematics curriculum, planning joint excursions and they are currently considering sharing responsibility for several curricula. There is a high degree of flexibility reported amongst the teachers in this group and they describe their classrooms as being "open".

**Human Resource Management**

Participants in the research consistently describe a preferred climate and structure for supervision. The data reveals the interpersonal climate and social needs of teachers are paramount if professional development through supervision is to occur. The data support existing theory on human resource management put forward by Sergiovanni and Starrat (1988) and others, which says that supervision needs to be personalised. Sergiovanni and Starrat have stated that supervisors need to show a broader concern for the human condition in schools.

**Praise**

This research has shown that supervisors and supervisees in two schools want to be praised for their work, but perceive they are rarely praised. As one supervisee commented, "There is not enough acknowledgement of what we do and what we do well." The research provides support for the view of Spencer and Nolan (1990), that praise is an imperative component of the administrative process and that the administrator should take the initiative in giving praise. These authors also question the reluctant attitude of Australians towards giving or receiving praise.
Unequal Power

Supervisees in the two case schools consistently report they want to participate in their supervision as equals. The data suggests that supervisors who attempt to control the supervisory relationship through the implied power of their position have difficulty in establishing collegial relations with teachers. Retallick (1990a, 1990b) argues that the hierarchical structure for supervision where supervisors retain more power than supervisees is for the purpose of controlling teachers. In chapter two research by Showers (1985) was cited which showed that cooperative methods of professional development were only compatible with supervision whilst ever the persons involved maintained equal power.

Collegiality/Collaboration

Teachers in this study have said they want to work together for professional development - the word "sharing" is referred to as a strategy for improvement. The data provide support for earlier research by Hood 1976, Paul 1977 and Aoki 1977 (cited in Schools Council 1990 p.94) which shows that teachers rate other teachers highest as sources of useful help and information. The Schools Council (Aust. 1990) recognises the value of teachers helping each other for professional development and states, "We strongly support efforts to formalise and strengthen these 'team' relationships." (p.66)

In the two case study schools participants overwhelmingly state a preference for cooperative practices for supervision. The development of such practices is stressed by specialists in the field as keys to effective supervision. (Goldsberry 1984, Showers 1985, Leiberman 1986 and 1990, Glatthorn 1987, Sergiovanni and Starratt 1988, Raney and Robbins 1989, Allan and Miller 1990)

Data from this study are in agreement with the findings of a state wide evaluation of in-school staff development in NSW government schools (NSW
Department of School Education 1990). One of the major findings outlined in the executive summary to the final report was, that group meetings for sharing ideas and resources was rated as generally effective for staff development by the highest proportion of all respondents.

**Classroom Visits**

One of the most controversial aspects of supervision to emerge from the study was the issue of supervisors visiting classrooms. All of the supervisees spoke very negatively about visits used for the purpose of "checking up" on the teacher where the supervisor sits in the classroom and takes notes on teacher's performance. This was uniformly perceived as threatening and inhibitory to teacher development. Teachers who had experienced classroom visits where the supervisor participated in the lesson and acted as a co-teacher, recommended classroom visits and said they were non-threatening and could be very helpful.

Smyth's (1986b) view of the reflective practitioner suggests watching the teacher teach is essential for improvement of instruction.

**Time for Supervision and Professional Development**

Supervisors and supervisees in these two schools consistently report a lack of time for supervision and professional development. Similar concerns are voiced in a statewide evaluation of in-school staff development conducted by the system ( NSW Department of School Education 1990):

"A major concern of principals and executives, particularly those in small (Class 3) primary schools was the lack of time in which to address staff development issues." (p.3)

The finding that time for professional development is an issue in the two case schools is reflected in earlier research conducted in the Valley Stream Central High School District of New York by Grube et al (1988).
These researchers found, that in attempting to build staff commitment to and implement a long term plan based on collegial practices, teachers needed "time out" from the classroom.

The highly interactive and complex nature of supervision which is highlighted in this study, is mirrored in the interaction of the researcher with the participants in each school culture. The schools were influenced by the presence of the researcher and the findings, and as well, the researcher was influenced by the schools and in particular, the views of the participants.

THE RESEARCHER'S EMERGING PERSPECTIVE

The research has had an immense effect on the researcher. The opportunity to hear and analyse the perspectives on supervision of thirty seven teachers and supervisors allowed me to "see" supervision through multiple lenses. As a result, my beliefs about supervision of teachers, have changed and I am now able to verbalise knowledge which had only been tacit. At the commencement of the research I thought that supervision could be a powerful form of professional development if it could be "harnessed correctly". I wanted to know what were the things that could get it to work. I also had a "gut feeling" that there was something wrong with supervision. These are the intuitive feelings that drove the research. The following diary entry dated 20.11.89, made after the first data collection, reveals a personal uncertainty about supervision:

I am not sure what my beliefs about supervision are and never have been....Teachers should play an active role in their own professional development. Professional development of teachers is necessary for educational improvement. I am pro cooperative methods.
Diary entries from March 27 1990 following the second collection of data reveal the researcher being influenced by the findings, "Negotiation and peer supervision appear to be having the most positive results. Sharing of information between classroom teachers is perceived as the greatest help... supervision doesn't necessarily lead to the professional growth of teachers." A month later I acknowledge the changes in my views with the comment: "I have a changing view of supervision. It is being changed by what people are telling me." (26.4.90)

Late in the second phase of the research, the diary entries reveal the researcher has serious doubts about supervision and the abilities of some supervisors. Researcher's comments included:

Some teachers have a better idea of how to supervise than their supervisors.
Someone should know what teachers think and want from supervision. Teachers want supervision to help and support them. Often it does not.
Is supervision helping teachers or is it merely serving the system? Can it serve both? Supervisors are uncertain about supervision. They are unsure of the job. What teachers want from supervision isn't what they are getting.
Teachers want to be developed and have definite ideas on how they want to be supervised. Some supervisors are not aware of what teachers want....Supervisors can talk about supervision for professional development but many cannot do it. Supervision is threatening to supervisors, more so than to teachers.

By July 1990 in view of what participants had said, I was beginning to question the purpose and motives of supervision. I asked myself," What is the
real supervisory relationships? There are some fundamental issues: is it control of supervisors versus empowerment of teachers? Is lack of training of supervisors the real cause of concern or who is promoted? Or is it the whole concept of supervision and implied superiority?" Despite these doubts, I still remained very loyal to the system which had "trained" me. The following diary excerpt reveals my personal beliefs at this stage of the research:

I believe there is the potential for supervisory relationships to play a positive role in the professional development of teachers, however there are a number of factors which are preventing this happening - some of which are actually inhibiting the professional development of teachers.

There is something inherently wrong with the set-up of supervision. Positive supervision can only happen if both parties are in full agreement as to what, how, when, where and why supervision will occur. The seniority element undermines this - supervisees do not have the same power as supervisors. If disagreement occurs over any one factor it can lead to undermining of the "trust" relationship so very necessary.... How many supervisors really know their supervisees?

Communication is an issue. (30.7.90)

In September 1990 during data Collection 3, I commented: "The literature says that collegiality and collaboration are the 'way to go' for professional development of teachers, but there are several barriers to collegiality and collaboration. Humans do not all interact easily. Some people dislike and distrust each other. Individuals must trust each other before they will share their strategies, professional ideas and feelings. Trust is built up on equal participation in a relationship, being able to have your say in a non-threatening situation. (The research has identified the importance of
building trust). The traditional hierarchical structure of supervision is not conducive to this sort of relationship."

In addition to the research data and review of the literature, the researcher's perspective was also being influenced by exposure to the opinions of academics, researchers and bureaucrats. In November 1990 the researcher participated in a public forum entitled, "Professionalisation of Teaching in the Next Decade" (a project of the United States-Australia Education Policy Project), which was held at the Sheraton Wentworth Hotel in Sydney. The emphasis of this forum was on improving the outcomes of schooling by improving the quality of teaching. Several of the key speakers, (Australian and American) expressed views which paralleled the findings of this research: 1

- "There must be time for collegial exchange. There is a need for recognition from peers and principal- a need to care about people."
  S. Moore Johnston.

- "Teachers are crying out for feedback growth, mentoring. Peer involvement in appraisal and promotion is important. Teachers want to be appreciated." M. Sawatztki (this last point is one of my biases 2.12.90)

- "Teachers have to have a say in their professional development."
  J. McLelland

A major concern of the forum, was that the quality of teaching must be improved. No-one was sure of how to go about this. The views put forward by the presenters and the people from the audience reflected (to the researcher) two different views which are evident in the school reform movement: control teachers more or give teachers more control. Attendance at this forum attuned the researcher to the fact that some education authorities
were looking for something "they could do to teachers" to improve schooling. A view which fitted with the traditional concept of "supervision" but which was in conflict with what teachers in this study were saying about professional development.

Diary entries following analysis of all the data collected, indicate the idiosyncracies of the human side of supervision to be a major issue:

"The missing link is the humanistic side of supervision." (22.11.90)
"There are multiple perspectives and multiple realities. It's [supervision] a contentious issue because it's about control. In School A and School B, some people do not like each other. (27.11.90)

Looking back to the commencement of the research I consider that the views I held then, as a result of 17 years of working for the NSW Department of School Education, were very "system oriented". Comments that I wrote to myself in the research diary at that stage, indicated that I thought that supervision could work, could professionally develop teachers, if only it could be found what was wrong and fix it up. I see now that supervision of teachers for professional development can be viewed in two different ways: firstly there is the view whereby professional development is considered a form of "training" and the supervisor is perceived as the "trainer"; in contrast is a view of the teacher as professional in control of his/her own development, consulting with other professionals and making decisions which will determine his/her own professional growth. Within this second view, the terms "supervisor" and "supervision" might even be considered redundant.

Professional development is not something other people do to you. A supervisor/advisor can play an important role in encouraging, supporting and praising the individual towards improving performance, and in providing
appropriate conditions, but the responsibility for a "personal best" ultimately remains with the individual.

*When we talk about education we're talking about the future of our country - the teacher plays an important role in that. The owner of the future will be the person who is the owner of his or her own human resources, and human resources are the product of high quality in education.* Jaime Escalante (1989)

Jaime Escalante is referring to the role of the teacher in the relationship between teacher and student, but his words are also relevant to the relationship between teacher and supervisor/s. 2

**IN CONCLUSION**

The data from this research show that supervision, particularly its role in professional development of teachers, is a complex and highly interactive process. Teachers and their supervisors in the two case study schools have highlighted the importance of interpersonal relations in teacher development and the need to recognise the social aspects of teacher growth and learning. The importance of "trust" has emerged as a key factor in supervision which is perceived as helpful and developmental.

This study, conducted in two primary schools over a 12 month period, reveals that what teachers want most from supervision is support. Experienced teachers in these two schools have said they want and expect supervision to enhance their professional development. As a group they say they want "...to get something out of it".

The research has identified barriers to supervision for professional development in the two schools as poor communication, lack of trust, negative
teacher attitudes, use of a checking up approach by supervisors and where the supervisor maintains the power in the supervisory relationship.

The system's view of and assumptions about supervision as a part of human resource management may need to change in light of the views of teachers presented in this research. The study reveals that it cannot be assumed that supervision leads to professional development of teachers or that supervisors and supervisees think alike about supervision.

Teachers in the two case schools however, uniformly describe the conditions necessary for "supervision" perceived as developmental. These "conditions" or "factors" fit a model for professional development of teachers that is in direct conflict with the traditional or bureaucratic model of supervision. Indeed teachers in these two schools describe a model for "supervision" which is in harmony with the strategies recommended by theorists advocating human resources supervision and professionalisation of teaching. (Sergiovanni and Starrat 1988, Darling Hammond 1989, Wise 1990) Teachers in these two schools report they want to work together in professional relationships based on trust and equality, for the purpose of professional development. The term "supervision" remains in use by all participants, despite it's perceived lack of fit to collegial models for professional development. This may be due to its long history. (I have deliberately avoided entering the argument about a name-change for supervision. A great deal of teacher cynicism surrounds the NSW education system's habit of grasping for a name-change whenever there is a change in policy, without changing the practice.)

The fundamental finding emerging from this study is that many good things concerning professional development of teachers are happening in these two schools despite the problems of the system and the inhibitory effect of the hierarchical structure. Experienced teachers and some of their supervisors in these two schools, have intuitively worked out how they can
develop each other. They have said that supervision works (that is, it can help teachers) if it is people-centred, a sharing process and based on trust. The data has shown that there is validity in what teachers know. To ignore this, is to ignore real strength of teachers as professionals.

Notes
1. Public Forum "Professionalisation of Teaching in the Next Decade" Australian American Foundation 1.11.90 Speakers quoted: Ms Susan Moore Johnston, Assoc. Prof. Education, Harvard University; Max Sawatzki, Deputy secretary, Education Division, ACT Ministry of Health, Education and the Arts; Ms Jan McClelland Assistant Director General, Human Resources NSW Department of School Education

CHAPTER 6
IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

THE NEW SOUTH WALES CONTEXT

In the context of public schooling in NSW, the future directions and planning for human resource management outlined in "Schools Renewal" (1988) and detailed in "School Centred Education" (March 1990) and "Teacher Education: Directions and Strategies" (September 1990), indicate a much larger role for supervisors in the professional development of teachers. Devolution of professional development to schools is the key factor in the proposed changes to commence 1991. The documents raise many significant questions, for example; "Who will be responsible for professional development in schools?" "Are current school executives up to the task?" "What about the conflict between time to teach and time for development, which is highlighted in this research?"

Government schools in NSW in 1991 are being funded directly for professional development on a per capita basis. It is now the responsibility of schools to organise and pay for their own professional development. This research has shown that school executives in two schools are unsure about professional development of teachers and that half of the teachers in both schools perceive they are not being developed by their current supervision. It is highly questionable, that further increasing the responsibility of school executives with respect to professional development of teachers, will necessarily improve teachers. By placing the responsibility for professional development of teachers at the school level, there is an opportunity for teachers to be further involved in their own development, as teachers in the two case schools indicate they so clearly desire. However, if schools follow the traditional hierarchical patterns which have long been established and
school executives decide how and what professional development is needed for teachers, and assume responsibility for "supervision" of professional development of teachers, then the problems identified in this study will be perpetuated.

QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

At present "supervisors" in NSW government schools are currently persons occupying promotions positions. These people were promoted because they were considered good classroom teachers, and not because they were good "staff developers". "Who should supervise?" is a question worth asking? The research has shown that in two schools supervisors are having some difficulties with regard to professional development of teachers. Perhaps decisions about professional development need to be made by teachers, through an elected team or committee.

The research has demonstrated the importance of interpersonal relations in supervision for professional development; specifically the need for trust between the parties involved. This raises the question; "Should teachers be allowed to choose their supervisor?"

The results of this research question the appropriateness of the "traditional hierarchical" model of supervision in NSW schools in the 1990s. In terms of professional development of experienced teachers, it may be that the term "supervision" is becoming or has become outmoded. Future research should investigate alternative structures for professional development in harmony with the needs of experienced teachers, as described in this study. Respondents have stated that the word "supervision" has negative overtones and implies superiority of the supervisor. Structures, (possibly lateral), which allow and encourage peer supervision, team teaching and non-threatening relationships based on participation as equals, need further investigation.
If the NSW public education system is sincere about professionally developing teachers, then this research suggests that it is time to listen to what experienced teachers say they need. The data has shown that experienced teachers in two schools want professional development and they want a say in it in how it is structured. A significant number of these teachers want to work with other teachers in a non-threatening arrangement based on equal power and status. The teachers in this study have said they want to help each other, but they need time out and support from the school executive to do it!

A FINAL COMMENT FROM THE RESEARCHER

In completing this report I hope that I have presented a very human account of supervision. I have tried to tell the stories of supervision - the lived experiences of the people in two schools. These teachers allowed me to be their voice. I hope, as they do, that the system in which we work is listening.
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APPENDIX 1

"AN EVALUATION OF THE 'PRIMARY EXECUTIVE TEACHERS' PROGRAM' ON SUPERVISION PHASE 1 AS IMPLEMENTED IN THE SOUTH COAST REGION DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, 1987 AND 1988."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rationale
The purpose of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of the 'Primary Executive Teachers' Program' on supervision Phase 1, implemented in the South Coast Region Department of Education 1987 and 1988. For the purposes of this evaluation "effectiveness" of the Primary Executive Teachers' Program is measured in terms of -

* The participants' perceptions as to whether program objectives were achieved
* The degree to which participants have been able to implement the program
* The degree to which the program has been implemented across the school

It is anticipated that this evaluation, by adopting a case study approach with participants from a small sample of schools, will yield valuable in depth information.

Background
Recent models of supervision stress the need to create a non-threatening environment and for the supervisor to play a different role, acting more as resource to the teacher offering advice and support. The Primary Teachers' Executive Program (hence PETP) implemented in the South Coast Region in 1987 and 1988 presents a 'Negotiated Model of Supervision', where the teacher negotiates a plan for his/her supervision with the supervisor/s.

Research Questions
The purpose of this evaluation is to establish whether the PETP course has been effective in influencing the participants' thinking with respect to 'negotiated supervision', whether it has encouraged/enabled participants' to personally implement negotiated supervision and whether negotiated supervision is being implemented across the school as a result of the participants attending the PETP course. The following research questions were designed with this purpose in mind;
* Has the course made a positive contribution to supervisory procedures?
* Does course content transfer readily into the school situation?
* A change in participants' thinking with respect to supervision?
* Have participants implemented changes in supervisory practices?
* What factors, enhanced/inhibited individual implementation?
* Have changes in supervisory practices been implemented in the school?
* What factors, promoted/ inhibited across school implementation?
* What is the response of supervisees to negotiated supervision?
* What are the recommendations of participants?

Methodology

Interviews were conducted with 13 participants of the PETP in seven Case Study schools which were selected randomly from a stratified sample. Interviews were also conducted with 21 teachers (supervisees) supervised by the 13 course participants. Background information about the course was also obtained from informal interviews with course organisers.

Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis was conducted by constructing a complete transcript for each interview from tape recordings. Common themes in the data were identified and categories created for organising the data. A Draft Report was then compiled for each interviewee (participants and supervisees) by listing their summarised responses under each category. Unanticipated data was grouped under the headings of 'Beliefs' and 'Concerns' about supervision. The Draft Reports were returned by mail to the interviewees with a request for verification and comment.

Combining the data of participants and supervisees in the same school enabled a report on each school to be written and by combining the data from the seven schools an overview report obtained.

Findings

1. All 13 participants felt that the course had made a positive contribution to supervisory procedures.
2. Eight of the 13 participants were positive about the transferability of course content. Two said they had trouble putting it into practice.
3. Two thirds of the participants said that the course had changed their thinking on supervision. The remainder said they already had these ideas.
4. The 12 participants in supervisory positions said they had changed their supervisory practices as a result of the course, particularly with respect to negotiation, planning and increased classroom visits. The data from supervisees however reveals that at least four of the participants are not negotiating satisfactorily with some of their supervisees.

5. Support from the principal and the executive were the most common factors mentioned as enhancing personal implementation.

6. Lack of time to supervise and negative teacher attitudes were the most common factors said to inhibit personal implementation.

7. Only three of the seven Case Study schools have developed a school policy document on supervision as part of a School Development Plan. (two of these claim to have updated existing policies as a result of the course)

8. Factors promoting across school implementation included, principal and executive support, the whole executive attending the PETP course, and the expectations of staff to be professionally developed.

9. Factors inhibiting across school implementation were stated as lack of time and some negative teacher attitudes.

10. All participants perceived that generally supervisees respond positively to negotiated supervision. It was made clear however that there are some teachers who do not like to be supervised in any fashion. Fourteen of the twenty one supervisees interviewed gave very favourable reports on their supervision and said that it was negotiated. Two more said their supervision was negotiated and that it was 'fair enough so far'. (As these persons had only had 10 weeks of supervision with the participant this was the most that could be expected.) Four supervisees were not happy with their supervision, two because they felt it was not being negotiated and two because they felt they didn't understand it and wanted it explained properly. One supervisee thought supervision was a nuisance.

11. Participants made numerous recommendations for improvements to the PETP. The most common included; a desire for follow-up (involving completion of a task set at the course), requests for more time on discussion and planning at the course, the whole executive needs to attend together, principals should attend even if only for a discussion session with their executive, more work on conflict resolution and negotiation, relax the high pressure timetable, try to cater for the needs of small schools.

In summary, it was found that the PETP achieved its objectives in terms of influencing participants' thinking and supervisory practices with respect to 'negotiated supervision'. Supervisees comments revealed that the majority were supervised
in a negotiated manner and preferred this model. Typically—"It works very well. It is the best and fairest model I have worked under."

However 25% of supervisees revealed their supervisors (course participants) were not negotiating satisfactorily.

With respect to the implementation of course ideas across the school, it was found that only three of the seven schools studied had progressed as far as a School Policy Document on Supervision. It appears that schools and executives need more support in this area.
APPENDIX 2

RESEARCH AGREEMENT

A. RATIONALE

The purpose of the research is to look at supervision in the context of whole school change.

B. RESEARCH GOALS

To determine what is happening in two Case Study schools with respect to supervision over a 12 month period.
To describe any changes in supervisory practices.
To determine factors which have been influential in either school with respect to supervisory practices/philosophy.

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

* What priority does supervision have in the context of whole school planning?

* Where/how does supervision 'fit in'?

* Have there been changes in supervisory practices implemented in the school as a whole in recent times?

* What factors
  a. promoted implementation
  b. inhibited implementation

* What has been the effect of Regional Professional Development Programs

* Where negotiated supervision has been implemented, what has been the response of those being supervised?

* What are the beliefs/concerns of personnel with regard to supervision?

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL

The research presents an opportunity for the school to objectively obtain useful information of a highly confidential nature that would not normally be available. It is anticipated that the research will present an in-depth view of supervisory practices and attitudes to supervision within the school.
E. RESEARCHER’S EXPECTATIONS

a. Interviews
* In order to conduct research which is valid it is desirable that the majority of staff will be available for interviews on two occasions during 1990.(late Term 1, Early Term 3, dates to be negotiated)
* Interviews will be approximately 20 minutes duration

b. Meetings
* The researcher would appreciate being invited to meetings concerning whole school policy changes with respect to supervision(exec. meetings, general staff meetings, committees)
  Plan - to collect data on 3 occasions over 12 months 1989-1990

   c. Documentation
   * The researcher would appreciate copies of school policies or documents relevant to the topic of research.

d. Response to draft reports
* It is expected that participants will verify data and respond to findings of the researcher.

F. RESEARCHER’S RESPONSIBILITY TO SCHOOL

* provide feedback to school during course of research; verbal and written
* provide access to findings
* provide copy of final report to the school
* be available as a resource to the school if required
* ensure confidentiality of all participants

RESEARCHER’S AGREEMENT

I agree to abide by the terms of this agreement and fulfil my responsibilities to the best of my ability.
# APPENDIX 3

## PARTICIPANTS' TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>0-10 YRS</th>
<th>10-15YRS</th>
<th>15-20YRS</th>
<th>20+YRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4 - PARTICIPANT RECORD

* interviewed - not interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th>Data 1.</th>
<th>Data 2.</th>
<th>Data 3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

DATA COLLECTION 1 NOVEMBER 1989

Interview Schedule: Supervisees

Q1. How would you describe the way in which you are currently supervised?

Q2. Is there a plan for your supervision? If yes, how was this arrived at?

Q3. Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision?

Q4. With respect to this school, what priority does supervision have in the context of whole school planning? Where does it fit in?

Q5. Have there been changes in supervisory practices implemented in the school as a whole in recent times?

Q6a What factors have promoted changes in supervisory practices?

Q6b. What factors have inhibited changes in supervisory practices?

Q7. What are the good things about teaching at this school?

Q8. Looking to 1990 what things do you think the school could improve upon?

Q9. What are your views on supervision?

Q10. Is there anything you would like to add on supervision?
APPENDIX 6
DATA COLLECTION 1 NOVEMBER 1989

Interview Schedule: Supervisors

Q1. Describe the way in which you have supervised teachers for 1989?

Q2. What has been the response of those being supervised?

Q3. Has there been a change in your thinking and practices with respect to supervision in recent times?

Q4a. What factors promoted recent changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?

Q4b. What factors inhibited changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?

Q5. With respect to this school what priority does supervision have in the context of whole school planning? Where does it fit in?

Q6. Have there been changes in supervisory practices implemented in the school as a whole in recent times?

Q7a. What factors promoted implementation of changes across school?

Q7b. What factors inhibited implementation of changes across school?

Q8. What are the good things about teaching at this school?

Q9. Looking to 1990, what things do you think the school could improve upon?

Q10. What are your views on supervision?

Q11. Is there anything you would like to add on supervision?
APPENDIX 7

DATA COLLECTION 2. MARCH 1990

Interview Schedule Supervisees

Q1. How do you feel about the feedback that has been provided by the research so far?

Q2. With respect to supervision what has happened in the school so far this year?

Q3. What do you consider to be the influential factors, either promoting or inhibiting change?

Q4. What is your perception of the priority of supervision in the school?

Q5. Could you describe the way in which you are supervised this year?

Q6. Is there a plan for your supervision? If yes, how was this arrived at?

Q7. Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision?

Q8. What do you consider ideal supervision to be? or If you were a supervisor how would you supervise?

Q9. Do you expect a supervisor to be an excellent classroom teacher?

Q10. What are your views on supervision?

Q11. Is there anything you would like to add on supervision?
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DATA COLLECTION 2. MARCH 1990

Interview Schedule: Supervisors

SCHOOL ID. PARTICIPANT ID.
SUPERVISEES

Q1. How do you feel about the feedback that has been provided by the research so far?

Q2. With respect to supervision what has happened in the school so far this year?

Q3. What do you consider to be the influential factors, either promoting or inhibiting change?

Q4. What is your perception of the priority of supervision in the school?

Q5. Describe the the way in which you have supervised teachers this year?

Q6. Is there a plan for your supervision? If yes, how was this arrived at?

Q7. What has been the response of those being supervised?

Q8. What factors have influenced your thinking and practices with respect to supervision in recent times?

Q9. Do you expect a supervisor to be an excellent classroom teacher?

Q10. What do you consider ideal supervision to be?

Q11. What are your views on supervision?

Q12. Is there anything you would like to add on supervision?
APPENDIX 9

DATA COLLECTION 3. SEPTEMBER 1990

Interview Schedule: Supervisees

Q1. Please describe the way in which you have been supervised this year?

Q2. To what extent has this experience contributed to your professional growth as a teacher?

Q3. Please describe any changes in supervision which have occurred at the school level in the last 12 months.

Q4. What do you consider to have been the influential factors, either promoting or inhibiting change?

Q6. Is there anything you would like to add, on the topic of supervision?
Appendix 10

Data Collection 3. September 1990

Interview Schedule: Supervisors

Q1. Please describe the way in which you have supervised this year?

Q2. To what extent has this experience contributed to the professional growth of the teachers involved?

Q3. Please describe any changes in supervision which have occurred at the school level in the last 12 months.

Q4. What do you consider to have been the influential factors, either promoting or inhibiting change?

Q6. Is there anything you would like to add, on the topic of supervision?
APPENDIX 11

QUESTIONNAIRE: PHASE 3
Supervisees with reference to the following statements,

**please indicate with a tick**
the five best things to improve supervision in this school

**please indicate with a cross**
the five least desirable things with respect to supervision

- the supervisor teaches in the classroom with you
- supervisor sits and watches you teach
- more discussion about supervision
- documentation of the supervision process and goals
- a trust relationship with the supervisor
- the supervisor makes the plans and the decisions
- having your efforts praised
- a strategy for encouraging teachers to share
- checking of programs
- allowing supervision by peers
- the supervisors to play a more supportive role
- the supervisors to play a less supportive role
- the executive decide how supervision should be done
- being supervised by a more senior member of staff
- a 'them and us' philosophy between executive and classroom teachers

If you feel a relevant category is missing, please add it and indicate your feelings, positive or negative as described above.
Supervisors with reference to the following statements,

**please indicate with a tick**
the five best things to improve supervision in this school

**please indicate with a cross**
the five least desirable things with respect to supervision

you teach in the classroom with the supervisee
you sit and watch the supervisee teach
more discussion about supervision
documentation of the supervision process and goals
a trust relationship with the supervisee
the supervisor makes the plans and the decisions
having your efforts praised
a strategy for encouraging teachers to share
checking of programs
allowing supervision by peers
the supervisors to play a more supportive role
the supervisors to play a less supportive role
the executive decide how supervision should be done
being supervised by a more senior member of staff
a 'them and us' philosophy between executive and classroom teachers

If you feel a relevant category is missing, please add it and indicate your feelings, positive or negative as described above.
APPENDIX 12
SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT (Supervisee School B: Phase 2)

A1. Quite satisfactory. It struck me that most people were wiling to improve their performance. I thought some supervisors sounded uncomfortable with their role as supervisors. I think feedback is constructive.

A2. The school has been divided up into three divisions with three supervisors primarily responsible. Has led to less Primary staff meetings. Now junior, middle and senior school are fitting in structured grade meetings - a whole group approach. We tended to miss out on grade meetings in the past because other things kept cropping up. There is an emphasis on programming.

A3. Anxiety inhibits things. There has to be a comfortable feeling about the situation. Executive in-service has helped to promote change. There has been a push from the executive this year- I get the impression most of us are responding. We will have to watch the number of areas we are making changes in.

A4. This term the priority has been with programming.

A5. Everybody has been asked for their programs twice this term. So far there hasn't been a great deal of time to sit down and plan. We seem to be trying to do a lot at the moment. We have had more division meetings involving small groups, which I think people have enjoyed more. They have been very satisfactory. There appears to be a stronger move toward programs and support for programs. A format for program documentation has been provided. I am attempting to try to use this format.

A6. I have set three goals for myself. There's an ad hoc sort of thing going on as well with being computer coordinator. There was some confusion over my role.

A7. I would like time to sit down and look at where we are going. One meeting would have been constructive. There has been a deluge of in-service in our own time. I have a concern for other staff who are finding it all a bit awesome.

A8. I like supervisors to be able to suggest resources, provide back-up- not breathe down my neck. I think some modelling doesn't go astray. It's nice to know there is somebody there who will look positively at your work, not criticise.
A10. I think supervision is desirable as long as it is structured in a positive way, with a view to developing staff. Having supervisors who are approachable is important. One should be supervised with a view to upgrading skills rather than judgement is important.

A11. I would not like to see a return to the TER, it is not constructive. IT bothers me that if we take on too much we will be unable to manage the basics.
APPENDIX 13

DATA VERIFICATION

Dear 

as part of my MEd Hons. research I am forwarding a draft of my observations following your interview a few weeks ago. I would appreciate it if you would read the draft of findings and indicate if the data is correct. Is there any information you want deleted before I make a final report? My apologies for the questions being on a separate page, as the responses are all on a data base for ease of combining them to make a school report.

Please place your reply (seal by stapling together), in the large brown envelope addressed to myself in admin. office School A by Wed 15th Nov. 3pm. Thank you again for participating in the research.

Yours faithfully,
APPENDIX 14

REPORT 1 SCHOOL B

Interview Questions: Supervisees Only
Q1. How would you describe the way in which you are currently supervised?
Q2. Is there a plan for your supervision? If yes, how was this arrived at?
Q3. Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision?

Interview Questions: Supervisors Only
Q1. Describe the way in which you have supervised teachers for 1989?
Q2. What has been the response of those being supervised?
Q3. Has there been a change in your thinking and practices with respect to supervision in recent times?
Q4a. What factors promoted recent changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?
Q4b. What factors inhibited changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?

Interview questions Common to Supervisors and Supervisees
Q5. With respect to this school, what priority does supervision have in the context of whole school planning? Where does it fit in?
Q6. Have there been changes in supervisory practices implemented in the school as a whole in recent times?
Q7a. What factors have promoted changes in supervisory practices?
Q7b. What factors have inhibited changes in supervisory practices?
Q8. What are the good things about teaching at this school?
Q9. Looking to 1990 what things do you think the school could improve upon?
Q10. What are your views on supervision?

RESPONSES: SUPERVISORS
Q3. Has there been a change in your thinking and practices with respect to supervision in recent times?
No I don't think so, maybe extended. Not really.
Yes my previous experience as a supervisor used a more clerical approach

Q4a. What factors promoted recent changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?
As a result of being a supervisor. Principal support
Principals and other executives in other schools.
Primary Executives course (two supervisors made this comment)

Q4b. What factors inhibited changes in your thinking and supervisory practices?
Time - for meetings -(two supervisors made this comment)
Principals and other executives in other schools.
Attitudes of some members of staff - that they need no advice
RESPONSES: SUPERVISORS & SUPERVISEES TO SAME/SIMILAR QUESTIONS.

Q1. Describe the way in which you have supervised teachers for 1989? (Supervisors)
After executives course I began implementing approaches towards developing a friendly relationship,
Very little - Hoping to implement peer supervision this year- hasn't worked so far, - it has taken time - we are just starting to get together and plan.
Mainly through meetings and discussions. I do classroom visits in a positive self esteem sense

Q1. How would you describe the way in which you are currently supervised? (Supervisees)
I'm very happy with it. Very professional. Mainly informal this year, just talking to each other -non threatening (two supervisees made this comment)
In team teaching situation with peer, we are able to supervise ourselves -Open classroom no problems with X coming in (two similar comments made)
Fairly low key. I like it that way. Less emphasis on rigid programming, more on discussions of what you are doing in the room. No class visits, not especially keen to have them. I feel confident, don't feel I need feedback.
Old fashioned,X is finding it difficult to handle new approach. I think X feels threatened and uncomfortable supervising me. I don't mind people in the classroom but I object to the checking up approach.
Fairly haphazard, not particularly constructive, no comments, only collection of program - no feedback X doesn't see what is happening in the classroom.
Left to my own devices. It was a term before I found out who my supervisor was. X has not asked to see programs - has left me to it- no class visits
Peer support structure not as successful as it should be, personalities do come into it. I like the setup, it's got a lot of potential. I see my peer as the one to help me.
No professional dev. with X, only informally with peer, share programming.

Q2. What has been the response of those being supervised? (Supervisors)
No negative response.
I think they are happy I've done so little.
Mixed reactions.
Q2. Is there a plan for your supervision? If yes, how was this arrived at? (Supervisees)
Beginning of year we had a plan and some goals-has eased in second half of year. Directives for goal setting came from principal via X. (five supervisees made similar comments)
No formalised plan with X or peer we work it out as we go.
I gave X a couple of goals at the beginning of year. Personal goals are something you hold within yourself, you shouldn't have to share them with someone.
No plans, have set down goals - done nothing conscious towards achieving them.

Q3. Are there any changes you would like to make to your supervision? (Supervisees)
Not really. I like the idea of talking together - could be more professional. I think X feels unable to help us.
Not really. I am being helped.
More on program formatting
More open, more sharing sessions, swapping ideas, giving each other support - can be informal. I don't like the program taken away, would like to look at it together.
More input from supervisor, more help, suggestions as to other ways of doing things. Some in depth planning of my teaching program. Perhaps classroom visits would be helpful. I'd like some feedback as to whether I am doing what is expected. I'd like to see the peer support method tried again, with goals for the whole year. "
The team teaching is fine.

Q5. With respect to this school what priority does supervision have in the context of whole school planning? Where does it fit in? (Supervisors)
Not large because many experienced teachers on this staff.
Definitely growing in it's importance. We are going to spend more time next year implementing peer support system more thoroughly.
Staff development as part of Supervision is a high priority.
Checking up on teacher's programs and children's books is a low priority.
It ought to have much higher priority.

(Supervisees)
Not particularly, beginning of year we set goals but tended to slip as the year grew on. It is an important issue, but it isn't discussed often at meetings.
Probably not as important as in other schools which have a lot of problems. Not as much need for it here- all competent and dedicated teachers.
It is left to the individual teacher to do their own professional development. There should be more help. It's very laissez faire. I am not familiar with what is going on with other people. Not a lot has been said about supervision in the time I have been here. A big part - teacher development, teacher accountability is very important.

Been a lot of talk about it this year, no negativeness. I think it is rated fairly importantly. Everyone came back enthusiastic from the course.

Fairly high priority - a lot of emphasis on staff development. Very important. Last three years have progressively placed more importance on supervision as a whole school- since the new principal arrived.

Q6. Have there been changes in supervisory practices implemented in the school as a whole in recent times? (Supervisors)
Yes. The peer support scheme.
It is more flexible
1989 introduced Supervision Peer-amid.-two teachers support each other, still haven't capitalised on that structure. A structural change not a change in practice."
(Supervisees)
Principal is responsible for making it more low-key. There is more support. People are more relaxed and view supervision in a different light. Supervision more 2 way, more planning.(three similar comments made)
Dramatic changes in supervision style - more negotiation -less emphasis on program checking- more concern with what goes into programs - are you really using the material in the program ?

Yes big changes. Most of the staff have been to the supervision course we ended up trialling the peer support model. (two supervisees made this comment)
I don't like to ask people how they are supervised- it's like breaking confidences."
Not sure how much sharing is going on in other grades. No feedback as to what is going on. (two supervisees made this comment)

Q7a. What factors promoted implementation of changes across school? (Supervisors)
The growing awareness in educational circles of the need to look at supervision
Big changes on the executive, The Primary Executives course would have had some effect but mainly on those already thinking along those lines. Two teams successfully implemented peer supervision - we need to extend this.
A feeling in the meetings held after the PETP course "that we can help each other"
(Supervisees)
Change of principal the biggest factor- (four supervisees made this comment) has tried to foster casual sharing of ideas
Executives course had a big impact, promoted knowledge - we came back enthused. (three supervisees made this comment)
Attitudes of teachers - a lot of us didn't like the way supervision was going - in particular getting your program back with spelling corrected.
Willingness of supervisors to embrace new ideas-
A much better feeling about supervision - the staff are interested in change.
Change implemented because it arose out of staff voluntarily attending staff meetings, participating in discussions, weighing it all up and jointly deciding."

Q7b. What factors inhibited implementation of changes across school? (Supervisors)

Time and planning. The sheer pressure of things that we are involved in.
Some people on the staff. Time is a barrier. If we are serious, we'll make time
Some teachers feel that they don't need supervision. We have done quite a bit of talking about supervision, but planning for supervision is lacking from top down. You have got to have a planned approach.
(Supervisees)
Workload of primary teachers - we are run off our feet from beginning of day to end. It has a great effect on morale and our efficiency. (two similar comments)
Resistance to change by teachers. (two supervisees made this comment)
No-one is too sceptical here. Having all had an input we were more open to ideas and change. (two similar comments made)
Supervisors who are unsure about how to go about change.
Years of previous principals stressing checking on aspects of supervision.
I don't really know.

Q8. What are the good things about teaching at this school? (Supervisors)
Wonderful kids, an active involved staff - a friendly atmosphere,
(all supervisors made similar comments)
(Supervisees)
The children, the surroundings, the boss, the other teachers are very cooperative and helpful - parents supportive, resources OK
(all supervisees made similar comments)
Always lots of enthusiasm from the top. If you want to try something, it is encouraged. The principal encourages your positives. (two similar comments made) I like the committee structure.
Lot of money coming into the school - parents well educated

Q9. Looking to 1990, what things do you think the school could improve upon? (Supervisors)
More implementation of the ideas on supervision we have been discussing. (two supervisors made this comment)
A less hectic pace- not involved in so many outside things-disruptive
Cut down the barriers between some members of staff - improve staff relations.
Breaking down resistance to change. Classroom practice in some cases is not innovative."
(Supervisees)
Sometimes too many extra curricular activities. could be fewer interruptions to normal classroom work. (three similar comments made)
More resources especially for Maths.
Supervisors employing more of the ideas of the PETP course.
cooperative planning.
Buildings need maintenance - make kids environmentally aware- plant more trees
Communication - a clerical assistant for the library
Nothing that I am willing to voice.

Q10. What are your views on supervision? (Supervisors)
I see supervision as a way of helping all of us. Classroom visits should be more informal basis, not sitting in lessons taking notes. like the peer support system, a more professional approach.
Unfortunately most people see supervision as checking up. It goes beyond that- it takes time and a willingness for people to sit down and negotiate, plan together. it means making us all more effective in our job. (two supervisors made this comment)
Not working at the whole school level. Supervision is very important. You can get positive feedback from it, we tend to resist it. People with open classrooms are those moving into practices consistent with curriculum.
I believe you have to develop a relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee. I have always believed that that is the basis of success.
Checking programs is not the way to supervise. (all supervisors made this comment)
Collecting programs for clerical checking a pointless exercise. Supervisor needs to be involved in discussions with teacher at dev. of program,during, teaching and follow-up evaluation.
(Supervisees)
I welcome it. I like to be accountable. I like to be told you are going the right way. I'd like more professional dev. I might be better supervised by a fellow teacher
Should be supportive role- encouraged to experiment. A friendly kind of give and take,shouldn't feel threatened in any way. Can be problems when personalities clash. A negative experience with supervision stays in your mind.
I want supervision to support me to not threaten me, to push me a little. To cooperate and work together. To show that I am valued, that my opinions matter. Teachers cannot operate successfully as an island. We have to make an effort 
It should be a really supportive thing with a view that everyone's got something to offer. We should try to learn from each other.
I like to be supervised. There should be supervision. You need to have someone who can help you work out how you can develop. It is a supervisor's responsibility to try to help the teacher develop, even if the need is not perceived.
If supervisor open no problems. A good supervisor is willing to work with you, set goals, oversee what you are doing in a non-threatening manner, will see your class in action- get involved, not sit and watch- a person with patience.
Supervision should be -low key, relaxed, not threatening, exchange and share ideas, share responsibility. Supervisors who consider themselves superior to the classroom teacher are a problem.
Team teaching a great experience. It can't work without support of the supervisors.
We should work step by step through a set of goals, communicating well, working together - can solve problems together.
Someone you can talk to easily. Does not correct spelling mistakes in your program. A role model- treats you as a professional, provided you are a professional-must meet them halfway. You have to be accountable.
A supervisor should teach with you.
It is a problem we are getting different definitions of supervision. It used to be just checking up, now there's checking up and staff development, where checking up and growth are
really the same thing. Accountability and professional development are not separate things.

CONCERNS SUPERVISORS

Executive need to develop a view of supervision that is appropriate to the needs of the people they supervise - they need skills to identify and respond to these needs. Another executive, inexperience is the greatest factor. People don't think the executive need praise.
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FINAL MEMBER CHECK

To all participants,

please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statement.

* The report presented by the researcher has been a reasonable account of this school.

strongly agree
agree
disagree
strongly disagree
do not know

Thank you again for your participation in the research.

Kathie Webb
APPENDIX 16

DIARY CATEGORIES

SCHOOL A              SCHOOL B

DATA 1
10/89
checking programs  checking programs
interpersonal relations. interpersonal relations.
classroom visits   classroom visits
trust             trust
supervision/promotion  team teaching
confidence         praise
supervisor insecurity documentation of goals
poor communication  influence of principal

RFF, Resource T., Librarian

DATA 2
03/90
them and us
time
influence of principal
curriculum change
documentation
inconsistency of supervision.
attitudes to staff dev.
new teachers views
poor communication
inf. political changes

them and us
peer supervision
programming concerns
school climate
school climate
time
time
executive role
choice of supervisor
praise
sharing
improved communication
attitudes to goal setting
willingness to supervise
lack of training of executive
trust & communication
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List of Total Categories 9.7.90

checking up
them and us
trust
insecurity of supervisors
climate
peer supervision
sharing
praise
attitudes to goal setting
documentation
communication problems
belief statements
concerns
influence of principal
classroom visits
influence of inservice
influence of political factors
accountability
supervision and promotion
attitudes to supervisor
perceptions of what is happening in the school
new teachers views
communication problems; infants to primary
programs
concerns re new curriculum
improved communication 1990
dissatisfaction with supervision
negative past experiences
relationships
time
role of supervisor
choice of supervisor
expectations of supervisors
willingness to supervise
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TOTAL CATEGORIES 7/90

PINBOARD ANALYSIS

accountability
attitudes to supervisor
attitudes to goal setting
belief statements
communication problems
classroom visits
curriculum concerns
choice of supervisor
documentation
dissatisfaction with supervision
expectations of supervisors
insecurity of supervisors
improved communication 1990
inservice
negative past experiences
new teachers views
principal
peer supervision
program concerns
praise
relationships
role of supervisor
sharing
inf. of political factors
supervision and promotion
perceptions of the school
time
them and us
willingness to supervise
peer supervision

TOTAL CATEGORIES 8/90

COMPUTER ANALYSIS

accountability
beliefs
changes thinking/practices
expectations of supervisors
class visits
climate
communication
concerns
documentation
executive
expectations
factors +positive
factors negative
feedback
how supervised
insecurity supervisors
inservice
peer supervision
praise
principal
priority of supervision
response to supervision
school changes
sharing
support
them and us
trust
APPENDIX 19
6 MAJOR CATEGORIES 22/10/90

BELIEFS ABOUT SUPERVISION accountability

CONCERNS ABOUT SUPERVISION

HOW SUPERVISED

+positive

negative

a plan for supervision?

response to supervision

+positive FACTORS AFFECTING SUPERVISION

executive

inservice

peer supervision

principal

sharing

trust

class visits/team teaching

negative FACTORS AFFECTING SUPERVISION

no praise

negative attitudes

checking

insecurity of supervisors

lack of trust

class visits/writing notes

documentation

SUPervision at whole SCHOOL LEVEL

changes perceived

priority of supervision

climate

improvements needed
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EVENTS IN THE COURSE OF THE RESEARCH

8.8.89  Meeting with Cowling Cloak and Booth
7/8.9.89 Principals' Symposium Ranelagh House
11.9.89  Phone call to Deputy Principal School A
21.9.89  Executive Meeting School A - present Executive Summary
3.10.89  Initial permission (by phone) to commence research from Regional office
9.10.89  Address School A general staff meeting - gain entre to school
10.10.89 First set of questions developed The researcher trying to get a handle on what sort of supervision has been current at the school for 1989, is supervisory change occurring, if so what are the major factors promoting and inhibiting change, questions giving a view of school climate
"What are the good things about teaching at this school?"
"Looking to 1990, what thing do you think the school could improve upon". Also open-ended questions trying to get at the beliefs and values about supervision. "What are your views on supervision?"
13.10.89 letter from regional office re initial approval to commence research
18.10.89 Data Collection 1 School A- 15 interviews (5 supervisors inc. principal, 10 supervisees)
20.10.89 address Executive Meeting School C
21.10.89 address executive meeting School B
15.11.89 Principal of School C declines involvement of school
13.11.89 Address general staff meeting School B - gain entre to school
16.11.89
17.11.89 Data verification School A - transcripts to participants
20.11.89 Data Verification School B - transcripts to participants

22.11.89 General Staff Meeting School B Preliminary report of Findings

24.11.89 General Staff Meeting School A Preliminary report of Findings

Xmas Holidays

16.12.89-30.01.90 Data Analysis

Feb 90 Literature Review

Mar 90 Report 1 to Schools A and B (written report)

Apr 90 Data Collection 2 School A and School B
(dairy notes 22 categories)

May 90 Data Verification - Transcripts to participants

June 90 Report 2 to Schools A and B - staffmeeting presentations

July 90 Pinboard analysis - Data 1 and 2 (total 36 categories)

24.8.90 Colloquium - peer debriefing

30.8.90 Poster Research 90

Aug Peer Debriefing - postgraduate students

2.9.9 Computer Data Analysis Data 1, Data 2 : School A and School B
(27 categories)

Sept 90 Summary stories (not workable)

1st Oct 90 Conceptual mapping of the research

Oct 90 Data Collection 3 Schools A and B - (Verif. of Categories)

Oct-Nov 90 Hobart Conferences - Presentation of Papers

Data Verification Schools A and B

Data Analysis Data 3, Analysis Data 1: Data 2 : Data 3
9-10 Nov   Colloquium - Peer Debriefing
14 - 23 Nov   Report Ch4 Findings 1st and 2nd drafts - Ch 5 1st draft
             Report 3 to schools Schools A and B-written report
16.11.90   Staffroom presentation - Member Check Schools A and B
20.11.90   conceptual mapping of the research continued
            Ch2 Literature review completed
            Ch1,3 completed
Dec 90
            Draft Research Report Ch.s 1-6 completed
Jan 91     Final Draft
Feb 91