To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Amy Fisher Pace entitled "The Effect of Participation in Collaborative Supervision on the Ability and Perceptions of Student Teachers and Cooperating Teachers as Helpers." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Mark A. Christiansen
Mark A. Christiansen, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

John T. Farrell

[illegible]

[illegible]

Accepted for the Council:

Hilton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

THE EFFECT OF PARTICIPATION IN COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION ON THE ABILITY AND PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT TEACHERS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS AS HELPERS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Amy Fisher Pace

August 1974

DEDICATION

The writer dedicates this study to the memory of her father, Samuel Lewis Fisher, who instilled in her at an early age a desire to learn.

1166067

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express deepest gratitude to Dr. Mark Christiansen, chairman of her doctoral committee, for his continuing interest and support throughout her program; to Dr. John Lovell, for inspiring interest in instructional supervision and for providing the theoretical framework within which this study developed; and to Dr. W. W. Wyatt and Dr. John Fisher, for their careful reading and incisive criticism of the text.

To the following people who assisted in the implementation of this study goes special appreciation: Dr. Charles Peccolo and his staff in the Bureau of Educational Research and Service; Dr. William Butefish and his staff in the Office of Student Teaching; members of the consultation team, who gave many hours of time to the workshop: Dr. Dale Doak, Dr. Jerry Bellon, Dr. Russell French, Dr. Lewis Hodge, Dr. Al Grant, and Dr. Peter Husen; the two researchers studying other effects of collaborative supervision: Mr. Jerry Hook and Mr. Arthur Earp; and the typist, Mrs. Nancy Collins Watkins.

The writer is especially indebted to her mother, Mrs. Ada Fisher, for her inspiration and encouragement, and to her mother-in-law, Mrs. Bessie Pace, for her patient help.

The writer's husband shared in all aspects of this study. Because of his constant concern, intellectual challenge, and psychological support, she has further proof of the value of collaboration.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the effects of participation in collaborative supervision on the abilities and perceptions of the subjects as helpers. Collaborative supervision was defined as a system of participatory supervision in which help is given on the basis of competence, esteem, and availability, not on the basis of formal role or authority, and which has the function of collaborating with the teaching behavior system so as to improve the probability of the achievement of the teaching behavior system.

The subjects were a randomly-selected group of 44 student teachers and the 44 cooperating teachers to whom they had been assigned for student teaching for the spring quarter, 1974, at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Subjects were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups. The basic research design was a simple parallel groups design with pretests and posttests. Treatment for the experimental group consisted of (1) eight three-hour training sessions in collaborative supervision skills and concepts during the winter quarter preceding the spring quarter student teaching, (2) 10 weeks of participation in collaborative supervision during the spring quarter, and (3) two review and evaluation sessions during the spring quarter. Subjects functioned as members of collaborative teams consisting of equal numbers of student teachers and cooperating teachers.

Three instruments--the *Index of Responding* and the *Index of Perception*, adapted by Gazda and associates from the helping indices of

Carkhuff, and a semantic differential instrument consisting of four concepts constructed by the investigator according to the techniques of Osgood--were used to test the following hypotheses at the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference between treatment groups on ability to make helpful responses.

2. There is no significant difference between treatment groups on ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response.

3. There is no significant difference between treatment groups in perceptions of the helping relationship as reflected in responses to the following four concepts: "Student Teachers as Helpers," "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers," "Being Helped by Other Teachers," and "Myself as a Helper."

The data were analyzed by a 2x2x2 analysis of variance with treatment, service level, and grade level as the sources of variation. Intercorrelations among instruments were also determined.

The following were the major findings:

1. The first hypothesis was not rejected. There was no evidence that participation in collaborative supervision increased the ability of student teachers or cooperating teachers to make helpful responses as measured by the *Index of Responding*.

2. The second hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant improvement in ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response for the treatment group as measured by the *Index of Perception*.

3. The third hypothesis was not rejected for three of the concepts; however, there was a significant treatment difference on

the concept "Being Helped by Other Teachers."

4. There were significant positive correlations between the concepts "Being Helped by Other Teachers" and "Student Teachers as Helpers," between the concepts "Myself as a Helper" and "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers," and between the concepts "Student Teachers as Helpers" and "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers."

In summary, the study indicated that participation in collaborative supervision caused significantly greater gains in the ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response, but no significant difference in ability to respond in a helpful way. Subjects' perceptions of themselves as helpers changed in the same direction as their perceptions of others as helpers changed. More positive perceptions of the subordinate in the role of helper were related to more positive feelings toward being helped.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY.	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Need for the study	1
	Purpose of the study	9
	Assumptions.	10
	The Concept of Collaborative Supervision	12
	Hypotheses to be Tested.	14
	Definition of Terms.	15
	Delimitations of the Study	17
	Organization of the Study.	17
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
	Supervision as a Team, Shared, or Cooperative Enterprise . .	18
	Utilization of the Student Teacher in Supervisory Behavior .	21
	Student Teacher-Cooperating Teacher Relationships.	23
	Training in Human Relations Skills	26
	The Helping Relationship	28
	Analysis of the Research Literature.	33
III.	PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY	35
	Methods of Collecting Data	36
	Cooperative research project	36
	Identification of population	36
	Experimental design.	37

CHAPTER PAGE

Treatment procedures 38
Testing procedures 44
Instruments Used 44
Analytic Procedures. 46
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA 49
Results on the *Index of Responding* 50
Results on the *Index of Perception* 50
Results on the *Semantic Differential* 54
Concept One: "Student Teachers as Helpers". 54
Concept Two: "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers". 54
Concept Three: "Being Helped by Other Teachers" 54
Concept Four: "Myself as a Helper". 58
Intercorrelations Among Instruments. 61
Summary. 61
V. ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 65
Analysis of the Data 65
Conclusions. 67
Conclusions from the data. 69
Conclusions from other sources 71
Summary of conclusions 72
Implications 73
Recommendations. 75
BIBLIOGRAPHY 76
APPENDICES 83
A. INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY. 84

APPENDICES PAGE

B. WORKSHOP PROGRAM 104

VITA 111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Summary Table for Analysis of Variance for Test Results. . .	48
II.	Number of Teachers in the Experiment	51
III.	Means of Gain Scores on *Index of Responding*.	51
IV.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table for *Index of Responding* .	52
V.	Means of Gain on Discrepancy Scores on *Index of Perception* .	52
VI.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table for *Index of Perception* .	53
VII.	Means of Gain Scores on Concept One, "Student Teachers as Helpers"	55
VIII.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Concept One, "Student Teachers as Helpers"	55
IX.	Means of Gain Scores on Concept Two, "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers".	56
X.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Concept Two, "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers".	56
XI.	Means of Gain Scores on Concept Three, "Being Helped by Other Teachers".	57
XII.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Concept Three, "Being Helped by Other Teachers"	57
XIII.	Means of Gain Scores on Concept Three Compared by Grade Level and Service Level.	59
XIV.	Means of Gain Scores on Concept Three Compared by Service Level and Treatment.	59

TABLE PAGE

XV. Means of Gain Scores on Concept Four, "Myself as a Helper" . 60

XVI. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Concept Four, "Myself as a Helper" 60

XVII. Correlations Among Gain Scores on the *Index of Responding*, the *Index of Perception*, and Four Concepts on the *Semantic Differential*. 62

XVIII. Direction of Change Made from Pretest to Posttest by Eight Groups on the Instruments Used in the Study. 68

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Need for the Study

Instructional supervision is far too often ineffective in meeting the needs of either the educational organization or of those within the organization, as is evident in its failure to establish positive attitudes toward the teaching profession, to appraise teacher performance adequately, or to provide psychological or technological support to teachers. This supervisory inadequacy can be particularly critical in the student teaching setting; however, little significant research exists concerning the effects of supervision on the performance and attitudes of student teachers and their cooperating teachers.

Two major groups of factors point to the need for such research:

1. Factors related to supervision
    a. Confused perceptions of the supervisory role exist among both student teachers and their supervisors.
    b. Cooperating teachers do not always have the expertise needed for helping student apprentices.
    c. Student teachers often experience difficulty in fitting into the existing structure of the public schools in which they do their student teaching.

d. Cooperating teachers often gain little from the exeri-ence of directing student teachers.

2. Factors related to organizational and curricular trends

a. Trends in organizational structure and curriculum development (e.g., team teaching, open space classrooms, expanded resource centers) demand that teachers work together, but insufficient effort is made to develop in them the appropriate human relations skills.

b. Misconceptions regarding what constitutes professional competence have led to isolation rather than cooperation among teachers.

c. Increased attention to the clinical approach in student teacher training and practice and to various types of human relations training in both regular and competency-based programs points to national interest in improving interpersonal skills.

Since the inception of the public school system in the United States, supervision has been an integral part of the administrative process. Two distinct approaches toward supervision have been apparent.

The first approach emphasized the needs of the educational organization. During the early years, supervision was performed by a school committee which employed teachers and checked their performance by classroom visitation, observation of the teachers' out-of-school behavior, and administration of formal and informal tests to the pupils. Faced with increasing numbers of teachers, school committees shifted the responsibility for checking teacher performance to a superintendent.

Further increases in personnel and in the complexity of curriculum led to the establishment of the role of principal and finally to the appointment of both general and special subject supervisors. Rising as it did from the need for a larger staff of inspectors, the supervisory role was perceived as that of inspecting, overseeing, or "scientific management." The supervisor's responsibilities involved the following: (1) describing or prescribing the best methods to be used in the instructional process; (2) showing the teachers how to use these methods; (3) enforcing the use of prescribed methods; (4) rating the teachers' use of the prescribed methodologies; and (5) rewarding those who successfully conformed and punishing those who failed to comply.

A challenge to the scientific management view of supervision emerged in the early part of the twentieth century from the human relations movement and its emphasis on the needs of the worker as a thinking and feeling organism. Thus, the emphasis was shifted from the needs of the organization to the needs of the individual worker. In response to the human relations movement, some school systems removed authority from the supervisory behavior system, and supervisors became people who were simply on call, waiting for requests for services. The important criterion for supervisory success was the "happiness index." The supervisor became the teacher's "big buddy"; his title was often changed to "helping teacher," "resource teacher," "curriculum consultant," or "director of curriculum and instruction."[1]

---

[1]Kimball Wiles and John T. Lovell, *Supervision for Better Schools* (4th ed.; New York: Prentice-Hall, [in press]), Chapter 2.

Thus, two seemingly incompatible roles were forced upon supervisors: inspecting and helping. The resulting role conflict, felt by both supervisor and teacher, led to confusion concerning what supervisory behavior should be. Further compounding the problem was the fact that even though titles might be changed, the upper levels of the administrative structure remained basically the same, even when curricular and organizational innovations demanded a new role for the supervisor. Such innovations as team teaching, open space classrooms, differentiated staffing, and individualized instruction demanded flexibility; however, school systems expected the flexibility to occur at the teaching level without instituting concomitant changes in flexibility at the administrative level. The need for developing skills of working together was overlooked, even though cooperation or collaboration was demanded by the organizational change.

The problem, then, is that supervision as it now exists is failing to meet the needs of either the educational organization or the teacher in the public school setting or in the student teaching setting. A nationwide survey of the supervision of student teaching revealed "an excessive amount of poor supervision by both university and public school supervisors."[2] Trends of change occurring in the educational organization demand that teachers work together to broaden the base of interpersonal influence, to utilize each other's expertise, and to solve problems. Thus the proper role of the supervisory behavior

---

[2]Joseph Merton Merring, "The Nature of the Supervision of Student Teaching," *Dissertation Abstracts* , XVI (February, 1956), 291.

system ought to be to help teachers work together to meet both their own technical and psychological needs and the goal of the organization, which is better learning outcomes for students.

Recent surveys of supervisory practices in the geographical area of this study have been conducted by Dr. John T. Lovell and others from The University of Tennessee. In these studies the following teacher expectations of effective supervision have been identified:

1. The supervisory behavior system is available to the teachers when needed.

2. The supervisory behavior system provides the teachers a source of new instructional ideas.

3. The supervisory behavior system provides the teachers a source of help in the use of instructional equipment.

4. The supervisory behavior system provides the teachers psychological and technical support.

5. The supervisory behavior system interacts with the teaching behavior system to provide a clear picture of what is happening in the classroom.

The surveys from which these teacher expectations were identified are on file in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

More than two-thirds of the teachers surveyed responded that these functions were not being performed by their present supervisory system. The reasons most frequently offered for the lack of performance in these areas by the supervisory system were (1) the large supervisor-teacher ratio and (2) lack of supervisory skills on the part of those

within the existing supervisory system.

Therefore, if the role of supervision is important to the development of an effective educational system, some method must be devised to increase the number of people functioning in the supervisory system as well as to increase the supervisory skills of those within the system.

Two concerns of professional educators seem evident from attention to the non-research literature on student teacher supervision:

1. There appears to be consensus that "new vistas of supervisory responsibility . . . are beginning to emerge."[3] Most of these new views involve, in some way, the necessity for more cooperation of professionals in supervision, evidenced by increased attention to clinical approaches,[4] to the teacher education center concept,[5] to

---

[3]Joseph Abruscato, "The College Supervisor of Student Teachers," *Improving College and University Teaching*, XX (Spring, 1972), 146; see also: E. Brooks Smith *et al.* (eds.), *Partnership in Teacher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966), pp. 12-151; Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, *Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 152-154.

[4]Ambrose A. Clegg and Harlan J. Trennepohl, "The Clinical Associate: A New Role?" *Educational Leadership*, XXVIII (January, 1971), 377-380; see also: William R. Hazard and B. J. Chandler, "Clinical Professor in Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, LIII (February, 1972), 370-371; Leo J. Alilunas, "Conant's Clinical Professor Concept," *Peabody Journal of Education*, XLVII (November, 1972), 173-177; Robert Goldhammer, *Clinical Supervision* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969), pp. 1-370; Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973), pp. 1-221; John R. Cumming, "Beast of Burden or Playboy? Which Role for the Student Teacher's College Supervisors?" *Clearing House*, XLIV (March, 1970), 437-445.

[5]Jay A. Monson and Aldon M. Bebb, "New Roles for the Supervision of Student Teaching," *Educational Leadership*, XXVIII (October, 1970),

the sharing of supervisory duties among university faculty members,[6] to the increased training of cooperating teachers,[7] and to inter-institutional development and implementation of student teaching programs.[8]

2. There is also evident a concern for increased responsibility on the part of the student teacher for his own professional growth and for that of his fellow teachers. Wilson noted that "teachers are asking, not for supervisors to relieve them of decision-making functions, but for an increase in their professional responsibility as teachers. They are asking, in short, to become participants in supervision, rather than the object of it."[9]

44-47; see also: Leon L. Munson, "Teaching Centers: A Step Backward," *Journal of Teacher Education,* XXII (Winter, 1971), 487-488; James F. Collins, "Teacher Education Center Concept: A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education," *Educational Leadership* XXVII (March, 1970), 544-547; Kathryn Maddox and Joseph Flaherty, "Appalachia Develops Unique Approach to Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education,* XXII (Summer, 1971), 185-188; Austin H. Patty, "Classroom Teachers Will Replace College Supervisors," *Contemporary Education*, XLIV (January, 1973), 179-183; R. Gordon McIntosh, "The Clinical Approach to Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Spring, 1971), 18-24.

[6]Marlin L. Languis *et al.*, "Teaming: Innovation in Teacher Education," *Educational Leadership,* XXVI (May, 1969), 806-810; see also: Loren Grey and Edward L. Greenblatt, "An Experiment in Team Supervision," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XIV (June, 1963), 154-163; Margaret Lindman *et al.*, "Team Approach to Supervision," *Contemporary Education*, XLIII (April, 1972), 267-272; G. Bradley Seegar, "Team Supervision," *Partnership in Teacher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966), pp. 251-253.

[7]E. Perry Hicks, "Changing the Role of the Cooperating Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education,* XX (Summer, 1969), 153-157; see also Monson and Bebb, *loc. cit.*

[8]Charles B. Myers *et al.*, "Cooperating Teacher Education Programs: Old Acquaintances Create New Partnerships," *Peabody Journal of Education,* XLIX (October, 1971), 12-19.

[9]L. Craig Wilson *et al.*, *Sociology of Supervision* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969), p. 21.

In a survey of student teachers, McConnell found that student teachers want "opportunities to show initiative and assume responsibility after a sense of security has been established by good personal relations with the supervising teacher and by a definition of what is expected of them."[10] Myers noted that the real crux of supervision lies in providing for self-evaluation and self-analysis by student teachers.[11]

Advocates of various approaches to the student teaching experience have reported the success of their programs to lie in such practices as allowing the practicing classroom teacher to utilize the observation and analysis skills of student teachers to improve their own teaching,[12] allowing student teachers to observe each other and give and receive feedback,[13] providing for the utilization of the talents and enthusiasm of student teachers,[14] and switching the role of "trainee" and "trainer" so that members of a "training community might learn from each other."[15]

Supervision, therefore, appears to be requiring increased cooperative effort among institutions, between public schools and teacher

---

[10]Gaither McConnell, "They Helped Us, But--," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XI (March, 1960), 86.

[11]Paul E. Myers, "Real Crux of Supervision," *Contemporary Education*, XLIV (January, 1973), 140-141.

[12]Ethel T. Picton, "My Supervisors, the Student Teachers," *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, XXXVI (Summer, 1970), 38-41; see also: Louise Wilder and Raymond K. Jung, "A Team Teaching Approach to Student Teaching," *Peabody Journal of Education*, XLVII (September, 1969), 114.

[13]Carol A. Schwartz, "Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Fall, 1971), 348.

[14]Ward Sinclair and L. K. Peters, "Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher as a Learning Team," *Clearing House*, XLIV (March, 1970), 430-432.

[15]McIntosh, *loc. cit.*

training institutions, and among the individuals involved in the student teaching experience itself. Strom saw such cooperation as a requirement for educators in the contemporary society:

> A prime incentive urging teacher collaboration is the educator's own need to influence affairs, to regard himself as a potent force, a person of significance. Although such desires have been common to men of all occupations throughout time, more than ever before their achievement depends upon acceptance of the collaborative principle . . . . It seems in contemporary society that the fulfillment of responsibility is highly social and political. What is required is not so much a person's strength as an individual but his readiness for corporate and social action.[16]

Sterns summarized the emphasis on teaming in student teaching as follows:

> It would appear that the innovative concept of teaming student teachers and classroom teachers in teacher education programs is rapidly becoming an accepted practice. The rationale and objectives for the practice have been established, but the research data required for an objective evaluation have not yet been provided. Research on the effectiveness of teaming in teacher education programs should be a priority for teacher education institutions in the 1970's.[17]

Purpose of the Study

The research reported here examines an approach to supervision designed to provide a new conceptualization and implementation of supervisory behavior based on the assumption that the interdependence, competence, and specialization of workers within the educational organization, including student teachers, make possible collaboration--the giving and

---

[16]Robert D. Strom, "Educating Teachers for Collaboration," *Educational Leadership,* XXVIII (January, 1971), 373.

[17]Harvey N. Sterns, "Team Teaching in Teacher Education Programs," *Journal of Teacher Education,* XXIII (Fall, 1972), 321.

receiving of help--from unequal positions of influence. Thus, in the student teaching situation, collaborative supervision between student teachers and cooperating teachers could help to overcome such problems as lack of availability of sufficient university coordinator time to devote to individual teachers, lack of subject matter expertise on the part of coordinators in all student teaching areas, and lack of personal reward to public school cooperating teachers. Cooperating teachers under a collaborative system could benefit not only from increased understanding of supervisory behavior, but also from utilization of the current training, expertise, and university contact brought to the situation by the student teachers. Student teachers would assume more responsibility for sharing their professional competencies with others, as well as for increasing those competencies.

II. ASSUMPTIONS

Both student teachers and cooperating teachers have needs, and those needs affect their behavior. Educational organizations have goals, and they need members whose behavior will contribute to the achievement of these goals. It is here proposed that supervisory behavior can implement the meeting of both individual and organizational goals if it operates under the following assumptions:

1. Teachers in educational organizations are capable of providing leadership in curriculum development and policy formulation activities.

2. Teachers in educational organizations are capable of giving help to and receiving help from each other.

3. Teachers and superordinates can give and need to give help to and receive help from each other.

4. Effective supervisory behavior is not just a function of formal position, but of many factors such as competence in area of group concern and level of esteem by group members.

5. Organizations have goals and, therefore, have a need for members to behave in ways that will contribute to the achievement of these goals. At the same time, however, organization members have their own unique goals and their own unique needs to behave in ways consistent with their goals. This set of circumstances produces the possibility of a conflict between organizational expectations and the personal needs of members.

6. The difference between supervisor and supervisee is one of function in a particular task situation rather than a general assumption of superiority or inferiority; therefore, authority needs to be associated with the task situation.

7. The supervisory behavior system should be a product of a scientific system for the allocation of human functions in the effort to improve the quality of learning for all children.

8. It is impossible for the person occupying the official role of "supervisor" to have all the availability, esteem of professionals, and expertise in all situations.

9. New developments in the educational organization such as changing teaching organizational patterns (e.g., in team teaching and open space situations) have contributed to the possibility of providing a broad base of instructional supervisory behavior.

10. The prescriptive model is not appropriate for supervision in the educational organization.

11. The supervisory behavior system should utilize all available resources from the supervisory behavior system, the teaching behavior system, and the administrative behavior system.

12. People receive satisfaction and recognition from serving in the role of helper.

III. THE CONCEPT OF COLLABORATIVE SUPERVISION

The assumptions in the preceding section provide the framework for a proposed system of collaborative supervision.[18] The concept "collaboration" was chosen over other possibilities such as "collegial" and "cooperative" for several reasons. First, the assumption that organizational members are specialized, competent, and interdependent workers leads to the need for a system of cooperation in curriculum and instruction decision-making and problem-solving. The lack of availability of teachers indicates a need to get the people with the expertise and esteem into a position from which they can collaborate with individuals needing psychological or technical support. But it is also assumed that organizational members achieve different levels of prestige and organizational authority, that organizational members would not always be collaborating from equal positions of power, and that two or more people nearly always collaborate from positions of unequal influence. Therefore, collaboration,

---

[18]The concept of collaborative supervision was developed by John T. Lovell at The University of Tennessee in collaboration with Peter M. Husen, Amy Pace, and Arthur Earp.

defined also as cooperating with a perceived adversary or person with greater power, seems to describe the situation as it often exists. But the need for cooperative help, sharing of ideas, coordination, and caring also exists; therefore, the need for collaborative supervision exists.

Supervisory behavior is assumed to have the function of interacting with teaching behavior in such a way as to improve the possibility of certain kinds of learning outcomes for students. "Collaborative supervision" has the function of collaborating with the teaching behavior system so as to increase the probability of the achievement of the teaching behavior system. The student behavior system is the target system. The teaching behavior system interacts with the student behavior system. Teaching behavior has at least five dimensions: planning, actualizing, describing, analyzing, and generalizing. Any one of these dimensions can serve as entry points for the system of collaborative supervision.

In most concepts of supervision, the supervisory behavior system has limited access to the teaching behavior system; in collaborative supervision the supervisory behavior system interacts with the teaching behavior system according to need. Thus, the entry points into the teaching behavior system are greatly extended. The system of collaborative supervision draws on human resources when they are needed from all available sources according to expertise, esteem, availability, and needs of the teaching behavior system.

Collaborative supervision, then, is a means for identifying psychological or technical needs, identifying sources of help, and allocating all available resources to provide the needed help.

In the usual student teaching situation, the student teacher is regarded as a receiver of help; the cooperating teacher, as a provider of help. In collaborative supervision, both student teacher and cooperating teacher would be regarded not only as potential helpers, but also as potential receivers of help. Thus, basic to a study of participation in collaborative supervision is an analysis of the effect of such participation on the ability and perceptions of the teachers involved as helpers and receivers of help.

If one accepts the idea of collaborative supervision, it becomes important to develop knowledge about how people gain the technical and psychological skills required for helping one another. This study focuses on a treatment designed to provide cooperating teachers and student teachers an opportunity to acquire and utilize the skills considered by the investigator to be basic to the helping relationship.

The treatment consisted of two parts: a 30-hour workshop in collaborative supervision and 10 weeks of participation in collaborative supervision. The treatment is described more fully in Chapter III and is outlined in Appendix B.

IV. HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

The basic concern of this study was to determine whether changes occurred in student teachers' and cooperating teachers' perceptions of the helping relationship and in their performance on indices of helping ability as a result of participation in a program designed to help subjects learn and utilize the skills of collaborative supervision. The following hypotheses were formulated and tested for

significance at the .05 level:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between experimental student teachers and control student teachers in ability to make helpful responses as measured by the *Index of Responding*.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between experimental cooperating teachers and control cooperating teachers in ability to make helpful responses as measured by the *Index of Responding*.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between experimental student teachers and control student teachers in ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response as measured by the *Index of Perception*.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between experimental cooperating teachers and control cooperating teachers in ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response as measured by the *Index of Perception*.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference between experimental student teachers and control student teachers in perceptions of the helping relationship as measured by a semantic differential scale.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference between experimental cooperating teachers and control cooperating teachers in perceptions of the helping relationship as measured by a semantic differential scale.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to present more clearly a report of the investigation

reported here, the following terms may need explication:

Collaborative supervision. A system of participatory supervision in which help is given on the basis of competence, esteem, and availability, not on the basis of formal role or authority and which has the function of collaborating with the teaching behavior system so as to improve the probability of the achievement of the teaching behavior system.

Supervisory behavior. Behavior which has the function of interacting with teaching behavior in such a way as to increase the possibility of certain kinds of outcomes for students.

Teaching behavior. Behavior which has the function of interacting with student behavior in such a way as to achieve certain learning outcomes.

Student behavior. Behavior which results in learning.

Clinical supervision. In-class or face-to-face supervision.

Student teacher. A college or university student who is engaged in practice teaching under the direction of public school and university supervision.

Supervisor. One who fills a formal role of direction and evaluation of instruction.

Coordinator. The university supervisor of student teachers.

Cooperating teacher. The public school classroom teacher who supervises student teachers.

Student teaching center. A group of public schools, in geographical proximity, which provides arrangements for approximately 20 to 25 student teaching experiences under the direction of one university coordinator.

VI. DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The investigation of the foregoing hypotheses was limited to a random sampling of 44 student teachers and their cooperating teachers in 10 of the 16 student teaching centers in operation during the Spring Quarter, 1974, at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Assessment of helping abilities and perceptions was made on the basis of written instruments since observation of participants' behaviors was beyond the scope of the present study.

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I contains a statement of the problem, including the need for and purpose of the study; the assumptions underlying an investigation of the effects of collaborative supervision on the helping relationship; a delineation of the concept of collaborative supervision; hypotheses to be tested; definition of terms; and delimitations of the study.

Chapter II reviews related literature and analyzes these previous formulations and investigations.

Chapter III describes procedures used for treatment and for gathering and analyzing the data.

Chapter IV presents and analyzes the data.

Chapter V includes a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Sterns in the *Journal of Teacher Education* noted that priority should be given to research on the effects of teaming student teachers and cooperating teachers.[19] Although extensive study has been done of the supervision of student teachers, investigation into the use of the student teacher in the supervisory behavior system is almost nonexistent.

No previous research into collaborative supervision in student teaching as conceptualized in Chapter I has been implemented. There have been, however, relevant studies of supervision and of the helping relationship. Criteria established for inclusion in the following review of related literature include reference to the following: (1) supervision as a team, shared, or cooperative enterprise; (2) the utilization of the student teacher in the supervisory behavior system; (3) the effects of student teacher-cooperating teacher relationships which are relevant to collaboration; (4) preservice or inservice training in human relations skills; and (5) training in and measurement of the helping relationship.

I. SUPERVISION AS A TEAM, SHARED, OR COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISE

In an article describing an approach to team supervision used at State University College, Oswego, New York, Readling and Blom discussed a program with some similarities to collaborative supervision. Suggesting

---

[19] Sterns, *loc. cit.*

a formal supervisory team composed of several classroom teachers and several student teachers supplemented by a consultation unit consisting of university personnel, principals, department supervisors, or others, the writers outlined a plan for teaching for team analysis through a clinical process. They envisioned their plan as a maintenance subsystem shared by the university and the public school.[20]

Other clinical approaches were examined by Clegg and Trennepohl, who described an experimental model for teacher education at the University of Washington, nothing the necessity for cooperative planning and for updating of training of those responsible for supervising student teachers;[21] by Languis and others, who described both a clinical education team and student participation teams in the Ohio State Middle Elementary Teaching Team program;[22] and by Price, who described a clinical cluster program at Michigan State.[23] McIntosh, who recommended the clincal approach as a means of providing for the exercise of responsibility for the trainee, breadth of experience for the trainee, and cohesiveness of relationships among trainer and trainee, presented the idea of a "training community, whose members learn from one another according to need through regular interaction."[24] Sterns and Patty

---

[20]John J. Readling and Mildred S. Blom, "Team Supervision: A Humanistic Approach to Accountability," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXI (Fall, 1970), 366-371.

[21]Clegg and Trennepohl, *loc. cit.*

[22]Languis, *loc. cit.*

[23]Robert D. Price, "The Influence of Supervising Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XII (December, 1961), 471-475.

[24]McIntosh, *loc. cit.*

both presented arguments for the supervisory team concept.[25] Lindman and others also advocated a supervisory team of professional educators.[26]

The foregoing articles propose teaming of university and/or public school personnel. At least two research studies tend to verify the beneficial effects of this teaming of peers. Grey and Greenblatt reported a study of the effects on student teachers of the teaming of two professors, one from psychology and the other from curriculum, utilizing several evaluation instruments. They found that this teaming resulted in lessening of student teacher anxieties, better solutions to student problems, and influence on student teacher views about desirable teacher behavior.[27] Nelson reported that collegial supervision among primary classroom teachers affected favorably those primary teachers who had also had group development training and to a lesser extent those teachers who had organizational development training.[28]

Davis drew the following conclusions based on an investigation of the growth of problem-solving in a three-way conference: (1) that three inquiring individuals evoke higher quality thinking than do two; (2) that three-way conferences are an effective means of helping a student teacher; (3) that three people working together can improve each stage of a problem-solving process; and (4) that three-way conferences

---

[25]Sterns, *loc. cit.*; Patty, *loc. cit.*

[26]Lindman, *loc. cit.*

[27]Grey and Greenblatt, *loc. cit.*

[28]Jack Earl Nelson, "Collegial Supervision in Multi-Unit Schools: A Study of an Inservice Program for Primary Teachers in Newly-Formed Units in Schools Which Have Received Two Forms of Organizational Development Training," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (March, 1972), 4925A.

seem to have a favorable influence on student understanding, interaction skills, and professional ethics and ideals.[29]

II. UTILIZATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHER IN SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR

Student teachers have been shown to recognize their need for involvement in supervisory behavior. In a study of attitude changes of student teachers, Corrigan and Griswold found evidence that student teaching "contributes to change in student teachers' attitudes toward the selected principles held to be important in guiding learning activities."[30] More important in light of the present study, however, is their finding that the direction and amount of this change was related to whether or not the student teachers perceived the student teaching term as a period to "formulate, participate in, and/or observe the implementation of the principles."[31] Describing an investigation of student teacher reactions to team teaching situations, Gallesich and Isco commented that student teachers expressed regret that they had not had opportunity for regular participation in the team planning sessions conducted by their cooperating teachers.[32]

---

[29]Hazel Grubbs Davis, "Student Teacher Growth in Problem Solving in the Three-Way Conference (A Case Study Approach)," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXIV (June, 1964), 5214.

[30]Dean C. Corrigan and Kenneth E. Griswold, "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, LVII (October, 1963), 94.

[31]*Ibid.*

[32]June Gallesich and Ira Isco, "Student Teacher Reaction to Training in Team Teaching Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research*, XXIII (May, 1972), 140.

Cooperating teachers also often recognize the need for involvement of the student in supervisory behavior. Sinclair and Peters presented a rationale for utilizing the talents and enthusiasm of student teachers.[33] Wilder and Jung stressed the benefit to the cooperating teacher of the student teacher's suggestions, evaluations, and presentations,[34] and Picton commented on the benefits of utilizing the observation and analysis skills of student teachers.[35] Monson and Bebb emphasized the importance of joint training sessions for cooperating and student teachers in instructional skills.[36]

Rich conducted a study designed to record and describe instances in which the presence of the student teacher had effect on the classroom behavior of the cooperating teacher. Using an open-ended questionnaire, she found that cooperating teachers did accept student teachers as contributors to their learning, particularly in bringing new knowledge and in cofunctioning as professional colleagues.[37]

Strom maintained that there may be promising prospective teachers eliminated from the profession who might be able to function well collaboratively, but not independently. He based his position on research into teacher achievement, which indicated that achievement via

---

[33]Sinclair and Peters, *loc. cit.*

[34]Wilder and Jung, *loc. cit.*

[35]Picton, *loc. cit.*

[36]Monson and Bebb, *loc. cit.*

[37]Anita Shapiro Rich, "The Student Teaching Experience as a Contributor to the Inservice Education of the Cooperating Teacher: Inquiry and Instance," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (December, 1971), 3143A.

conformance is an excellent predictor of inner city teacher success, while achievement via independence is not.[38]

III. STUDENT TEACHER-COOPERATING TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

Many studies of the relationship between student teachers and cooperating teachers and of the effect of cooperating teachers on student teachers have been conducted; several of these seemed relevant to a study of collaborative supervision.

One synthesis of research on the cooperating teacher pointed out the fact that he is the one who "directs the drama" of the student teaching experience and implied that he is thus of critical importance to the experience. This research indicated that the most important role of the cooperating teacher lies in helping the student teacher fit into the existing school structure.[39] This transition into professional status was emphasized by Lowther, who noted that research evidence has demonstrated that status movement can be emotionally hazardous.[40] He called for research into the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship:

> Can different kinds of relationships between the student teacher and supervising teacher be identified? What strategic variables contribute to the structuring of the relationship as well as the roles each participant will enact? What is a "good" or "bad" relationship? What are the outcomes of such

---

[38]Strom, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

[39]Jeraline Dorris Harven, "The Supervisory Teacher: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Thought," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVI (November, 1965), 2601-2602.

[40]Malcolm A. Lowther, "Successful and Unsuccessful Experiences of Student Teachers in Secondary Education," *Contemporary Education*, XLI (May, 1970), 272.

> relationships? Why is it so difficult for supervising teachers to provide direct feedback to student teachers? A final conclusion of this study [of status passage] is that investigation into these issues should have high priority.[41]

Another survey of research relative to student teachers at the secondary level led to one conclusion most relevant to collaborative supervision: that cooperative planning, clearly defined roles, and prior association of cooperating teachers and student teachers are prominent factors contributing to good human relations.[42]

Several studies stressed the cruciality of interaction between cooperating teacher and student teacher in effecting change;[43] in providing more positive attitudes toward the benefits of student teaching;[44] in providing appropriate supervisory information to student teachers;[45] and in providing for student teacher achievement and acceptance.[46]

---

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 275.

[42] Joe DeLayne Cornett, "A Survey of Research Relative to Supervision of Student Teachers at the Secondary Level," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVII (September, 1967), 686A.

[43] Edwin Paul Kulawiec, "A Study to Determine the Relationship Between Attitude Toward Teaching and the Perception of Supervisory Concepts of Secondary School Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (August, 1971), 821A.

[44] Raymond Jensen Weckmuller, "The Influence of the Organizational Pattern for Student Teaching Upon the Degree to Which Student Teachers Participate in Selected Experiences," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXIX (June, 1969), 4359A.

[45] Dale Keith Showalter, "Supervisory Information and Activities Recommended for Supervising Teachers in a Secondary Student Teaching Program," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (May, 1971), 5915A.

[46] George Perkins Freeman, "Personal and Professional Relationships Between Supervising Teachers and Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XVII (February, 1958), 511.

It has been demonstrated that the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship has an effect on the morale, attitudes, openness, and innovativeness of student teachers--four areas that are important to collaborative supervision. Turner found that the level of morale of the cooperating teacher related significantly to the level of morale of the student teacher at the end of the student teaching experience.[47] Mortenson found the direction of change in the attitudes of student teachers to be away from the attitudes of the college coordinator and toward the attitudes of the cooperating teacher.[48] Price had similar results in an investigation of attitude change.[49]

Elliott found the change in openness of student teachers to be related to the openness qualities of cooperating teachers;[50] however, Bremer did not find the cooperating teacher influential in changing student teacher dogmatism.[51] Corl found that student teachers who showed high innovativeness felt their cooperating teachers to be more supportive of their innovativeness, expressed less agreement with the

---

[47]Ruth Donham Turner, "Assessment of Supervisory and Student Teacher Morale in Relationship to Supervisory Practices," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (October, 1971), 1968A.

[48]Robert Albert Mortenson, "Student Teacher Attitudinal Changes," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (May, 1971), 5912A.

[49]Price, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

[50]Richard J. Elliott, "Changes in Openness of Student Teachers as a Function of Openness of Supervising and Cooperating Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVI (July, 1965), 210.

[51]Burdette Dean Bremer, "Changes in Student Teacher Dogmatism and Attitude as a Function of Cooperating Teachers and Grading Systems," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (February, 1971), 3998A.

idea that student teachers must play by the rules, felt teachers had more say in decision-making, and perceived their students as being more able to handle creative situations than did student teachers who showed low innovativeness.[52]

In a study designed to develop a list of critical behaviors of cooperating teachers as perceived by the student teacher, the following behaviors are particularly relevant to collaborative supervision: (1) the cooperating teacher shows interest in the future of the student behavior; and (2) the cooperating teacher treats the student teacher as a professional colleague.[53]

IV. TRAINING IN HUMAN RELATIONS SKILLS

Several models of supervision have been developed recently which focus on human needs.[54] Nisenholz reported the following significant effects of one humanistically-oriented approach, focusing on the

---

[52]Samuel Shirey Corl, "The Relationships Between Student Teacher Innovative Behaviors and Selected Attitudes, Perceptions, and Personality Characteristics," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (August, 1970), 661A.

[53]Harry Heil Deischer, "Development of a List of Critical Behaviors of Secondary School Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (June, 1971), 6449A.

[54]Gilles Dussault, "The Development of a Middle-Range Theory of Supervision in Teacher Education Programs," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (January, 1971), 3386A; see also: William Paul Shipp, "The Development of a Theory of Humanistic Educational Supervision," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (August, 1971), 712A; Charles Allen Chance, "Consideration of Human Needs in Three Alternative Models of Motivation and the Implications for Supervision: An Exploratory Study" (unpublished doctor's dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1970), pp. 1-282.

relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher: more positive self-reference statements, and more statements indicating self-responsibility on the part of student teachers. He urged further research on humanistic approaches to student-teacher supervision.[55] Although no conclusions relevant to collaborative supervision resulted from her study of student teaching, Spencer made a relevant summary statement: "[T]he student teaching experience appeared to have evoked a number of issues of which difficulty in interpersonal relationships was predominant."[56] In a study of supervision in counselor training, Horgan commented on a trend indicating movement away from technique-oriented supervision and toward emphasis on the supervisory relationship itself.[57]

Many studies examine the effects of various approaches to human relations training. Although the training programs differ, similarities exist in the types of changes created by emphasis on interpersonal relationships. The following results are representative:

1. Significant change in the perception of self as teacher and a positive relationship between such change and reported change in

---

[55]Bernard Nisenholz, "An Investigation Using a Humanistic Approach in the Supervision of Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (June, 1972), 6841A.

[56]Pamela Jeanne Spencer, "Student Teaching: An Exploratory Study, *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (March, 1971), 4607A.

[57]Jeremiah Michael Horgan, "A Natural History Approach to the Teaching-Learning Process of Supervision: A Critical Analysis of Supervision Strategies of Intervention in the Training of Counselors," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXIII (July, 1972), 157A.

teaching behavior.[58]

2. Improvement of teaching performance in the areas of variety of activities, development and implementation of classroom goals, and exploration of value judgements.[59]

3. Positive effect on level of self-esteem.[60]

4. Increased acceptance of humanistic values and increased congruence between ideal teacher role and self-defined role.[61]

V. THE HELPING RELATIONSHIP

Much attention has been given in the past decade to an examination of the "helping relationship," which was defined by Rogers as "a relationship in which at least one of the parties has the intent of promoting the growth, development, maturity, improved functioning, improved coping with life of the other."[62] Freeze stated that "it is generally hypothesized that if the quality of student teaching is to be improved, the college supervisor and supervising teacher must be educated for

---

[58]Stephen Martin Sperber, "Development of a Training Program for Teachers Using Interpersonal Process, Communications and Problem Solving Skills," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXIII (August, 1972), 656A.

[59]James Theodore Perry, "The Relationship of Student Teacher Attitudes and Teaching Performance to Participation in an Iota Pro-Seminar," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXII (September, 1971), 1386A.

[60]Joseph Robert Minter, "The Effects of Sensitivity Training on Self Concept and Attitudes of Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXX (June, 1970), 5323A-5324A.

[61]Ted D. Kilpatrick, "Expanding Teacher Role Definition Toward Humanistic Value," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXX (August, 1972), 648A.

[62]Carl R. Rogers, "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, XXXVII (September, 1958), 6.

supervision with emphasis being placed on the 'helping relationship.'"[63]

Most discussions of the helping relationship refer to Rogers, who concluded after a review of a number of studies on the nature of the helping relationship that

> All of us who are working in the field of human relationships and trying to understand the basic orderliness of that field are engaged in the most crucial enterprise in today's world. If we are thoughtfully trying to understand our tasks as administrators, teachers, educational counselors, vocational counselors, then we are working on the problem which will determine the future of the planet.[64]

Rogers concluded from studies reviewed on the nature of the helping relationship that helpful relationships have different characteristics from unhelpful ones and that the differences lie in the attitudes of the helper and in the perceptions of the one being helped.[65] At the time of his writing (1958) he felt that there were few answers about what a helping relationship is and how it is formed.[66]

At least two key groups of studies have been conducted to get at the answers to these questions. Combs and his associates at the University of Florida conducted a group of studies into the helping relationship, concluding that "the nature of effective helping relationships was not to be found in what the helper knows or in the methods he uses"; therefore they turned to the "self as instrument" concept,

---

[63]Chester R. Freeze, "On Becoming an Open Supervisor," *High School Journal*, LIII (March, 1970), 360.

[64]Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[65]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[66]*Ibid.*

examining the perceptual organization of effective helpers.[67] The following conclusions from these studies seemed particularly relevant to collaborative supervision:

1. Effective helpers perceive their clients as able to help themselves, as dependable, friendly, worthy people.[68]

2. Effective helpers appear to see themselves as one with people, not set apart.[69]

3. Effective helpers have a positive view of themselves.[70]

4. Effective helpers see their task as freeing, not controlling.[71]

Another group of investigations has been done under the influence of Carkhuff, many of which are reported in his two-volume *Helping and Human Relations*.[72] Carkhuff took the stance that human effectiveness comes through training; thus he has translated his research findings into a training model for the development of the helping relationship. He stated that "the extensive validity data indicating a relationship between counselor-offered conditions of empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, and confrontation and criteria of client process movement

---

[67]Arthur W. Combs *et al.*, *Florida Studies in the Helping Professions*, University of Florida Monographs, Social Studies, No. 37 (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1969), p. 9 *et passim*.

[68]*Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

[69]*Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

[70]*Ibid.*, p. 74.

[71]*Ibid.*

[72]Robert R. Carkhuff, *Helping and Human Relations*, I and II (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969).

and outcome . . . dictates the development of relevant and valid indexes to train those who can benefit most from training."[73] He developed communication and discrimination indexes to predict helpers' levels of functioning in the helping role, noting that being able to discriminate the helpfulness of a response is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for helping, that communication is also necessary.[74]

Among educators influenced by Carkhuff's work were Gazda of the University of Georgia and his associates. Using the rationale behind the "Carkhuff Model," Gazda developed an adaptation of the model for use in training teachers. He pointed out that

> Generally speaking, the universally accepted goal of helping is to generate more appropriate behavior. The specific goals for a given helpee will be determined by the helper and helpee collaboratively as they interact in the helping relationship. The nature of the interaction must be controlled by the helper. He is the expert in the conditions necessary for change to occur; therefore he must control his own behavior and create an atmosphere of security and trust that are prerequisites for the first step or goal in helping. These conditions can be taught, practiced, and used systematically.[75]

Gazda and his associates developed adaptations of the discrimination and communication indexes of Carkhuff, which they called the *Index of Receiving* and the *Index of Responding*.

Several recent doctoral studies have reported conclusions about

---

[73]Robert R. Carkhuff, "The Prediction of the Effects of Teacher-Counselor Education: The Development of Communication and Discrimination Indexes," *Counselor Education and Supervision*, VIII (Summer, 1969), 265.

[74]*Ibid.*, p. 211

[75]George M. Gazda, *Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974), p. 22.

the helping relationship which are relevant to a consideration of collaborative supervision.

One study developed and tested a structured triad model to help participants learn to play three roles in a helping relationship: the client, the consultant, and the process observer. The investigator concluded that in groups of three, rotating these roles, participants could identify and develop competencies in verbal interaction and that feedback on performance, discussion sessions, and readings could increase the rate at which they could develop competencies in a helping relationship.[76]

After comparing students in the four years of the professional education program of a major university and finding no differences, another investigation concluded that teacher education programs may not be providing growth in ability to identify a helping relationship.[77]

A study designed to synthesize research findings on helping behavior with implications for instructional supervision reported these findings:

> 1. In order to be effective, a helper must understand the situation. Ambiguity results in a situation if the real needs of the recipient are uncertain, if the cost to the helper is uncertain, and if there are unresponsive bystanders.
>
> 2. Successful experiences facilitate helping behavior, and feelings of failure inhibit it.

---

[76]John F. Hines, "The Development and Testing of a Structured Triad Model for Identifying and Learning to Play the Major Role of a Supervisor in a Helping Relationship," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (March, 1971), 4623A.

[77]James M. Boland, "An Effect of Teacher Education on the Ability of Students to Identify a Helping Relationship," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (December, 1972), 2704A.

3. Competency in a particular area makes an individual more likely to help in an area calling for that competency.

4. People tend to help individuals similar to themselves.

5. Belief that an individual can make a change is necessary for the helper.[78]

Another study into the value of training in helping relationships for cooperating teachers and student teachers concluded that such training is an effective means of changing the perceptions of participants in a favorable direction.[79]

VI. ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE

The survey of the research on five areas related to collaborative supervision seemed to indicate that: (1) supervisors of student teachers are finding it both beneficial and necessary to work together to achieve their goals; (2) student teachers have professional competencies which they desire to use for their own improvement and that of their fellow teachers; (3) many cooperating teachers have recognized the expertise of their student teachers and utilized it for improvement of their own teaching; (4) the relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher is a critical one; and (5) ability to perceive helpful responses and respond effectively in helping situations is a function of effective interpersonal relationships.

---

[78]Raymond William Barber, "A Synthesis of Research Concerning Helping Behavior and Its Implications for Instructional Supervision," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (February, 1973), 3982A.

[79]John Martin Mullenex, "A Study of a Training in Helping Relationships Experience for Cooperating Secondary School Teachers and Its Effects Upon Selected Perceptions of the Teachers and Their Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (March, 1973), 4803.

Nowhere in the literature, however, has there been reported an investigation of what happens to the helping relationship when student teachers and their cooperating teachers are teamed for collaborative supervision, for helping each other on the basis of competence, situational factors, and esteem, rather than on the basis of role or formal authority.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether participation in collaborative supervision would affect abilities in and perceptions of the helping relationship among a group of randomly-selected student teachers and their cooperating teachers.

Specifically, the study attempted to answer the following broad questions about subjects participating in collaborative supervision:

1. Will subjects be better able to perceive the helpfulness of responses?

2. Will subjects be better able to make helpful responses?

3. Will subjects' perceptions change toward themselves as helpers and receivers of help?

4. Will subjects' perceptions change toward their fellow teachers as helpers and receivers of help?

Some more specific questions considered in the study were the following:

1. Will there be a difference in helping ability and perceptions between student teachers and cooperating teachers?

2. Will there be a difference in helping ability and perceptions between elementary and secondary teachers?

I. METHODS OF COLLECTING DATA

Cooperative Research Project

This study was conducted within the limits of a joint research project on collaborative supervision conducted at The University of Tennessee under the coordination of the Director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Service and the Director of Student Teaching. Other concurrent studies investigated the effects of collaborative supervision on leadership and on psychological and technological support among the subjects.

Identification of Population

The population for this study consisted of all student teachers and their cooperating teachers in 10 of the 16 student teaching centers in operation at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, during the spring quarter of 1974. Four centers were eliminated because of distance from the campus; and two, because they were created after the study was under way.

The total population in these 10 centers consisted of 224 student teachers and their 224 cooperating teachers. These 448 teachers consisted of approximately 65 percent of all participants in student teaching during the spring quarter.

The 10 centers selected for the study were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control group. Then four student teachers were randomly selected from each center and invited at the beginning of the winter quarter to participate in the study. The cooperating teachers who had already been assigned by the university coordinator were then

invited to participate. The total resulting sample consisted of 44 student teachers and their cooperating teachers. Two cooperating teachers and one student teacher in the control group subsequently dropped from the study, leaving a total sample of 43 student teachers and 42 cooperating teachers.

Control in sampling procedures was exercised in the following ways:

1. Centers were randomly assigned to control and experimental groups rather than having both groups in each center to prevent interaction between groups.

2. The centers distant from the campus were eliminated because of the necessity for on-campus attendance of activities provided for the experimental group.

3. Additional subjects were randomly drawn to provide for instances of refusal to participate. In the case of such refusal, additional subjects were invited in the order drawn.

Experimental Design

The basic research design was a simple parallel groups design with pretests and posttests as follows:

	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experimental Group	X	X	X
Control Group	X		X

This design is described by Campbell and Stanley as a pretest-posttest control group design, which requires random assignment to treatment groups and exposure of the experimental group to an experimental variable

or event, the effects of which are to be measured or observed.[80] It should be noted that this study utilizes what Campbell and Stanley termed "invited remedial treatment";[81] however, the control group also had to be invited to participate. It is apparent that a study in collaboration would have been impossible without the consent of the participants.

Treatment Procedures

The control group in this study continued to function in the existing pattern of the student teaching program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

The existing program operates as follows: The Director of Student Teaching assigns each student to one of the student teaching centers. The University coordinator in charge of that center matches the student teacher to a cooperating teacher on the basis of personal judgment. During the quarter preceding student teaching, all students assigned to a University coordinator meet with him periodically for orientation. In the actual student teaching experience, the University coordinator observes the student teacher a minimum of three times during the quarter, consults with the student teacher and cooperating teacher, conducts seminars for the student teachers in his center, deals with any difficulties that may arise, and evaluates the student teacher on the basis of input from the cooperating teacher and personal contact with the student teacher.

---

[80] Donald F. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, "Quasi-Experimental Design for Research on Teaching," *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed. N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1963), pp. 183-194.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 186.

In this study, the University coordinators continued to operate in exactly the same manner as usual with both control and experimental subjects; they did not participate in the training sessions, the review sessions, or any of the collaborative functions of the treatment.

The treatment provided for the experimental student teachers and cooperating teachers consisted of three phases (see also Appendix B):

1. Eight three-hour training sessions in collaborative supervision skills and concepts during the winter quarter preceding the spring quarter student teaching experience.

2. Ten weeks of participation in collaborative supervision during the spring quarter.

3. Two review and evaluation sessions during the spring quarter.

Experimental subjects were assigned to five collaborative teams consisting of two student teachers and two cooperating teachers or three student teachers and three cooperating teachers. The following conditions were provided for these collaborative supervision teams:

1. The student teachers were given the opportunity to develop a concept of themselves as supervisors and a feeling of responsibility for providing psychological and technological support for other members of the team.

2. The experimental teams had the opportunity to develop and utilize in a collaborative manner appropriate supervisory skills. Thus, the members of the collaborative team could help each other in all dimensions of teaching behavior. Such help was predicated upon effectiveness in communication, in cooperative planning, in describing and analyzing

teaching behavior, and in working with fellow teachers in the process of actualization.

To insure these conditions, a workshop was provided according to the following purposes: (1) to help cooperating teachers and student teachers develop a role concept that includes the process of helping and being helped by other teachers and (2) to help cooperating teachers and student teachers develop the skills necessary for helping and being helped.

Eight consultants, all professors of education at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, were selected to provide the following concepts and skills deemed necessary for meeting these purposes:

1. Collaborative supervision
    a. Concept of collaborative supervision
    b. Supervisory skills needed for collaboration
        (1) Describing
        (2) Analyzing
        (3) Planning
2. Group processes
    a. Concepts of group processes
        (1) Leadership
        (2) Followership
        (3) Group dimensions
    b. Problem-solving skills
3. Communication
    a. Concept of communication

b. Skills of communication

(1) Verbal communication skills

(2) Nonverbal communication skills

The researchers, working with the eight consultants, developed objectives for a workshop to provide such training. The objectives developed were that participation in collaborative supervision would make team members able to do the following:

1. Become acquainted with other members of the workshop group, especially members of their own team, and develop group identity.

2. Demonstrate in small group discussion their understanding of the concept of collaborative supervision.

3. Identify, through group discussion, problems faced by groups (e.g., lack of effective communication, lack of group-accepted goals, lack of problem-solving skills, lack of tolerance for and acceptance of individual thoughts and ideas).

4. Identify, through discussion, tools for recording descriptive data and the most effective use of the different tools.

5. Utilize data gathered from one group session to identify, in a collaborative manner, the cause and effect of events occurring in the session and to identify other useful evaluative procedures.

6. Identify through group discussion: (a) the different leadership styles; (b) the most appropriate (relationship-oriented) style for collaborative supervision; and (c) the basis for leadership influence in collaborative supervision.

7. State in group discussion how and why leadership behavior

may vary according to the needs of the group and to the situation facing the groups.

8. Identify through discussion the characteristics of effective leadership and the guidelines for becoming an effective leader.

9. Identify and describe means by which members of a group are excluded from communication and describe means of correcting this situation.

10. Identify and describe communication problems (e.g., wasted time, misunderstandings, inappropriate attitudes) and project means of offsetting these problems.

11. Recognize inadequacies in "trust" relationships with peers and colleagues and suggest ways of improving these relationships.

12. Identify through analysis of tapes of role playing situations the meanings conveyed by certain body movements, positions, and proximity, and by facial expressions and their effects upon group interaction.

13. Identify the role of nonverbal communication in transmitting a person's feelings, especially with regard to general support and approval and to the reinforcement of verbal communication.

14. Understand the interpersonal dimension of nonverbal communication.

15. Demonstrate effective nonverbal behaviors appropriate to both one-to-one relationships and small group (four persons) communication.

16. Identify through group discussion the curricular trends and organizational patterns that demand team effort, changes which can

be accomplished only in groups (e.g., erasing inclination toward isolationism in the profession), and the ways in which a group effort makes it possible to resolve conflicts between personal needs and organizational needs.

17. Identify through group discussion some of the different types of groups, the characteristics of an effective group, and the ways an individual can enhance the effectiveness of a group through collaborative functioning, especially in a task-oriented group.

18. Identify through group discussion ways in which group membership influences behavior, especially in the area of respect for and knowledge of other individuals.

19. Identify the different bases of influence in the supervisory behavior system, especially as interpreted in collaborative supervision.

20. Demonstrate through discussion and role playing that they have been able to synthesize in a meaningful context previous workshop concepts of leadership, verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and tools of analysis of instruction.

Eight three-hour workshop sessions were then planned by the researchers and conducted by the researchers and consultants during the winter quarter to meet the stated objectives.

The collaborative teams functioned during the spring quarter with the student teachers actively participating in the supervisory behavior system. During this time, the researchers conducted two additional workshop sessions for the purpose of review of collaborative principles and planning.

Testing Procedures

Pretesting of subjects was conducted at the beginning of the winter quarter and at the end of the spring quarter. Pretesting of student teachers took place on campus; and posttesting at the student teaching centers. Both pretesting and posttesting of cooperating teachers was conducted at the student teaching centers.

II. INSTRUMENTS USED

The following three instruments were used as both pretests and posttests: (1) the *Index of Responding*; (2) the *Index of Perceiving*; and (3) a semantic differential instrument.

Both the *Index of Responding* and the *Index of Perceiving* were developed by Gazda and his associates at the University of Georgia as educational adaptations of the widely-used and thoroughly-researched *Index of Communication* developed by Carkhuff and his associates.[82]

These two instruments look at the helping relationship in the educational setting in two different ways: the *Index of Responding* measures the level of helpfulness of a teacher's response in eight different problem situations, and the *Index of Perceiving* measures the ability of a teacher to assess the level of helpfulness of several teacher responses provided for eight different situations. The scale used to measure these responses is in both cases the "Global Scale" developed by Carkhuff.

---

[82]Gazda, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-22; see also Carkhuff, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-244.

Carkhuff's scale for rating discrimination and communication was constructed after intensive research into the helping relationship.[83] Developed and validated for helpers functioning as psychotherapists and counselors, the Carkhuff scale includes a continuum from one to five, with five representing a very high level of functioning, such as that seen in intensive counseling and therapy relationships. Gazda found that Level Five responses were extremely rare in the student-teacher relationship; therefore, he modified the scale to eliminate Level Five.[84]

The *Index of Perceiving* is rated according to this scale with subjects' responses measured in terms of discrepancy from the levels established and provided by the developers of the scale.

A study of the retest reliability of the *Index of Responding* resulted in an unrestricted r of .90, using 63 undergraduate students of education at the University of Georgia.[85]

Subjects' responses on the *Index of Responding* are rated as to level of helpfulness of the scale by a group of judges who must be trained in the Carkhuff method. Three judges were used to rate responses on the *Index of Responding* for this study. All three had had 70 hours of carefully-monitored training in the Carkhuff method by Carkhuff and Associates. All three used the method in their respective positions as members of the faculty at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

---

[83]Carkhuff, *op. cit.*, pp. 291-329.

[84]Gazda, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[85]George M. Gazda *et al.*, *Instructor's Manual to Accompany Human Relations Development* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973), pp. 19-20.

One judge was an assistant professor of Educational Psychology and a guidance counselor at the Student Counseling Center. Another was an instructor in Rehabilitation Counseling in the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation. The third was Educational Motivation Director in the Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

Judging was done independently by the three judges and results compiled by the researcher.

The *Semantic Differential* scale, henceforth called the SD, constructed by the researcher according to the techniques outlined by Osgood,[86] consists of the following four concepts: (1) "Student Teachers as Helpers"; (2) "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers"; (3) "Being Helped by Other Teachers': and (4) "Myself as a Helper." Subjects' feelings about each concept were measured by use of 10 sets of bipolar adjectives, or scales, including the three basic dimensions which Osgood found to be behind the scales: evaluation, potency, and activity.[87]

III. ANALYTIC PROCEDURES

The data for all three of the instruments used in this study were analyzed by a two-way analysis of variance of the differences between pretest and posttest scores. Ostle's Model I (Fixed Effects

---

[86]Charles E. Osgood *et al.*, *The Measurement of Meaning* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957), pp. 1-342; see also Fred N. Kerlinger, *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (New York: Holt, Rine-Hart, and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 564-580.

[87]Osgood, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63.

Model) analysis,[88] with Factors A, B, and C fixed, was followed. The following factors were considered:

Factor A - Grade Level Taught

A_1 - Secondary

A_2 - Elementary

Factor B - Service Level

B_1 - Preservice (student teacher)

B_2 - Inservice (cooperating teacher)

Factor C - Treatment

C_1 - Workshop and collaborative supervision

C_2 - Regular University of Tennessee student teaching plan

The summary of analysis of variance for each instrument was prepared as shown in Table I. Responses to the *Index of Responding* and the *Index of Perceiving* were analyzed in terms of difference in response to the instrument as a whole; the SD was analyzed concept by concept.

---

[88]Bernard Ostle, *Statistics in Research* (2d ed.; Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1963), pp. 318, 324.

TABLE I

SUMMARY TABLE FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TEST RESULTS

Source	df	MS	F
Grade Level (A)	1		A/E
Service Level (B)	1		B/E
Treatment (C)	1		C/E
A x B	1		AB/E
A x C	1		AC/E
B x C	1		BC/E
A x B x C	1		ABC/E
Within Cells (E)	77		
Total	84		

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The three instruments used in this study measured changes in the ability and perceptions of student teachers and cooperating teachers as helpers during the time of the experiment.

The *Index of Responding* was used to measure changes in the ability of the subjects to make helpful responses in a problem situation. The *Index of Perception* measured changes in ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of responses made in a problem situation. The *Semantic Differential* instrument measured changes in positivism toward four concepts: "Student Teachers as Helpers," "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers," "Being Helped by Other Teachers," and "Myself as a Helper."

Pre- and post-test scores on the *Index of Responding*, the *Index of Perception*, and each of the four concepts on the *Semantic Differential* were compared by an analysis of variance of gain scores. The constant number 30 was added to all difference scores to eliminate negative numbers. Adjustment was made for unequal cell frequencies by the use of the least squares solution suggested by Winer.[89] Then the gain scores on these six instruments were examined for any intercorrelations. Statistical analysis was done by The University of Tennessee Computing Center, using the

---

[89]B. J. Winer, *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), pp. 224-227.

Statistical Analysis System designed and implemented by Barr and Goodnight.[90] Raw data for each of the instruments are available from the investigator.

Table II indicates the number of subjects in each level of each of the three factors used in the analysis of variance.

I. RESULTS ON THE *INDEX OF RESPONDING*

Table III reports the means of gain scores on the *Index of Responding*. Table IV summarizes the analysis of variance on this instrument. There were no significant differences on any of the main effects and no interactions. Thus, participation in collaborative supervision made no differences among subjects in the ability to make helpful responses as measured by this instrument.

II. RESULTS ON THE *INDEX OF PERCEPTION*

Table V indicates means of gain on discrepancy scores for the *Index of Perception*. Increased ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response would be reflected in smaller discrepancy scores. It will be noted that the mean for both experimental groups was smaller than for both control groups.

Table VI, which analyzes the variance, shows that there was a significant difference at the .05 level between the two treatment groups.

---

[90]Anthony James Barr and James Howard Goodnight, *SAS: A User's Guide to the Statistical Analysis System* (Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University Student Supply Stores, August, 1972), pp. 94-120.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF TEACHERS IN THE EXPERIMENT

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	22	21
Secondary (A_1)	13	14
Elementary (A_2)	9	7
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	22	20
Secondary (A_1)	13	14
Elementary (A_2)	9	6
Total	44	41
Grand Total	85	

TABLE III

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON *INDEX OF RESPONDING*

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	29.66	29.79
Secondary (A_1)	29.63	29.37
Elementary (A_2)	29.71	30.64
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	30.65	29.80
Secondary (A_1)	30.89	29.86
Elementary (A_2)	30.32	29.66
Total Group	30.16	29.79

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR *INDEX OF RESPONDING*

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	0.41	1	0.41	0.10
Service (B)	2.26	1	2.26	0.57
Treatment (C)	1.25	1	1.25	0.32
A x B	5.41	1	5.41	1.36
A x C	2.95	1	2.95	0.74
B x C	6.74	1	6.74	1.70
A x B x C	0.83	1	0.83	0.21
Within Cells (E)	305.46	77	3.97	--
Total	328.54	84	--	--

TABLE V

MEANS OF GAIN ON DISCREPANCY SCORES ON *INDEX OF PERCEPTION*

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	29.38	31.14
Secondary (A_1)	28.92	31.46
Elementary (A_2)	30.06	30.50
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	28.66	32.39
Secondary (A_1)	28.92	32.39
Elementary (A_2)	28.28	33.92

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR *INDEX OF PERCEPTION*

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	1.34	1	1.34	0.03
Service (B)	8.00	1	8.00	0.19
Treatment (C)	176.79	1	176.79	4.30*
A x B	0.60	1	0.60	0.01
A x C	0.01	1	0.01	0.0001
B x C	45.14	1	45.14	1.10
A x B x C	22.05	1	22.05	0.54
Within Cells (E)	3168.65	77	41.15	--
Total	3412.81	84	---	--

*$p < .05$.

There was no difference in either of the other two main effects, grade level and service level, and no interaction.

III. RESULTS ON THE *SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL*

Concept One: "Student Teachers as Helpers"

Table VII reports means of gain in positivism toward the concept, "Student Teachers as Helpers." Table VIII summarizes the analysis of variance for this concept. There were no significant differences between treatment groups; however, it will be noted that both experimental group means were higher than either control group mean. An interesting result revealed in an examination of means before adjustment for negative numbers was that both experimental and control elementary student teachers were less positive in their perceptions of student teachers as helpers in the posttest than in the pretest, while all other student teachers and cooperating teachers became more positive.

Concept Two: "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers"

Table IX presents means of gain in positivism toward the concept, "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers." Again, the two experimental groups showed a greater gain than the controls, but this gain was not statistically significant, as may be seen in the summary of analysis of variance for this concept in Table X.

Concept Three: "Being Helped by Other Teachers"

Table XI indicates the means of gain in positivism on the concept, "Being Helped by Other Teachers." Table XII summarizes the analysis of variance for Concept Three. There was a significant difference in

TABLE VII

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT ONE, "STUDENT TEACHERS AS HELPERS"

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	32.64	31.10
Secondary (A_1)	34.62	32.36
Elementary (A_2)	29.78	28.57
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	32.82	31.70
Secondary (A_1)	33.92	31.00
Elementary (A_2)	31.22	33.33
Total Group	32.7273	31.3902

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CONCEPT ONE, "STUDENT TEACHERS AS HELPERS"

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	97.57	1	97.57	2.70
Service (B)	20.86	1	20.86	0.58
Treatment (C)	22.08	1	22.08	0.61
A x B	82.27	1	82.27	2.27
A x C	44.71	1	44.71	1.24
B x C	8.49	1	8.49	0.23
A x B x C	19.14	1	19.14	0.53
Within Cells (E)	2787.37	77	36.20	--
Total	3082.42	84	---	--

TABLE IX

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT TWO, "COOPERATING TEACHERS AS HELPERS"

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	33.50	31.76
Secondary (A_1)	35.54	32.07
Elementary (A_2)	30.56	31.14
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	32.23	31.35
Secondary (A_1)	32.77	30.43
Elementary (A_2)	31.44	33.50
Total Group	32.86	31.56

TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CONCEPT TWO, "COOPERATING TEACHERS AS HELPERS"

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	20.94	1	20.94	0.48
Service (B)	1.64	1	1.64	0.04
Treatment (C)	12.09	1	12.09	0.28
A x B	70.79	1	70.79	1.62
A x C	86.20	1	86.20	1.98
B x C	8.13	1	8.13	0.19
A x B x C	0.14	1	0.14	0.003
Within Cells (E)	3597.29	77	43.59	--
Total	3597.29	84	---	--

TABLE XI

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT THREE, "BEING HELPED BY OTHER TEACHERS"

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	32.36	25.62
Secondary (A_1)	33.08	27.43
Elementary (A_2)	31.33	22.00
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	32.55	31.95
Secondary (A_1)	31.77	30.43
Elementary (A_2)	33.67	35.50
Total Group	32.45	28.71

TABLE XII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CONCEPT THREE, "BEING HELPED BY OTHER TEACHERS"

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	0.05	1	0.05	0.001
Service (B)	370.75	1	370.75	7.29**
Treatment (C)	253.40	1	253.40	4.98*
A x B	241.38	1	241.38	4.75*
A x C	0.32	1	0.32	0.01
B x C	289.04	1	289.04	5.68*
A x B x C	56.79	1	56.79	1.12
Within Cells (E)	3915.59	77	50.85	--
Total	4905.41	--	---	--

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

treatment at the .05 level and in service level at the .01 level. As is shown in Table XI, the experimental subjects gained more in positivism than the controls. Cooperating teachers gained more than student teachers on this concept.

Two interactions were significant at the .05 level: the interaction between grade level and service level and between service level and treatment. Table XIII reports means of gain scores compared by grade level and service level. It will be noted that although secondary student teachers and secondary cooperating teachers made comparable gains, elementary student teachers differed greatly from elementary cooperating teachers.

Table XIV reports means of gain scores compared by service level and treatment. Student teachers as a whole gained less than cooperating teachers on this concept. Examination of the unadjusted gain scores indicates that control student teachers, both elementary and secondary, became more negative toward being helped, while experimental students, both secondary and elementary, became more positive toward this concept. All subjects in the study except control student teachers gained in positivism.

Concept Four: "Myself as a Helper"

Table XV presents the means of gain in positivism on the concept "Myself as a Helper." All group means showed a gain in positivism; there was no significant variation in gain, as may be seen in Table XVI. There was less variation among groups in gain on this concept than on any other instrument used in the study.

TABLE XIII

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT THREE COMPARED BY GRADE LEVEL AND SERVICE LEVEL

Grade and Service Level	Means
Secondary	30.61
Student Teacher	30.15
Cooperating Teacher	31.07
Elementary	30.71
Student Teacher	27.25
Cooperating Teacher	34.40

TABLE XIV

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT THREE COMPARED BY SERVICE LEVEL AND TREATMENT

Service and Treatment Level	Means
Student Teacher	29.07
Experimental	32.36
Control	25.62
Cooperating Teacher	31.09
Experimental	32.55
Control	31.95

TABLE XV

MEANS OF GAIN SCORES ON CONCEPT FOUR, "MYSELF AS A HELPER"

Service and Grade Level	Experimental (C_1)	Control (C_2)
Student Teacher (B_1)	31.05	31.14
Secondary (A_1)	32.08	30.57
Elementary (A_2)	29.56	32.29
Cooperating Teacher (B_2)	31.05	31.35
Secondary (A_1)	31.15	31.43
Elementary (A_2)	30.89	31.17
Total Group	31.09	31.19

TABLE XVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE FOR CONCEPT FOUR, "MYSELF AS A HELPER"

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Grade (A)	2.15	1	2.15	0.08
Service (B)	0.03	1	0.03	0.001
Treatment (C)	3.81	1	3.81	0.15
A x B	0.09	1	0.09	0.003
A x C	21.69	1	21.69	0.84
B x C	0.55	1	0.55	0.02
A x B x C	21.62	1	21.62	0.84
Within Cells (E)	1990.85	77	25.86	--
Total	2040.31	--	---	--

IV. INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG INSTRUMENTS

Table XVII shows correlations among gain scores between pre- and posttests on the six instruments. There was no correlation between gain scores on the *Index of Responding* and any other instrument nor between the *Index of Perception* and any other instrument. Of particular interest is the fact that there was no correlation between these two indices. Apparently, increase in the ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response does not effect a concomitant increase in the ability to make a helpful response.

Very significant positive correlations ($p < .0001$) existed between Concept Four ("Myself as a Helper") and Concepts One and Two ("Student Teachers as Helpers" and "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers"). Concepts One and Two were also correlated with each other ($p < .0001$). Subjects' perceptions of themselves as helpers apparently changed in the same direction as their perceptions of others as helpers changed.

Another significant positive correlation ($p < .05$) existed between changes in positivism on Concept Three ("Being Helped by Other Teachers") and Concept One ("Student Teachers as Helpers"); however, no correlation existed between Concept Three and Concepts Two or Four ("Cooperating Teachers as Helpers" and "Myself as a Helper"). More positive perceptions of the subordinate in the role of a helper apparently were related to more positive feelings toward being helped.

V. SUMMARY

The first two hypotheses of this study were not rejected. There was no evidence that participation in collaborative supervision increased

TABLE XVII

CORRELATIONS AMONG GAIN SCORES ON THE *INDEX OF RESPONDING*, THE *INDEX OF PERCEPTION*, AND FOUR CONCEPTS ON THE *SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL*

Instrument	*Index of Responding*	*Index of Perception*	*Semantic Differential* Concept One	Concept Two	Concept Three	Concept Four
Index of Responding	1.000000	-0.082314	-0.024542	-0.107494	0.047101	-0.106323
Index of Perception	-0.082314	1.000000	-0.149941	-0.122671	-0.066825	-0.023629
Semantic Differential						
Concept One	-0.024542	-0.14994	1.000000	0.614234****	0.223600*	0.537527****
Concept Two	-0.107494	-0.122671	0.614234****	1.000000	0.191647	0.542668****
Concept Three	0.047101	-0.066825	0.223600*	0.191647	1.000000	0.170764
Concept Four	-0.106323	-0.023629	0.537527****	0.542668****	0.170764	1.000000

*p < .05.

****p < .0001.

the ability of student teachers or cooperating teachers to make helpful responses as measured by the *Index of Responding*. The group which grew most in ability was the experimental cooperating teacher group, both elementary and secondary.

The second and third hypotheses of this study were rejected. There was a significant decrease in discrepancy scores on the part of student teachers and cooperating teachers between pre- and posttests on the *Index of Perception*. The treatment effect was significant at the .05 level.

Hypotheses five and six were not rejected for Concepts One, Two, and Four of the *Semantic Differential*. For Concept Three, however, there was a significant difference ($p < .05$) between experimental and control teachers as a whole group. There was also a difference significant at the .01 level between student teachers and cooperating teachers. Examination of the mean scores for this concept reveals that the control student teachers' scores account for most of this difference, with the elementary student teachers in the control group producing much lower gain scores than any other group.

In answer to the broad questions raised in Chapter III of this report, the following effects of participation in collaborative supervision for the 85 student teachers and cooperating teachers involved in this study are apparent:

1. Participation in collaborative supervision does positively affect the ability of student teachers and cooperating teachers to perceive the helpfulness of responses. Service level and grade level do not affect this ability.

2. Participation in collaborative supervision does not affect the ability of student teachers and cooperating teachers to make helpful responses. Service level and grade level do not significantly affect this ability.

3. Participation in collaborative supervision does not affect the perceptions of student teachers and cooperating teachers of student teachers as helpers, of cooperating teachers as helpers, or of themselves as helpers; it does positively affect their perceptions of being helped by other teachers. Service level also significantly affects this perception, with cooperating teachers making greater gains than student teachers. Elementary student teachers make less gain than secondary.

Chapter IV has presented the data gathered from the administration of pre- and posttests on three instruments: the *Index of Responding*, the *Index of Perception*, and a *Semantic Differential* questionnaire consisting of four concepts. Chapter V will examine the conclusions, implications, and recommendations which might be drawn from analysis of these data.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data gathered from the administration of testing instruments which are reported in Chapter IV indicated that participation in collaborative supervision did affect the abilities and perceptions of the student teachers and cooperating teachers involved as helpers. The treatment, which consisted of attending a workshop in collaborative supervision and serving as a member of a supervisory team, significantly affected the ability to perceive the level of helpfulness of a response and perceptions about being helped by other teachers. There is some indication that the treatment might have affected some experimental groups differently from others.

Data were analyzed by a 2x2x2 analysis of variance consisting of three factors--treatment, service level, and grade level--each of which had two levels. Such an analysis resulted in eight major groups of subjects:

1. Experimental secondary student teachers.
2. Experimental elementary student teachers.
3. Experimental secondary cooperating teachers.
4. Experimental elementary cooperating teachers.
5. Control secondary student teachers.

6. Control elementary student teachers.

7. Control secondary cooperating teachers.

8. Control elementary cooperating teachers.

Evidence from the data indicated that these eight groups responded as follows:

1. Experimental secondary student teachers did somewhat worse on the ability to give a helpful response and better in their ability to perceive helpfulness in a response; they were more positive on all four concepts of the *Semantic Differential*.

2. Experimental elementary student teachers did worse on ability to give a helpful response and worse on the ability to perceive helpfulness; they were more negative toward "Student Teachers as Helpers," very slightly more positive toward "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers," more positive toward "Being Helped by Other Teachers," and more negative toward "Myself as a Helper."

3. Experimental secondary cooperating teachers improved on both helping indices and became more positive on all four concepts.

4. Experimental elementary cooperating teachers improved or became more positive on all instruments.

5. Control secondary student teachers did worse on both helping indices and became more positive on all the concepts except "Being Helped by Other Teachers."

6. Control elementary student teachers gained slightly on the ability to give helpful responses, became worse on ability to perceive helpfulness, became more negative toward "Student Teachers as Helpers," much more negative toward "Being Helped by Other Teachers,"

and more positive toward "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers" and "Myself as a Helper."

7. Control secondary cooperating teachers did more poorly on the ability to give a helpful response and to perceive helpfulness, and became more positive on all concepts except "Being Helped by Other Teachers."

8. Control elementary cooperating teachers became worse on ability to respond helpfully, worse on ability to perceive helpfulness, and either more positive or about the same on all concepts.

Table XVII shows the type of results for each of these eight groups for each instrument by indicating the direction of the average change from pretest to posttest. Table XVIII reveals that the experimental elementary student teacher group made several changes in a negative direction. Negative changes were made in several instances in all four control groups. Cooperating teachers, both elementary and secondary, in the experimental group made improved scores on all instruments.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions about the effects of the experimental study in collaborative supervision on a group of 85 student teachers and cooperating teachers might be made on the basis of two sources of information: the data gathered from the changes between pretest and posttest administrations of three instruments and other informal sources of feedback such as investigator observations, evaluations of the participants, evaluations of the outside observers, and assessment of the coordinators who directed the student teacher centers in which experimental subjects

TABLE XVIII

DIRECTION OF CHANGE MADE FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST BY EIGHT GROUPS ON THE INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

Subgroup	*Index of Responding*	*Index of Perception*	*Semantic Differential Concepts* I	II	III	IV
Experimental Student Secondary	-	+	+	+	+	+
Experimental Student Elementary	-	-	-	+	+	-
Experimental Teacher Secondary	+	+	+	+	+	+
Experimental Teacher Elementary	+	+	+	+	+	+
Control Student Secondary	-	-	-	+	-	+
Control Student Elementary	+	-	+	+	-	+
Control Teacher Secondary	-	-	+	+	+	+
Control Teacher Elementary	-	-	+	+	+	+

+ = better or more positive

- = worse or more negative

worked together during the student teaching quarter.

Conclusions from the Data

Analyses of variance and correlational analysis of the data of this study reveal the following:

1. Collaborative supervision treatment groups were better able to perceive helpfulness in responses than control groups. All control subgroups did more poorly on posttests than on pretests of this measure.

2. Collaborative supervision treatment groups were not significantly better than control groups in providing helpful responses; however, only two subgroups of the experimental group, as opposed to three control subgroups, lost ground during the time of the experiment on this measure.

3. There was no correlation between growth in ability to perceive helpfulness and ability to give helpful responses.

4. No significant differences in changes in perceptions of "Student Teachers as Helpers," "Cooperating Teachers as Helpers," or "Myself as a Helper" occurred; however, two student teacher subgroups (experimental elementary and control secondary) became more negative toward student teachers as helpers. Experimental elementary student teachers were also the only subgroup becoming more negative in their perceptions of themselves as helpers.

5. There was a significantly more positive perception of "Being Helped by Other Teachers" on the part of the experimental treatment group, and the difference could be attributed to negative changes in the control students on this concept. Cooperating teachers, on the

whole, gained more in positivism on this concept than student teachers.

6. A significant correlation existed between the concepts "Being Helped by Other Teachers" and "Student Teachers as Helpers."

7. Significant correlations existed between perceptions of student teachers as helpers and self as helper and between cooperating teachers as helpers and self as helper. Elementary student teachers in the experimental group became more negative toward both student teachers as helpers and themselves as helpers.

It appears from the data that the experiment affected the elementary student teachers differently from the other three experimental subgroups. One might hypothesize that the workshop was geared more toward secondary teachers or that collaboration affects secondary teachers more positively except for the fact that the experimental elementary cooperating teachers improved or became more positive on all instruments.

It also appeared from the data that the experiment affected student teachers and cooperating teachers of the experimental group differently. Both experimental cooperating teacher groups improved or became more positive on all measures, while the secondary experimental students did more poorly on one measure and the elementary on four.

One might conclude that although experimental groups showed significant differences on ability to discern level of helpfulness and on perceptions of being helped, cooperating teachers profited somewhat more than did student teachers.

Elementary and secondary student teachers did not differ on the pretest measures of the two indices of helping. On all four pretest

measures of the concepts of the *Semantic Differential* the elementary subgroups were more positive than their secondary counterparts. Gain scores on these concepts, however, did not differ significantly between secondary and elementary student teachers. One might hypothesize by the number of instances of more negative perceptions toward the four concepts at posttesting that the student teaching experience causes more negative perceptions of helping relationships, which collaborative supervision was able to ameliorate for secondary student teachers, but not for elementary.

Conclusions from Other Sources

Other sources of information in addition to the data from the instruments should be considered in drawing conclusions about the experiment in collaborative supervision: the investigator's observations; reports from the participants; reports from student teachers and cooperating teachers not involved in the study; and opinions of coordinators working in student teaching centers where experimental subjects collaborated.

The investigator's informal observations indicated that the cooperating teachers and student teachers enjoyed working together as members of collaborative teams, that planning sessions by teams led to improved classroom teaching, that student teacher anxieties were lessened, that adjustment for the student teacher to the school situation was easier, and that student teachers had more opportunities to perceive themselves as professionals.

Student teacher experimental participants in the study commented often on the lessening of anxiety, the satisfaction resulting from increased classroom responsibility, and the added technical help available from team members. Cooperating teacher participants pointed out the value of planning with student teachers, the personal and professional advantages of receiving help from student teachers, and the increased understanding of the supervisory skills necessary to effective functioning as a cooperating teacher.

Many students and classroom teachers not involved in the study requested that a similar program be made available for future student teachers and cooperating teachers. Many from both groups expressed the opinion that such a program should be mandatory.

All five student teaching coordinators directing the centers where experimental subjects worked together as teams expressed the opinion that the experiment greatly enhanced the student teaching experience for participants. Some of these coordinators have announced plans to incorporate elements of the experimental program into their programs for all student and cooperating teachers.

Summary of Conclusions

From analyzing both data and informal sources of information, one might make the following broad conclusions from this study:

1. Collaborative supervision, the treatment carried out in this study, positively affects the ability of student teachers and cooperating teachers to perceive helpfulness.

2. Collaborative supervision positvely affects attitudes toward being helped.

3. Changes in perceptions of being helped by other teachers are positively correlated with changes in perceptions of student teachers as helpers.

4. Changes in perceptions of the self as helper are positively correlated with changes in perceptions of others as helpers.

5. Changes in ability to make helpful responses are not correlated with ability to perceive helpfulness nor with perceptions of self or others as helpers.

6. Training and participation in collaborative supervision can improve the student teaching experience for both student teachers and cooperating teachers.

7. Training and participation in collaborative supervision may in some instances have different effects on student teachers than on cooperating teachers and on elementary teachers than secondary.

III. IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions drawn from the study have several implications for instructional supervision as well as for both preservice and inservice education of teachers.

The following implications might be drawn for instructional supervision as a whole:

1. Teachers can become more receptive to receiving help as they work in a situation which requires collaboration, or the giving and receiving of help from unequal positions of influence or authority. This increase in receptivity goes hand in hand with more positive perceptions of subordinates in the role of helper. Collaborative

supervision, then, seems to hold potential as one means of helping to overcome the isolation in the instructional setting which arises from fear that revealing need for help is an admission of professional inadequacy.

2. Teachers receive positive reinforcement from working together to help one another. They are able to give one another both psychological and technical support.

3. Collaborative supervision, as implemented in this study, provides increase in ability to perceive helpfulness, a necessary but not sufficient condition to being able to give helpful responses; therefore, further attention would be required to aid teachers in making helpful responses.

The following implications seem to hold for preservice education:

1. Collaborative supervision can help to overcome some of the trauma and negativism created in the student teacher by the student teaching experience.

2. Collaborative supervision, as implemented in this study, appears more effective in meeting the needs of secondary student teachers than elementary student teachers.

For inservice education, the following implications seem apparent:

1. Collaborative supervision has a very positive effect on cooperating teachers; therefore, it may have potential for inservice training.

2. Cooperating teachers need training in the human relations skills prerequisite to the helping relationship.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made on the basis of the conclusions and implications drawn from the analysis of the data gathered in this study:

1. That collaborative supervision be considered as a viable alternative to the traditional supervision pattern in student teaching.

2. That future workshops in collaborative supervision include specific training in making helpful responses.

3. That further study of collaborative supervision be made with the coordinator of student teaching involved as an active member of the supervisory team.

4. That further study be made of the comparative effects of collaborative supervision on elementary and secondary student teachers.

5. That study be made of collaborative supervision in the inservice setting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abruscato, Joseph. "The College Supervisor of Student Teachers," *Improving College and University Teaching*, XX (Spring, 1972), 146-147.

Alilunas, Leo J. "Conant's Clinical Professor Concept," *Peabody Journal of Education*, XLVII (November, 1969), 173-177.

Barber, Raymond William. "A Synthesis of Research Concerning Helping Behavior and Its Implications for Instructional Supervision," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (February, 1973), 3982A.

Barr, Anthony James, and James Howard Goodnight. *SAS: A User's Guide to the Statistical Analysis System*. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University Student Supply Store, 1972.

Boland, James M. "An Effect of Teacher Education on the Ability of Students to Identify a Helping Relationship," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (December, 1972), 2704A.

Bremer, Burdette Dean. "Changes in Student Teacher Dogmatism and Attitude as a Function of Cooperating Teachers and Grading Systems," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (February, 1971), 3998A.

Carkhuff, Robert R. *Helping and Human Relations*. 2 vols. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

_____. "The Prediction of the Effects of Teacher-Counselor Education: The Development of Communication and Discrimination Indexes," *Counselor Education and Supervision*, VIII (Summer, 1969), 265.

Chance, Charles Allen. "Consideration of Human Needs in Three Alternative Models of Motivation and the Implication for Supervision: An Exploratory Study." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1970.

Clegg, Ambrose A., Jr., and Harlan J. Trennepohl. "The Clinical Associate: A New Role?" *Educational Leadership*, XXVIII (January, 1971), 377-380.

Cogan, Morris L. *Clinical Supervision*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

Collins, James F. "Teacher Education Center Concept: A Unifying Approach to Teacher Education," *Educational Leadership*, XXVII (March, 1970), 544-547.

Combs, Arthur W., *et al.* *Florida Studies in the Helping Professions.* University of Florida Monographs, Social Studies, No. 37. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1969.

Corl, Samuel Shirey. "The Relationships Between Student Teacher Innovative Behaviors and Selected Attitudes, Perceptions, and Personality Characteristics," *Dissertation Abstracts International,* XXXI (August, 1970), 661A.

Cornett, Joe DeLayne. "A Survey of Research Relative to Supervision of Student Teachers at the Secondary Level," *Dissertation Abstracts,* XXVII (September, 1967), 686A.

Corrigan, Dean C., and Kenneth E. Griswold. "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," *Journal of Educational Research*, LVII (October, 1963), 93-95.

Cumming, John R. "Beast of Burden or Playboy? Which Role for the Student Teacher's College Supervisors," *Clearing House*, XLIV (March, 1970), 437-445.

Davis, Hazel Grubbs. "Student Teacher Growth in Problem Solving in the Three-Way Conference (A Case Study Approach)," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXIV (June, 1964), 5214.

Deischer, Harry Heil. "Development of a List of Critical Behaviors of Secondary School Cooperating Teachers as Perceived by Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (June, 1971), 6449A.

Dussault, Gilles. "The Development of a Middle-Range Theory of Supervision in Teacher Education Programs," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (January, 1971), 3386A.

Elliott, Richard J. "Changes in Openness of Student Teachers as a Function of Openness of Supervising and Cooperating Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVI (July, 1965), 210.

Freeman, George Perkins. "Personal and Professional Relationships Between Supervisory Teachers and Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts,* XVII (February, 1958), 511.

Freeze, Chester R. "On Becoming an Open Supervisor," *High School Journal,* LIII (March, 1970), 360.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). *Handbook for Research on Teachers.* Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Gallessich, June, and Ira Iscoe. "Student Teacher Reaction to Training in Team Teaching Schools," *California Journal of Educational Research,* XXIII (May, 1972), 138-147.

Gazda, George M. *Human Relations Development: A Manual for Education.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974.

_____ *et al. Instructor's Manual to Accompany Human Relations Development.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.

Goldhammer, Robert. *Clinical Supervision.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Grey, Loren, and Edward L. Greenblatt. "An Experiment in Team Supervision," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XIV (June, 1963), 154-162.

Harven, Jeraline Dorris. "The Supervisory Teacher: A Synthesis of Research Findings and Thought," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXVI (November, 1965), 2601-2602.

Hazard, William R., and B. J. Chandler. "Clinical Professor in Teacher Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, LIII (February, 1972), 370-371.

Hicks, E. Perry. "Changing the Role of the Cooperating Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XX (Summer, 1969), 153-157.

Hines, John F. "The Development and Testing of a Structured Triad Model for Identifying and Learning to Play the Major Role of a Supervisor in a Helping Relationship," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (December, 1972), 2704A.

Horgan, Jeremiah Michael. "A Natural History Approach to the Teaching-Learning Process of Supervision: A Critical Analysis of Supervision Strategies of Intervention in the Training of Counselors," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (July, 1972), 157A.

Kerlinger, Fred N. *Foundations of Behavioral Research.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Kilpatrick, Ted D. "Expanding Teacher Role Definition Toward Humanistic Value," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXX (August, 1972), 648A.

Kulawiec, Edwin Paul. "A Study to Determine the Relationship Between Attitude Toward Teaching and the Perception of Supervisory Concepts of Secondary School Student Teachers and Their Cooperating Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (August, 1971), 821A.

Languis, Marlin L., Lorren L. Stall, and James E. Kerber. "Teaming: Innovation in Teacher Education," *Educational Leadership*, XXVI (May, 1966), 806-810.

Lindman, Margarit, *et al.* "Team Approach to Supervision," *Contemporary Education*, XLIII (April, 1972), 267-272.

Lowther, Malcolm A. "Successful and Unsuccessful Experiences of Student Teachers in Secondary Education," *Contemporary Education*, XLI (May, 1970), 272.

Maddox, Kathryn, and Joseph Flaherty. "Appalachia Develops Unique Approach to Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Summer, 1971), 185-188.

McConnell, Gaither. "They Helped Us, But--," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XI (March, 1960), 84-86.

McIntosh, R. Gordon. "The Clinical Approach to Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Spring, 1971), 18-24.

Merring, Joseph Merton. "The Nature of Supervision of Student Teaching," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XVI (February, 1956), 291.

Minter, Joseph Robert. "The Effects of Sensitivity Training on Self Concept and Attitudes of Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXX (June, 1970), 5323A-5324A.

Monson, Jay A., and Aldon M. Bebb. "New Roles for the Supervisor of Student Teaching," *Educational Leadership*, XXVIII (October, 1970), 44-47.

Mortenson, Robert Albert. "Student Teacher Attitudinal Changes," *Dissertation Abstracts*, XXXI (May, 1971), 5912A.

Mullenex, John Martin. "A Study of a Training in Helping Relationships Experience for Cooperating Secondary School Teachers and Its Effects Upon Selected Perceptions of the Teachers and Their Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXIII (March, 1972), 4803A.

Munson, Leon L. "Teaching Centers: A Step Backward," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Winter, 1971), 487-488.

Myers, Charles B., *et al*. "Cooperative Teacher Education Programs: Old Acquaintances Create New Partnerships," *Peabody Journal of Education*, XLIX (October, 1971), 12-19.

Nelson, Jack Earl. "Collegial Supervision in Multi-Unit Schools: A Study of an Inservice Program for Primary Teachers in Newly-Formed Units in Schools Which Have Received Two Forms of Organizational Development," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (March, 1972), 4925A.

Nisenholz, Bernard. "An Investigation of Using a Humanistic Approach in the Supervision of Student Teachers," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (June, 1972), 6841A.

Osgood, Charles E., *et al.* *The Measurement of Meaning.* Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Ostle, Bernard. *Statistics in Research.* 2d ed. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1963.

Patty, Austin, H. "Classroom Teachers Will Replace College Supervisors," *Contemporary Education,* XLIV (January, 1973), 179-183.

Perry, James Theodore. "The Relationship of Student Teacher Attitudes and Teaching Performance to Participation in an Iota Pro-Seminar," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (September, 1971), 1386A.

Picton, Ethel T. "My Supervisors, the Student Teachers," *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, XXXVI (Summer, 1970), 38-41.

Price, Robert D. "The Influence of Supervising Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XII (December, 1961), 38-41.

Readling, John J., and Mildred S. Blom. "Team Supervision: A Humanistic Approach to Accountability," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXI (Fall, 1970), 366-371.

Rich, Anita Shapiro. "The Student Teaching Experience as a Contributor to the Inservice Education of the Cooperating Teacher: Inquiry and Instance," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (December, 1971), 3143A.

Rogers, Carl R. "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, XXXVII (September, 1958), 6-16.

Schwartz, Carol A. "Effect of a Cluster Plan on Secondary Student Teachers," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXII (Fall, 1971), 348-357.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Robert J. Starratt. *Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Shipp, William Paul. "The Development of a Theory of Humanistic Educational Supervision," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (August, 1971), 712A.

Showalter, Dale Keith. "Supervisory Information and Activities Recommended for Supervising Teachers in a Secondary Student Teaching Programs," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (May, 1971), 5915A.

Sinclair, Ward, and L. K. Peters. "Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher as a Learning Team," *Clearing House*, XLIV (March, 1970), 430-432.

Smith, E. Brooks, *et al.* (eds.). *Partnership in Teacher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1966.

Spencer, Pamela Jeanne. "Student Teaching: An Exploratory Study," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXI (March, 1971), 4607A.

Sperber, Stephen Martin. "Development of a Training Program for Teachers Using Interpersonal Process, Communications and Problem Solving Skills," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXX (August, 1972), 656A.

Sterns, Harvey N. "Team Teaching in Teacher Education Programs," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXIII (Fall, 1972), 318-322.

Strom, Robert D. "Educating Teachers for Collaboration," *Educational Leadership*, XXVIII (January, 1971), 373-376.

Turner, Ruth Donham. "Assessment of Supervisory and Student Teacher Morale in Relationship to Supervisory Practices," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXXII (October, 1971), 1968A.

Weckmuller, Raymond Jensen. "The Influence of the Organizational Pattern for Student Teaching Upon the Degree to Which Student Teachers Participate in Selected Experiences," *Dissertation Abstracts International*, XXIX (June, 1969), 4359A.

Wilder, Louise, and Raymond K. Jung. "A Team Teaching Approach to Student Teaching," *Peabody Journal of Education*, XLVII (September, 1969), 112-115.

Wiles, Kimball, and John T. Lovell. *Supervision for Better Schools.* 4th ed. New York: Prentice Hall, [in press].

Wilson, L. Craig, *et al.* *Sociology of Supervision.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.

Winer, B. J. *Statistical Principles in Experimental Design.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE STUDY

INDEX OF RESPONDING

The following index contains eight different situations representing a person talking to someone else (YOU) about things personally meaningful to the speaker.

Each situation is a separate event. Do not attempt to relate one to the other. You may consider the different speakers to be persons who have come to you in a time of need. He or she has turned to you for understanding, assistance; in short, for a helpful response.

For each statement assume that you are the helping person (facilitator) and write your response exactly as you would say it to the person seeking help. You are to use the description below by Carkhuff of a helping person (facilitator) to guide you in formulating your responses to the stimulus statements in the *Index of Responding*.

Carkhuff described the helpful person as follows:

> The facilitator is a person who is living effectively himself and so discloses himself in a genuine, constructive fashion in response to others. He communicates an accurate empathic understanding and a respect for all of the feelings of other persons and guides discussions with those persons into specific feelings and experiences. He communicates confidence in what he is doing and is spontaneous and intense. In addition, while he is open and flexible in his relations with others, in his commitment to the welfare of the other person he is quite capable of active, assertive, and even confronting behavior when it is appropriate.*

---

*R. R. Carkhuff, *Helping and Human Relations*, Vol. I in *Selection and Training* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), p. 133. Reprinted by permission.

SITUATION I: Comments of student to his chemistry teacher.

I spent all weekend working on my chemistry equations and you know, I really understand them now. I left school Friday feeling really depressed, but the work I did over the weekend paid off. I feel just great now!

Write what you would say:

SITUATION II: Black student to white teacher after school.

Why do you always pick on me in class? You don't do that to the other kids. You know, I used to think you were a fair person but lately I get the feeling you are picking on me because I'm black.

Write what you would say:

SITUATION III: Student to teacher.

I am sure happy since we moved to this town. It is just great! I have met so many nice people and I go to parties now. I'm 10 times as happy as I've ever been!

Write what you would say:

SITUATION IV: Twelfth grade student to teacher.

You're the best teacher I've ever had. It's been great being in your class! You were the only teacher who didn't make me feel like I was in terrible trouble if I didn't get everything perfect.

Write what you would say:

SITUATION V: Parent to teacher.

I don't understand it. My son had always gotten good marks until he came to your class. He spends as much time studying as he always did. I wonder what is going wrong in your class?

Write what you would say:

SITUATION VI: Teacher to counselor.

I feel like one of my students is using some type of drug. He sleeps through classes and really acts kind of "doped up." I don't know whether to talk to him or the principal or his parents. I'm really confused about how to handle this.

Write what you would say:

SITUATION VII: Comments of one teacher to another in teacher's lounge.

I'm really burned up! Bill Pack lets his students run wild in his class. Then they come into my class thinking they can do the same thing.

Write what you would say:

SITUATION VIII: Student to teacher.

Look, leave me alone! I don't want to study history. It has no meaning to me. It's hard and I can't see how it's ever going to help me earn a living.

Write what you would say:

INDEX OF PERCEPTION

In the following exercise you will find eight stimulus statements. You will be given four responses to each situation and you are asked to rate them as to their level of helpfulness. This process involves your ability to perceive helpful conditions present in a given response.

Situation I and Situation VII will each represent a continuous dialogue with four related responses to rate. Each of these responses will thus be followed by a further continuation of the initial problem statement. Read the helpee's statement, helper's response, and helpee's reply before rating each item in Situations I and VII. That is, consider the effects of the helper's response before rating. The other six problem situations will offer four separate unrelated responses for you to rate. You are to insert a numerical rating (1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, or 4.0) in each numbered space provided. Use the scale on the following page to quantify or given numerical value to the *degree* of help or lack of help which you feel is offered in each response.

GLOBAL SCALE

A response in which the helper attends to neither the content nor the surface feelings of the helpee; discredits, ridicules, or scolds the helpee; shows a lack of caring for, or belief in the helpee; is vague or deals with the helpee in general terms; tries to hide his

1.0 → feelings or uses them to punish the helpee; reveals nothing about himself or discloses himself exclusively to meet his own needs; passively accepts or ignores discrepancies in the helpee's behavior that are self-deflating; ignores all cues from the helpee regarding their immediate relationship.

1.5 →

A response in which the helper only partially attends to the surface feelings of the helpee or distorts what the helpee communicated; withholds himself from involvement with the helpee by declining to help, ignoring the helpee, responding in a casual way, or giving cheap advice before really understanding the situation; behaves in a manner congruent with some preconceived role he is taking, but is incongruent with his true feelings; is neutral in his nonverbal

2.0 → expressions and gestures; is specific in his verbal expressions (e.g., gives advice or own opinion) or solicits specificity from the helpee (e.g., asks questions) but does so prematurely; does not voluntarily reveal, but may briefly answer questions regarding his own feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns; does not accept discrepancies in the helpee's behavior but does not draw attention to them either; comments superficially on communications from the helpee regarding their relationship.

2.5 →

A response in which the helper reflects the surface feelings of the helpee and does not distort the content; communicates his openness to entering a helpful relationship; recognizes the helpee as a person of worth, capable of thinking and expressing himself and acting constructively; communicates his attention and interest through his nonverbal expressions or gestures; shows that he is open to caring for and believing in the helpee; is specific in communicating his

3.0 → understanding but does not point out the directionality emerging for helpee action; shows no signs of phoniness but controls his expression of feeling so as to facilitate the development of the relationship; in a general manner, reveals his own feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns; makes tentative expressions of discrepancies in the helpee's behavior but does not point out the directions in which these lead; discusses his relationship with the helpee but in a general rather than a personal way.

3.5 →

A response in which the helper goes beyond reflection of the essence of the helpee's communication by identifying underlying feelings and meanings; is committed to the helpee's welfare; is intensely attentive; models and actively solicits specificity from the helpee; shows a genuine congruence between his feelings (whether they are positive

4.0 → or negative) and his overt behavior and communicates these feelings

in a way that strengthens the relationship; freely volunteers specific feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns (these may involve a degree of risk taking for the helper); clearly points out discrepancies in the helpee's behavior and the specific directions in which these discrepancies lead; explicitly discusses their relationship in the immediate moment.

Rarely, if ever, would all of the conditions described in each level be represented in a single response; therefore, when the scale is used to rate responses, the rater must be guided by the level(s) of the condition(s) that are offered or withheld in the helper's response.

SITUATION I: Comments of student to his chemistry teacher.

I spent all weekend working on my chemistry equations and you know, I really understand them now. I left school Friday feeling really depressed, but the work I did over the weekend paid off. I feel great now!

_____ 1. Teacher: *If you spend a lot of time studying, you will find out how exciting chemistry can be.*

Student: *Well, I don't really find chemistry exciting; in fact, I find it very hard, but I'm willing to study it in order to make a good grade.*

_____ 2. Teacher: *So you aren't really excited about chemistry; you are just motivated by good grades.*

Student: *Right, I'm planning to go to a good college and the only way I can get in is to make top grades in high school.*

_____ 3. Teacher: *I think you are saying all of your work in high school is in preparation for college, and you aren't that interested in the subjects.*

Student: *You know, I think you hit the nail on the head. I'm bored in school but I have a lot of pressure from the family to go to college, so I'm doing what I have to do to get in.*

_____ 4. Teacher: *You have the feeling that your life is controlled by others and you aren't allowed to make any independent decisions.*

Student: *Yeah, I do feel that way and it is more than just my parents. I feel like many areas of my life are controlled by others.*

SITUATION II: Student to teacher.

I sure am happy since we moved to this town. It is just great! I have met so many nice people and I go to parties now. I'm ten times happier than I've ever been!

Teacher responses:

_____ 5. *I guess you're saying you have never been this happy in other towns.*

_____ 6. *Don't be too sure all these parties are good for you. All of the teachers have heard about what goes on at high school parties in this day and time. Things have really changed for the worse since I was in high school.*

_____ 7. *You feel that a lot of good things have happened to you since you moved to this town.*

_____ 8. *Going to parties is something new for you.*

SITUATION III: Black student to white teacher after school.

Why do you always pick on me in class? You don't do that to the other kids. You know, I used to think you were a fair person but lately I get the feeling you are picking on me because I'm black.

Teacher responses:

_____ 9. *Now you know, son, that I am completely fair with everybody. Everyone who needs to be corrected is corrected in class, no matter who they are.*

_____10. *I was afraid you would feel that way, but believe me, that is not the reason. I'm not picking on you, I just expect all my students to behave in class and take part in class discussions. You just happen to be the only student who has misbehaved regularly the last couple of weeks.*

_____11. *You have the feeling that I pick on you in class and the main reason that I do this is because you are black.*

_____12. *You're just going to have to shape up or ship out. Either do the work and pay attention in class or be ready to suffer the consequences.*

SITUATION IV: Twelfth grade student to teacher.

You're the best teacher I've ever had. It's been great being in your class! You were the only teacher who didn't make me feel like I was in terrible trouble if I didn't get everything perfect.

Teacher responses:

_____13. *Oh, I'd have done that much for anybody.*

_____14. *There aren't many students who take time out to thank me. A lot of times I wonder if I'm doing a good job and it makes me feel good to know you've enjoyed my teaching.*

_____15. *You're pleased I didn't pick on every mistake you made.*

_____16. *It was a pleasure having you in my class. I enjoy all my students.*

SITUATION V: Parent to teacher.

I don't understand it. My son had always received good marks until he came to your class. He spends as much time studying as he always did. I wonder what is going wrong in your class?

Teacher responses:

_____17. *Your son is not doing well in class and since this is the first time his grades have been low, you feel it is something that is happening in my class.*

_____18. *It is upsetting for you to see your child's performance drop and you feel a need to find out why.*

_____19. *I am certainly as fair with your son as with any of the students; he is just not the student you thought he was.*

_____20. *It must be a tough situation when you find your son is not working to what you feel is his potential.*

SITUATION VI: Teacher to counselor.

I feel like one of my students is using some type of drug. He sleeps through classes and really acts kind of "doped up." I don't know whether to talk to him or the principal or his parents. I'm really confused about how to handle this.

Counselor responses:

_____21. *This is a problem for a lot of teachers since some students really don't trust them.*

_____22. *You feel mighty darn helpless as a teacher, wanting to help but not knowing how.*

_____23. *You're quite concerned about this student and although you want to do the right thing for him, you are not sure what the right thing is.*

_____24. *You know as well as I do that drug abuse is against the law. Call the kid's parents and let them straighten him out.*

SITUATION VII: Comments of one teacher to another in teacher's lounge.

Teacher No. 1: *I'm really burned up! Bill Jones lets his students run wild in his class. Then they come into my class thinking they can do the same thing.*

_____25. Teacher No. 2: *You can't blame him for their behavior in your class.*

Teacher No. 1: *Well, if he weren't such a poor teacher, he could control them better and I could teach them instead of yell at them when they get to my class.*

_____26. Teacher No. 2: *You feel like you would have a better chance to teach if the kids didn't get so much freedom in his class.*

Teacher No. 1: *Yeah, the kids say that Mr. Jones is nice to them and they ask me why I'm not more like him.*

_____27. Teacher No. 2: *This sort of puts you on the spot, doesn't it?*

Teacher No. 1: *Yes, but I realize that I must control my own classes and quit worrying about Bill Jones.*

_____28. Teacher No. 2: *That's what I told you in the first place.*

Teacher No. 1: *Hell with you!*

SITUATION VIII: Student to teacher.

Look, leave me alone! I don't want to study history. It has no meaning to me. It's hard, and I don't see how it's ever going to help me earn a living.

Teacher responses:

____29. *Ancient history can have much meaning to you. Present events can be understood better with historical perspective.*

____30. *You don't want me to force you to study since you feel history is not important enough for you to study hard.*

____31. *There's more to life than just earning a living, young man.*

____32. *You find ancient history unnecessary and difficult, and it doesn't seem to be related to any job you will ever have.*

SD QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this test is to measure the *meanings* certain concepts hold for you by having you judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgements on the basis of what these things mean *to you*. On each page of this test you will find a different concept to be judged and beneath it a set of scales. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order. Following is a description of how you are to use these scales.

If you feel that the concept at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your checkmark as shown:

fair : ✓ : : : : : : unfair
fair : : : : : : : ✓ : unfair

If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your checkmark as follows:

strong : : ✓ : : : : : weak
strong : : : : : : ✓ : : weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), you should check as follows:

active : : : ✓ : : : : passive
active : : : : : ✓ : : passive

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems more characteristic of the thing you are judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, you should place your checkmark in the middle space:

safe : : : : : : : dangerous

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your checkmarks in the middle of a space, not between spaces.

: : ✓ : : ✓
↑ ↑
This *Not this*

(2) Be sure to check every scale for every concept; please do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one checkmark on a single space.

Do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. *Make each item a separate and independent judgement.* Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your *first impression*, your immediate "feeling" about each item, that is important.

STUDENT TEACHERS AS HELPERS

destructive :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: constructive

participating :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: bystanding

persistent :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: easily discouraged

likeable :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: irritating

dependable :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: undependable

lackadaisical :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: energetic

accepted :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: rejected

aimless :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: purposeful

aggressive :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: submissive

passive :_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____: active

COOPERATING TEACHERS AS HELPERS

destructive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	constructive
participating	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	bystanding
persistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	easily discouraged
likeable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	irritating
dependable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	undependable
lackadaisical	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	energetic
accepted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	rejected
aimless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	purposeful
aggressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	submissive
passive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	active

BEING HELPED BY OTHER TEACHERS

destructive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	constructive
participating	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	bystanding
persistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	easily discouraged
likeable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	irritating
dependable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	undependable
lackadaisical	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	energetic
accepted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	rejected
aimless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	purposeful
aggressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	submissive
passive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	active

MYSELF AS HELPER

destructive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	constructive
participating	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	bystanding
persistent	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	easily discouraged
likeable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	irritating
dependable	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	undependable
lackadaisical	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	energetic
accepted	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	rejected
aimless	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	purposeful
aggressive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	submissive
passive	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	active

APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

MEMORANDUM TO CONSULTANTS

TO: Consultants for Workshop on Collaborative Supervision (Drs. Butefish, Grant, Bellon, French, Hodge, Husen, Lovell, Doak, Coffield, and Peccolo)

FROM: Amy Pace, Jerry Hook, and Art Earp

RE: Participation in Workshop Sessions

Listed below are the dates and major emphases for the seven workshop sessions which will be held on campus. The other three sessions will be conducted by the researchers at the student teaching centers.

January 29 - Get acquainted, Introduction of Concept of Collaborative Supervision (Butefish, Doak, Coffield, Lovell, Peccolo)

February 4 - Tools for Analysis (Butefish, Grant, Lovell)

February 5 - Leadership (Bellon)

February 11- Verbal Communication (French)

February 12- Nonverbal Communication (Hodge)

February 18- Problem Situations (researchers)

February 19- Group Process (Lovell, Husen)

The following objectives, which have been identified in meetings with you during the past few weeks, are arranged according to the preceding calendar:

January 29

As a result of participation in this session, group members will:

1. Become acquainted with other members of the workshop group, especially members of their own team, and develop group identity.

2. Demonstrate in small group discussion their understanding of the concept of collaborative supervision.

February 4

As a result of participation in this session, the group members will be able to:

1. Identify, through group discussion, problems faced by groups (e.g., lack of effective communication, lack of group-accepted goals, lack of problem-solving skills, lack of tolerance for and acceptance of individual thoughts and ideas).

2. Identify, through discussion, tools for recording descriptive data and the most effective use of the different tools.

3. Utilize data gathered from one group session to identify, in a collaborative manner, the cause and effects of events occurring in the session and to identify other useful evaluative procedures.

February 5

As a result of participation in this session, participants will demonstrate their understanding of the leadership pattern best suited for collaborative supervision by:

1. Identifying through group discussion during this session or in a subsequent session (a) the different leadership styles, (b) the most appropriate (relationship-oriented) style for collaborative supervision, and (c) the basis for leadership influence in collaborative supervision.

2. Stating in a group discussion, during this session or in a subsequent session, how and why leadership behavior may vary according to the needs of the group and to the situation facing the groups.

3. Identifying through discussion, during this session or in a subsequent session, the characteristics of effective leadership and the guidelines for becoming an effective leader.

February 11

As a result of his/her participation in this workshop, the participant should be able to:

1. Identify and describe means by which members of a group are excluded from communication and describe means of correcting this situation.

2. Identify and describe communication problems (e.g., wasted time, misunderstandings, inappropriate attitudes) and project means of offsetting these problems.

3. Recognize inadequacies in "trust" relationships with peers and colleagues and suggest ways of improving these relationships.

February 12

As a result of participation in this session, workshop members will indicate their understanding of the concepts of nonverbal communication by identifying, through analysis of tapes of role-playing situations, the meanings conveyed by certain body movements, position, and proximity, and by facial expressions and their effects upon group interaction.

February 19

As a result of participation in this session, the group members will demonstrate their understanding of the role group process plays in collaborative supervision by:

1. Identifying, through group discussion, the curricular trends and organizational patterns that demand team effort, changes which can be accomplished only in groups (e.g., erasing inclination toward isolationism in the profession), and the ways in which a group effort makes it possible to resolve conflicts between personal needs and organizational needs.

2. Identifying, through group discussion, some of the different types of groups, the characteristics of an effective group, and the ways an individual can enhance the effectiveness of a group through collaborative functioning, especially in a task-oriented group.

3. Identifying, through group discussion, ways in which group membership influences behavior, especially in the area of respect for and knowledge of other individuals.

4. Identifying the different bases of influence in the supervisory behavior system, especially as interpreted in collaborative supervision.

5. Demonstrating, through discussion and role-playing, that they have been able to synthesize in a meaningful context previous workshop concepts of leadership, verbal communications, nonverbal communication, and tools of analysis of instruction.

WORKSHOP PROGRAM

TEACHERS WORKING TOGETHER

A Workshop

in

Collaborative Supervision

January 29, February 4, 5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 1974

5:30 - 9:00 p.m.

University Center



In unity and cooperativeness there is a common strength that aids us all in achieving the best education for the students and the greatest satisfaction for a job well done. In disunity and uncooperativeness there is a common weakness that destroys our overall effectiveness and our enjoyment from work.

PROGRAM OUTLINE

January 29:	Registration Get Acquainted Dinner Introduction to Collaborative Supervision
February 4:	Identification of Problems Encountered in Groups
February 5:	Dimensions of Leadership
February 11:	Verbal Communication
February 12:	Nonverbal Communication
February 18:	Small Group Discussion Role Playing
February 19:	Group Processes Recap of Previous Sessions

∞∞∞∞

Three other three-hour sessions to be scheduled at the convenience of the Team Members.

CONSULTANTS . . .

Dr. Charles Peccolo

Dr. William Butefish

Dr. Dale Doak

Dr. Al Grant

Dr. Jerry Bellon

Dr. Russell French

Dr. Lewis Hodge

Dr. John Lovell

Dr. Peter Husen

Mrs. Amy Pace

Mr. Jerry Hook

Mr. Wm. Arthur Earp

VITA

Amy Fisher Pace was born in Hendersonville, North Carolina, August 6, 1934, the only child of Mr. and Mrs. Samuel Lewis Fisher.

She graduated from Hendersonville High School in 1952 and from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1955, with the A.B. degree in English. After teaching in public schools in North Carolina and Virginia from 1955 to 1961, she entered the University of California at Berkeley in 1962 and received the M.A. degree in Secondary Education in 1963. She then taught high school English and served as English department chairman in public schools in California and North Carolina.

In 1972 she entered The University of Tennessee, receiving the Ed.D. degree in Curriculum and Instruction in August, 1974, after completing a program in English Education with collateral programs in Educational Administration and Supervision and in English. While at The University of Tennessee, she held a graduate assistantship in the Bureau of Educational Research and Service and a position as instructor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

She accepted a position as Assistant Professor of Language Education at the University of Georgia beginning in 1974.

She was married to Daniel Eugene Pace in 1956.