THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

**Effective Supervisory Behaviors and Characteristics
in Field-Based Experiences**

by

Terrance Allan Ell

A DISSERTATION

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

GRADUATE DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

CALGARY, ALBERTA

SEPTEMBER, 1999

© Terrance Allan Ell 1999

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-49491-8

Canada

Those who are wise learn not only from books

But from flowers, seashells, and stars,

From animals, and children,

From their own experience,

And from the lives of others.

Hallmark

ABSTRACT

This study chronicles an extensive record of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors and characteristics in field-based experiences as identified by field supervisors and student teachers in the Community and Workplace segment of a pre-service teacher education program. A number of statistically significant differences are found between the responses indicating incompatible perspectives and expectations between these two groups. Demographic data also suggests inconsistencies that may impact the learning/teaching environment. A cluster analysis does not demonstrate any particular pattern of behavior segmentation. However, a factor analysis of behaviors categorized by the author reveals a correlation to five supervisory functions; social integrator, teacher, evaluator, consultant, and role model.

A comparison of the results of this investigation to antecedent research conducted on supervision of student teachers in the K-12 setting and in other disciplines demonstrates both similarities and variances. Student teachers and field supervisors are generally in agreement with previously defined effective supervisory behaviors. However, it is apparent that the Community and Workplace setting is a unique educational environment and that participants do not hold exactly the same conception of supervision as in other pre-service field-based experiences.

Conclusions are drawn regarding the potential impact of discrepant supervisory perspectives on learning and teaching. Recommendations are made as to how this data may improve the current supervision of student teachers. It is anticipated that this study will add to the nascent body of knowledge concerning the supervision of student teachers in field-based experiences and will be applied to facilitate the support, training, assessment, and credentialing of field supervisors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

If I have learned anything from this experience, it is that one cannot learn in isolation from others or the environment. It is with the deepest of appreciation that I thank Dr. Alice Boberg for her support and tutelage. She is the personification of the consummate supervisor. Her supervisory style is an exemplary model; providing precisely the type of motivation and guidance to facilitate optimum learning.

I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Robert Stamp's assistance. His ideas and direction have been instrumental in the development of this thesis from its very inception. Thanks to my rest of my candidacy committee, Dr. Richard Heyman, Dr. Eila Lamb, and Dr. Penny Jennett for their wisdom and suggestions. Gesla Engels was most helpful and patient as she tutored me in statistical methodology.

I am indebted to all of the student teachers and supervisors who took time out of their busy schedules to complete yet another survey. I hope that you may someday benefit from the fruits of your labors.

To my parents, Marie and Ed, I can never express the full extent of my gratitude for your unwavering encouragement. I can only hope that I will be able to fulfill your faith in me. I know I will never be able to repay your all of your loving kindness.

I am most thankful to my "split apart", Laura, for without her love and assurances I simply would never have competed this work.

Finally, thanks to Uncle Don for planting the seed so many years ago.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate my efforts to all of those field supervisors (especially my colleagues in Nuclear Medicine), who continue to extend themselves to facilitate a positive learning climate for initiates into their respective disciplines. While fulfilling the daily duties of satisfying the needs of their clients they are prepared to take on the added responsibilities of inculcating neophytes into the workplace. Without the support and guidance of their patience, expertise, and motivational skills few of us would be prepared to face the "real world" of employment. May these dedicated individuals be rewarded for their devotion to the instruction of others. It is my hope that they will some day receive the recognition they so richly deserve and the guidance, assistance, and direction they so fervently desire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Sheet	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of Figures	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of Terms	3
Significance of this Study	9
Limitations of this Study	11
Background to the Community and Workplace Setting	13
Program Rationale	14
Program Purpose	14
Program Principles	15
Program Overview	16
Expectations and Requirements for C/W Experiences	19
The Supervisory Cycle	22
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	24
The Importance of FBEs	24
Purpose of FBEs	25
The FBE Context	29
Difficulties with FBEs	35
The Effect of the Field Supervisor on the Student Teacher	37
Supervisory Models	39
Social Integrator Function	45
Teacher Function	49
Evaluator or Assessor Function	59
Counselor/Consultant Function	67
Role Model Function	70
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN	77
Quantitative Survey Methodology	77
The Sample	79
The Survey Instrument	80
Data Collection Methods	82
Data Analysis	83

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	85
Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire Results	86
Consensus Items	94
Responses Demonstrating a Significant Difference	97
Demographics	98
Cluster Analysis	100
Factor Analysis	101
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	104
CHAPTER SIX: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES	126
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	131
APPENDIX ONE	138
Introductory Letter	138
Consent Form	139
APPENDIX TWO	
Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire	140
REFERENCES	145

LIST OF TABLES

- 4.1 Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire Results**
- 4.2 Consensus Items of Effective Supervisory Behaviors**
- 4.3 Item Responses Which Demonstrate a Significant Difference**
- 4.4 Demographic Data For Field Supervisors**
- 4.5 Demographic Data For Student Teachers**
- 4.6 Factor Loadings for Social Integration Behaviors**
- 4.7 Factor Loadings for Teaching Behaviors**
- 4.8 Factor Loadings for Evaluatory Behaviors**
- 4.9 Factor Loadings for Consultant Behaviors**
- 4.10 Factor Loadings for Role Modeling Behaviors**

LIST OF FIGURES

- 2.1 THE SUPERVISORY CYCLE**
- 2.2 CONTEXTUAL SUPERVISION IN THE FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE**
- 2.3 THE FIELD-BASED SUPERVISORY TRIAD**
- 2.4 CLINICAL SUPERVISION**
- 2.5 FUNCTIONS OF A FIELD SUPERVISOR**
- 4.1 CLUSTER ANALYSIS USING WARD'S DENDOGRAM**

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTION

Since the inception of formal teacher preparation programs in the early 1800's, there has been considerable controversy and debate surrounding the methods of preparing teachers to teach (Ziechner, 1980). Until fairly recently, the field-based experience (FBE) component of teacher preparation has largely escaped critical assessment. However, despite their virtual omnipresence in teacher education preparation programs, FBEs continue to be persistently problematic (Copas, 1984; Beynon and Onslow, 1992). While many authors claim that FBEs are crucial to the successful inculcation of student teachers (STs), other researchers have, for decades, found the impact of FBEs on the professional expertise of pre-service teachers to be questionable (Hooper, and Johnston, 1973; Clifton, 1979; Copeland, 1979; Zeichner, 1980; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981; Evertson, Hawley, and Zlotnik, 1985; Holmes Group, 1986). Miklos and Greene (1987) concluded that pre-service programs only make a limited contribution to the development of skills essential to the performance of teaching in the classroom. Indeed, some researchers claim that involvement in student teaching may actually do more harm than good (Kaltsounis and Nelson, 1968; Salzillo and Van Fleet, 1977).

Notwithstanding the contradictory evidence regarding the appropriateness of FBEs, implementation of this practice is frequently considered the cornerstone of teacher education (Johnson, 1986). FBEs are commonly cited as one of the highlights and the single indisputably essential element in professional education (Conant, 1963; Tardif, 1985; Awender and Harte, 1986; Wideen and Holborn, 1986b; Miklos and Greene 1987). It is generally assumed by teachers, teacher educators, pre-service STs, and lay people alike that FBEs are beneficial and necessary (Zeichner, 1980). STs often cite their FBEs as the most valuable – and sometimes only valuable – part of professional preparation (Silberman, 1970). The implementation of FBEs has expanded, to being virtually universally accepted and implemented by educational faculties throughout Canada, the United States, and Britain (Grimmett and Ratzlaff, 1986).

If the FBE is cited the most beneficial aspect of pre-service education, then it is also commonly asserted that the value of this learning experience is largely dependent upon the quality of the field supervisor (FS) with whom the ST is placed (Copas, 1984). It is

imperative that only the best FSs available are selected to interact with the ST and that these individuals be professionally prepared. If FBEs are to be successful then greater emphasis needs to be placed on the quality of the FS (Ziechner, 1980). A first step in establishing such quality control is to identify effective supervisory characteristics (Schuster and Stevens, 1991).

There have been literally hundreds of studies conducted on the affect FSs have on pre-service FBEs. For decades, multiple authors have sought to elicit specific expectations and behaviors for the role of FSs in both Canadian and American contexts as perceived by STs, FSs, and university advisors (Hicks, 1969; Horton and Harvey, 1979; McIntyre and Morris, 1980; Yoder and Arms, 1981; Ratzlaff and Grimmett, 1986). Ratzlaff and Grimmett (1986) compared their Canadian findings of effective supervision to similar previous American studies so as to assess the influence of time and context on these practices. Their study concluded that the skills of a successful FS were most similar if the context of the learning environment was comparable and that this expertise was largely unaffected by the passage of time. These authors called for further research to determine if the tendencies evidenced in the 1980s represent solid tenet of knowledge on which to base the preparation of FSs and to further determine the effects of other learning environments on the optimum supervisory behaviors of FSs.

The purpose of this inquiry, then, is to extend the nascent body of knowledge on supervision in FBEs by having incumbent FBE participants identify effective and ineffective supervisory characteristics and behaviors which they perceive to be contributory to successful learning in a unique Community and Workplace (C/W) setting. It is anticipated that this investigation will elaborate upon previous research underlying the dimensions of the supervisory process and provide basic information that might clarify the central features of FBE supervision.

The questions to be answered in this study are:

1. What supervisory behaviors are perceived as effective by participant FSs and STs in the unique Community and Workplace segment of the University of Calgary's Master of Teaching program?

2. Are there differences in perceptions between FSs and STs regarding effective supervisory behaviors?
3. How do the perceptions of FSs and STs regarding supervision in the C/W setting differ from supervision identified by FSs and STs in FBEs in other settings?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

This study is beleaguered at the outset with the inherent difficulty of defining its investigational nomenclature. Yet, unless this obstacle can be overcome, a clear understanding of the implications of this inquiry will be impossible. There are two primary barriers related to this issue of terminology.

The first problem is that previous research does not adequately document much of the terminology used in this study nor are certain terms universally agreed upon. Many earlier investigators of FBEs have not delimited the contextual variants of the participants or the situations which they purport to study. It is not uncommon for individual researchers to define variables in a context-specific manner that is inconsistent with the works of other authors (Glickman and Bey, 1990). Some studies lack consistency regarding vocabulary even within a single investigation. For example, authors have been known to inappropriately use similar nomenclature to describe dissimilar conditions. Such is the case when the terms *cooperating teacher* and *mentor* are used interchangeably. While there are commonalties between these two positions, each of these terms depict a unique role characterized by individual qualifications which should not be misrepresented through the use of a singular designation. Similarly, various researchers may apply different expressions to situations that exhibit analogous, if not identical, qualities as with the terms *practice teaching*, *teaching rounds*, and *student teaching* (Turney *et. al.*, 1982). This lack of precision causes confusion and limits a complete understanding of the issues being studied.

The lack of uniform terminology is further compounded when attempting to compare the results of investigations performed in multiple disciplines. For example, the designations *preceptorship*, *internship*, and *practicum* each refer to pre-professional

practice in nursing, medicine, and education respectively. While there are certainly differences in content, structure, and context, the intent of each instance is the practical application of theory to real-life working scenarios. The use of discrepant labels to denote circumstances of similar intent serves more to segregate and isolate than to provide a unified collective understanding of related activities.

The second dilemma regarding terminology is that this study involves a unique situation which has heretofore not been detailed by other investigators. Very rarely are STs involved with community placements outside of the traditional school environment. It will become apparent that the FSs in the C/W setting have distinctive roles and responsibilities and do not act in the precisely the same capacity as previously described pre-professional supervisors such as preceptors or cooperating teachers (CTs). Nor do the conditions and expectations of these FBEs coincide directly with those of the traditional student teaching practicum. This makes it difficult to relate to the traditional concepts of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and student teaching in general.

While it might be tempting to develop an entirely new vernacular to delineate the FBE in the C/W environment, this course of action may only serve to further confuse and complicate an understanding of the situation. Certainly, such a stance would severely restrict a comparison between this milieu and others with similar pre-profession educational intent.

Hence, the following discussion will attempt to adapt the terminology of previous educational research to a description of the current C/W setting. Additionally, a marriage of related terms and concepts from other disciplines will be proposed to facilitate further descriptive enrichment and understanding of the C/W FBE in terms of previous research from numerous venues.

This tact is particularly applicable to the exploratory nature of this investigation. Similarities and differences in terminology will be outlined to explicate the complexities of this learning environment. While it is not expected that this discussion will settle any terminological controversy, at the very least the reader will become aware of various works in the field and be cognizant of the vocabulary upon which this study is based.

There is a widely held and revered assumption throughout most professional preparation programs that a key ingredient to learning is the concept of “learning by doing”. This has given structure to such time-honored and respected practices as the residency and internship in medicine, clerkship in the justice profession, clinical field placement in psychology and social work, preceptorship in technologies and nursing, apprenticeship in the trades, and internship in urban planning and public administration (Daresh, 1990). While there are certainly differences in the content and context of each curriculum, the common essential element is an application of theory under the direction of a practicing professional in a practical setting in which the learner may anticipate future professional enrolment. This, too, is the premise of the C/W setting.

Teacher education is characterized by diversity. Programs differ widely from one institution to the next. Considerable variety exists in the way these experiences are conceptualized, organized, and actually implemented even within the same institution (Zeichner, 1987). Likewise, the vista is continually shifting as new programs are planned and implemented (Wideen and Holborn, 1986a). The pre-professional practice of teachers is conducted under a variety of names including practice teaching, in-school experience, teaching rounds, student teaching, clinical placement, and, perhaps most commonly, the practicum. Unfortunately, the literature does not provide a uniform or cohesive description of the purposes, goals, or activities for such experiences (Cooper, 1994). Student teaching may vary in the timing of the initial placement, the number and variety of placements, the duration of individual placements, the total number of hours, the type and extent of student teacher involvement, the frequency and extent of supervision and assessment, and the degree of responsibility for evaluation (Morine-Dershimer and Leighfield, 1994). Despite these variations the intent of these practices is similar: to allow the learner to implement what they have learned in teacher education courses and to provide experiential learning and practice in an actual occupational situation under the direction of a professional skilled and practiced in the discipline (Turney, 1994). Kagen (1992) states that the primary goal of pre-service programs is to provide procedural knowledge to novices and to promote the acquisition of standard routines that integrate management and instruction. Neither theory nor practice should take precedence.

This study is premised upon the generalized concept of *field-based experiences* (FBEs). The terms student teaching, the practicum, and FBE are commonly used interchangeably (Zeichner, 1987). Certainly, there are a number of commonalities. Like student teaching in the practicum, educational FBEs typically begin with structured observation of an experienced professional in the learning setting designed to facilitate future teaching or tutoring of individuals or small groups. Eventually full classes may be taught in part of a subject, in a full subject, or, rarely, even a full course.

However, there are several features particularly relevant to this investigation that may distinguish FBEs from traditional student teaching. The first difference is that the FBE placement in the learning setting is usually of shorter duration (a few hours distributed over a few weeks). The terms *early* or *exploratory* FBE often refers to circumstances which entail less participation and more observation in preparation for teaching (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). Student teaching typically involves more extended practice (full days for several weeks).

A second difference between FBEs and student teaching is that the former frequently involves a wider variety of sites rather than the traditional K-12 school system. While the school classroom environment may be interpreted as representing the *field* for a teacher, field placements may include such diverse venues as public and private community service organizations, community centers, public health facilities, museums and galleries, multicultural societies, charitable organizations, correctional institutions, and counseling establishments (Handbook, 1997). A significant difference between this inquiry and previous works will be the context of the learning milieu and the resulting sample population. Previous researchers focussed upon STs and CTs in traditional K-12 school practica. This study will examine a number of diverse FBEs in the community and workplace setting.

A third distinction between FBEs and student teaching is the curricular focus. STs in the school system are most commonly involved with teaching lessons within a standardized curriculum generally engendered by an association of professional teachers and accepted by society. Field sites may not be designed to facilitate teaching the traditional K-12 curriculum. Rather, content emphasis for each site revolves around a

fuller understanding of the specific services offered by the particular organization involved. For example, STs in one FBE may assist in the preparation and presentation of instructional materials for police recruits. Another FBE may request the planning and implementation of site-specific curricula and activities which assist adults to become functional members of a work team in an institution. Other FBEs may expect STs to create client activity manuals, exhibits, or teacher resources. Yet other FBEs are involved with the preparation of staff-training and customer-education programs. Ultimately, "Students will gain an understanding of the complexity and diversity of the educational experience. Students can see the social and community dimensions of the educational enterprise. Students gain experience of the out-of-school interests, behaviors and activities of learners. Students experience a variety of different yet successful approaches to instruction. They are challenged to extend and expand the possible" (Handbook, 1997).

Hence, this study will employ the term FBE to refer to any one of a variety of pre-professional scenarios in which a learner is afforded the opportunity to apply instructional theory to practice under the direct supervision of a practicing professional.

On-site supervisors of the traditional educational experience have been variously named cooperating teacher (CT), associate teacher, and clinical instructor. Copas (1984) developed a definition for such supervisors from her experience with thirty-one institutions of higher education. She denotes a CT as any professionally trained teacher who is directly responsible for facilitating the student teacher's development of a deep and meaningful concept of teaching, helps the student teacher analyze the many facets of teaching, provides the student teacher with resources, and encourages the student teacher's unique teaching style. In other words, a supervisor is a practicing authority who assists the ST to become a competent professional.

Unlike CTs in the school system, field supervisors are not generally professionally trained teachers or licensed educators and have little or no explicit education in aspects of formalized teaching. Professional teachers teach but the focus of FSs is often the service of their unique client base through the use and understanding of the distinctive resources offered by that site. For example, FSs may be counselors with qualifications in crisis intervention, wildlife protection officers devoted to environmental issues, or

technologists with expertise in the medical profession. Hence, the term CT is an inappropriate descriptor for supervisors in the C/W scenario. FSs are subject matter experts in the site-specific discipline. While they are involved with training to various degrees, the education of others is not commonly their principle vocation. General education, and the instruction of the ST in particular, is often a responsibility added to an already heavy work load.

Rather than use the term cooperating *teacher* to designate these people who may not be certified as professional teachers nor whose principle activities need necessarily be instruction, this study will adopt the broader term *field supervisor* (FS) to denote an experienced individual with subject-matter expertise who is specifically responsible for assisting the ST to meet predetermined goals established for a specific aspect of professional growth.

The term *university supervisor* (US) will be used to signify an individual from the post-secondary educational institution who is directly responsible for the education of the ST and who acts as a liaison between the field site and the university.

Unlike the typical school scenario, FBE placements do not always cater specifically to children. FBEs may deal with individuals of any age group but they are commonly adults. They are also more likely to involve groups with specific needs such as young offenders, the severely disabled, immigrants, or at-risk teenage girls not addressed by many schools (Handbook, 1997). Whereas the traditional school system seeks to educate the majority of children in society, FBEs are usually intent on the instruction of a much more specific portion of the population that fit within the rather narrow parameters defined by the particular site.

In typical educational parlance the term *student* is used to designate the primary learner; usually a child in K-12. The broader term *client* will be used in this study since this designation refers to any learner seeking instruction in the site-specific content. To reduce confusion, this study will employ the term student teacher (ST) to refer to the learner involved with a post-secondary pre-professional program in education.

The goals of pre-professional supervision in education are often not agreed upon nor fully articulated (Glickman and Bey, 1990). They are frequently vague and may lack

congruence with rest of teacher education program (Turney, 1994). This study defines *supervision*, in its broadest sense, as the process of facilitating the professional self-development and competency of an individual in task-related skills. The purpose of supervision is to assist the ST to become a competent teacher. Supervision involves cooperative planning and dialogue, observation, periodic intervention and assistance, role modeling, and feedback for the purposes of improving professional competencies (Glickman and Bey, 1990; Heppner *et. al.*, 1994).

An *effective behavior* is an observable action that contributes directly to the attainment of one or more of the program's aims (i.e. expertise as a practicing teacher). *Ineffective behaviors* are those which interfere with attainment of these aims (Copas, 1984).

SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS STUDY

The elucidation of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors in FBEs is particularly significant because of the impact these behaviors have on the student teaching experience and on subsequent teaching behaviors (Copas, 1984). The professional attitudes, skills, and decision-making processes of the ST are not innate but are largely derived from exposure to the FS in the FBEs (Duquette, 1993). Given the tremendous influence supervision by FSs has on the ST (Worthington and Roehike, 1979), it is the intention of this research to allow program participants to specify those supervisory behaviors which they have found to successfully facilitate the education of STs.

Selection of the best FSs available must be of paramount importance to pre-service education programs (Copas, 1984). Despite the control FSs may exert over STs, FSs are commonly selected arbitrarily. Long term exposure to FSs who do not exhibit appropriate supervisory skills will surely have a detrimental impact on the ST's learning. It is vital that only those professionals who demonstrate ideal supervisory characteristics are selected and maintained as FSs. For the sake of a strong FBE, those specialists who do not exhibit suitable supervisory behaviors would best assist the organization in positions

which do not significantly affect STs. This survey attempts to support the selection process by identifying exemplary supervisory practices.

FSs and STs, alike, indicate that FSs are frequently inadequately prepared for their work as supervisors. Multiple studies have indicated that better preparation of FSs is a principle need for most FBEs (Wideen and Holborn, 1986a). Most FSs have little training in superior supervisory techniques and do not possess an in-depth understanding of the nature of supervision. While the purpose of supervision in the FBE is to assist STs to improve actual professional practice, both STs and FSs are repeatedly frustrated. Their potential is often not realized as a result of poor supervisory approaches (Smith, 1990). FSs feel ill-prepared for supervision and express a desire to understand the fundamentals of supervision so that they can improve their techniques. Without knowledge of their own strengths and weaknesses, FSs cannot be expected to modify their actions appropriately and enhance their communications with STs. Currently there is no research base that delineates best practices associated with effective supervision of STs in FBEs (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Close examination of the key participants of FBEs will lead to an understanding that will inform supervisory practice (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). This investigation seeks to reveal supervisory practices to be incorporated, sustained, or deleted from current supervisory practice to empower effective supervision. This data may provide the foundational groundwork for the development of instructional opportunities such as workshops, courses, and programs that will assist FSs in improving the quality of their instruction. Ideally, the results of this inquiry will provide for the development, assessment, and improvement of effective supervision by FSs in the FBE. By working to enhance the supervisory skills of FSs there is great potential to positively affect ST learning in the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains thereby ultimately producing more competent practitioners

The identification of supervisory competence will assist in promoting FS accountability and evaluation. A recognition of these behaviors may provide the foundation for the assessment of an individual's suitability to act as a FS.

A further intent of this study is to enhance this type of communication between STs, FSs, and USs (and their respective institutions). This data should contribute to improved

communications by establishing common ground between and among FSs and STs and direct participants towards enacting shared goals and structures.

FBEs can be improved through public acknowledgement of and a comprehensive understanding of the needs and constraints experienced by participants. This study may provide data for the development of public statements that may guide and direct program policies and the implementation of more effective teacher pre-service practice (Smith, 1990).

Finally, this investigation seeks out similarities and differences between supervisory practices in the C/W setting and those behaviors practiced by FSs in other disciplines. It is anticipated that this type of inquiry will draw together research findings from various sources and thereby stimulate interest and collaboration among other analysts and provide a basis for further exploration. It is hoped that, through a sharing of ideas, FSs in a number of environments may benefit. This may be particularly relevant to the C/W Program which is in its infancy and still developing.

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

This investigation documents the responses of those individuals who replied to the survey. As with any study, there is always the concern that these results may not generalize to individuals with similar functions in other FBEs. It is important to recognize that the results of this study may be temporally and contextually dependent and may not apply to other FSs or STs in other FBEs or disciplines. Research has demonstrated that the perceptions of FSs and STs may vary with site or educational experience, the stage of development, the policies of the program, and the context of the FBE (Grimmett and Ratzlaff, 1986). However, it should be noted that the variety of FBEs involved in this study is quite extensive including both educational and non-educationally based organizations. This site heterogeneity should imply some commonalities across divergent FBEs.

Only STs and FSs were queried in this inquiry. Other participants such as USs, clients, and site administrators may have different views regarding the FBE. Further

research would be required to ascertain their perspectives of effective supervisory behaviors.

The responses received in the survey are only a measure of the respondents perceptions of events in the FBE. Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) results reveal numerous inconsistencies between the stated effectiveness of certain behaviors and the frequency with which they are actually practiced. Only actual observation of the FBE interactions could provide evidence for those behaviors which are truly enacted by FSs.

Using a forced-choice format in the survey may have limited some of the potential responses from STs and FSs. However, this concern was partially defrayed by soliciting extended responses through the open-ended questions at the end of the survey.

No attempt was made to determine differences within each group of respondents. Duquette (1993) has demonstrated that there may be significant differences between members of varying educational and experiential backgrounds within a group.

This research did not attempt to ascertain the reasons for FS or ST responses. It may be that variances with other the conclusions of other researchers are a result of contextual variables such as the type of content or the environment of the FBE itself. It may be that the maturity level of the C/W STs places them in an heightened state of readiness and do not perceive the need for the intense FS intervention demonstrated by some previous studies. As Ralph (1993) points out, STs mature from a state in which they require structured direction through stages in which coaching and supporting behaviors are required and finally to a state of development in which STs possess the expertise and experience that allows them to be self-regulating. Further investigation is required to comprehend the actual underlying rationale for FS's behavior. At this stage of understanding this type of FBE it was felt a foundational identification of those supervisory behaviors which were perceived as being effective was essential. Hence, the exploratory survey approach was deemed appropriate. Other research methodologies such as ethnography, interviews, and case studies should be able to more completely clarify the motivation behind these responses.

BACKGROUND TO THE COMMUNITY AND WORKPLACE SETTING

The amount of time and the type of activities devoted to FBEs in a teacher education program is determined by the often competing priorities of theory, as advocated by the university, and actual practice, as endorsed by the field site. FBEs vary in duration and total number of hours involved, when they are placed within the total program, the expectations placed upon the participants, the number of sites involved, frequency and type of intervention by university personnel, the method of evaluation, and the prerequisites (Morine-Dershimer and Leighfeld, 1994). The following is a description of the unique FBE to be studied in this investigation that has been developed and implemented by the Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary.

In 1994 the Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Calgary questioned current B.Ed. students and recent graduates regarding their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the B.Ed. Program (Handbook, 1997-1998). It was the consensus of the respondents that the link between theory and practice was considered tenuous. Replies suggested that theory should assist in the understanding of and development of a practice-based program. Integration of theory and practice was essential and central to the success and effectiveness of the program. These results seemed consistent with resolutions recently passed by the Alberta Teacher's Association and the Department of Education which called for a closer relationship between theory and practice, an improvement of the quality of educational faculties more oriented toward producing a true professional, and a move towards producing graduates that possessed the clearly defined and definite subject-related knowledge, pedagogical skills, instructional attitudes, moral qualities, and ethical standards of a teacher.

Faculty, students, practicing teachers, and representatives from a number of other educational stakeholder groups provided input into defining the needs of the teacher preparation program. Based on these imperatives, a group of faculty members was asked by the Dean to propose a new program. The result was the Master of Teaching Program launched in September 1996.

PROGRAM RATIONALE

The teacher preparation program was changed as a result of pragmatic and pedagogic constraints. Pragmatically, the viability of the traditional program was jeopardized by continued deterioration of provincial and federal resources. The program faced increased competition for resources from both internal and external (provincial, national and international) sources.

However, the modification of the teacher education program was not only a result of economic necessity. Pedagogically, it was felt that the traditional program did not address the immediate or future learning/teaching needs of the programs' participants. Organizers recognized that the traditional model was based on university course work framed by theoretical/research-based knowledge followed by short-term school experiences. The problems with this model relate to the lack of integration of theory and practice, to the lack of self-directed inquiry and self-assessment by students, and to the limited opportunities for students to witness and participate in exemplary field-based practices. The new program sought to overcome these limitations by promoting extensive field practice which would focus on university-field site partnerships and thereby strengthen the connections between theory and practice.

The new Master of Teaching Program is founded upon several general principles. First, the belief that education students are adults who learn best when learning is self-initiated and when individuals are in control of their own learning. Secondly, learning must be perceived as relevant and problem-based. Learning is enhanced through "hands on" opportunities in real learning/teaching situations both in the school classroom and in other community and workplace educational settings. Thirdly, learning is facilitated by developing relationships with professionals and peers throughout the community. And finally, students must also have time to work and to reflect upon their actions.

PROGRAM PURPOSE

The stated purpose of the Program is to educate learners about what it means to become a professional educator and to ensure that graduates possess and demonstrate the

commitment and abilities necessary to fulfill the obligations of a teacher. This means that prospective teachers should come to understand:

- Their pedagogic responsibilities to students, parents, colleagues, communities and the profession itself,
- The diverse ways in which people learn and express learning,
- The necessary ambiguity surrounding theory, practice, and outcomes that requires on-going inquiry, reflection, and conversation, and

that they are able to:

- Negotiate a complex, and often conflicting set of demands emanating from the learner, curricula, and context;
- Create and maintain a "learning and teaching" climate both for self and others;
- Work both collaboratively and independently and know when each is contextually appropriate;
- Assess self, students, curricula, and contexts in order to make wise decisions;
- Communicate clearly, efficiently, and effectively with a wide variety of audiences.

PROGRAM PRINCIPLES

The Program is based on several key teaching, learning, and teacher education principles:

Teaching:

- Competence in teaching is achieved through intentional, situational, and thoughtful practical action – praxis.
- Teaching requires passion, trust, and interest –objective skills and cognitive understandings are only a portion of the pedagogy while subjectivity is also important to learning and teaching.
- Teaching is a complex social activity that cannot be divorced from larger social, cultural, and political contexts.

Learning:

- Learning is developmental and the learner's social, physical, emotional and cognitive abilities must direct the teaching strategies.
- Individuals learn in different ways and teaching should recognize and accommodate various learning strategies.
- Learner development is continuous, sequential, and interactive. Individual differences should be recognized.
- Interaction with others is essential to learning. Such interplay is necessary to define, clarify, elaborate, analyze, and organize learning experiences.
- Most learners learn through observation and modeling.
- Motivation is a key to learning effectiveness and is enhanced when the learner has direct input into the decisions about their own learning .
- Learning is augmented when it has personal meaning, relevance and practical application.
- Learners learn best when learning is challenging but expectations must be realistic and structured for success.

Teacher Education:

- Is a reflective practice.
- Must promote integration of theory and practice.
- Learning and teaching experiences and knowledge need to be experienced across a variety of contexts.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Master of Teaching Program is learner-focused, inquiry-based, and field-oriented.

Learner-Focused: The Program focuses on the individual needs of the learners as teachers. The program offers opportunities for students to become self-directed learners.

There are opportunities for learners to work independently as well as collaboratively with peers and field supervisors.

Inquiry-Based: The Program requires that learners inquire into learning, teaching, and the curriculum. Issues are presented from real life situations which learners will face in their profession in the form of case studies, simulations, or real experiences. Resolving the issues is not mandatory but learning from them is paramount.

Field-Oriented: The Program is premised upon participatory, practical, and structured learning and teaching experiences in appropriate field-sites. Learners are allowed graded levels of autonomy as they discover the actualities of learning and teaching in a field site and accept responsibility for teaching/learning relationships.

In this two year (four semester) post-baccalaureate teacher preparation program learning experiences are conceptually integrated around a series of six interrelated themes each of which emphasizes a specific body of knowledge and professional skills. These thematic units serve to guide and integrate campus learning and field experiences.

Theme 1: Learners and Learning focuses on an understanding of the psychological, sociological, philosophical and pedagogic phenomenon of learning and serves to integrate and guide learning experiences on campus and in the FBE. (Semester 1)

Theme 2: Teachers and Teaching employs case studies to elucidate the purpose, history, practices, ethics, culture, assessment, and theories of teaching. Understanding ones own beliefs, philosophies, and history of becoming a teacher is emphasized. (Semester 1)

Themes 3 and 4: Curriculum Contexts and Curriculum Studies deal with curriculum development and teaching practices specific to teaching in schools. (Semester 2)

Theme 5: Praxis details teaching practices that are intentional, thoughtful, and situational actions. It is during this unit that STs form collaborative working relationships with working professionals who model inquiry and reflective planning, teaching, and assessment practices in the practicum. (Semester 3)

Theme 6: Integration attempts to integrate theoretical and practical understandings of teaching and learning gathered from the campus and FBEs. Emphasis is placed on the interplay of teaching and learning processes with institutional, professional, ethical and moral contexts. (Semester 4)

The Program offers six strands of learning experiences:

- An integrated lecture series which guides the learner through the thematic units of studies and emphasizes a body knowledge and professional skills in topics such as Learning and Learners, Teachers and Teaching, Curriculum, Praxis, and Integration. (1.5 hours per week on campus)
- Case inquiry tutorials organized as a series of predetermined and/or negotiated cases reflecting topics within the thematic units (3 hours per week on campus)
- Professional seminars with the university advisor (2 hours per week on campus)
- Independent inquiries on topics related to their area of study (2 are required in year 1)
- Observation-participation in field experiences including 20 weeks in the first year (10 weeks in Semester 1 and 10 in semester 2 for two days per week). In the first semester, 5 weeks (two days per week for a total of 75 hours) of the field experience are in a C/W site. In the other five weeks and all of the second semester field experiences are in one assigned school. In the second year the field experience consists of a 13-week block (4 days per week) in a different school site. STs may elect to participate in a further 150-hour C/W experience during semester 4.
- Field-oriented inquiry seminars during which learners are introduced to and guided through various forms of field-oriented inquiry that allows for observation, examination, and enhancement of their teaching practices. Classroom discussion of their experiences is encouraged (1.5 hours per week on campus or in the field).

One of the elements that makes the Program so innovative and revolutionary is the innovative Community and Workplace (C/W) component. All learners must complete an observation-participation period in an assigned, non-traditional, community/workplace setting in order to enhance their understandings of teaching and learning. STs are afforded opportunities to become familiar with individuals and institutions in the educational field normally outside the experience of teacher preparation students. Sites range over a broad spectrum of public-sector agencies and private sectors businesses. Clients may include young children, teenagers, and adults including seniors.

The stated value of C/W placements to students include:

- As participant-observers STs are immersed directly in the world of teaching and learning thereby gaining an understanding of the complexity and diversity of the educational experience
- STs can see the social and community dimensions of the educational enterprise
- STs gain experience in the out-of-school interests, behaviors, and activities of learners
- STs experience a variety of different yet successful approaches to instruction. They are challenged to extend and expand the possible
- As perspective teachers observe and participate in teaching and learning in non-traditional setting their career opportunities may be widened

The stated value of C/W placements to C/W sites include:

- STs bring excitement, energy, enthusiasm, and fresh perspectives to the C/W site

EXPECTATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR C/W EXPERIENCES

The Faculty of Education will:

- Prepare and distribute the annual handbook with detailed information and expectations regarding C/W experiences
- Provide students with information on the C/W sites
- Match student backgrounds with site needs and requirements
- Inform sites of student placements

- **Require students to make initial contact with sites**
- **Provide an orientation workshop for site supervisors**
- **Designate faculty members as field supervisors for specific sites**
- **Ensure that each site is visited by a university field supervisor**
- **Provide support for students**
- **Offer assistance if requested at evaluation times**

Students will:

- **Attend 75 hours required for the C/W component of the program**
- **Make the initial contact with the C/W site**
- **Assume the personal and vocational behavioral characteristics of a professional educator**
- **Understand and participate first as observers, then as assisting participants and as collaborators, in their own and others' learning and teaching**
- **Gain familiarity with their supervisors to discuss observations and self-reflections**
- **Begin to develop their own teaching styles**
- **Integrate observations and analysis of teaching and learning with university-based components of the program**
- **Record and reflect on their experiences via field journals**

The Community and Workplace sites will:

- **Provide 75 hours (15 hours x 5 weeks) of observation and participation experiences for students**
- **Designate supervisor(s) specifically charged with mentoring students**
- **Provide opportunities for students to observe and engage in a variety of teaching and learning activities**
- **Offer quality approaches to teaching and learning which are highly regarded and admired in the community**
- **Allow students to broaden their understanding of the teaching/learning process**

- Provide opportunities for students to learn about human development
- Provide experiences which students can compare and contrast with school-based experiences
- Allow students to explore non-traditional career employment opportunities

Community and Workplace Supervisors will:

- Welcome the ST and provide an introduction to site personnel, familiarize them with site facilities and policies, and orient them to instructional activities
- Provide space supplies timetables, staff lists, curriculum guides, client lists, and textbooks
- Provide clear lines of communication and promote regular dialogue with school personnel so as to initiate the ST into the language of practice and move toward the informed understanding and critical analysis of learning and teaching
- Clarify expectations of the ST (e.g. teaching responsibilities, supervision routines, observations to be made, extracurricular activities)
- Act as a mentor who can answer the ST's questions and regularly discuss issues
- Coordinate meaningful learning experiences for the ST and provide opportunities to observe and participate collaboratively in a variety of instructional situations
- Collaboratively plan an array of meaningful field experiences
- Model various instructional strategies
- Assign the student instructional tasks on a gradually increasing basis of difficulty
- Suggest instructional strategies, material, and alternatives throughout the experience
- Include the student planning, assessment, monitoring, and debriefing
- Encourage the ST to participate in extra-curricular and supervisory duties
- Contact the university field advisor in the early stages of concern if the ST appears to need special assistance
- Provide feedback to the ST on a regular basis through conferencing and written comments
- Prepare narrative evaluations regarding the ST strengths and weaknesses

Figure 2.1

THE SUPERVISORY CYCLE

Supervision in the C/W is to focus on positive and constructive dialogue, feedback, and self-reflection. The suggested supervisory cycle follows the general outline of supervision proposed by Cogan (1973). A pre-conference is to be held between the ST

objectives, strategies and evaluation procedures. During the pre-conference the FS and ST will identify areas of interest to be observed during client interaction and agree upon a means of gathering such data. STs are encouraged to ask questions to ensure understanding.

While the ST is involved with clients the FS will use the prescribed data gathering instrument(s) to observe, interpret, and record data pertinent to the previously identified areas of focus.

During the post conference process the ST and FS will mutually analyze the data collected during the observation period to identify strengths and weaknesses. Constructive suggestions, alternatives, and future directions will be developed to enhance the ST's work.

CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW

"Direct classroom involvement, over the long term, in partnership with an excellent teaching model provided me with more knowledge and skills than I ever could have acquired through books and lectures." (Duquette, 1993)

"The on-site program helped me to get a more realistic perspective on how schools are operated, especially what is expected from teachers on a day-to-day basis. " (Duquette, 1993)

"Learning in the workplace is the most stressful component of professional education. Supervisors are generally too busy to provide me with adequate supervision. I feel as though I am in the way. Most supervisors have little training or experience in teaching and are unable or unwilling to contribute appropriate instruction, feedback, or direction. I am often treated like a child or simply (used) as free labor; performing routine procedures that are designed to give supervisors free time rather than enhance my own professional skills. ' (Personal correspondence with a learner in the workplace).

Such are the range of dichotomous views expressed by learners regarding their encounters in the FBE portion of pre-service professional educational programs. It is the purpose of this discussion to review the literature regarding FBEs in general and the supervisory behaviors of FSs in particular.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FBEs

Multiple studies have cited FBEs as the single most essential and powerful intervention in a teacher's professional preparation (Rogers, 1992; Potthoff and Kline, 1995). Such experiences are considered to have a profound effect on the ST's personal and professional demeanor and are commonly considered an indisputably essential element of professional education (McAteer, 1976; Friebus, 1977; Campbell and Williamson, 1983; Ellenberg, 1981; Freeland, 1979; Funk *et. al.*, 1982). Teachers cite practice teaching as the most valuable - and sometimes the only valuable - portion of their professional preparations (Copas, 1984). FBEs are seen as the strongest feature of teacher preparation while courses taught at the university have the reputation of being irrelevant to the needs of the field (Grimmett and Ratzlaff, 1986).

It is frequently assumed that some time in the field is better than none and that the more time spent in this fashion the better (Tabachnick, 1980). This perception is so widely held that FBEs are an integral part of virtually every pre-service education program in America, Britain, and Canada (Grimmett and Ratzloff, 1986). FBEs constitute an average of one-tenth of the total teaching training process. Governmental and educational agencies such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education have mandated that this time should increase (Daresh, 1990; Guyton and McIntyre, 1990; Morine-Dershimer and Leighfeld, 1994).

PURPOSE OF FBEs

FBEs act in a pivotal role in the transition between the university and the work environment for new professionals. As a pre-service, entry to practice educational experience, the aim of the FBE is to provide inexperienced prospective STs with a supportive exposure to and practice within a *real-life* teaching/learning environment. STs are afforded opportunities to implement the theory they have learned in teacher education courses at a university to actual practice in a workplace scenario in which they expect to define their careers. STs act under the direct supervision of an experienced, competent specialist for the impending purpose of becoming a full fledged functioning professional replete with licensure, responsibilities, and benefits accorded to an individual in possession of such credentials (Morine-Dershimer and Leighfeld, 1994).

Kagan (1992) identified five components of professional growth particularly associated with FBEs: development of standardized routines for client management and instruction; development of problem-solving skills that are multidimensional and context-specific; increased awareness of knowledge and beliefs about clients and the learning environment; reconstruction of idealized and inaccurate images of clients and self-as-teacher; and shifts in attention from self to instructional issues and then to client learning. Though STs may have a considerable didactic base from the university, they lack the experience and expertise to exercise theory in practical situations (Duquette, 1993). Educated for the ideal situation, they may not be capable of assuming the full range of responsibilities; often finding themselves overwhelmed with the obligations and

limitations of everyday practice. They require significant exposure to the practice of interacting with clients under actual employment situations. For STs with little experience and little background against which to examine judgements or ideas, the FBE becomes crucial to active, intelligent involvement (Castillo, 1971). Direct experience gives meaning to ideas and contributes to a functional understanding of theories discussed in university classes.

The first-hand experience of FBEs allow the novice to clarify professional and personal beliefs by viewing various methods in which pertinent knowledge and skills are implemented. As the ST explicates personal meaning to solutions to real problems encountered in daily life, she is often encouraged to display resourcefulness and initiatives not generally required in traditional educational settings (Ralph, 1993). Cognitive development theory informs us that individuals learn best through active participation. Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld's (1991) rationale for FBEs is founded upon the premise that learning is most effective when the learner is actively engaged in relevant and meaningful circumstances. A program that intimately harmonizes the ST's needs with program development and goals contributes realism and meaning to the learner (MacKinnon, 1989) and decreases reality shock when the ST graduates.

The FBE is essential in synthesizing insights, ideas, understandings, attitudes, and skills which form the foundation of professional judgments and actions. As a result of this integration of theory and practice the FBE becomes a powerful tool in which the perspective teacher is able to develop, apply, reconstruct, and refine theoretical learning's into appropriate professional skills and attitudes and teaching competence (Morine-Dershimer and Leighfield; Turney *et. al.*, 1982). FBEs allow the ST to acquire the critical norms, values, and behaviors of the discipline and generally become socialized into professional practice (Castillo, 1971). Karmos and Jacko (1977a) suggest that FBEs are a major unifying experience in teacher education; a time for ST to explore, experiment, and *put it all together* prior to becoming a professional.

The novice is afforded opportunities to test ideas in action before accepting or rejecting them and further questioning personal teaching problems and abilities. FBEs permit the ST to raise questions, define needs, and focus university work. STs are

encouraged to discover their own personal problems and realize personal abilities. The neophyte moves from the relatively sheltered, limited, and ideally focussed world of theory towards the exposed, multifocal, reality-based world of practice. STs progressively develop competencies through participation in a range of practical experiences in a relatively risk-free environment (O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee, 1994).

During FBEs the ST is furnished with the direct and immediate feedback regarding personal strengths and weaknesses so essential for improvement. The FS is in an ideal situation to offer timely, relevant, personal counseling and suggest appropriate remediation.

FBEs can enhance the ST's self-knowledge, feelings of autonomy, and self-efficacy. Participation in FBEs allow STs to become more self-critical and demonstrate a more realistic understanding and optimism of the professional environment. They become more positively motivated and exhibit a stronger professional attitude. Wideen and Holborn, (1986b) cite several studies which indicate that self-esteem, enhanced professional attitudes, and a reduction in anxiety are other benefits with exposure to well designed FBEs. STs tend to accept a greater personal responsibility for learning after being involved with FBEs (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). FBEs provide a venue that furnishes opportunities to assess one's own suitability to teach and to question the legitimacy of one's place in this complex position. Applegate (1987) states that FBEs may assist the ST to develop leadership and organizational abilities and to test and improve one's overall career commitment (Turney *et. al.*, 1982).

The interpersonal networks and collaborations that STs form during FBEs may have a significant impact on the access to future employment in the discipline. Lifetime friendships with other professionals are not an uncommon outcome of FBE involvement.

It is important to recognize that the impact of the FBE is not solely relegated to the learner. While educational researchers have largely neglected this area of study, other disciplines such as nursing are acutely aware of the influence FBEs have on FSs (Chickerella and Lutz, 1981; Limon *et al.*, 1982). The overall impression gained from the literature is that FSs find FBEs to be personally very valuable. They claim that involvement with the neophyte encourages them to reflect upon their own practice and

ultimately improves their own skills and knowledge of the discipline. As FSs discuss with the ST areas of mutual interests they recognize that STs bring with them new ideas and outlooks and alternative insights to traditional problems.

FBEs provide FSs with opportunities for professional growth and stimulation and a means of enhancing their flexibility and gaining new ideas (Guyton, 1987). FBEs allow FSs to demonstrate leadership and teaching abilities to supervisors and peers and thereby gain recognition and support for future advancements. Association with FBEs tend to improve the self-esteem and self-confidence of FSs (Guyton, 1987). Karmos and Jacko (1977b) report that FSs demonstrate enhanced commitment, motivation, and inner satisfaction as a result of their interactions with the novice. As FSs become responsible for the growth and achievement of STs they experience a sense of legacy; passing their skills and expertise on to future professionals (Guyton, 1987). FSs perceive their relationship with STs as a refreshing change of pace; an opportunity to transcend the rut of daily routine. Rikard and Veal (1996) found that involvement with STs breaks the sense of isolation many FSs experience as educators. They perceive their affiliation with FBEs to be an opportunity to examine their own teaching style and engage in self-evaluation, thereby improving personal practice. Finally, FSs note that, as the ST gains confidence and competence, the FS is able to delegate authority to the ST and relieve some of the workload. This permits more time to be spent on the client and improves client service.

It is also important to recognize the affects of FBE involvement has on sponsoring institutions. Studies demonstrate that FBEs can reduce the long-term costs of neophyte inculcation into the organization as it speeds socialization and integration toward becoming a functional staff member (Chickerella and Lutz, 1981; Shamian and Inhaber, 1985). Improved communications between staff and the learner is a hallmark of successful FBEs. FBEs often increase the enthusiasm and professionalism of employees. Morale and motivation is enhanced particularly when FSs are afforded opportunity for advancement. Participation in FBEs allows institutions to recognize exceptional personnel for their instructional and organizational abilities.

Strong FBEs may attract professional staff with desirable expertise as it demonstrates institutional concern about staff developmental needs. This in-turn has been shown to increase the retention of the most qualified and competent personnel. FBEs provide a challenging growth environment for participants and encourage a positive learning atmosphere. This promotes a continual review and evaluation of practice that ensures execution of optimal required skills.

Finally, FBEs provide direct, first-hand observation of the novice's competency which is so essential for skill validation and hiring proficient individuals. FBEs can ensure that the novice learns and performs to optimum standards and within institutional and professional guidelines. This facilitates hiring practices as the employer becomes intimately aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the prospective applicant and has the opportunity to minimize any deficiencies. Involvement with FBEs will ensure the creation of future generations of individuals with ideal professional characteristics. Documented observations of ST's behavior in FBEs also provides invaluable corroboration should termination or future legal actions become necessary.

THE FBE CONTEXT

While all FBEs endeavor to achieve the common goal of professional acculturation there is considerable variance in the content, context, style, and format of individual programs. Ralph (1993) provides a generalized model for a pre-service FBE (2.2).

Figure 2.2

CONTEXTUAL SUPERVISION IN THE FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCE

Adapted from Ralph (1993)

The institutional (university) core curriculum introduces the principles and philosophy (the foundational theory) of education. These understandings can then be applied in an actual teaching practice in the workplace during activities which may include observational internships, peer teaching, and microteaching. This practice setting is impacted upon by the numerous contextual variables delineated in the diagram. The US and FS are expected to match supervisory support and task assistance with the STs' developmental confidence and competence in a symbiotic relationship. The US generally encourages the application of theoretical, conceptual, evaluative, and practical knowledge while the FS promotes practice in socialization, managerial skills, and hands-on professional expertise.

FBEs seem to be centered upon one of two contrasting major conceptualizations. The most predominant conception is that of apprenticeship in which STs directly model their actions upon those of the FS. In this scenario USs and FSs assist STs to gain techniques, values, and attitudes that will assist them to survive within the existing workplace. The *status quo* is unquestioned. University coursework is cited as providing the conceptions of subject matter and the theoretical principles of learning, instruction, and management while FBEs are obliged to provide practical survival skills, knowledge of student interests, an understanding of the difficulties with subject material, and additional learning about specific topics within the subject content. FBEs are intended to afford STs the opportunity to implement the theory of university-based coursework into practice under the guidance and direction of a trained and competent experienced professional in a utilitarian scenario (Karmos and Jacko, 1977b; Grimmet and Ratzlaff, 1986; Schuster and Stevens, 1991). In this view, FBEs are expected to prove more effective in facilitating the acquisition of teaching behaviors than the remote, abstract, vicarious, or simulated experiences that the educational institution may have to offer (Beynon and Onslow, 1992).

The other conception of FBEs is more akin to a laboratory experience in which the ST receives supervisory assistance in developing the habits of personal inquiry and reflection about learning/teaching and the context in which these occur (Zeichner, 1980). STs engage in a broader range of inquiry about education in general and learn by solving

practical problems. As the ST reflects upon personal actions within the FBE, the relationship between theory and practice is expected to become more closely linked.

FBEs may begin as early as the first semester of an educational degree. In other situations exposure to the school setting is not until a substantial portion of the educational course work has been completed (Copas, 1984). In some teacher education programs FBEs are integrated directly into and throughout the entire teacher preparation curriculum and educational courses are interspersed with one or more short practice FBEs (Wideen and Holborn, 1986b). For example, the Yokohama National University in Japan provides FBEs to undergraduates during a two year college experience (Mordine-Dershimer and Leighfield, 1994). An early FBE in the junior year consists of only two days of classroom observation and four weeks of actual teaching occurs in the senior year. The British Columbia Institute of Technology (B.C.I.T.) provides a similarly integrated two-year program of studies for medical radiation technologists. Students receive approximately 48 weeks of practical training in a hospital interspersed between didactic modules held at the college.

In other programs FBEs may not be provided until after an educational degree is already conferred so that the FBE acts almost as a post-degree apprenticeship or internship (e.g., University of Western Ontario). Such programs are not unlike the teacher's college or normal school concept (Wideen and Holborn, 1986b). At the University of New Hampshire the FBE is an apprenticeship component of the program *added on* at the end of a four year didactic training program. Technical colleges such as the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (S.A.I.T.) provide a comparable program for medical technologists in which the first year is primarily the didactic learning at the college and the second year is a practical FBE at a sponsoring medical facility.

The number and diversity of placements available also vary between institutions. The Nebraska-Lincoln professional development model provides FBE exposure in multiple settings to novices during each year of a five years degree program. During the first year the emphasis is primarily on observational experiences but teaching responsibilities increase and supervision decreases until in the latter years the novice is largely accountable for a full range of pedagogical skills and is afforded almost complete

autonomy. At the University of Western Ontario placements are split into three different sites to provide practice to novices in at least two areas of specialization. FBEs in this case are exclusively school-based. The medical technologies at B.C.I.T. and S.A.I.T. generally provide practical training in a variety of medical settings including community clinics and various hospitals. The experience is further enhanced by ensuring that the novice is exposed to a number of departments within a clinical site.

It would appear that the quantity and variety of placements is largely based upon availability of sites. As the numbers of novices expand and the accessibility to FBEs tend to decrease the maintenance of an adequate supply of appropriate FBEs becomes increasingly problematic.

FBEs differ considerably in the duration of individual placements and the total hours available. FBEs range from several hours to a couple of days to several weeks and finally to a full year-long apprenticeship. Morine-Dershimer and Leighfield (1994) document an American survey of 90 teacher preparation institutions offering between 0-400 hours of FBE with novices in secondary education spending less time than elementary or special education STs. Ben-Peretz and Rumney (1991) describe distinct differences between universities and teacher education colleges in Israel. Universities require only 14-40 FBE hours during a two-year program while teacher education colleges mandate 80-150 hours for prospective teachers in each of three to four years of study.

In the innovative C/W initiative recently implemented by the University of Calgary (U of C), novices are exposed to both school-based and non-traditional, community or workplace situated FBEs including such diverse venues as zoological gardens, penal correctional centers, and museums. The U of C teacher preparation program offers a two-year (four semester), second degree in education. In the first semester five weeks (two days per week) are spent in each of a regular K-12 school and a C/W FBE; for a total of 75 hours in each. These FBEs are fully integrated with professional seminars, lectures, and tutorial case work at the university. In the fourth semester the novice has the option to spend a further 150 hours in a C/W placement which is also integrated into inquiry projects at the university.

Expectations of FBE participants varies considerably. The roles and responsibilities of the novice, the FS, and the US are defined differently by each program. For example, ST activities range from merely observation of the FS (especially in *early* FBEs) with minimal interaction with pupils or other professionals to a gradual increase in the number and extent of lessons taught until, in some instances, a full course load may be assumed for a short period of time. Unfortunately, a major persistent weakness of some FBEs is that participants are not clearly aware of their own or others' expectations or responsibilities prior to commencement of the relationship. This lack of clarity often leads to the great source of frustration. Unlike many programs, the expectations and requirements for C/W experiences are well detailed (Handbook, 1997-1998). These stipulations are stated for the novice, the FS, and the site itself.

Perhaps the area in which FBEs differ most substantially is the type and quality of supervisory personnel and the frequency of supervision. In the school scenario, FSs are generally teachers with regular teaching duties who accept responsibility for supervision of a ST. The selection of these individuals may be by the principal, the university, or may be simply voluntary. There is usually no stipulation as to requirements to act as a FS. Selection criteria is most often *ad hoc* which makes quality control a problem (Duquette, 1993). However, in some instances FSs are noted for their excellence and are carefully selected based on specifically stated criteria. FSs may or may not be provided with additional training to facilitate their role.

C/W FBEs such as those used by the U of C and those used by the technical colleges utilize FSs who are resident practitioners in their respective discipline. Many have little or no previous training or experience in supervising novices nor any instruction in being a teacher.

In most FBEs supervision is shared between the US and the FS. At many universities the supervision of STs is afforded low status and is often assigned to junior faculty or graduate students. The US may be a tenured professor but, at least in the United States, is most often a graduate student or assistant professor (Morine-Dersheimer and Leighfield, 1994). The degree of supervisory expertise and experience amongst these individuals varies considerably and is often not considered adequate by STs (Turney *et. al.*, 1982).

The FS assumes the majority of the direct supervisory responsibilities in the FBE as the US typically observes individual lessons presented by the novice once a week or once every other week for a total of between one and four times during the FBE. These observational periods may or may not be scheduled and typically last 30-90 minutes. Due to a heavy assignment load, many USs are unable to provide substantial observation, data collection, and feedback to STs. Their role is often reduced to one of liaison and moral support (Cooper, 1994). Unfortunately, there are some programs in which the US may not interact with the novice during a single instance in the FBE but is still deemed the primary source of assessment data.

DIFFICULTIES WITH FBEs

Despite the apparent widespread acceptance of FBEs, there are a number of teacher educators who have raised serious doubts about the efficacy of these practices in their present form (Zeichner, 1980). The student teaching experience is persistently problematic (Copas, 1984). As early as 1964 Andrews expressed concern about the effectiveness of FBEs. Yet, even in situations where participants are highly critical of the pre-service program they paradoxically continue to advocate extended FBE involvement (Wideen and Holborn, 1986a).

Some authors (Copeland, 1979; Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981) claim that FBEs may do more harm than good. Some of the grave concerns regarding FBEs that have been identified by salient studies include, but are not limited to, the need to provide sufficient time to STs, to enhance the structure of FBEs, to adequately prepare FSs, to better define the roles of participants, to improve teaching models, to enhance the integration of theory and practice, to increase the emphasis on practical teaching skills, to extend opportunities for STs to reflect on their own practice and self image as a teacher, and to encourage better university-school collaboration (Allen 1976; Zeichner, 1983; Tardif, 1985; Awender and Harte, 1986; Theis-Sprinthal, 1986; Wideen and Holborn, 1986a and b; Miklos and Greene 1987; Cole and McNay, 1989). Many researchers criticize FBEs as being atheoretical, lacking standard structure, and being overly dependent on an outmoded apprenticeship model (Morine-Derschimer and Leighfield, 1994). A review by

Covert and Clifton (1983) found limited empirical evidence to support the value of an extended FBE especially for the purpose of developing STs' attitudes and values. Various studies have found either no link between ST performance before and after FBEs or that the quality of performance actually declined with increased exposure to the FBE. One or more of these shortfalls exist in most pre-service programs and these deficiencies have the potential to seriously undermine FBE effectiveness.

While FBEs may conceptually emphasize experimentation and the continuous exploration of educational possibilities, Ziechener (1980) and Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) summarize the critics view of present practice by stating that the largest unvalidated portion of professional education programs is that of FBEs. They state that the only identified function of these activities is one of socialization and assimilation into the existing bureaucratic framework.. Some evidence exists that the socialization effects of FBEs may defeat the general purpose of teacher education programs by simply adapting the novice into old patterns and perpetuating traditional institutional patterns. This erodes the instructional gains during campus instruction (Wideen and Holborn, 1986b). There is also some concern that FBEs emphasize the product of technical teaching skills over the processes of inquiry and understanding.

Zeichner (1980) has found that participation in FBEs may cause STS to become more controlling, conservative, custodial, and conforming thereby demonstrating a concomitant loss of the liberal aspects propounded by the university. The Holmes Group (1986) concurs with this view. It states that FBEs merely encourage STs to imitate the FSs' attitudes and behaviors and to become subservient to the traditional system. Research suggests that FBEs may encourage cynicism and the rejection of theory (Zeichner, 1980). STs are sometimes viewed merely as empty vessels into which the stagnant values, customs, and practices of the profession and fostering the *status quo*. This limits the variety of teaching strategies practiced and precludes inquiry rather than developing an expanded repertoire of teaching strategies.

Lortie (1975) laments that FBEs promote reflexive conservatism in both STs and FSs. A lack of critical analysis of action may not allow STs to differentiate between appropriate and inappropriate conduct. STs lack self-critical analysis and often

demonstrate unrealistic optimism. FSs often display a suspicion of innovative teaching techniques and a negative view of educational research and theory.

Morine-Derschimer and Leighfield (1994) conclude that though there is dissatisfaction with the dominant supervisory pattern in teacher education these standards have proven remarkably resilient. Poor relationships between FSs, USs, and STs, the dominant influence of the FS on the ST, infrequent visits by the US, inadequate training for FSs, the atheoretical nature of the ST experience, and the reliance of the traditional apprenticeship model all seem to be in little danger of extinction.

THE EFFECT OF THE FIELD SUPERVISOR ON THE STUDENT TEACHER

Various individuals such as clients, administrators, and service personnel become involved with the ST in the FBE. However, the US and the FS are most commonly responsible for supervision of the ST. Together with the ST, these two key figures form a triad (Figure 2.3) concerned with achieving the objectives of the teacher education program and facilitating the professional development of the ST (Turney *et. al.*, 1982).

Figure 2.3 THE FIELD-BASED SUPERVISORY TRIAD

Many researchers contend that it is the FS that most directly influences the ST and that the quality of the FS is eminently responsible for the success or failure of the FBE (Yee, 1969; Copas, 1984; Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Indeed, the importance of the FS cannot be overstated (Seperson and Joyce, 1973). STs believe that the influence of the FSs on their learning is greater than any other single individual (Price, 1961; Yee, 1969; Freibus, 1977). Karmos and Jacko (1977a), too, found that FSs were by far the most significant professional that influenced STs. As a result of such studies, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education require all FBEs to be accompanied by professional supervision (Potthoff and Kline, 1995).

FSs have the responsibility for providing both the atmosphere and the opportunities whereby the neophyte can mature into a practicing professional in a relatively short period of time. There exists significant support for the assertion that the quality of the student teaching experience is considerably influenced by the professional abilities and attitudes of the FS who works with the ST on a day-to-day basis (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). STs tend to internalize the values and attitudes modeled by the FS during the many hours spent in close contact with FSs. Johnson (1969) demonstrated that the ST may model the personality characteristics of the FS even when such behaviors are disapproved of by the US and are at odds with the values of the individual ST. Smith (1990) has demonstrated that 80% of the ST's practice can be attributed to the actions of the FS while only 15% of the ST's conduct can be attributed to the US. Some researchers (Yee, 1969) express a concern that this mimicry may even cause the ST to become a social puppet of the FS.

Despite the importance of the FS, the criteria used by administrators to select FSs are habitually unrelated to the goals of the teacher education program and are pragmatic rather than academic in nature (Copas, 1984). Wideen and Holborn (1986b) found that the most frequent suggestion for improving FBEs was an appeal for more competent FSs. Selection is frequently based on the quantity of individuals who willingly accept the position and not on the quality of their supervisory skills (Gregory, 1971). FSs may be chosen as a result of their observed success in teaching but this proficiency does not always translate into superior supervisory capacity which may be extraneous to their

work, experience, and expertise (Castillo, 1971; Kalekin-Fishman, and Kronfeld, 1991). Grimmatt and Ratzlaff (1986), too, have found that FSs are generally unprepared for the task of ST supervision. Many FSs do not fully understand the purposes to be accomplished in the FBE. Nor do all FSs view the program in the same manner as the ST or USs.

FSs are commonly used by other disciplines in the inculcation of the novice with similar negative results. Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) explain that many medical faculty who are involved in providing similar learning experiences have little or no educational methods training and are often chosen on the basis of the willingness to participate, availability, or clinical expertise rather than their ability to impart knowledge, skills, and appropriate attitudes to the ST.

Mitchell and Schwager (1993) have found that there is a ~~ubiquitous~~ lack of theoretical and conceptual framework for FSs. As a group, they do not fulfill their full potential because they do not exhibit common specific goals and are not aware of what tact to take to achieve desired results. Given the important potential for facilitating (or thwarting) learning, it should never be assumed that FS role is necessarily worthwhile or informative. It is essential that educators fulfilling this position demonstrate the most admirable educative qualities and are adequately prepared for their crucial role. Supervision must be exemplary and of the highest caliber if FBEs are to produce highly competent, successful practicing professionals.

SUPERVISORY MODELS

Although multiple teacher-training models have been reported, a literature review demonstrates a paucity of information regarding effective FS behaviors which would lead to identifying valid FS competencies (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). The variety of supervisory models is perhaps due to the abstract, amorphous, and undefined nature of the supervision itself (Heppner *et. al.*, 1994). Due to differences in backgrounds, goals, context, and positions, FSs do not have similar viewpoints for their positions. They often have different expectations as to what are considered to be effective supervisory techniques. There are no clear indications of the core dimensions for supervision from

either the supervisor's or learner's perspective. Unfortunately, the acceptance of this lack of generality has caused confusion regarding the purpose of supervision, its distinction from other similar activities, the role and function of each participant in the process, and the appropriate tasks and methods to be employed.

Various supervisory models have been proposed for the FBE. These models differ in terms of the theoretical underpinnings and the manner in which they are applied. Though most have common elements, none are universally accepted. Zimpher (1987) and Siedentop (1981) have described three complimentary, yet contrasting, supervisory approaches to supervision in teacher pre-service programs. The positivistic approach employs a behavioristic, technical, and rationalistic design to diagnose problems during observation of the ST's practice. STs and supervisors are admonished to agree on set of teacher behaviors and competencies, to design a reliable and valid system for observing said behaviors, to observe significant ST behavioral changes, and, as a result of the observations, provide regular feedback prescribing an effective course of action for remediation of weaknesses.

The phenomenological style reflects more humanistic concerns. In this approach, FSs express concern about ST values, their views of educational setting, and their overall feelings. FS see themselves as assisting STs to develop their own values and attitudes. Knowledge and teaching are highly personalized. The supervisor's role is more of a counselor than trainer and the supervisory style tends to be non-directive and collaborative.

The critical theorist technique encourages the supervisor to create a better learning world for the ST and to seek ideal learning conditions. This approach values justice, equality, and happiness and works to assist the ST to assume a greater role in shaping educational environments. Teaching is perceived as a reflective, moral, and ethical action. Giltin's (1981) horizontal supervision expands on this notion advocating that STs and FSs establish these goals together. Lessons focussing on these goals are observed and comparisons are made between the STs' practice and the original intent. Case studies of this model demonstrate that its use has led to more reflective and self-evaluative STs who view teaching holistically rather than a set of technical skills.

Copeland compared directive supervision (offering the ST immediate and useful feedback for overcoming instructional problems) and non-directive supervision (asking questions to solicit the STs' opinions and suggestions, reflecting the STs' ideas, and offering information only as the ST requested it). It was found that STs preferred the directive approach early in the FBE but progressed toward a preference of the non-directive strategy as experience increased. These findings are consistent with Glickman's (Glickman and Bey, 1990) developmental theory of supervision which suggests that the FS may use a directive, collaborative, or non-directive orientations to supervision depending on the ST's expertise and willingness to personally accept responsibility for improvement. STs' developmental variances may explain why no single approach has proven to be effective for all STs and why contrasting approaches such as Siedentop's (1981) and Gitlin's (1981) can both be effective depending on the STs' maturity and ability. Variations in maturity levels also reiterate the importance of modifying the supervisory approach to the STs' capabilities.

Zeicher (1983) describes four similar orientations that he claims direct supervision in FBEs. His behavioristic orientation emphasizes the development of specific and observable teaching skills. His personalistic position promotes psychological maturity in STs and emphasizes perceptions and beliefs over the mastery of specific skills and knowledge. The traditional-craft orientation that he proposes encourages STs to view teaching as a craft in which student teaching is an apprenticeship. The inquiry orientation prioritizes the development of inquiry about teaching activities, contexts, and the origin and consequences of their actions. This orientation views the ST as an active (rather than passive) participant that reflects on the complex nature of improving education by offering a perspective that would challenge the existing instructional patterns and belief systems.

The clinical supervision model developed by Goldhammer *et al.* (1980) aligns itself with the behavioristic and positivistic approaches outlined above. This technique draws data from first-hand observation of actual teaching by the ST and involves face-to-face interactions between the supervisor and the ST in an analysis of teaching and activities for the purpose of instructional improvement. The principle emphasis is on assisting the

ST to focus upon improving particular aspects of teaching through a systematic approach to supervision.

At least five stages can be identified in the clinical supervision model (Figure 2.4).

Figure 2.4

In the first stage (pre-observation), the supervisor and the ST discuss teaching plans to delineate areas of focus and ways in which these observations will be acquired during observation of the ST. In the second phase (observation), the FS carries out the actual observations in the teaching setting and records data so as to prepare to discuss teaching issues with the ST. The third stage (analysis and strategy), is the heart of the process. Separately, the ST and supervisor reflect upon what has happened during teaching and decide what issues should be addressed based on the ST's strengths and weaknesses. In stage four (post-observation), data is fed back to the ST and decisions are made about future teaching. In the fifth stage (post-conference analysis), both the FS and the ST

reflect upon their professional behavior and the supervision process itself. Then the cycle continues with appropriate revisions based on the outcome of the previous sequence of steps. In this model the intent is to change the role of the FS from that of an evaluator to that of a colleague or consultant with greater and more systematic participation from the ST.

From these various models researchers have attempted to categorize the desired behaviors of the FS. Stenack and Dye (1982) identified three clear and separate categories of supervisory behaviors. Their classifications included teacher, counselor, and consultant; with the consultant class containing elements of overlap with the other two. Copas (1984) proposed that supervisory behaviors could be subsumed under the groupings of orientation (providing the ST with information basic to adjustment to the setting), guiding (assisting the ST to develop skills in interacting and teaching clients), and reflecting (observing the ST and providing appropriate feedback). Grimmatt and Ratzlaff (1985) expanded these divisions to those of orientation, planning and instruction, evaluation, and professional development. O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee (1994) added role modeling and feedback to these categories of supervisory behaviors. Goldhammer's (1980) clinical supervision model suggests six key supervisory roles – manager, counselor, instructor, observer, provider of feedback, and evaluator. Weller (1983) and Turney *et. al.*, (1982) separately proposed that FS behaviors include evaluation, interpersonal relations, conference skills, instructional skills, professional role model, and site coordination. Dye and Border (1990) identified 11 core areas of effective supervisory behaviors and characteristics associated with FSs in counseling supervision including personal traits, knowledge, role modeling, instruction, evaluation of performance, counseling, and competency in actual professional practice.

There are substantive similarities between these classifications despite the use of different labels. Based on these studies, this author proposes a similar corresponding classification of supervisory behaviors for FSs (Figure 2.5). The functions of the social integrator include those of a manager and expand those of orientation. The evaluation behaviors are separated into the more social counseling or consultant functions and the true evaluation duties. Both of these categories include observation and feedback but

evaluation denotes a more formalized, summative approach. It is felt that the professional development behaviors should be further expanded to include a number of broader role modeling obligations. Inherent in each category is the FS's personality.

Figure 2.5

FUNCTIONS OF A FIELD SUPERVISOR

Little is known about the relative effectiveness of the various models in FBEs. Too frequently, models are developed out of convenience or tradition. Little thought is given to the most powerful or effective means for linking campus activities and FBEs or to reinforcing the goals of the entire program (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). May and Zimpher (1986) have concluded that supervisory practice has been eclectic rather than rooted in any single theoretical position. The array of labels and models has often promoted confusion and limited practice. It would appear that there is a definite need to identify behaviors and characteristics of effective supervision. Areas of high agreement will give direction to defining structure, content, practice, and training. Areas of

disagreement will guide future initiatives towards clarification and improvement. The subsequent discussion will delineate those characteristics previously identified by a number of sources as effective supervisory strategies.

SOCIAL INTEGRATOR FUNCTION

In their attempt to describe effective supervisory practices, many studies seem to fixate on teaching and evaluatory principles and fail to address the vital social integrator perspective. Yet, socialization of the ST is an integral component of supervisory practice (Manning, 1977; Johnson, 1969; McIntyre and Morris 1980; Zeichner, 1980; Wideen and Holborn, 1986). STs believe the FBE assists them to gain a sense of belonging more than to learn the dimensions of teaching or to rehearse the teacher's role. VanLeuvan (1995) found that 31% of the activities performed by the FS are designed to socialize the ST into the institutional environment. The following is a discussion of those social integration practices which previous studies have found to be effective in FBEs.

In the role of social integrator the FS must create and maintain a positive learning climate in which the ST feels comfortable. The FS is charged with ensuring a sense of belonging and conveying feelings of acceptance. This foundation is particularly essential during the first few days of the FBE which are important periods of adjustment and learning for the ST who is confronted with a new environment and whole new series of tasks (Henry and Beasley, 1989). Beynon and Onslow (1992) have found that when FSs abandon the function of social integration the ST may encounter feelings of isolation.

Early experiences tend to set the tone for later encounters. Seperson and Joyce (1973) demonstrated that relationships (positive and negative) between FSs and STs established early in the FBE tended to continue throughout the entire experience. Once secured, the rapport between the individuals varied little as the relationship matured. Negative associations were difficult to improve and positive alliances seemed to withstand fairly strong outside influences. If early experiences are positive later confrontations are less likely to pose a threat.

It is essential that the FS provide a comprehensive and organized orientation for the ST upon initiation into the site. Schuster and Stevens (1991) encourage FBEs to develop

an orientation handbook which contains information such as schedules, institutional rules, dress codes, expectations, and evaluation forms and criteria. This document should be disseminated to STs prior to their placement. This practice saves both FSs and STs time and avoids the potential for omitting important details.

Guyton and McIntyre (1990) and Graham (1996) advocate an extensive orientation which includes providing the ST with a place for personal belongings, acquainting the ST with available resources such as parking, cafeteria, AV equipment, and photocopying, and an introduction to the overall learning environment. In this way the ST achieves a sense of belonging and familiarization with the site (Schuster and Stevens, 1991).

Numerous individuals socialize, train, and influence the ST during the FBE. It is essential that the FS introduce the ST to all staff and administration (Castillo, 1971; Schuster and Stevens, 1991). This may include support staff, librarians, media specialists, custodians, and cafeteria employees. The introduction to staff should be made in such a manner so as to provide recognition and acceptance of the ST. These introductions set the groundwork for future cooperative interactions.

The FS should assist the ST to develop a positive and appropriate rapport with clients. The FS should introduce the ST to the clients and explain to the clients the exact nature and role of the ST. Clients must be made aware of and become accepting of the duties and responsibilities of ST. The FS must impress upon the clients that the ST is a professional "just like me" with shared expertise, responsibilities, and authority (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Failure of the FS to communicate this concept to the clients and to provide continued support for these initiatives may undermine the STs' requisite influence on the clients. The FS must ensure that the ST achieves the client's respect required to establish a positive working relationship.

Lack of communication between the triad members has been a major barrier to effective supervision in FBEs (Yates, 1981). The learning environment must provide organizational support and lend itself to trust, equality, openness, and collegial relationships. A basic factor for the development of the FBE is a cooperative triad relationship including collaboratively formulated and communicated objectives, explicit role expectations, and a recognition of each others' problems. The FS must also ensure

that the ST is conversant with institutional routines, expectations, rules, and policies. Institutional goals and objectives must be explained. It is essential that the FS explicate clear lines of communications and a hierarchy of authority. As a social integrator, the FS is responsible for setting the communication groundwork for participants in the FBE and identifying the roles and responsibilities of each. Without this knowledge the ST may function inappropriately and never achieve success.

The triad relationship is inherently unstable with a strong tendency for two members to bond together and isolate the third (Yee, 1969). Within the triad various complexities, complications, and conflicts occur. It has been found that many triads lack a positive working partnership. Competitive and dyadic coalitions may be formed which hamper supervisory functions (Yee, 1969).

Members of the triad experience intra- and inter-personal role confusion being uncertain about both their own and others' role and having divergent role expectations of themselves and others. The FS is obligated to explain the specific roles and responsibilities of all participants in the FBE. Many Canadian and American investigators continually identify unresolved role clarification and differences in expectations between STs, FSs, and USs as being a major barrier to effective supervision in FBEs resulting in confusion and frustration (Karmos, and Jacko, 1977; Diem and Schnitz, 1978; Lipton and Lessor, 1978; Bowman, 1979; Horton and Harvey, 1979; Kilgore, 1979; Ellenburg, 1981; Yoder and Arms, 1981; Funk, Hoffman, Keithley, and Long, 1982; Applegate and Lasley, 1982; Emans, 1983; Wideen and Holborn, 1986). Clearly differentiated supervisory behaviors and responsibilities are frequently conspicuously absent leading to duplication or omission of important functions (Grimmett and Ratzlaff, 1986). A number of authors (e.g., Campbell and Williamson, 1983; Applegate and Lasley, 1985) have found few instances in which policies, practices, or personal relationships are clearly articulated and agreed upon in FBEs. Studies consistently indicate that participants are unclear about what should happen in the FBE, about who is responsible for what activities, and how individuals and the FBE itself should be assessed (Duquette, 1993).

In their comparison of international FBEs across various time periods Grimmett and Ratzlaff (1986) concluded that collaborative program development, constant monitoring,

and abundant formal and informal communication within the triad is virtually absent. There appears to be little evidence that STs, FSs, and USs possess or work towards common perceptions of common goals, roles, and practices.

Members of the triad often have vastly different frames of reference of what constitutes effective teaching which often has a negative effect upon the teaching performance of the ST. Each member of the triad operates on its own perspectives, needs, and assumptions. FSs' expectations may be different from STs' expectations and STs may not be able to gain experiences compatible with their level of expectations. Campbell and Williamson (1983) found significant differences between the FSs' expectations and reality. Too often STs fail to exhibit initiative because they are not sure if they are expected to observe or become actively involved in an event (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Where the FBE and campus input are offered separately, students are highly critical of most aspects of the program. Where attempts have been made to combine campus course work and the FBE activities STs are much more positive towards both. Olk and Fiedlander (1992) have demonstrated that tension, dissatisfaction, and decreased self-confidence result in the presence of role conflict and ambiguity. While three individuals involved in a common experience may not always share the same frame of reference, convergence rather than divergence can be fostered through effective communication. The FS must be held largely accountable for ensuring that the ST has a clear understanding of the criteria for success.

Triad members lack an understanding of each other's problems. Tittle (1974) found triad members blame each other when problem areas are examined. For example, the US and ST saw the FS's lack of modeling as a serious concern, the US perceived a lack of control over the FBE, and the FS viewed lack of assistance from the US as a major difficulty. There is evidence of wariness and distrust between the FSs and the university (Cope, 1973). STs are far more likely to seek legitimization of their professional roles from FSs than USs (Friebus, 1977). Dissatisfaction with the US is often expressed by STs and these feelings often increase as the FBE continues (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990).

Unfortunately, both FSs and STs often function in relative isolation from their peers (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). As time in the FBE progresses the FS should ensure that the

ST be permitted to observe and learn from other staff (Grimmett and Ratzloff, 1986). STs require exposure to multiple teaching perspectives (Clarke, 1995). No single FS can be expected to provide the entire gamut of learning experiences to a ST (Joyce and Weil, 1980). Beynon and Onslow (1992) suggest that STs should be exposed to the expertise and ideas of other professionals at multiple sites. This improves the skills of the ST and limits a sense of isolation. The experiences of others provide a useful resource for the ST's learning, valuing, thinking, and action.

There may be times when the ST will encounter opposition from institutional staff. FSs must be prepared to protect the ST from the conflicting ideals, personalities, and styles of other staff and even the US (Henry and Beasley, 1989). It is important for the FS to handle such conflicts effectively and to assist the ST in dealing with other staff members. In this capacity the FS walks a thin line. While the ST must be protected from conflicts with other staff members the FS must also ensure a professional and working relationship with colleagues. This can probably best be achieved if everyone has been made aware of each others roles and expectations; that the ST is there to learn and that criticisms from staff are not a personal attack but meant to enhance that learning.

TEACHER FUNCTION

FBE researchers commonly express concerns that FSs are poorly prepared, present poor teaching models, and lack emphasis on teaching skills (Miklos and Greene, 1987). FSs may not always take their instructional responsibilities seriously but may educationally misdirect STs. The following is a discussion of teaching practices which previous studies have found to be effective in FBEs.

As previously stated, one of the most important effective supervisory behaviors is the articulation of goals and responsibilities. As an exemplary teacher, the FS should begin the FBE by explicitly stating learning objectives that are clearly understood and accepted by all participants. A lack of articulation and agreement of educational expectations, policies, or procedures is a major barrier to a positive learning environment. Only when all participants are aware of and accepting of the program's learning objectives will a plan for success be realized.

Traditionally, FBE objectives are set by administrators and/or supervisors with little input from STs. It is imperative that STs have direct involvement into the development of these goals. Wideen and Holborn (1986) cites research that indicates that the positive outcomes of FBEs can be severely curtailed in situations in which STs perceive a lack of legitimacy in their role. Ralph (1993) and Susi (1992) explain the importance of reciprocal exchange, cooperation, and collegiality in defining goals and expectations. Through open and honest discussions with the ST, the FS must mutually set goals, objectives, and activities prior to commencement of the FBE. Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld (1991) have shown that if STs have input into the development of program goals and objectives they are more likely to achieve those goals since such aims have the force of self-fulfilling prophecies.

Learning objectives and activities must be based on the needs, choices, previous knowledge, skills, and experiences of individual STs (Castillo 1971; Grimmert and Ratzloff, 1986). Through face-to-face dialogue, the FS is expected to become actively familiar with the ST's academic, technical, and emotional maturity level. FSs should match the experiences and content of the FBE to the level of the ST. A deliberate attempt should be made to place STs in situations which are appropriate to their stage of professional development. In this way learning objectives become personally relevant and the ST is more likely to successfully cope with and overcome problems in a gradual and realistic manner.

FSs are responsible for supplying the ST with relevant course materials such as texts, study guides, curriculum guides, faculty and student handbooks, schedules, and teacher's manuals (Quimby, 1985). Since the FS is in the admirable position of being able to directly follow the daily progress of the ST and identify deficiencies, the FS should also be prepared to ensure that relevant supplementary resources are available to the ST (Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld, 1991). This includes practice and remedial activities and supplementary personnel who might better be able to facilitate the ST's learning (Copas, 1984).

Unfortunately, FBEs may act as a breeding ground for the traditional conflict between theory and practice. Leavitt (1991) states that this theory-practice dichotomy is one of

eight worldwide issues in teacher education. Other authors (Allen, 1976; Tardif, 1985; Awender and Harte, 1986; Wideen and Holborn, 198; Cole and Miklos and Greene 1987; Cole and McNay, 1989) reiterate these concerns when they explain that the lack of integration of theory with practice and the excessive importance accorded to theory serves as principle deterrents to effective supervision in the FBEs.

Both FSs and STs have expressed a belief that they are constrained by the fact that the university typically dictates program goals and objectives. STs and FSs often assert a desire for more communication with the US and enhanced input into program planning, development and design (Wideen, 1986). FSs express concern over the lack of support and assistance from the US. FSs state that USs do not inform them of their role and responsibilities in the FBE (Yates, 1982). FSs claim that their work and their input is not valued by university personnel. Hence, the impact they make on FBEs is limited.

Multiple studies cited by Grimmer and Ratzloff (1986) contend that STs in the FBE learn the most from the FS and little from the US. The FS is certainly more cognizant than the US of the ST's daily strengths and weaknesses and better able to provide appropriate activities for remediation. It is the FS who is most adept at ensuring that the ST is confronted with adequate challenges and responsibilities at appropriate times without provoking inordinate stress levels. Given the affinity between the FS and the ST and the FS's knowledge of the actual learning environment it seems strange that the university is typically responsible for setting goals for the ST.

Participants often attribute different values to theory and practice. Universities typically provide the foundations of education such as psychology, sociology, philosophy, learning styles, and ethical standards of teaching (Miklos and Greene, 1987). University pressures tend to accentuate subject-matter and research-based issues. University faculty tend to be more likely to search for abstract, generalizable precepts of education (Allen, 1976; Mitchell and Schwager, 1993). FSs and FBEs are more likely to be pragmatic and perhaps justifiably pessimistic about the value of research in education (Duquette, 1993).

FBE pressures are generally felt to be practice-oriented in which technique becomes a means to an end rather than a means of understanding or generalization. It is felt that a

method works in the FBE if it solves the immediate problem at hand and does not disturb the *status quo* substantially (Zeichner, 1980). The primary goal of the FBE is often to provide procedural knowledge and promote acquisition of standard managerial and instructional routines.

STs often perceive a distinct dichotomy between the FBE and university course work; associating theory solely with university courses and practice with the FBEs (Jacknicke and Samiroden, 1991). This two-step process rarely results in situations where research-based knowledge informs the STs decision making and practice (Duquette, 1993). STs are caught between opposing forces of these two institutions as they attempt to implement theories promoted by university instructors in a FBE environment where theory is often viewed as irrelevant, insignificant and contrary to “the real world” (Zeichner, 1980). Research suggests that FSs may reject university ideals and demonstrate cynicism and pessimistic about the value of research in education (Smith, 1990). Because FSs tend to be more oriented toward the utilitarian and particular rather than theory and generalizations, STs may not learn general principles that would allow them to adapt to another learning situations (Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

On-campus prerequisites and curricula must be in concert and congruent with the resources and direction of the FBE. Too often on-campus activities and FBEs lack articulation, function independently, and even conflict with one another (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). Learning to teach is viewed as an experiential, craft-oriented process that is guided only indirectly by theory if at all. This incongruence fosters the development of STs who deny allegiance to educational courses, fail to understand the theoretical foundation behind their own or their clients actions and clam that ST is the only beneficial aspect of the teacher education program. FSs can create a more positive learning environment if they can integrate didactic and practical issues (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). FBEs can provide STs with opportunity to relate theory to specific settings that made the ideas more meaningful. A great deal of time and thought must be expended by the FS in the planning and preparation of FBEs. Such planning would include preparing the ST in areas of instructional strategies, the use of media, lesson planning, evaluation procedures, how to interact with clients, and general organizational

skills (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Pre-instructional conferences are essential to clarify and answer questions before teaching.

Blumberg (1980) has demonstrated that the supervisory style has a direct affect on ST learning and morale. Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld (1991) extended this concept by encouraging the FS to provide the ST with exposure to a variety of teaching and managerial styles that address the learning needs and styles of the individual ST. Duquette (1993), Ralph (1993), and Adams (1996) invite FSs to match their supervisory style with the learner's developmental expertise and needs. The situational leadership model outlined by Ralph (1993) encourages the FS to match supervisory support with the confidence, commitment or motivation level of the learner.

Turney (1994) explains that STs generally do not appreciate the permissiveness, lack of structure, and loose planning and evaluation found in some progressive classrooms as they conflict with advice given by the university. The ST must not be expected to flounder in a "sink or swim" or laissez -faire approach to supervision. The level and type of supervision afforded the ST should change with time and experience. A high level of direct supervision is usually required during the initial phase of the FBE but less guidance and more support is indicated as the developmental competency of the ST increases. STs initially request a structured learning environment and favor specific, step-by-step, pragmatic guidance. Olk and Friedlander (1992) demonstrated that less experienced learners required and requested more directive guidance and a more supportive framework. As the ST's competencies progress and the ST becomes more comfortable with the site STs felt affronted by such direction and wanted a more open and collaborative relationship with the FS (Bean, 1997). As their experience increases STs desire freedom to experiment and work out their own problems.

Objectives must be continually re-assessed and updated against the progressively changing growth of the ST (Basom *et. al.* 1994). FSs will serve the ST well if they are able to adapt their own leadership style to the learning needs of the ST Through frequent questioning and observation the FS is best suited to adapt the existing FBE situation to the individual learning developmental stage of the ST (Henry and Beasley, 1989). For the

FS to acknowledge the contextual influences of FBEs and to consider the impact of supervision on the ST is at heart of supervision.

It is not sufficient that the FS demonstrate teaching competency. Most researchers agree with that FSs play a significant role in the development of ST's educational philosophies. The FS must explain the principles and ideals of those instructional techniques and provide sound rationale for her actions (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). FSs should communicate their personal styles and perceptions of teaching to the ST (Basom *et.al.*, 1994; Rikard and Veal, 1996). This requires that supervisors not only model effective teaching but also recognize it, describe it, and communicate why it is effective.

FSs frequently express anxiety regarding this duty. First, most FSs are concerned that working with STs is generally an inordinate time commitment added to an already overburdened workload (Duquette, 1993; Morine-Derschimer and Leighfield, 1994). The ST must be allowed adequate time to observe, to question, and to confer with the FS (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). Teaching is not merely a management expertise but includes important cognitive skills; ways of thinking, processing information and arriving at decisions (Berliner, 1986).

MacDonald *et. al.*, (1992) has documented that both STs and FSs are of the opinion that one of the biggest problems in the FBE is that FSs are not readily available to the ST and do not spend an adequate amount of time dealing with ST concerns. The ST is typically slower and requires a great deal of time to instruct. FSs lament that there is simply insufficient time and resources to provide STs with the necessary learning climate. FSs claim that there is simply not sufficient time to deal with STs, clients, and administrative duties. STs concur, stating that in at least 50% of all FBEs they do not receive adequate amounts of the FS's time (Fereshteh, 1996).

Secondly, FSs are not always aware of or able to explain how they teach. They may not have the time, inclination, experience, or expertise to reflect upon and assess their own practice in a manner that is conducive to effective change. They are often unable or unwilling to explicate the principles of their practice (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Many FSs feel uncomfortable having STs observe, scrutinize, and question their every action. They may not have the confidence or understanding to make their own tacit knowledge

about teaching and learning available (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). Hence, they are unable to establish this process with the ST.

As a teacher, the FS must demonstrate an adequate knowledge base of the discipline-related subject material (Susi, 1992). Without this foundational knowledge the FS will appear incompetent and will be unable to adequately assess or augment the ST's informational base. Unfortunately, being knowledgeable about the profession is sometimes considered to be the only requisite for being a FS. A FS who is perceived as being a brilliant practitioner may still be an inept FS.

The FS should review and approve ST activities before teaching begins. The FS knows the client base, the type of work, and the work schedule and uses this knowledge to ensure the ST is exposed to an appropriate number of relevant assignments (MacDonald *et. al.*, 1992). The FS must demonstrate flexibility in expectations and workload (Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld, 1991) and decrease certain assignments to respond to the STs' needs. Activities must be modified according to the STs' skill and experiential level (Olk and Friedlander, 1992). After the lesson the FS is obligated to advise the ST on how to improve presentation and teaching techniques (Copas, 1984).

It is imperative that the FS facilitate adequate time and resources for the ST to prepare and learn. There must provide ample opportunity for the ST to interact with clients and to develop and practice effective teaching skills until competency is achieved (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). The FS should also assist the ST to develop client management and evaluation skills (Schuster and Stevens, 1991; Turney, 1994).

These requirements may appear to be self-evident. However, it often happens that STs are given odd jobs or repetitive tasks that amount to little more than busy work. Menial tasks may be interpreted as a lack of faith in the STs' ability. The ST is apt to become bored and lack motivation. There may be a decrease in self-concept and a loss of enthusiasm. Some FBEs do not allow STs exposure to learning situations that would permit them to fulfill the stated expectations of the FS. The ST may function as aids to free up time for the FS or be dispatched to tasks in which she will not hinder the work of the FS. This is especially true when the FS is otherwise engaged in a busy work schedule or the ST is particularly slow. The ST must perceive assignments as relevant, meaningful,

and challenging. FS must share responsibilities so as to make the ST feel as though she is contributing.

A number of researchers have expressed concern that FSs promote conformity rather than encourage exploration in learning (Grimmett and Ratzloff 1986; MacKinnon, 1989). Beynon and Onslow (1992) declare that a major problem with FBEs is that they merely enforce a ritual socialization of the ST into conservative traditions. MacKinnon (1989) asserts that FSs perpetuate an uncritical replication of practice from a utilitarian perspective. Thus, FBEs perpetuate institutional patterns, foster *status quo* attitudes (Wideen and Holborn, 1986), preclude inquiry, and emphasize product over process (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). STs may become more conservative during their FBEs and reject many of the tenets of the progressive thinking generated by university pre-service training (Bunting, 1988).

FSs tend to be domineering; telling the STs what to do and how to do it rather than providing instructive alternatives and suggestions. Instruction tends to be overtly authoritarian, as the FS determines the direction of the interaction and functions as the expert in an attempt to remain in charge (Stenback and Dye, 1982). FSs may assume that what works for them will work for STs in all other situations regardless of the context. The inquiry method endorsed by the university is often opposed by FSs. FSs often propagate a set of processes and routines (ecology) of learning which fails to develop and extend the content and the context of the environment (Smith, 1990). It is not uncommon for FSs to promulgate the "my way or no way" attitude.

STs are very dependant on FSs for practical advice. Heppner, *et al.* (1994) explains that STs passively accept the traditional curriculum and standard forms of instruction even at cost of their own professional self-worth. Imitation, subservience, and conservatism are the hallmark of traditional FBEs (Potthoff and Kline, 1995). Even short exposures to the FS may cause the ST to follow established routines and structures and emulate certain mannerisms and styles of the FS. STs reflect FSs' practice and methods and even speech rather than display their own unique style. Perhaps this is not surprising given that such techniques and methods are likely to be successful if only because clients are familiar with them and they provide ecological congruence (Copeland, 1982).

Whether for status, out of concern for clients or for pragmatic self-interest, STs generally perceive that advocating significant change is not advisable. They will often take path of least resistance despite personal disapproval of certain practices so as not to jeopardize success in FBE.

While both FSs and STs must live within extant institutional framework, it is also expected that FSs explicate basic assumptions about teaching and learning and develop plans for modifying and going beyond specified material so that these can be applied to future and novel situations (MacKinnon, 1989). Teaching is much more than a skilled trade (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990) and unless experience is related to theory the tricks learned by STs will remain little more than tricks. If, on the other hand, FBEs are looked upon as laboratory experiences then FSs are more likely to stress the creative application of fundamental principles, analysis of generalizations, and the continuous exploration of new techniques (Castillo, 1971). STs should be encouraged recognize that teaching is highly situationally dependant and should focus on specific problems and individuals. FSs must assist the ST to not only learn pedagogical theories but to reflect critically upon those theories and to apply theory to practice (Beynon and Onslow, 1992).

Some investigators are concerned that the apprenticeship or medieval craft-guild orientation which predominates in many FBEs may promote modeling of the “master” or “expert” practitioner as opposed to a paradigm which would engage the ST in inquiry and advocate learning by solving practical problems with one’s own resources. It is imperative that the FS allow STs opportunities to develop their own style; to create an accepting learning environment in which the STs do not feel stifled. STs should be encouraged to investigate unique and individualized teaching methods. FSs should offer support for STs to experiment with and develop teaching strategies congruent with their own initiative and teaching styles. Schuster and Stevens (1991) encourage STs to go beyond current practice. The FS must create an environment that allows the ST to explore the theories and assumptions underlying a particular action, assess the consequences of the action, and attempt unique and individualized alternative ways of acting (MacKinnon, 1989). Dealing with mistakes may be as beneficial as successes in learning how to cope with problems.

As an instructor, the FS is charged with discussing the client's attitudes, skills, interests and abilities with the ST. This will facilitate an understanding of the client and allow for realistic expectations and appropriate interactions with clients.

It is commonly ascribed that FSs must work with the US to plan and deliver the FBE (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). Zimpher, DeVoss, Nott (1980) have found that many FSs are quite discouraged with their dealings with USs and that this interaction has lead them to be unsatisfied with their role in the FBE (Yates, 1982). Fereshteh (1996) suggests that the everyday closeness between the ST and the FS empowers the FS with a more valid view of the ST than that of the US. The FS is more cognizant of the workings of the site and how best to apply the site resources to most effectively teach the ST. Often STs and FSs do not believe that USs carry out their functions adequately and campus course work is not held in high esteem by either FSs or STs (Yates, 1982; Wideen and Holborn, 1986; Glickman and Bey, 1990).

Some faculty members may be out of touch with the FSs, teaching methodology, the clients, and the day-to-day problems of the FBEs. There are indications that FSs may be inept, and not adequately prepared professionally for supervising STs in the FBE; not having actually practiced in the FBE for long time (Turney, 1994). USs are frequently not subject-area specialists in the particular FBE discipline (Yates, 1982). FSs and STs also suggest that USs often “do not practice what they preach” which limits the trust within the triad (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). Richardson-Koehler (1988) recommends that the US supervise the FBE process rather than the individual ST.

Grimmett and Ratzlaff's study (1986), summarizing the research on US, is not complementary. The role of the US is portrayed as confused and ambiguous at best and often opposed to the FS's intent. Mitchell and Schwager (1993) indicate that the impact of the US in the FBE is of little consequence to the performance of the ST except to provide some organizational structure and to slightly increase the self-esteem of the ST. Critical differences between the perceptions of FSs, USs and STs hinder communication and limit supervisory effectiveness. There have been extreme proposals to abolish the role of the US based on empirical evidence that FSs are more influential and USs are of little value. However, such proposals would simply shift the issues of

evaluation to the FS and enhance the apprenticeship model of learning (Turney, 1994). Emans (1983) suggests that USs should have less direct responsibility for ST supervision and should act as liaison between the university and the site, work with FSs on curriculum development, be available for trouble-shooting.

Tardif (1985) acknowledges that the typical FBE does not represent the realities of teachers who have sole responsibility for the FBE. However, FSs should allow STs increasing levels of graded responsibility until full autonomy can be achieved (Grimmett and Ratzloff 1986; Copas, 1984). It is imperative that ST be allowed input into planning stages including timing and sequencing (Weller, 1983). The ST should be encouraged to exhibit independence and have input into when full responsibilities are assumed so that the stress levels are not inordinate. This gives ownership and legitimacy to the STs' role.

Unfortunately, the norm is to provide all STs with the same amount of time in the FBE and expect each individual to achieve the same standards within the same timeline. Rarely, is there the opportunity to extend the experience for those who would benefit from added exposure. It is assumed that every ST will progress at the same rate and to the same level.

EVALUATOR or ASSESSOR FUNCTION

Ralph (1993) asserts that evaluation is an integral function of all supervision and of learning in general. Most STs are accepting of this component of the FBE so long as the appraisal is perceived as being just and fair and is performed in a sensitive manner that demonstrates respect for the integrity of the individual (Copas, 1984). STs are especially receptive of evaluations that they perceive will assist them in better performing their functions. Indeed, STs frequently express a desire for more direction and feedback than most FS are prepared to offer (Seirferth and Samuel, 1984).

The assessment component of the FBE serves at least three separate, yet integrated purposes (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). First, there is a need to act in a "gatekeeping" capacity in an endeavor to control individual entry into the profession. Evaluations serve to distinguish between competent and incompetent practitioners.

Secondly, properly administered evaluations act as a mechanism for assisting the ST to identify personal strengths and weaknesses and thereby improves the practice of the ST (O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee, 1994). Evaluation should be developmental, diagnostic, supportive, and assist the ST to achieve the FBE goals. If evaluation is to be effective it must be perceived as a valid means for improving the ST's skills. The focus must be on the ST's growth and development rather than as a means of denigration or fault finding.

A third purpose of evaluation is the assessment of the ST in terms of program goals. This serves to validate the program and acts as a source of feedback for future program modifications. Evaluation should not be restricted to the ST. The FS should be involved with evaluation of the FBE process as well. Input from the FS should promote constructive changes within the FBE (Adams, 1996).

Despite the expressed desire and ascribed need for adequate evaluation, assessment is commonly felt to be the most difficult aspect of the FS's responsibilities (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). In one study (Fereshteh, 1996) fully one-quarter of all FSs did not perform the required evaluation function. Zimpher *et al.* (1980) reported that many FSs were not interested in observing STs. Mitchell and Schwager (1993) indicate that only 4% of all evaluations address ST weaknesses.

FSs lament that they are unable to successfully evaluate STs. Their reluctance to fulfill this duty is based on several concerns. First, FSs indicate that the main barrier to evaluation, like teaching, is insufficient time due to an already heavy workload (Lyon *et al.* 1989). Susi (1992) indicates that FSs find that typical daily activities preclude the recognition of ST's strengths and weaknesses and offering alternative solutions to alleviate inadequacies .

Secondly, FSs typically do not want to be involved with any conflicts which may potentially arise from the evaluation process. They are very uncomfortable confronting STs with their deficiencies and discussing these incompetencies openly and honestly. They would prefer to be a supportive friend rather than assess specific ST weaknesses. FSs usually do not wish to be perceived as providing judgmental conclusions. They may have some difficulty tempering their friendship and rapport with the ST and actually

instituting the role of evaluator (Rikard and Veal, 1996). FSs are often conflicted between providing a warm and supportive atmosphere and actual judgmental feedback (Turney, 1994). They would prefer to act as a buddy or chum rather than providing specific advice or criticisms. FSs often indicate that they are worried about hurting the ST's feelings (Rikard and Veal, 1996). This attitude often conflicts with the university expectation of an analysis of specific performance elements (Wideen and Holborn 1986b) and generally limits the usefulness of the feedback. As a result FSs may not discriminate between effective and ineffective STs and are likely to provide inflated evaluations (failure is rare) (Haviland and Haviland, 1981; Defino, 1983).

Thirdly, FSs fear that specific suggestions may conflict with the ST's personal style and development thus denying potential learning opportunities (Susi, 1992).

Finally, FSs indicate that they are not properly trained to evaluate STs. The ST may also be older than the FS and have more experience in certain areas. FSs are unsure how to deal with STs who are to be treated as colleagues in one instance and yet evaluated as subordinates in the next instance.

STs want and need constant and ongoing formative feedback that assists their learning. They express a need for FSs to routinely and systematically observe their actions and provide constructive feedback for improvement. STs require regularly scheduled time and daily conferences during which time they expect the FS to observe their actions and to discuss their questions and concerns (Schuster and Stevens, 1991; O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee, 1994). However, previous research indicates that such observation is generally not available (Yates, 1982). Evidence indicates that STs are not provided with an adequate amount or type of feedback by either FSs or USs (Tittle, 1974). Wideen (1986) reports that FSs observed STs' entire lessons only 39% of the time and that there was no standardized reporting mechanism. This study also noted that STs expressed concerns over a lack of clarity regarding their evaluation procedures and questioned the evaluation expertise of the FSs.

There is a question as to what standards should be applied when assessing the ST. Evaluation becomes threatening when the participants are unclear of expectations or if participants do not feel as though they have the capability of successfully achieving the

objectives. Since evaluations serve as a major screening device for acceptance into the profession (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990) reliability and validity should be considered essential. The ST's progress should be consistently evaluated against well defined and relevant objectives and expectations. However, these factors are typically not a major consideration when assessing STs (Hoover *et. al.* 1988).

Various dimensions have been used to evaluate the ST including assessment of client management skills, client success on certain tests, the relationship the ST has with clients, and the ability of the ST to sustain client interest (Wideen and Holborn, 1986). To facilitate the evaluative process FSs must clearly and explicitly define all evaluation criteria prior to observation and the stated standards should be the actual standards utilized for assessment (Koehler, 1984). Both qualitative and quantitative data are valid assuming that objectivity is maintained. Professional judgements regarding standards of conduct, dress, interactions with staff and clients, and a commitment to ideal of profession are useful (Weller, 1983). This feedback is to be shared with the US (Schuster and Stevens, 1991) who can then act as a valuable resource to overcome difficulties with ST.

Expectations must focus on concrete, specific, and achievable behavior. The evaluations must focus on behaviors that the ST can modify rather than personality traits of the individual. The FS and the ST should develop strategies for observation and analysis for the purpose of identifying problems, recognizing similarities and differences between the actual and expected results, and examining consequences. A variety of data-gathering techniques should be available for evaluation. Unfortunately, ST evaluations are commonly subjective, impressionistic, and not based on the stated objectives. Turney *et. al.* (1982) found that evaluation is subjective and impressionistic using hidden criteria more concerned with personality and social acceptability rather than knowledge of subject matter or instructional skills. Attitudes, interpersonal skills, personal appearance and emotional factors are used as evaluation criteria more than instructional skills, content knowledge, intellectual skills, and leadership (Webb *et al.*, 1981). FSs use apparent motivation as the outstanding criterion for likelihood as STs success while pedagogical and didactic skills are relatively inconsequential. It appears that some FSs

may be of the mind that given the adequate motivational and interpersonal skills the ST will be able to acquire or improve their teaching performance.

FSs tend to base evaluations on a single overall affective impression rather than on distinct professional competencies even when explicit behaviors have been previously defined (Griffin, *et. al.* 1983). A ST may be judged on not on professional competency but on how close to the ST adheres to the FS's ideals, actions and expectations (stated or not). Definao (1983) has found that FSs attribute success or failure of STs to their ability to motivate clients and field site management almost exclusively rather than to instructional ability. Yee (1967) demonstrated that STs who indicated that they wanted sympathy and emotional support from FS were more likely to receive a better evaluation than STs who requested instructional guidance.

Unfortunately, formal evaluation strategies and forms are often lacking and such forms that are in existence are often poorly designed. The assessment instruments must be valid and objective and based on competency statements. FSs are encouraged to provide documented written as well as verbal feedback to the ST (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Well documented written feedback allows the ST to review as often as necessary, decreases redundant questions regarding past and future performance, eliminates misinterpretations, and provides documentation should further disciplinary actions be required. The FS is expected to keep accurate and comprehensive records of ST activities and evaluations (Schuster and Stevens, 1991).

It is important to allow ST input into evaluation techniques and processes. However, is rare for the ST to define the criteria for assessment. This is most often done by US and less frequently by FSs. STs may feel that the evaluation process is something that is done "to" them rather than "for" them.

The FS should allow STs to question and discuss the evaluation. In a consultative capacity, the FS must encourage ST contributions into discussions and act on this feedback. The FS should listen to such concerns and address them appropriately (Cotton, 1981). However, Ben-Peretz and Rumney (1991) report that descriptive and directive comments dominate assessment discussions between the FS and the ST. The ST is not generally encouraged to question the FSs judgments nor express personal opinions.

It is imperative that corrective feedback is accompanied by suggestions on how to correct the problem and that the FS follows-up on advice given to the ST to ensure success (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Such processes establish trust, demonstrates commitment to the ST, improves the ST's self-confidence, and often decreases the perceived threat involved with evaluation (Tittle, 1974).

FSs must provide their assessment a tactful and polite manner (Copas, 1984; Schuster and Stevens, 1991; MacDonald *et al.*, 1992). Yet, the advice must be assertive, honest, constructive, and sincere (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). The ST is not always looking for a "pat on the back" or "beat around bush" but rather for forthright and straightforward feedback that will improve practice. There is a fine line between feedback that will be considered as positive and corrective and that which will be considered as confrontational.

The timing of feedback is an essential character of assessment. Errors will not correct themselves and without appropriate feedback problems will snowball. Evaluations that are provided too early or too late lose much of their value (Hoover *et.al.* 1988). One of the greatest advantages of the FBE is that feedback can be provided immediately after the action and can be accompanied by specific, positive, and constructive criticism (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Timely, constructive, and positive feedback results in the acquisition of and fluency in skills by STs in FBEs (Smith, 1990).

Unfortunately, evaluations are not always furnished at an appropriate time or in a suitable fashion. Evaluations are often rendered at a time convenient for the FS rather than when most effective to learning. Many FSs provide feedback to STs only at the end of a prescribed period of time in a particular FBE. It is not uncommon for an evaluation to be given just before the ST leaves the site so that discussion is limited and rectification of the problem is impossible. This summative type of assessment is inadequate. It does not allow for the ST to modify behavior or initiate changes (Mitchell and Schwager, 1993). Individual lesson evaluations are typically performed directly after a lesson (or worse yet during the lesson in front of the clients) when the ST is unlikely to be either calm or receptive.

Assessment should also be developmental. The FS is in the unique position of knowing the ST well enough to recognize when and what type of feedback will be most useful to the ST. Feedback near the beginning of the FBE should tend to be more directive while increased experience should cause the advice to be more supportive (Smith, 1990).

Due to being overloaded with a large number of STs in widely separated sites, evaluation from USs may be sporadic and their observations unsystematic. A representative of the university (frequently not a tenured staff member) may or may not view the "orphaned" ST's performance within the FBE. FSs and STs have indicated that they feel that professors teach theory at the university and periodically interrupt their courses to do a stint of practice teaching. Their FBE visits are often a series of brief (typically averaging 30-90 minutes) (Yates, 1982), hurried observational periods once or twice during the FBE (Bowman, 1978). Often USs will rush in and out of the FBE with little understanding of the specific environmental context. USs are often are not appreciative of antecedent events which have lead up to a particular observation. They are not aware of future planned occurrences. They are not familiar with the particular clients. It is not uncommon for the ST to go to extraordinary lengths to prepare and execute the supervised lesson that engenders the university prescribed ideals of teaching. STs may attempt to project a positive image rather than admit to a weakness. The US may not know if such a lesson or the behavior of he clients is typical or episodic.

All too often faculty members do not engage the students and/or FSs in the type of dialogue that would permit the integration of theory and practice (Yates, 1982). Yates found that post-lesson supervisory discussions did not occur in 24% of his sample. When such dialogue does take place it is hasty and often perceived as public relations encounter rather than professional discourse aimed at facilitating improved instruction by the ST (Beynon and Onslow, 1992).

During feedback FSs do most (60-90%) of the discourse (Chandler, 1971) while STs remain largely passive and simply acknowledge what the FS has said (Mitchell and Schwager, 1993). The FS is most apt to insist on recounting past events rather than engaging in serious reflection . The ST and the FS generally center on specific concerns

regarding individuals and contexts rather than generalizations of optimum teaching strategies. There is little articulation of theory and practice (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Feedback is situation-specific and not tied to research or general aims of teaching. Discussions center on memory and cognitive level skills where statement-making, directions, procedural issues, and site management concerns predominate. There is little actual analysis of what the ST has done (Glickman and Bey, 1990). Dialogue about alternative instructional methods, divergent thinking, and educational theory is rare (Chandler, 1971). Turney (1994) cites evidence that STs want much more assistance than FS are generally prepared to provide or believe desirable especially in analyzing the teaching performance.

US visits and discussions have been known to cause considerable anxiety and confusion. FSs often elicit a defensive response as they believe they are being assessed. STs are stressed and confused as they are torn between the dissonant views of the FSs and USs regarding the quality of the teaching, how to teach, and what parameters are to be used for assessment (Glickman and Bey, 1990). Such practices do little to promote the linking of theory to practice or provide a sufficient base from which to offer useful suggestions for changes in ST behavior. This results in an insufficient FBE arrangement and an artificial integration of theory and practice (Jacknicke and Samiroden, 1991).

Evaluation protocols vary with each program. USs are generally instrumental in providing the final grade for the ST in the FBE (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). This is probably inappropriate in most cases. Evaluation from the FS is generally more valid since the FS typically is most familiar with the ST having spent considerably more time observing the ST than the US (Yates, 1982). The US may not have training in evaluation techniques and is not always experienced in the assessment of STs in the FBE. USs also indicate that they simply do not have sufficient time to discuss lesson plans, observe teaching performances, provide adequate feedback, and supply adequate encouragement and follow-up. For the US the dual responsibilities of counselor and evaluator often creates problems in developing a close and trusting relationship with the ST (Yates, 1982). Glickman and Bey (1990) have found that USs often act merely as a troubleshooter and have little impact or even a negative affect on STs.

There are often significant discrepancies between the feedback from USs and FSs (Guyton and McIntyre, 1990). USs and FS also may exhibit conflicting expectations of what constitutes effective teaching. Biases are commonplace as the conceptual level of thinking, standards, and expectations of FSs and USs often differ (MacDonald *et. al.*, 1992). There is a very real possibility of disagreements occurring particularly if poor communication exists or if there are variations in expectations between individuals. The ST is then torn between the demands of each (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). This inconsistency is a stated cause of stress for many STs. In fact, some FSs feel the need to protect the ST from the US and may neglect to voice legitimate concerns in front of the US (Richardson-Koehler, 1988). When discrepancies exist STs tend to lend more credence to the FS remarks.

Assessments must be private and confidential (Copas, 1984). This process will help to instill the ST with trust of the FS (Henry and Beasley, 1989). Feedback and criticisms given in front of clients or in the corridor is unacceptable. Unfortunately, "private" conferences with STs are often carried *ad hoc* out in a crowded staff room or in a noisy hallway. Comparison to other STs is also frowned upon (MacDonald *et. al.*, 1992).

Considering all the difficulties with evaluation of STs in FBEs has caused several authors (MacDonald *et. al.*, 1992; Wideen, 1986) to suggest that STs should not be evaluated at all during the FBE. Lamb (1997) reports that students believe a "pass/fail" designation rather than a graded evaluation relieves anxiety and decreases competition. This tact has been demonstrated to decrease the ST stress levels and may ultimately lead to improved learning.

COUNSELOR/CONSULTANT FUNCTION

Some STs consider the FBE to be the most stressful segment of teacher education programs (MacDonald *et. al.*, 1992). Student teaching can be highly anxiety producing as self-adequacy and security are threatened. Anxiety often stems from concerns about fulfilling conflicting expectations of the university and the field site and from dealing with FSs. STs have a strong need for social and emotional support from FSs. There is almost universal agreement that FSs must establish supportive human relationships with

the ST (Lamb, 1997). As a counselor/consultant the FS affords the ST with the necessary emotional support, encouragement, and praise (Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld, 1991) to facilitate a comfortable learning climate. Karmos and Jacko (1977) speculate that empathy and understanding from the FS is essential to relieve ST pressures and anxieties.

The success of a FS is partially based on the individual personality of the FS (Rikard and Veal, 1996). A sense of humor and a friendly pleasant attitude are important prerequisites to develop the trust and close rapport with the ST necessary for a successful FBE (Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld, 1991; Copas, 1984). Indeed, some authors (Rikard and Veal, 1996) would suggest that supervision is fundamentally an exercise in human relations. Personal perceptions may actually take precedence over practice and professional competence. Technical expertise is useless unless it is combined with the patience and willingness to give of oneself and the ability to provide the ST with a positive learning environment. Henry and Beasley (1989) experiences have shown that a match or mis-match of FSs and STs personality characteristics has an important influence on the overall effectiveness of FBEs. Differences can cause each participant to become uncomfortable with working with one another. When this happens it becomes difficult to be objective and rigidity predominates. The resulting tension causes communications to deteriorate. The FS must be able to recognize and overcome such barriers by being flexible and being accepting of individual differences in instructional abilities and educational philosophies. As a coach or mentor, the FS is sensitive to provide a balance between positive with corrective feedback (Schuster and Stevens, 1991).

FSs have the opportunity and the obligation to recognize when STs are experiencing emotional highs and lows and offer appropriate assistance. This may require that activities and schedules be modified to accommodate the changes in the ST's demeanor (Hoover, *et.al.* 1988). FSs can either restrict or encourage STs to explore the full meaning of teaching behaviors.

Clarke (1995) has found that an enthusiastic and uncritical approach to supervision significantly improves the FBE. While it is vital that STs are assessed objectively against stated standards it is also true that STs require informal feedback. Smith (1990) has noted that STs highly value the candid advice and subjective opinions that FSs provide. STs

appreciate FSs who share helpful hints for improvement, explain the reasons behind their decisions, and provide suggestions for future situations.

Most FSs are committed to the caring and nurturing of STs. As a counselor, the goal of the FS is to facilitate the self-growth of the ST as a perspective teacher. Benefice and devotion to the welfare of the ST is paramount. A professional rapport is established and strengthened when the FS demonstrates respect for the ST and accepts the ST as a colleague by soliciting opinions and suggestions.

As a consultant the goal is to provide STs with alternatives and options rather than merely answers. FSs must encourage choice and responsibility. A sense of collaboration, collegiality, cooperation, and constructive confrontation must infuse FS/ST interactions (Susi, 1992). Strong FSs respect differences in ST's personality and teaching styles (Tabchnick, 1980).

Glickman and Bey (1990) report that the encouraging and supportive framework developed by the FS motivates the ST more than that of the US. STs exhibit a higher self-concept, were more satisfied, and felt more successful if they perceived that the FS believed them to be confident and competent. The faith in, endorsement of, and approval of the FS can be all-important in developing and sustaining a positive relationship with the ST. FSs are responsible for facilitating the positive human relations that are essential to motivate the ST.

Teaching is conceptualized as an inquiry process in which the teachers' understanding is continually constructed and reconstructed based on events in actual teaching practice. Teaching is an ongoing process in which the ST collects data through observation, reflects back to understand personal actions, criticizes these actions through discussion with self and others, and restructures these actions for further personal meaning and action. As a consultant, the FS engages the ST in personal and social dialogue regarding clients, subject matter, and the teaching context. The FS answers ST questions and provides suggestions. The FS should empower the ST to self-evaluate and reflect upon and develop personal teaching philosophies, styles, and perspectives (Zeichner, 1983; Thies-Sprinthal, 1986; Kagen, 1992; Beynon and Onslow, 1992). The FS should guide the ST toward the identification and development of desirable personal

and professional characteristics. Through reflective practice FSs should encourage STs to recognize what they are doing, its impact on themselves and the clients, and potential alternatives (Schon, 1987). This will increase the STs' self-confidence and self-image make them more self-assured (Wideen and Holborn, 1986)

ROLE MODEL FUNCTION

STs learn a great deal by observing the attitudes and behaviors of FSs who act as role models for both personal and professional standards (Weller, 1983). The quality of the interaction with the ST is significantly influenced by the FSs' view of self, their workplace, and the world in general. Yee (1969) found that the teaching of most STs closely reflected those methods used by the FS rather than those promoted by the university. Even the patterns of the ST's speech may mimic those of the FS. It is evident that the FS's role modeling behavior critically affects the ST.

As a role model the FS must consistently act as a competent and proficient professional demonstrating personal and practical knowledge of the discipline that the ST can observe and emulate (Kalekin-Fishman and Kornfeld, 1991). As an exemplary practitioner, the FS is familiar with the working environment and is aware of effective and ineffective practices that will contribute to the STs' professional growth. The FS will command respect as she exhibits self-confidence and communicates a sense of professionalism, ethical conduct, and a positive attitude (Ralph, 1989) through everyday practice.

The effective FS will have adequate experience which will allow her to exhibit sound decision-making skills both in her own professional practice and for the benefit of the ST (Susi, 1992). A quality role model will also draw upon previous experience to adequately recognize and diagnose STs' strengths and weaknesses, determine readiness to participate in a variety of activities, and to recognize available resources most likely to assist ST to successfully achieve desired ends. As a role model the FS will be able to plan and structure the FBE to suit the individual needs of the ST and modify the workload accordingly while not impacting negatively on the clients (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). The FS can manipulate variables such as the amount time in a particular environment and

exposure to personnel with the required expertise or send the ST to other areas if extant resources are inadequate. In general, the FS will make instructional decisions that match program goals and the social, cognitive, and cultural needs of the ST. When this is successful STs were more positive about the FBE and less critical of other elements of the program. Those FSs who can reduce the gap between the idealistic teaching situations in university classes and the real world are most likely to ensure a positive FBE (Wideen and Holborn, 1986).

FSs wield considerable influence in shaping the professional perspectives of the STs. A number of investigators have indicated that the attitudes of STs tend to move during FBE in the direction held by the FS (Price, 1961). Unfortunately, there are indications that, at least in some instances, the general effects of FSs are poor attitudes toward students, suspicion of innovative teaching methods, and negative views of educational research and theory (Joyce, 1988). While most FSs are committed to the development of professional STs, FSs sometimes regard STs as a threat to their control of the learning environment, perceive STs simply as a means of lightening their own workload, or accept STs for the additional payment involved. As a result of imitating the attitudes and behaviors of ineffective FSs, ST teaching strategies may become limited rather than leading to an expanded instructional repertoire. Awender and Harte (1986) and Zeichner (1980) suggest that STs may merely model the behaviors of FSs to earn a commendable evaluation. They suggest that subjugation to the conservative wishes of the FS and the routines of daily practice may suppress innovative strategies and creativity. These authors stress how essential it is to select only those FSs who have positive attitudes towards enlightened educational ideals, professionalism (Ralph, 1989), an interest and enthusiasm for everyday practice, and a commitment to teaching. Great professional damage can be done by consistently placed STs with FSs who do demonstrate a positive professional disposition.

The FS will improve the FBE for the ST by building and maintaining a positive rapport with clients and colleagues (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). The FS should respect cultural/gender diversity amongst staff and clients. It is essential that the FS speak professionally of colleagues, the institution, and the educational community (Schuster

and Stevens, 1991; Koerner, 1992). Unfortunately, it is not uncommon to hear FSs grumble about conflicts with peers or administration in the presence of STs (Duquette, 1993). For many FSs supervision is simply a chore to be endured. FSs may openly criticize associates, the organization, and the educational institution. They may express beliefs that STs are disruptive to their routine and interrupt instruction (Yates, 1982). They complain that STs displace the FS from the central figure in the FBE. FSs sometimes lament that time spent with the ST is time and energy shifted from the client (Rikard and Veal, 1996). Such unprofessional remarks can be very detrimental to the self-esteem of the ST and also give the ST an impression that the supervisory aspect of the FS's position is of limited value. While it is incumbent upon the FS to explain the advantages/disadvantages of working in the profession such comments must be perceived as positive and constructive rather than derogatory. If the FS is intent on verbalizing legitimate concerns then the FS should be exposed to the acceptable manner in which to frame those matters. Positive remarks regarding colleagues and the profession demonstrate high standards and show respect for administration, the institution, and the program.

The FS should be prepared to communicate a personal perception of teaching to the ST and that these views be in keeping with strong pedagogical approaches. It is expected that the FS will assist the ST to develop a realistic understanding of the profession by articulating both the advantages and disadvantages of working in the discipline. FSs should aid the ST to examine the requirements and expectations of the profession and to consider career opportunities (Beynon and Onslow, 1992). STs frequently question their place in the workplace and the expertise of the FS (Wideen, 1986). The FS must not be deterred by these challenges but recognize them as legitimate concerns and use them as a platform to assist the ST to evolve authentic insights into the profession .

It is incumbent upon the FS to be available to the ST as the situation dictates. Typically, STs require more assistance during the initial learning situations. These needs decrease as the ST gains experience, competence, and confidence. Lack of accessibility to the FS causes the ST become isolated and frustrated.

Strong organizational skills and the ability to provide efficacious long and short-range plans will allow the FS to ensure that the ST is afforded optimum resources and encounter the maximum chances of success (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Such skills will allow a competent FS to provide a harmonious and effective mix between university theory and field experience. As an experienced, competent professional, the FS is familiar with the daily workload and client base that will provide the most appropriate and timely learning scenario that best suits the learning needs of the ST while still ensuring appropriate client care.

The FS should be prepared to allow the ST to experiment, make mistakes, and take risks within a reasonable context (Tittle, 1974). Certainly clients should never be put in jeopardy. An effective FS is cognizant of the ST's limitations and capable of protecting clients from ST inadequacies. However, a capable role model will provide the encouraging learning environment necessary to permit the ST to attempt various teaching strategies under a variety of conditions so as to learn which approaches are most suitable to a given learning situation. As an exemplary role model, the FS will allow the ST to learn by trial and error and support the decisions made by the ST. This encourages initiative and creativity and builds a strong self-image by demonstrating confidence in the ST.

Adams (1996) states that it is important for a ST to become an integral part of the institution's personnel. Interactions with the faculty is a major growth experience for the ST. Relationships with other staff define and formulate professional behavior. A ST's previous experience with faculty may have been primarily as a student. Now they are associates. There is much to be learned from associations with other colleagues. The FS should instill a "team approach" perspective within the ST which nourishes a collegial interplay between the ST and other members of the FBE. To aid in the initiation of the ST into the profession, the FS should invite the ST to participate in staff activities and to facilitate this interaction. Without an adequate introduction to all the participants in the FBE and the professional as a whole the ST may miss important resource people which may promote a sense of isolation and significantly hamper future learning. It is expected that the FS will also facilitate the ST's interactions in extracurricular activities in the local

community and the professional association. It has been suggested that FSs might even extend their social association with the ST outside the educational environment.

The FSs should critically reflect upon personal practices, monitor the effectiveness of their supervision, and institute suitable changes as appropriate (Ralph, 1989; Schuster and Stevens, 1991). Many FSs find that contact with STs bring in fresh ideas and the necessity to be more self-analytical (Wideen, 1986). It is imperative that FSs seek feedback regarding their supervisory behaviors and continually strive to improve their own personal practices (Basom *et.al.* 1994). The FS is also responsible for using this data for the purpose of promoting constructive changes to the educational program (Ralph, 1989).

A number of studies (Smith, 1990; Adams, 1996) have demonstrated that previous experience in the supervision of STs assists the FS to increase the efficacy of the FBE. Experienced FSs tend to be more proactive and to provide more verbal interactions with the ST (Glickman and Bey, 1990). Previous experience in teaching in the subject area has also been seen to be helpful (Glickman and Bey, 1990). Previous experience at the particular site may also be assistive as it enhances the FS's knowledge of various resources. It follows that the FS is somewhat older to accommodate this quantity and quality of experience.

A strong role model is able to effectively deal with stress and change in the workplace. Stress is an individual concern and may come in many forms. Excessive workload, concerns about the potential negative impact of the ST on clients and staff, and trepidation about how to evaluate STs are important stressors of FSs. Such tensions can be relieved if the FS is adaptable and flexible. A meritorious FS can also use these pressures to establish constructive change.

The FS is expected to protect the ST from potential personality conflicts within the FBE. This requires tact and diplomacy. The ST is often perceived as a burden and outsider and not always well received by other staff members. It is the FS's responsibility to ensure that the ST is accepted as a functioning member of the workplace while still maintaining a professional rapport with colleagues.

A major theme among research is that STs are dissatisfied with the lack of integration between site preparation and future placement. Wideen and Holborn (1986) suggest that there should be an integral link between pre-service training and the hiring policies of the educational institutions that train the STs. It has been recommended that FSs should promote the ST to administrators thereby assisting the ST to obtain employment in the profession.

As a role model, the FS actively participates in the activities of the profession. She becomes involved with meetings, committees, and reading current professional literature. She adheres to a professional code of ethics and standards of practice.

FSs are expected to participate in continuing education and in-service training. Training has been shown to improve the supervisory practice of FSs. Evidence from a number of studies suggests that training FSs for their roles is essential to improve supervisory skills in data collection, observation, analysis of behavior, conducting conferences and providing feedback. Instruction can assist the FS to demonstrate initiative and innovation and implement effective intervention (Rikard and Veal, 1996). Trained FSs tend to provide a collegial approach to education and be less directive/controlling. They are more apt to provide a the ST with a supportive learning environment. Supervisory instruction can assist FSs to interact with and spend increased time with STs (Yates, 1982; Glickman and Bey, 1990). Trained FSs also feel more comfortable with their roles and responsibilities and are more eager to accept STs. FSs who have participated in supervisory workshops are rated more highly by STs than untrained personnel. Unfortunately, fewer than 20% of the FSs are trained in supervision (Johnson and Yates, 1982). Lack of time and funding seem to be the major impediments to support these programs (Potthoff and Kline, 1994). Finally, the FS should encourage the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks and, in particular, assist the ST to develop educational research interests and skills.

Given that it is unlikely that FBEs will become less common, there is a very real need for understanding the behaviors of FSs and improving their practice. A number of studies have sought to elucidate educative and miseducative effects of FSs in the FBE (Thies-Sprinthal, 1980, 1984). If FBEs are to be successful, greater emphasis must be placed on

their quality (Ziechner, 1980). A first step in improving quality is the identification of effective supervisory behaviors of FSs. Numerous studies have sought to describe effective supervision in FBEs by ascertaining the STs preferences for the type of supervision provided by FSs (Copeland, 1982), describing the personality traits of effective FSs, generating job requirements of FSs, identifying problems FSs encounter in performing their role (Applegate and Lasley, 1982), describing the functions of FSs, and identifying critical behaviors deemed effective/ineffective to the learning of STs (Copas, 1984; Ratzloff and Grimmett, 1986). Unfortunately, there is a great deal of confusion and contradiction surrounding the existing data regarding what constitutes a competent FS (Zeichner, 1980). It is the purpose of this investigation to identify effective supervisory behaviors that will be instrumental in enhancing FBEs and reducing the confusion and conflict that often develops in this type of scenario.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

QUANTITATIVE SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Survey research is one of the best research designs available to the social scientist interested in describing, defining, or exploring a population of individuals too large to observe directly (Babbie, 1992). The fundamental purpose of survey research is to study the prevalence or trend of some construct in a population by directly examining a sample of that population (Smith and Glass, 1987). Surveys provide an excellent means for describing the characteristics, attitudes, and orientations of a large population (Babbie, 1992). As a positivist approach to investigation, this type of quantitative research is based on the assumption that human actions are regular (rather than random) and can be described in probabilistic terms (allowing for individual exceptions).

As an investigative process, the survey approach is particularly pertinent to the aims of this study. First, this strategy solicits perceptions directly from active participants (FSs and STs) involved in the C/W process rather than from written policy documents or mission statements. Perception is always involved with attitude formation and decision-making because attitudes are derived from experience rather than being innate (Duquette, 1993). It is the individual's interpretation of experience that is important to a cognizance of the experience (MacKinnon, 1989). Questionnaire responses allow FSs and STs to express their individual understanding of their lived experiences in the field. While subject to the artificiality imposed by the forced questionnaire responses inherent in responding to surveys, a request for additional individual comments does not limit the participants' ability to provide informative, relevant supplementary data.

Secondly, surveys are well suited for the comprehensive examination of a complex topic and, hence, is well suited to the exploratory nature of this investigation. Survey research methodology permits the analysis of complex propositions involving several variables in simultaneous interaction within a population. This type of non-experimental quantitative research, including the simultaneous operation of numerous variables inherent to the natural setting, employs the logico-empirical basis of statistics to verify if the observed matches the expected (Babbie, 1990). The breadth of the questionnaire is designed to promote an understanding of complicated interactions between STs and FSs.

An analysis of this data seeks to discern and evaluate tendencies in the responses which may provide precursor data for the future understanding and development of such behaviors in this learning/teaching environment and ultimately inform program policy decisions.

Thirdly, the empirical nature of survey research provides a more representative and efficient approach for studying aggregate patterns in large populations than qualitative methods like interviews and focus groups. Most of the STs and FSs in the C/W were queried in an effort to increase generalizability, to reduce sampling errors, and to ascertain a broad range of perspectives. Other data gathering methodologies such as interviews, critical incident technique, or case studies would limit the number of respondents. The major intent of this investigation is to provide an exploratory analysis of the effective supervisory behaviors exhibited by FSs in a C/W setting. The object is not to explain why participants perceive these traits to be effective in supervision but, rather, to delineate the broadest range of effective behaviors. The goal is to develop a foundational data set by identifying as many effective supervisory behaviors as possible from participants in as many C/W sites as feasible.

Survey research is generally strong on reliability (Babbie, 1992). The use of computer-scored answer sheets serves to improve reliability as all subjects receive the same questionnaire. This alleviates the need to interpret individual responses. Misinterpretations and recording errors are limited. The survey format also improves the response rate as participants are allowed to complete the questionnaire at a time and place of their convenience. Computer-scored responses can ensure respondent anonymity thereby promoting candid replies (Babbie, 1992).

Finally, the use of a survey format for data gathering permits inter- and intra-disciplinary comparisons between similar previous studies of supervisors in the K-12 school system and clinical teaching scenarios.

The use of survey methodology is not without its detractors. This approach has come under scrutiny by researchers such as Capra (1996) who suggests that the assumption that a complex system can be understood as a function of its parts may provide an inadequate conceptualization. The requirement for a standardized questionnaire may impute a

superficial coverage of such a complex topic. Examining individual and specific facets of human behavior often fails to adequately represent the dynamic interactions that make the system more than a sum of its parts. Attempting to comprehend human interactions through a reductionist's view provides only an approximate and limited understanding of the complete system. Capra further argues that such reductionism is futile as a system's components cannot be understood outside the context of the environment (Barnetson, 1997). Despite these limitations, the inability to achieve perfection should not constrain the potential good resulting from research if generalizing relationships can assist in understanding the environment and promoting effective change (Barnetson, 1997).

The artificiality of the survey format and responses puts a strain on validity (Babbie, 1992). However, to say something is a valid or an invalid measure assumes the existence of a real definition of what is being measured. Many scholars now reject that assumption indicating that conceptualization of a construct such as supervision is valid if it can be described by an appropriate set of indicators. The intent of this research satisfies this criterion as it does not propose to define supervision but to recognize those behaviors that participants deem inherent in exemplary supervision.

Babbie (1990) further elucidates limitations of statistical evaluation in the social sciences. Sampling assumptions are rarely fully satisfied and statistical techniques are often applied in violation of assumptions that underlie them. There is also the concern that the aggregation of data in a survey necessary for analyses may blur the unique combination of traits and circumstances that affect individual perceptions (Babbie, 1992). Again, Barnetson (1997) explains that the value of using inappropriate statistical treatments to understand data may be high enough to warrant their use if the value of properly reasoned outcomes outweigh the disadvantages of violating parametric rules.

THE SAMPLE

An understanding of the teaching/learning experiences within FBEs are not to be found in public statements of intentions but through an examination of the experience itself through the interpretation of participants (Tabachnick, Popkewitz, and Zeichner, 1979). Hence, data for this study comes from the direct responses of FSs and STs who

were involved with the daily activities of FBEs. The subjects of this study were categorized into two groups; the STs and the FSs.

The ST sample consisted of 288 of the population of 385 STs who were enrolled in the first semester of the four-semester newly implemented Master Teaching program at the University of Calgary. Those individuals who were not directly involved with the survey were either a part of the pilot survey or were available through their professional seminar activities. These STs had recently completed the first two week FBE in the C/W setting.

The FS population was composed of all (101) FSs who had been involved in the same C/W program with the surveyed STs.

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The literature recognizes the use of scales and forms that list effective supervisory behaviors as an acceptable means of identifying effective practice in FBE (Dunlevy and Wolf, 1992). Such forms are generally completed by FSs and students and are subsequently used to assess supervisory effectiveness (Fallon, Croen, and Shelov, 1987; Castledon, 1999)

The instrument for this study was a three-part questionnaire with similar forms for STs and FSs. The first section of the form consisted of a Likert-like scale to measure the participants perceptions of the effectiveness of 94 FSs' supervisory behaviors. The second segment of the form contained nine items that elicited demographic data on each group of participants. In the third section open-ended questions sought broad input from respondents that could not be captured on the forced-choice questionnaire. This latter portion allowed the respondents to provide personal perceptions that the Likert-scale may have neglected.

The questionnaire (Appendix 2) was designed from a compilation of items found in a number of previous similar studies. For example, Copas (1984) used the critical incident technique developed by Flanagan (1954) to document specific behaviors felt to be critical requirements for effective supervisory behaviors provided by those directly responsible for STs. She analyzed 1,490 critical incidents described by 476 (elementary) STs from 31

higher education institutions and abstracted 28 categories of critical requirements for effective and ineffective behaviors. Castillo (1971) used a 50-item four-point, forced choice questionnaire to ascertain similar information. Grimmatt and Ratzlaff (1986) distributed a 166-item survey constructed from a 76-item questionnaire from Garland's (1964), Kaplan's (1967) and Castillo's (1971) inquiries of 950 STs and 1,375 FSs. Miklos and Greene (1987) developed 30 items which surveyed 515 recent graduates to assess the importance, effectiveness, and potential of a teacher education program regarding the knowledge, skill, and understanding of teaching.

To ensure a broad range of perspectives and in keeping with the exploratory intent of this investigation, this questionnaire also employs items from research in other disciplines. For example, Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) used an effective clinical teaching behaviors form to appraise the roles and instructional abilities of clinical instructors. Dye and Border (1990) developed standards for 11 core areas of knowledge, competencies, and personal characteristics that characterize effective counseling supervisors. Worthington and Roehlke (1979) found 42 supervisory behaviors which were deemed to be effective by counseling novices. Bergman and Gaitskill (1990) uncovered faculty and student perceptions of effective supervision in nursing.

There was considerable overlap between the items in questionnaires developed by these various investigators. However, there were distinct differences, as well, especially amongst the diverse disciplines. For example, the counseling literature tended to favor questions of consultant nature. Educational investigators had a predilection to be more prescriptive in character. Medical researchers seemed to be more practically oriented. The questionnaire for this investigation was prepared by cross-referencing and combining all relevant items from the above studies until no new details could be discerned. The wording of the items was revised to relate to the implementation of the C/W sites.

The questionnaire was field-tested by fifteen STs in the C/W program to establish construct and content validity. Medical technology students in the field experience portion of their training also provided feedback and suggestions regarding potential changes. None of these individuals were surveyed in the final study. Construct validity was accomplished through changes as a result of their recommendations prior to

distribution of the final form. Item additions, deletions, and wording modifications were implemented to ensure comprehension and applicability to the C/W scenario. Content validity was not considered a major issue in this study as the exploratory nature was to determine the broadest perspective of effective behaviors. It was assumed that the responses would determine those behaviors which were and were not valid to the individual C/W sites.

The items were divided into five main categories of behaviors; social integration, teaching, evaluation, counseling/consultation, and role modeling. These categories are consistent with other researchers. For example, Copas (1984) abstracted 4 main categories (each with multiple sub-categories) from 1,490 critical incident techniques. His *orienting* behaviors provide STs with basic information regarding the client and the institution and help the ST to locate resource material, persons, and supplementary materials. This is similar to the social integrator class of questions in this investigation. The *induction* function, like the teacher category of behaviors, provides structured responsibilities which gradually initiate the ST into full-time teaching. *Guiding* behaviors, like those of a consultant, are designed to assist the ST to develop the planning and presentation skills. *Reflecting* behaviors involve those strategies required to observe the ST and provide feedback (evaluation) as to the effectiveness of performance. *The role modeling* behaviors have been particularly promoted by counseling supervisors as well as other educators.

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

During a weekly field inquiry seminar in the Fall of 1998, university professors delivered to each ST a package containing a covering letter requesting their participation and explaining the intent of the study (Appendix 1) along with an "Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire" including directions for completing the questionnaire (Appendix 2). They were asked to return their computer-scored answer sheets by campus mail to the faculty office within six weeks. Four weeks later the professors were asked to remind the STs to return the surveys. The last questionnaire was received On December 15, 1998.

At the same time, packets containing a covering letter requesting their participation and explaining the intent of the study, an “Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire” (similar to those of the ST with appropriate wording modifications), and a stamped self-addressed envelope were sent by mail to each FS in the C/W Program.

The response rate was unexpectedly low particularly for the ST sample ($n=27$). To facilitate valid statistical analysis, questionnaire packages were distributed and collected personally by the author to an additional 37 STs in their weekly professional seminar in April, 1999.

DATA ANALYSIS

Response sheets were optically scored and the data was entered into SPSS 6.1. Three statistical analyses were performed on the data. First, a t-test was performed on each item to assess the statistical significance of the difference between the means of the responses by STs and FSs. Milliken and Johnson (1992) explain that there are few good procedures for making multiple comparisons in two-way experiments in which there are unequal numbers of observations per treatment combination. To make multiple comparisons on the population means they recommend using the Bonferroni’s method to determine the level of statistical differences between the two groups of respondents. Given that an α of 0.05 was chosen in advance, Bonferroni’s method claims two population means to be statically different only when the calculated α is less than α/p where α is the selected experimentwise error rate (0.05) and p is the number of comparisons planned prior to conducting the analysis (94 items). Hence, an α of 0.0005 ($0.05/94$) would be considered significant.

However, upon deliberation, this author felt that such a minimal α be unduly restrictive and inadequately reflect potential differences between the two groups. Certainly, such an extreme level of confidence would violate the proposed exploratory nature of this inquiry. As a compromise and in an effort to minimize both Type I and Type II errors, a conservative α level of 0.01 was established.

Secondly, a cluster analysis was performed to determine potential relationships between the questionnaire items. A squared Euclidean distance was selected. SPSS’s

hierarchical cluster analysis procedure grouped data by item. An average linkage clustering was employed. It was difficult to achieve good dispersion of cases into different variables due to the small sample size.

It was initially intended that the third statistical analysis, a principle component analysis, would be performed on the entire 94 behavior variables to determine the existence of an underlying factor structure. However, it was felt that the small data set ($n=98$) was inadequate to justify a factor analysis of the entire questionnaire data. Hence, in an attempt to determine the congruency of items within the categories of behaviors (social integrator, teacher, evaluator, consultant, and role model) a factor analysis was performed separately on each of the classifications. No rotation was employed since only a single factor was extracted for each category of questions.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The respondents consisted of a total of 64 STs and 34 FSs representing a return rate of 22% and 34% respectively.

The initial return rate for the STs was only 9% (27 of 288). To improve the unexpected low response rate additional questionnaire packages were personally distributed by the author to 37 more STs during their weekly professional seminar in April, 1999. A statistical evaluation of responses from the two sets of STs (December and April) demonstrated no significant differences so the responses were pooled to provide a single cohort (n=64).

A computer analysis of the data is presented in a frequency table for responses by STs and FSs for each of the 94 items in the questionnaire (Table 4.1). Percentages may not add up to 100% due to non-responses and/or rounding errors. Means were calculated by assigning numerical values to the responses (A=1, B=2, D=3, C=4, and E=0). Two-tailed t-tests were calculated for each item to determine if there was a statistically significant ($p < 0.0005$) difference between the responses of the two groups (Table 4.1). Responses to the request to detail any effective or ineffective supervisory behaviors or characteristics not identified by the survey did not uncover any supplementary suggestions. Written comments will be cited as appropriate in the discussion section.

Table 4.1 EFFECTIVE SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

- A. Very Effective (Very Beneficial)
 B. Somewhat Effective (Somewhat Beneficial)
 C. Ineffective (Detrimental)
 D. Neither Beneficial nor Detrimental (Not Necessary)
 E. Is not applicable to my teaching/learning situation

ST = Student Teachers (N=64) FS = Field Supervisors (N=34) clients = those being taught

* = statistically significant difference ($p < 0.01$) between FS's and ST's responses

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E (%) (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
1. Provides the ST with a place for personal belongings.	42 (27)	35 (12)	33 (21)	47 (16)	9 (6)	15 (5)	6 (4)		6 (4)	3 (1)	0.947	1.79	1.78
2. Encourages the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks.	48 (31)	59 (20)	42 (27)	29 (10)	2 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	6 (2)	2 (1)		0.861	1.55	1.57
3. Establishes clear lines of communication.	64 (41)	94 (32)	28 (18)	3 (1)	2 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)		2 (1)		0.006*	1.09	1.38
4. Explains all institutional routines, rules, and policies.	70 (45)	71 (24)	17 (11)	15 (5)	3 (2)	9 (3)	5 (3)		2 (1)	6 (2)	0.759	1.34	1.39
5. Explains the institutional goals and objectives to the ST.	70 (45)	82 (28)	22 (14)	12 (4)		6 (2)	2 (1)		3 (2)		0.688	1.24	1.28
6. Acquaints the ST with the set-up of the learning environment prior to teaching.	47 (30)	74 (25)	39 (25)	21 (7)	2 (1)	3 (1)	6 (4)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.078	1.35	1.65

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
7. Acquaints the ST with resources (e.g. parking, cafeteria, AV equipment, photocopying, etc.)	52 (33)	56 (19)	39 (25)	32 (11)		3 (1)	3 (2)		3 (2)	9 (3)	0.494	1.42	1.52
8. Introduces the ST to staff and administration.	47 (30)	71 (24)	38 (24)	24 (8)		3 (1)	8 (5)	3 (1)	5 (3)		0.112	1.38	1.66
9. Allows time to observe and learn from other staff.	58 (37)	77 (26)	25 (16)	12 (4)	2 (1)	3 (1)	8 (5)		5 (3)	9 (3)	0.041	1.23	1.56
10. Assists the ST to deal with conflicts with other staff.	38 (24)	32 (11)	16 (10)	21 (7)	8 (5)	9 (3)	5 (3)		31 (20)	32 (11)	0.589	1.83	1.69
11. Introduces the ST to clients.	42 (27)	50 (17)	30 (19)	24 (8)	5 (3)	3 (1)	5 (3)	9 (3)	14 (9)	15 (5)	0.995	1.66	1.65
12. Explains responsibilities of the ST to clients.	34 (22)	35 (12)	30 (19)	30 (10)	2 (1)	12 (4)	14 (9)	6 (2)	16 (10)	18 (6)	0.731	1.86	1.94
13. Explains specific roles/responsibilities of the ST to the ST.	41 (26)	82 (28)	45 (29)	9 (3)	2 (1)	3 (1)	8 (5)		2 (1)	6 (2)	0.00*	1.16	1.75
14. Designs learning objectives and activities based on the STs needs, choices, previous knowledge, skills, and experiences.	36 (23)	65 (22)	42 (27)	21 (7)	5 (3)	6 (2)	9 (6)	3 (1)	5 (3)	6 (2)	0.027	1.44	1.86
15. Directs the ST towards supplementary resources and personnel as required.	47 (30)	65 (22)	36 (23)	21 (7)		3 (1)	6 (4)	6 (2)	8 (5)	6 (2)	0.429	1.47	1.61
16. Develops teaching goals and activities mutually with ST.	38 (24)	53 (18)	27 (17)	30 (10)	3 (2)	3 (1)	20 (13)		9 (6)	15 (5)	0.001*	1.41	2.07
17. Demonstrates a variety of teaching styles and techniques to the ST.	34 (22)	68 (23)	39 (25)	24 (8)	2 (1)	3 (1)	16 (10)		6 (4)	6 (2)	0.002	1.34	1.98
18. Explains the principles of instructional techniques.	38 (24)	59 (20)	33 (21)	27 (9)	2 (1)	6 (2)	17 (11)	3 (1)	8 (5)	6 (2)	0.032	1.50	1.98

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
19. Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject material.	53 (34)	82 (28)	36 (23)	15 (5)	3 (2)		2 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.051	1.24	1.50
20. Instructs the ST on how to establish a close rapport with clients.	27 (17)	47 (16)	36 (23)	32 (11)	6 (4)	3 (1)	13 (8)	3 (1)	16 (10)	15 (5)	0.021	1.55	2.06
21. Allows ST adequate time to learn and prepare for teaching.	56 (36)	62 (21)	18 (12)	18 (6)	6 (4)		5 (3)	3 (1)	11 (7)	18 (6)	0.271	1.32	1.53
22. Reviews and approves ST activities before teaching.	28 (18)	41 (14)	36 (23)	27 (9)	5 (3)	3 (1)	13 (8)		16 (1)	30 (10)	0.014	1.46	2.02
23. Allows adequate time to teach clients.	41 (26)	65 (22)	31 (20)	12 (4)	6 (4)	3 (1)	3 (2)		16 (10)	21 (7)	0.004*	1.22	1.65
24. Assists the ST to improve presentation techniques.	41 (26)	71 (24)	25 (16)	15 (5)	5 (3)	3 (1)	13 (8)	3 (1)	14 (9)	9 (3)	0.006*	1.32	1.87
25. Allows the ST to develop and implement client evaluations.	28 (18)	35 (12)	28 (18)	24 (8)	6 (4)	3 (1)	11 (7)	6 (2)	22 (14)	32 (11)	0.239	1.70	2.00
26. Assists the ST to develop client management skills.	28 (18)	30 (10)	35 (23)	41 (14)	2 (1)		9 (6)	6 (2)	20 (13)	24 (8)	0.568	1.77	1.90
27. Allows ST graded levels of responsibility and autonomy.	41 (26)	62 (21)	38 (24)	27 (9)		3 (1)	8 (5)	3 (1)	9 (6)	3 (1)	0.140	1.44	1.71
28. Encourages the ST to explore unique, individualized teaching methods.	38 (24)	53 (18)	36 (23)	32 (11)	3 (2)	6 (2)	13 (8)	3 (1)	6 (4)	6 (2)	0.109	1.56	1.89
29. Encourages ST to think critically and apply theory to practice.	39 (25)	71 (24)	39 (25)	21 (7)		3 (1)	9 (6)		8 (5)	6 (2)	0.002*	1.28	1.77
30. Works with the university supervisor in planning the STs' program.	31 (20)	21 (7)	23 (15)	15 (5)	8 (5)	18 (6)	19 (12)	12 (4)	14 (9)	6 (2)	0.627	2.32	2.17
31. Allows ST input into assumption of full teaching responsibilities.	34 (22)	35 (12)	23 (15)	32 (11)	5 (3)	3 (1)	11 (7)	6 (2)	22 (14)	24 (8)	0.509	1.73	1.89

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
32. Discusses client's interests and abilities with the ST.	45 (29)	44 (15)	31 (20)	32 (11)		6 (2)	13 (8)	3 (1)	13 (8)	15 (5)	0.929	1.62	1.60
33. Supplies relevant course materials (e.g. texts, guides/manuals).	30 (32)	77 (26)	28 (18)	18 (6)			13 (8)	3 (1)	5 (3)	3 (1)	0.011	1.27	1.72
34. Discusses objectives/expectations with the ST prior to teaching.	55 (35)	82 (28)	28 (18)	6 (2)	2 (1)		5 (3)	3 (1)	6 (4)	9 (3)	0.021	1.16	1.51
35. Regularly schedules time to discuss ST questions and concerns.	61 (39)	74 (25)	22 (14)	15 (5)		3 (1)	9 (6)	6 (2)	3 (2)	3 (1)	0.449	1.39	1.54
36. Clearly defines all ST evaluation criteria.	39 (25)	65 (22)	36 (23)	21 (7)	3 (2)	6 (2)	14 (9)		3 (2)	9 (3)	0.002*	1.35	1.92
37. Clearly defines lines of authority to deal with problems.	33 (21)	68 (23)	27 (17)	15 (5)	3 (2)	9 (3)	14 (9)		3 (2)	9 (3)	0.001*	1.35	2.02
38. Regularly observes the ST.	42 (27)	71 (24)	30 (19)	21 (7)	6 (4)	3 (1)	14 (9)	3 (1)	3 (2)	3 (1)	0.004*	1.36	1.92
39. Uses a variety of data-gathering techniques for evaluation.	28 (18)	35 (12)	36 (23)	35 (12)	4 (3)	9 (3)	17 (11)	6 (2)	8 (5)	15 (5)	0.206	1.83	2.13
40. Provides the ST with both written and verbal evaluations.	55 (35)	79 (27)	33 (21)	9 (3)	3 (2)	3 (1)	5 (3)			9 (3)	0.003*	1.16	1.56
41. Follows up on advice to the ST to ensure success.	38 (24)	71 (24)	36 (23)	27 (9)	3 (2)	3 (1)	9 (6)		9 (6)		0.002*	1.32	1.82
42. Tactfully makes ST aware of strengths and weaknesses.	30 (19)	74 (25)	47 (30)	24 (8)	3 (2)		9 (6)	3 (1)	6 (4)		0.001*	1.32	1.91
43. Protects clients from ST inefficiencies.	33 (21)	35 (12)	20 (13)	41 (14)	13 (8)	12 (4)	8 (5)	6 (2)	22 (14)	6 (2)	0.784	1.88	1.94
44. Advises the ST about proper grooming and decorum.	39 (25)	41 (14)	22 (14)	35 (12)	11 (7)	21 (7)	6 (4)		17 (11)	3 (1)	0.952	1.79	1.80

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
57. Exhibits sensitivity.	61 (39)	77 (26)	20 (13)	21 (7)	2 (1)	3 (1)	8 (5)		5 (3)		0.090	1.26	1.52
58. Develops a close rapport with the ST.	52 (33)	65 (22)	30 (19)	29 (10)	2 (1)		8 (5)	6 (2)	5 (3)		0.420	1.47	1.62
59. Demonstrates a friendly and pleasant attitude.	75 (48)	85 (29)	17 (11)	12 (4)			2 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)		0.818	1.21	1.23
60. Motivates the ST.	53 (34)	71 (24)	33 (21)	24 (8)	3 (2)	3 (1)	3 (2)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.356	1.38	1.53
61. Demonstrates respect for the ST.	67 (43)	88 (30)	23 (15)	9 (3)	2 (1)		2 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)		0.220	1.18	1.33
62. Acts as a competent and proficient professional.	66 (42)	88 (30)	20 (13)	9 (3)	2 (1)		5 (3)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.105	1.18	1.41
63. Exhibits sound decision-making skills.	45 (29)	82 (28)	38 (24)	15 (5)			8 (5)	3 (1)	5 (3)		0.006*	1.24	1.67
64. Demonstrates self-confidence.	58 (37)	77 (26)	30 (19)	21 (7)			5 (3)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.240	1.29	1.47
65. Demonstrates interest and enthusiasm in everyday practice.	59 (38)	88 (30)	27 (17)	9 (3)	2 (1)		5 (3)	3 (1)	3 (2)		0.037	1.18	1.47
66. Demonstrates a positive rapport with clients.	58 (37)	79 (27)	23 (15)	12 (4)	2 (1)	3 (1)	5 (3)	3 (1)	8 (5)	3 (1)	0.245	1.27	1.46
67. Demonstrates a positive rapport with colleagues.	69 (44)	82 (28)	22 (14)	15 (5)	3 (1)			3 (1)	2 (1)		0.591	1.24	1.30
68. Communicates a personal perception of teaching to ST.	58 (37)	53 (18)	25 (16)	35 (12)			8 (5)	3 (1)	5 (3)	6 (2)	0.782	1.48	1.53
69. Spends adequate time and is available to the ST as needed.	47 (30)	79 (27)	41 (26)	12 (4)	2 (1)		5 (3)	6 (2)	2 (1)		0.061	1.30	1.62
70. Demonstrates strong organizational skills.	52 (33)	65 (22)	38 (24)	29 (10)	2 (1)	3 (1)	5 (3)	3 (1)			0.406	1.44	1.57
71. Allows the ST to make mistakes and take risks (within reason).	47 (30)	62 (21)	28 (18)	35 (12)	2 (1)		9 (6)	3 (1)	9 (6)		0.186	1.44	1.69

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
72. Invites the ST to participate in staff activities.	56 (36)	47 (16)	19 (12)	44 (15)	5 (3)	3 (1)	9 (6)		6 (4)	6 (2)	0.546	1.53	1.63
73. Facilitates ST interactions in extracurricular activities in the local community and profession.	34 (22)	21 (7)	22 (14)	29 (10)	6 (4)	21 (7)	9 (6)	6 (2)	23 (15)	24 (8)	0.253	2.15	1.87
74. Associates with ST socially outside the site environment.	19 (12)	6 (2)	19 (12)	12 (8)	13 (8)	38 (13)	16 (10)	27 (9)	28 (18)	18 (6)	0.009*	3.04	2.38
75. Promotes evaluation and constructive changes into the C/W experience.	38 (24)	44 (15)	34 (22)	44 (15)	5 (3)	6 (2)	14 (9)		5 (3)	6 (2)	0.084	1.59	1.95
76. Speaks professionally of colleagues, the institution, and the educational community.	48 (31)	79 (27)	39 (25)	18 (6)	2 (1)		3 (2)	3 (1)	2 (1)		0.045	1.26	1.56
77. Requests feedback from the ST regarding supervisory practices and makes appropriate changes.	45 (29)	44 (15)	31 (20)	38 (13)	3 (2)	6 (2)	9 (6)	9 (3)	5 (3)	3 (1)	0.806	1.79	1.74
78. Reflects critically on own practice and makes changes.	39 (25)	71 (24)	31 (20)	24 (8)	3 (2)	3 (1)	8 (5)	3 (1)	11 (7)		0.051	1.38	1.75
79. Possesses previous experience in supervision.	36 (23)	29 (10)	38 (24)	35 (12)	11 (7)	24 (8)	6 (4)	6 (2)	3 (2)	6 (2)	0.318	2.06	1.86
80. Possesses previous experience in teaching the subject area.	44 (28)	56 (19)	20 (13)	24 (8)	3 (2)	6 (2)	22 (14)	3 (1)	3 (2)	12 (4)	0.034	1.50	2.04
81. Possesses several years of experience at the site.	48 (31)	38 (13)	34 (22)	29 (10)	6 (4)	21 (7)	5 (3)	6 (2)	6 (4)	6 (2)	0.133	1.94	1.65
82. Is older than the ST.	34 (22)	18 (6)	23 (15)	24 (8)	22 (14)	47 (16)	5 (3)	9 (3)	9 (6)	3 (1)	0.013	2.48	1.96
83. Handles stress and change effectively.	38 (24)	71 (24)	33 (21)	24 (8)	5 (3)	3 (1)	14 (9)	3 (1)	5 (3)		0.007*	1.38	1.95

TABLE 4.1 (continued)

FS BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS	A% (N)		B% (N)		C% (N)		D% (N)		E% (N)		P value	Mean	
	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS	ST	FS		ST	FS
84. Handles personality conflicts effectively.	34 (22)	68 (23)	39 (25)	21 (7)	3 (2)	3 (1)	8 (5)	3 (1)	9 (6)	6 (2)	0.020	1.38	1.81
85. Protects the ST from conflicts with other staff members.	20 (13)	18 (6)	36 (23)	35 (12)	16 (10)	18 (6)	5 (3)	9 (3)	16 (10)	21 (7)	0.448	2.22	2.06
86. Promotes the ST to administration within the institution.	31 (20)	21 (7)	28 (18)	29 (10)	9 (6)	18 (6)	11 (7)	6 (2)	14 (9)	27 (9)	0.626	2.12	2.00
87. Assists the ST in obtaining employment in the profession.	17 (11)	12 (4)	23 (15)	27 (9)	11 (10)	18 (6)	16 (10)	9 (3)	23 (15)	35 (12)	0.976	2.36	2.37
88. Explains the advantages/disadvantages of working in the profession to ST.	36 (23)	32 (11)	30 (19)	41 (14)	5 (3)	12 (4)	11 (7)	6 (2)	11 (7)	9 (3)	0.933	1.90	1.88
89. Demonstrates a sense of humor.	48 (31)	68 (23)	42 (27)	27 (9)	2 (1)	3 (1)	2 (1)	3 (1)			0.388	1.41	1.53
90. Respects cultural/gender diversity amongst staff and clients.	58 (37)	82 (28)	30 (19)	12 (4)		3	2 (1)	3 (1)	5 (3)	3 (1)	0.184	1.21	1.39
91. Actively participates in the activities of professional associations.	30 (19)	24 (8)	28 (18)	32 (11)	6 (4)	24 (8)	11 (7)	9 (3)	19 (12)	12 (4)	0.351	2.20	1.98
92. Participates in in-service training for field supervisors.	20 (13)	38 (13)	23 (15)	21 (7)	14 (9)	24 (8)	6 (4)	3 (1)	28 (18)	15 (5)	0.390	1.90	2.10
93. Demonstrates a professional image and act as a positive role model	55 (35)	82 (28)	28 (18)	15 (5)	2 (1)		8 (5)	3 (1)	2 (1)		0.024	1.24	1.59
94. Assists the ST to develop educational research interests and skills.	45 (29)	35 (12)	30 (19)	32 (11)		24 (8)	8 (5)	9 (3)	11 (7)		0.050	2.06	1.64

In the interest of a cross-study comparison with previous research carried out by Castillo (1971), Copas (1984), and Grimmatt and Ratzlaff (1986), behaviors were divided into those which demonstrate a strong intra-diad consensus ($\geq 85\%$ stating that the behavior is effective), moderate agreement (65%-84%), weak (50-64%) agreement, and behaviors not supported by either group ($< 50\%$ indicating that the behavior is effective) (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 BEHAVIORS DEMONSTRATING A DIAD CONSENSUS

Encourages the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks.
Establishes clear lines of communication.
Explains all institutional routines, rules, policies.
Explains the institutional goals and objectives to the ST.
Acquaints ST with set-up of the learning environment prior to teaching.
Acquaints ST with resources (e.g. parking, cafeteria, AV equipment, photocopying)
Introduces the ST to staff and administration.
Explains specific roles/responsibilities of the ST to the ST.
Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject material.
Provides ST with both written and verbal evaluations.
Provides feedback in a confidential manner.
Provides appropriate encouragement and praise.
Exhibits patience.
Demonstrates a friendly and pleasant attitude.
Motivates the ST.
Demonstrates respect for the ST.
Acts as a competent and proficient professional.
Exhibits sound decision-making skills.
Demonstrates self-confidence.
Demonstrates interest and enthusiasm in everyday practice.
Demonstrates a positive rapport with colleagues.
Spends adequate time and is available to the ST as needed.
Demonstrates strong organizational skills.
Speaks professionally of colleagues, the institution, and the educational community.
Demonstrates a sense of humor.
Respects cultural/gender diversity amongst staff and clients.

Table 4.2 (continued) BEHAVIORS OF MODERATE AGREEMENT

Provides the ST with a place for personal belongings.
Allows time to observe and learn from other staff.
Introduces ST to clients.
Explains responsibilities of the ST to clients.
Designs learning objectives and activities based on the STs needs, choices, previous knowledge, skills, and experiences.
Directs the ST towards supplementary resources and personnel as required.
Develops teaching goals and activities mutually with ST.
Demonstrates a variety of teaching styles and techniques to the ST.
Explains the principles of instructional techniques.
Allows adequate time to learn and prepare for teaching.
Reviews and approve ST activities before teaching.
Allows adequate time to teach clients.
Assists the ST to improve presentation techniques.
Allows ST graded levels of responsibility and autonomy.
Encourages the ST to explore unique, individualized teaching methods.
Encourages ST to think critically and apply theory to practice.
Discusses client's interests and abilities with ST.
Discusses objectives/expectations with the ST prior to teaching.
Regularly schedules time to discuss ST questions and concerns.
Clearly defines all ST evaluation criteria.
Clearly defines lines of authority to deal with problems.
Uses a variety of data-gathering techniques for evaluation.
Regularly observes ST.
Follows up on advice to ST to ensure success.
Tactfully makes ST aware of strengths and weaknesses.
Encourages ST input into discussions and acts upon this feedback.
Consistently evaluates ST progress against stated and relevant objectives and expectations.
Provides a fair, honest, direct and unbiased evaluation
Demonstrates flexibility in expectations and workload.
Provides feedback on STs' interactions with staff.
Provides feedback on STs' interactions with clients.
Exhibits sensitivity.
Develops a close rapport with the ST.
Demonstrates a positive rapport with clients.
Communicates a personal perception of teaching to the ST.
Allows the ST to make mistakes and take risks (within reason).
Invites ST to participate in staff activities.
Promotes evaluation and constructive changes in the C/W expedience.
Requests feedback from ST regarding supervisory practices and makes appropriate changes.

Reflects critically on own practice and makes changes.
Possesses previous expedience in supervision.
Possesses previous experience in teaching the subject area.
Possess several years of experience at the site.
Handles stress and change effectively.
Handles personality conflicts effectively.
Explains advantages/disadvantages of working in the profession to ST.
Demonstrates a professional image and acts as a positive role model.
Assists ST to develop educational research interests/skills.

Table 4.2 (continued) BEHAVIORS OF WEAK AGREEMENT

Assists ST in dealing with conflicts with other staff.
Instructs the ST on how to establish a close rapport with clients.
Allows ST to develop and implement client evaluations.
Assists the ST to develop client management skills.
Allows ST input into assumption of full teaching responsibilities.
Supplies relevant course materials (e.g., texts, guides/manuals).
Protects clients from ST inefficiencies.
Advises ST about proper grooming and decorum.
Keeps accurate and comprehensive records of ST activities and evaluations.
Encourages the ST to self-evaluate and reflect upon personal teaching philosophies, styles, and abilities.
Facilitates ST interactions in extracurricular activities in the local community and profession.
Protects the ST from conflicts with other staff members.
Promotes the ST to administration within the institution.
Actively participates in the activities of professional associations.

Table 4.2 (continued) BEHAVIORS NOT SUPORTED BY BOTH GROUPS

Works with the university supervisor in planning the STs' program.
Associates with ST socially outside the site environment.
Assists the ST in obtaining employment in the profession.
Is older than the ST.
Works with university supervisor to asses the ST.
Participates in in-service training for field supervisors.

The two groups of respondents agreed on 80.9% (n=76) of the items but differed significantly ($p<0.01$) on 19.1% (n=18) of the responses as indicated in Table 4.3. These results demonstrate less agreement than those of Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) but more conformity than Castillo (1971) observed (96% and 76% agreement respectively).

Table 4.3 ITEMS DEMONSTRATING A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (p<0.01)

BEHAVIOR/CHARACTERISTIC	COMMENT
Establishes clear lines of communication.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs
Explains specific roles/responsibilities of the ST to the ST.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Develops teaching goals and activities mutually with ST.	FSs are more likely to agree though 15% do not see this behavior to be applicable.
Demonstrates a variety of teaching styles and techniques to the ST.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Allows adequate time to teach clients.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs. A substantial number of STs (16%) and FSs (21%) feel that this behavior is not applicable to them.
Assists the ST to improve presentation techniques.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Encourages the ST to think critically and apply theory to practice.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Clearly defines all ST evaluation criteria.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Clearly defines lines of authority to deal with problems.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Regularly observes the ST.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Provides the ST with both written and verbal evaluations.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Follows up on advice to the ST to ensure success.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Tactfully makes ST aware of strengths and weaknesses.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Provides a fair, honest, direct and unbiased evaluation.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Provides appropriate encouragement and praise.	FSs are more likely to agree (100%) than STs
Exhibits sound decision-making skills.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.
Associates with ST socially outside the site environment.	STs are more likely to agree than FSs. 38% of the FSs deem this to actually be a detriment as do 18% of the STs. A substantial number of STs (28%) and FSs (18%) feel that this behavior is not applicable to them.
Handles stress and change effectively.	FSs are more likely to agree than STs.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The demographic data are reported in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 below:

Table 4.4 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR FIELD SUPERVISORS

Years of work experience	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
% (n)		9 (3)	18 (6)	18 (6)	50 (17)
Years of formal teaching experience	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
% (n)	21 (7)	12 (4)	18 (6)	24 (8)	18 (6)
How many STs taught	1	2	3	4	>4
% (n)	21 (7)	12 (4)	6 (2)	18 (6)	38 (13)
Highest level of formalized education	Bachelors (Education)	Bachelors (not in Education)	Masters	Diploma	Grade 12
% (n)	21 (7)	12 (4)	18 (6)	41 (14)	
Gender	Male	Female			
% (n)	44 (15)	50 (17)			
Age Group	<25	26-35	36-45	46-55	>56
% (n)		29 (10)	15 (5)	18 (6)	32 (11)
Hours spent on the C/W program each day	1	2-3	4-5	6-8	>8
% (n)	29 (10)	35 (12)	15 (5)	12 (4)	3 (1)
Hours spent per day on the C/W Program outside of work	<1	1-2	3-4	5-6	>6
% (n)	77 (26)	15 (5)		3 (1)	
Attended a seminar or workshop on ST supervision	Yes	No			
% (n)	53 (18)	35 (12)			

Table 4.5 DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR STUDENT TEACHERS

Years of work experience	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
%	23	28	6	28	8
(n)	(15)	(18)	(4)	(18)	(5)
Years of formal teaching experience	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
%	53	33		8	
(n)	(34)	(21)		(5)	
Number of STs at your site	1	2	3	4	>4
%	28	42	5	6	9
(n)	(18)	(27)	(3)	(4)	(6)
Highest level of formalized education	Bachelors (Education)	Bachelors (not in Education)	Masters	Diploma	Grade 12
%	20	61	2	11	
(n)	(13)	(39)	(1)	(7)	
Gender	Female	Male			
%	50	38			
(n)	(32)	(24)			
Age Group	<25	26-35	36-45	46-55	>56
%	42	38	5	9	
(n)	(27)	(24)	(3)	(6)	
Hours spent on the C/W Program each day	1	2-3	4-5	6-8	>8
%	16	16	41	13	8
(n)	(10)	(10)	(26)	(8)	(5)
Hours spent per day on the C/W program outside of work	<1	1-2	3-4	5-6	>6
%	36	38	14	5	2
(n)	(23)	(24)	(9)	(3)	(1)
Attended a seminar or workshop on ST supervision	Yes	No			
%	14	72			
(n)	(9)	(46)			

CLUSTER ANALYSIS

A cluster analysis was performed to determine potential relationships between the questionnaire items. Cluster analysis is inherently difficult and poses a number of interpretational challenges (Barnetson, 1997). Some items did not cluster well. The dendrogram using Average Linkage analysis appears in Figure 4.1 below.

Figure 4.1

Cluster Analysis Dendogram Using Average Linkage

FACTOR ANALYSIS

Principle components analysis was performed on variables in each the categories of behaviors to determine the applicability of the classification scheme. The first supervisory factor (Social Integration) can be represented as orienting the ST to the learning environment. The factor loadings are for this category of behaviors is outlined in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6 FACTOR LOADINGS FOR SOCIAL INTEGRATION BEHAVIORS

QUESTION	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9
LOADING	.506	.199	.499	.743	.671	.670	.460	.721	.387

QUESTION	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
LOADING	.544	.547	.574	.796

The loadings of the majority of these behaviors would support the assertion that both STs and FSs are in agreement that supervision by FSs entails familiarizing the ST with the site. STs look to FSs to provide an introduction and acclimatization into the workplace. Providing an effective and comprehensive orientation is a prime supervisory requisite. Only items 2 (Encourages the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks.) and 9 (Allows time to observe and learn from other staff.) do not load highly in this category. However, both are still strongly supported by both STs and FSs. This and subsequent factor analyses will be discussed more completely in Chapter Five.

The second supervisory category (Teaching) can be represented by the instructional behaviors of FSs. The factor loadings for teaching behaviors are outlined in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 FACTOR LOADINGS FOR TEACHING BEHAVIORS

QUESTION	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21
LOADING	.451	.407	.730	.590	.826	.576	.777	.801

QUESTION	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29
LOADING	.744	.714	.783	.698	.666	.430	.642	.745

QUESTION	Q30	Q31	Q32	Q33
LOADING	.512	.757	.648	.390

All items but 33 (Supplies relevant course material) load relatively highly in this section. It is apparent that C/W participants feel these teaching behaviors represent a common group of supervisory behaviors.

The third supervisory category (Evaluation) can be represented by the evaluation and assessment behaviors of FSs. The factor loadings are outlined in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 FACTOR LOADINGS FOR EVALUATORY BEHAVIORS

QUESTION	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37	Q38	Q39	Q40	Q41	Q42
LOADING	.722	.614	.790	.664	.612	.656	.712	.761	.735

QUESTION	Q43	Q44	Q45	Q46	Q47	Q48	Q49	Q50	Q51
LOADING	.576	.330	.760	.817	.689	.575	.611	.613	.789

Only item 44 does not load well. Respondents perceive that the rest of the items in the evaluation category portray a similar set of behaviors.

The fourth supervisory category (Consulting) can be represented by counseling and supportive feedback type of behaviors. The factor loadings are outlined in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 FACTOR LOADINGS FOR CONSULTANT BEHAVIORS

QUESTION	Q52	Q53	Q54	Q55	Q56
LOADING	.732	.547	.726	.618	.823

QUESTION	Q57	Q58	Q59	Q60	Q61
LOADING	.599	.731	.730	.726	.821

All of the ten behaviors in the consultant category load well into this category indicating that participants acknowledge a very real need for FSs to provide STs with assistance in a positive and supportive manner.

The fifth supervisory category (Role Modeling) is represented by items 62-94. The factor loadings are outlined in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10 FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ROLE MODELING BEHAVIORS

QUESTION	Q62	Q63	Q64	Q65	Q66	Q67	Q68	Q69	Q70
LOADING	.805	.854	.828	.817	.724	.846	.657	.786	.735

QUESTION	Q71	Q72	Q73	Q74	Q75	Q76	Q77	Q78	Q79
LOADING	.683	.458	.360	.125	.511	.809	.471	.777	.512

QUESTION	Q80	Q81	Q82	Q83	Q84	Q85	Q86	Q87	Q88
LOADING	.369	.397	.000	.788	.779	.539	.348	.474	.485

QUESTION	Q89	Q90	Q91	Q92	Q93	Q94
LOADING	.725	.803	.519	.619	.809	.548

The poorest loadings are demonstrated in the role modeling category of behaviors (only 27 of 33 items load above 0.400). It would appear that there is a strong factor loading when dealing with behaviors that pertain to working in the daily environment with colleagues and ST (items 62-72). However, areas that do not load well in this category include involving STs in various non-instructional activities in the community (items 73-74), issues regarding experience (items 80, 81, and 82), and promoting the ST to the institutional administration (item 86).

These behaviors may load poorly into the role model classification of behaviors because a considerable portion of the respondents do not perceive them as effective supervisory behaviors. These results and their potential implications on supervision of STs in C/W FBEs will be discussed further in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

This chapter elaborates upon the findings noted in Chapter Four by placing them in context, comparing them with the outcomes of previous research, and exploring the impact that they may have on C/W supervision. The results will be discussed as they answer the first two questions posed at the outset of the investigation; namely, 1). "What supervisory behaviors are perceived as effective by participant FSs and STs in the unique Community and Workplace segment of the University of Calgary's Master of Teaching Program?" and 2). "Are there any differences in perceptions between FSs and STs regarding effective supervisory behaviors?". The third question "How do perceptions of FSs and STs regarding supervision in the C/W setting differ from supervision identified by FSs and STs in other FBEs?" will be considered throughout the entire discussion.

The initial response rate to this survey was generally unacceptable by educational research standards and poses the potential of significant non-response error. However, Barnetson (1997) cites sources that report mail-based marketing surveys having consistent response rates of 23%. Grimmert and Ratzloff (1986) also noted that a 20% response rate on similar surveys from STs is not unexpected.

Low response rates do not necessarily preclude valid results (Barnetson, 1997). The fact that the responses from STs at two separate intervals (December and April) were not significantly different lends credence to the assumption that the results amalgamated from the two samples provide a representative statement from the entire C/W ST population. Smith and Glass (1987) report that the more homogenous the population is with respect to a variable being estimated the smaller the sample needs to be. The consistency of the responses in this survey also suggests that the small number of returns is sufficient to draw reasonable conclusions.

There may be various reasons for the low number of returns. Since their cooperation was not mandatory, participants may have felt that they were too preoccupied to respond (towards the end of the semester always seems to be a busy time of year). Alternatively, participants may not have perceived any personal utility for this study. It may have been

that they felt that their responses would have little current or future impact on the supervision in the field site in which they were involved.

In response to the first question posed by this study "What supervisory behaviors are perceived as effective by participant FSs and STs in the unique Community and Workplace segment of the University of Calgary's Master of Teaching Program?" it was found that FSs and STs generally supported the notion that the stated behaviors represent effective supervisory behaviors. Seventy-nine percent of the survey items ($n=74$) were deemed effective by 75% of either the STs or the FSs. The request to detail any effective or ineffective supervisory behaviors or characteristics not identified by the survey did not uncover any supplementary suggestions. Comments such as "all aspects were well covered in (the) questionnaire" and "I think you identified most of them (supervisory behaviors) twice" were made by both FSs and STs.

FSs were more inclined than STs to agree that the stated behaviors were effective to supervision. For example, 85% or more of the FSs agreed with 63% ($n=59$) of the listed behaviors while only 28% of the behaviors ($n=26$) were felt to be effective by an equal percentage of STs. A further 23% ($n=22$) of the items were judged effective by 65-84% of the FSs compared to 46% ($n=43$) of the items by the same percentage of STs. Twenty-three percent and 6% of the behaviors demonstrated weak agreement (51-64% of the sample) in the ST and FS samples respectively.

Seven items were not felt to be effective supervisory behaviors by 50% or less of the FS respondents. At least 10% of the FSs felt that 18 items were actually ineffective supervisory behaviors. STs were not as critical. Nine behaviors were reputed to be ineffective by at least 10% of the STs. Three items were deemed to be effective by less than 50% of the STs. A number of behaviors were also deemed to be inapplicable to the C/W learning/teaching situation. At least 10% of the FSs felt that 22 items were not pertinent to their supervisory role. Likewise, STs reported that 28 of the behaviors were not relevant to their learning.

Two observations can be made as a general overview of these results. First, though each behavior is not fully sanctioned by either STs or FSs, this survey provides a

comprehensive inventory of effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors for the C/W setting as perceived by active program participants.

Secondly, in most instances where STs and FSs expressed a difference of opinion, the FSs were more likely than the STs to indicate that the stated behavior was effective for supervision of the ST. Previous studies indicated that the STs were most apt to recognize the stated behaviors as being effective to their learning and that FSs were unwilling or unable to adequately contribute to the ST's education. It appears that the expectations were reversed in the C/W setting. That is, the FSs in the C/W were more prepared to participate in the FBE than STs required. It seems that some STs in C/W FBEs do not expect as much input from FSs into their education as STs in traditional educational FBEs. STs appear to feel that the FSs may be an interference with their learning. On the other hand, it seems that FSs in the C/W setting are more likely to accept supervisory responsibilities and provide the extra effort required to achieve effective supervision.

The demographic data were enlightening. As reported in other studies (Castillo, 1971; Duquette, 1993; Dunlevey and Wolf, 1992) the FSs have considerably more work experience than the STs (86% over 5 years and 50% over 15 years for FSs compared to 42% over 5 years and 8% over 15 years for STs). A number of STs (23%) possess limited (<1 year) work experience. This would suggest that FSs are well versed in their respective fields and should possess adequate discipline-specific technical expertise and content knowledge to offer to the inexperienced novice. As one FS noted, one strength of FSs in the C/W setting is "Their diversity and their knowledge and experience in the non-school based or untraditional learning settings. This may provide students with alternative viewpoints."

FSs also reported more formalized teaching experience (60% more than five years) than did STs (only 8% more than five years). This is to be expected considering that the STs are learning from the FSs to be teachers. However, it is interesting that 33% of the STs have 2-5 years of formal teaching experiences. It would seem that a substantial portion of the STs are not strictly novices to the field of teaching. This may suggest that STs in the C/W scenario are more professionally mature and may have different expectations of site supervisors than traditional STs in the K-12 setting.

There are a substantial number (21%) of FSs reporting one year or less of teaching experience. This is considerably less than that reported by Duquette (1993) who found almost two-thirds of FSs had between one and five years of experience and 33% had over five years. FSs in the C/W setting are not professional teachers and do not possess such experience. If teaching experience is an asset in assisting others to teach then it may be that these individuals are not optimally suited to supervising STs. Alternatively, as one FS suggested "There are many non-traditional settings with highly motivated individuals (FSs) that should be given credit for their experience, regardless of their educational background. Many have insightful philosophies about learning and have never taken a university level education course."

Most FSs seem to have experience with STs. More than one-half (56%) of the FSs have taught four or more STs. Yet, 21% have been involved with only a single ST. Analysis also demonstrated that only one of the FSs with less than five years of work or teaching experience had two or more STs at the site. Duquette (1993) reported that FSs did not feel that previous involvement with STs was a necessary prerequisite for supervision but STs did regard such experience as an asset. Whether by intent or by fortune, it would appear that only the more experienced FSs were involved with more than three STs at a site. Further investigation is required to ascertain the impact of previous supervisory involvement.

In 28% of the sites there was only one ST. This may be detrimental if, as Lamb (1997) suggests, peer interaction is important for learning and support. Conversely, an inordinate number of STs stationed at any one site will surely stress available human and physical resources. Forty-two percent of the sites had two STs and 15% of the FBEs were responsible for four or more STs simultaneously. One ST commented that "C/W supervisors tend to be annoyed that so many of us are at the site. We are hindering their teaching style." The optimum number of STs at a particular site has not been established and may be of investigational interest in the future.

FSs tend to be well educated (33% possess bachelors degrees and 18% a masters degree). However, only 21% of the bachelors degrees are in education. Educational researchers (e.g., Duquette, 1993) report a higher percentage of FSs with education

degrees but other disciplines such as technology and nursing report fewer degrees in *toto* and almost no education degrees. Again, it is apparent that FSs in the C/W setting are generally not professional teachers, do not possess formalized teaching credentials, and may not be adequately trained to prepare prospective teachers to teach. Further studies are required to assess the impact of the FS's formalized educational background on the success of the ST.

The STs are similarly well educated. Only 2% have a masters degree (greater than Duquette, 1993) but 81% have bachelors degrees. This would be expected in a program that requires a degree for admission. It does seem peculiar that 20% already possess an education baccalaureate degree in education since graduates of the program will receive an education degree. Such experience will surely impact upon the perspectives and needs of the STs. It is incumbent upon the FS to take the ST's education and experience into account when developing an appropriate FBE.

The FSs are almost equally split between female and male participants. This is in contrast to cooperating teachers in the school system who are predominantly female and may reflect a more proportioned gender balance found in other disciplines. In keeping with the trend in education (Wideen and Holborn, 1986), the STs are more likely to be female than male (50% and 38% respectively).

As with other studies (e.g., Duquette, 1993), FSs tend to be older than STs. None of the FSs are under 25, 65% are over 35 and 32% are over 55 years of age. The age of the STs is greater than other researchers. For example, Wideen and Holborn (1986) reported that 42% of the STs were under 25 years and only 14% were over 35 years of age. This probably reflects the degree requirement as a prerequisite to be admitted to the program. The age of the STs may affect the ST maturity level and subsequently affect their views of and attitudes towards the C/W setting.

FSs tend to spend less time in the C/W program during the workday than STs. Other studies did not review the time commitment of the participants. Some 62% of the STs spend four or more hours on the program each working day while only 30% of the FSs spend an equal amount of time. This probably reflects FS's commitments to other duties. One wonders with whom the STs are working and what type of supervision they receive

during the time FSs are not available and ultimately whether adequate supervision is accessible (a supervisory behavior recognized in item 69 to be highly effective by both FSs and STs). It has also come to light that the more inexperienced FSs tend to spend less time on C/W activities. None of the FSs with less than five years of work and educational experience spent more than two hours at work or outside of work on the FBE. However, nearly 40% of the FSs with more than five years of experience spent four or more hours on the program. This is perhaps unfortunate since one would expect that the less experienced FSs might require the most time with STs.

It is interesting to note that 32% of the STs spend less than four hours at the C/W site. This is somewhat alarming as program policy mandates that STs are accountable to the site supervisor for the entire day. When these respondents are analyzed it becomes apparent that they are almost equally split between male and female but 38% of them are under the age of 25 years. It would seem that the younger STs are more reticent to spend the required time at their respective site. Further investigation is required to understand why they feel it necessary to abstain from the FBE and to ascertain their activities during the time they are not at the site.

Most of the FSs (77%) spend less than one hour outside of the placement on the program. This contrasts with 36% of the STs who spend less than one hour and 38% who spend between one and two hours.

Just over one-half (53%) of the FSs have attended a seminar or workshop on ST supervision. This attendance correlates well with those FSs (59%) who reported that participation in in-service training is an effective supervisory behavior. It is interesting to note that only those FSs with more than five years of experience have attended such workshops and that none of the inexperienced FSs had attended. Only 14% of the STs report attending such seminars or workshops. STs report that they do not generally envisage in-service training as a necessary supervisory behavior (item 92).

A cluster analysis of the data did not appear to segregate the items into any discernible classification pattern. While some behaviors combined into cohesive groupings (e.g., demonstrates a positive rapport with clients, demonstrates a positive rapport with colleagues, and speaks professionally of colleagues, the institution, and the

educational community) the similarities between items within most of the groupings were not intuitively obvious and some items (e.g. items 1, 30, 58, and 70) did not cluster well with any particular group. Some clusters contained behaviors which are clearly related to more than one category. For example, one cluster contains items 3, 9 (social integration), 19 (teaching), 34, 40 (evaluation), 52, 56, 57, 59, 61 (counselor/consultant) and 65, 66, 67, 76, 90 (role modeling). Other items which were expected to aggregate into uniform clusters (e.g., teaching behaviors such as 17, 18, 19, and 24) did not group into a uniform cluster. The cluster analysis did not provide any useful insight into classifying the various supervisory behaviors.

However, a factor analysis of each category of behaviors proposed by the author (social integrator, teacher, evaluator, consultant, and role model) suggests that such a classification scheme is adequate and applicable. As factor loadings of 0.400 or greater typically demonstrate construct correlation, the individual items load quite well with the proposed categories. In the social integrator segment only items 2 (“Encourages the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks”) and 9 (“Allows time to observe and learn from other staff”) were not consistent with the other behaviors. In retrospect these two behaviors may be considered to be more role modeling behaviors. Both behaviors were perceived to be effective in supervision by STs and FSs.

Only item 33 (“Supplies relevant course materials”) does not load as a teaching behavior. It is considered an effective supervisory behavior by FSs but not by STs and is probably best suited to this category of behaviors.

Only item 44 did not load well in the evaluation category. This is somewhat surprising as previous research has demonstrated that evaluation is inherently difficult and frequently provided the most discrepancy amongst STs and FSs. STs and FSs in the C/W apparently recognize these types of behaviors as common to the goals of assessment.

All (10) items loaded well in the consultant role. Participants perceived the commonalities amongst these behaviors.

The greatest disparity in categorization is to be found within the role modeling function. Six (18%) of the items in this section do not appear to be statistically

applicable to this grouping. These items tend to relate to three sub-groupings. For example, items 73, and 74 (“Facilitates ST interactions in extracurricular activities in the local community and profession”, and “Associates with ST socially outside the site environment”) involve encouraging the ST to become involved with non-academic activities. These supervisory behaviors may not load well into this class of behaviors because they are not advocated by FSs or STs.

Previous experience is not considered to represent an effective role modeling characteristic (as evidenced by the factor loadings of items 80-82. Whether the concept of experience belongs to the category of role modeling is debatable but it seems intuitive that previous experience in supervision, teaching, and the particular site would be required to adequately supervise the ST. Further investigations are required to ascertain how ST learning may be affected when supervised by an inexperienced FS.

FSs and STs generally do not support the contention that FSs should promote the ST within the institution (behaviors 86 and 87). Nor does item 86 strongly load with role modeling behaviors (factor load 0.348). This is probably because the C/W sites are not perceived as exclusively institutions of education. Perhaps with increased exposure both STs and FSs will fulfill the university’s expectations and recognize that these organizations offer legitimate potential employment prospects for STs. Future investigations should determine the number of STs actually being hired in these non-traditional settings.

Thus, while a limited number of specific items may not fit well into each of the classification assigned by the author, the results suggest that social integrator, teacher, evaluator, consultant, and role model are appropriate classifications of supervisory behaviors. This categorization may assist in the more thorough understanding of supervision and may help to relieve constraints in particular categories.

In answer to the second question posed by this study, "Are there differences in perceptions between FSs and STs regarding effective supervisory behaviors?", it became evident that STs and FSs responded differently to individual survey items. To further delineate the degree of similarity between the responses from the two sample populations

Table 4.2 reports those behaviors which demonstrate consensus, moderate agreement, weak agreement, and those behaviors not supported by either STs or FSs.

The two groups of respondents agreed on 80.9% (n=76) of the items but differed significantly ($p < 0.01$) on 19.1% (n=18) of the responses as indicated in Table 4.3. The greatest proportion of items which demonstrate agreement between FSs and STs was found in the categories of social integrator and counselor/consultant. This is consistent with other studies such as Duquette (1993) which also reported that STs and FSs were more likely to report similarities than differences in these areas.

Despite the statistical indication that there are significant differences between the ST and FS responses to a number of items both groups were adamant that the FS establish and maintain clear lines of communication (item 3). They stressed the importance of being “open-minded, approachable (and a) strong communicator”. As one ST pointed out “The ability to maintain a positive, open and effective communication with one another contributed to my success in the field”. Effective communication is a hallmark of effective supervision and yet perhaps one of the most neglected issues in teacher education. It is absolutely imperative that program administrators ensure that all participants are aware of their roles and responsibilities and the needs of one another.

The data overwhelmingly supports the recommendation of a number of other authors (Castillo, 1971; Copas, 1984; Grimmatt and Ratzloff, 1986) that an orientation of the ST to the personnel, rules, policies, and resources of the site is an essential component of supervision. One site explained: “We prepare an outline that provides specific objectives for each of the 10 days the students are here. This is provided to the students prior to their first day, enabling them to prepare for the experience.” Both FSs and STs are in agreement that the stated social integrator behaviors were effective in supervision. As one ST stated, an effective orientation will “help us integrate easier”.

STs were insistent that FSs be prepared for the ST's arrival. Researchers have noted that a major deficiency of FBEs has been lack of understanding of the various roles and responsibilities of participants (Grimmett and Ratzlaff, 1986). Both FSs and STs in the C/W milieu recognize this (item 13). As one FS noted “one of the most frustrating aspects of being a field supervisor is not being fully aware of the responsibilities and

authority of the position.” Several STs indicated that the FS must be knowledgeable about the program. As one ST states “planning (by the FS) ... prior to my arrival” is an essential component of the FBE. Another ST noted that a weakness of her site was that the FS was “unaware of me coming to this site so programs were not running at the time and they did not have time to prepare anything for me.” Several STs expressed a concern that FSs were not familiar with their responsibilities; “C/W supervisors need to be informed on exactly what our program is intended to run like!!” and “(some FSs exhibit) non-interest or motivation to comply with program expectations. C/W supervisors do not study/read the handbook on expectations.” One site indicated that it was important to ensure FS’s preparation: “We contact teachers (FSs) that visit our site and request permission to have a ST work with them while they are at this site. This ensures that teachers (FSs) are mentally prepared to deal with an ST during their time here.” These comments demonstrate that it is essential that each site develop and implement a comprehensive orientation package for STs and FSs.

Neither FSs nor STs strongly support the perception that assisting the ST to deal with conflicts with other staff is an effective supervisory behavior pertinent to the C/W setting (item 10). Almost a third of each group responded that this behavior was not applicable to their learning environment. Nor is it expected that STs need be protected from conflicts with other staff members (item 85). In fact, 16% of the STs and 18% of the FSs perceive this behavior to actually be detrimental to learning. This is in contrast with other reports (particularly in the medical field) in which STs expect FSs to act to protect them from such discord.

These results may imply that the C/W setting is more harmonious than other FBEs or that there is less contact with other staff. However, since both groups support introducing the ST to staff and administration (item 8), find that observing and learning from other staff (item 9) is effective, and are willing to direct STs toward supplementary personnel (item 15) the implication is that conflict rather than contact with other staff is minimized.

A number of both STs and FSs reported that items relating to interactions with clients are not applicable to the C/W scenario (items 11, 12, and 20). A portion of the sample consistently indicated that FSs are not expected to introduce the ST to clients, to explain

the ST's responsibilities to the client, to instruct the ST on how to establish a close rapport with clients, to aid the ST in developing client management skills or evaluation, or to discuss client interests and abilities. This suggests that some STs actually have little contact with clients. Written statements from the STs suggest that they were involved in projects that did not entail teaching or interaction with clients: "We were asked to do a project, given a due date (and) let at it"; there was "no contact with students at this field site"; the FS "let me do own thing, had free reign to go where I wanted, no pressure, no real questioning of my action". Only about one-half of the STs felt that FSs need to protect the client from ST inadequacies. This suggests that either STs feel that interactions with clients can do no harm or that STs simply have limited contact with clients in the C/W scenario.

The survey results suggest that many STs and FSs do not expect STs to be involved with teaching clients but rather to be engaged in peripheral projects and activities. The "not applicable" responses to items such as items 20 (Instructs the ST on how to establish a close rapport with clients), 21 (Allows ST adequate time to learn and prepare for teaching), 22 (review and approve ST activities prior to teaching), 23 (Allows adequate time to teach clients), 24 (Assists the ST to improve presentation techniques), and 25 (Allows the ST to develop client management skills) suggests that STs are frequently not required to actually teach. One ST commented that "ST's are treated like manual laborers at times; gofers". FSs confirm this practice: "some sites do not offer teaching opportunities at all; only the general jobs that the staffers don't want to do – those requiring min(imum)/no skill. Those particular sites should be re-evaluated as to the (amount) of quality learning opportunities avail(able) to your students – not just the 'grunt work'; STs are often considered just "extra manpower"; "Students are given projects to work on (and maybe requested to perform) research away from the facility"; "Please note (that) not all sites have teachers as program facilitators or teaching opportunities for ST. Roles for ST (are) more observational and supervisory".

These results are in contrast with the conclusions of other researchers (e.g., Castillo, 1971; 1977; Copas, 1984; and Grimmatt and Ratzloff, 1986) who firmly support the need for STs to directly interact with clients in a teaching capacity. The C/W program is

encouraged to determine what the STs are actually doing in the FBE and either modify the stated expectations regarding the need to actually teach or to motivate the sites to provide substantive teaching experiences for the STs.

Though STs may not be involved with teaching clients to the degree program administrators expect, FSs and STs were still moderately in agreement with what constitutes effective teaching behaviors (items 14-33).

However, as indicated by other investigators, considerable differences exist between ST's and FS's perceptions of effective teaching behaviors. In this investigation STs and FSs were found to differ significantly in their responses to 5 of 20 teaching behaviors.

It appears that a number of expectations were reversed in the C/W setting when compared to previous research. Specifically, the FSs valued the ST's contribution more than STs expected. As one FS stated; "the C/W supervisor must allow the ST to identify his/her own needs". The STs in this study were largely unconcerned with being involved with program decision-making and often felt that input into these matters was not pertinent to their learning.

After consultation with the FSs and STs, Castillo (1971) and Duquette (1993) found that STs expressed a desire for more personal input into program goals and activities and for an increase in freedom to assume greater teaching responsibilities. STs stated that they should be permitted graded levels of autonomy and have more input into when to assume teaching responsibilities. In discussions with his sample population, Castillo found that STs believed that their needs were not be adequately met and that their feedback was not advising program modifications. Castillo (1971) reported that FSs were much more inclined to be the sole designer of leaning objectives and activities. FSs felt more qualified to fulfil these functions and were reluctant to relinquish control for such responsibilities to the ST. STs did not hold with FS expectations because they felt that the FS was not the singular authority in planning the ST's activities.

Unlike FSs in previous studies, the FSs in this investigation were much more apt to encourage ST contributions into developing goals and activities and to facilitate input into assuming responsibilities in the C/W. FS recognize the need to develop learning objectives and activities based on the STs needs, choices, previous knowledge, skills, and

experiences (item 14), to develop teaching goals and activities mutually with ST (item 16), to allow the ST graded levels of responsibility and autonomy (item 27), to encourage the ST to explore unique, individualized teaching methods (item 28), and to allow the ST input into assumption of full teaching responsibilities (item 31). Several STs in this survey indicated that for the FS to demonstrate trust in the abilities of the ST is an essential supervisory attribute. As one ST states, it is essential that the FS exhibit “trust in student teachers and thereby give them responsibility for the task at hand”. The differences in opinions between STs and FSs would appear to corroborate Turney’s (1982) conclusions that the development of a cooperative relationship between STs and FSs including collaboratively formulated and communicated roles, responsibilities, and objectives with the necessary formal and informal channels of communication is not strong.

Castillo’s study also showed significant differences in operational behaviors similar to items 17 (demonstrates a variety of teaching styles and techniques), 18 (Explains the principles of instructional techniques), and 24 (Assists the ST to improve presentation techniques). FSs in Castillo’s investigation indicated that they lacked the time or sufficient understanding of current issues in education to adequately perform these types of functions. The FSs expressed a concern that these activities require more effort than they are worth.

While FSs in the C/W noted that supervision required a great deal of time and effort, they are more likely to accept such responsibility and the extra effort that was implied. In almost every item in the teaching category of behaviors the FSs were more likely than STs to recognize the behavior as effective to supervision. STs often did not perceive these efforts as being pertinent to their learning. This is contrary to the results of virtually every previous investigation this author reviewed in which STs consistently demanded more time and assistance in teaching than FSs were prepared to exert. Other studies (Copas, 1984; and Grimmer and Ratzlaff, 1986) have reported each of these behaviors to be important to the supervision of STs in both American and Canadian contexts and across time. These differences may again relate to the premise that many STs often did not actually teach clients.

The overall impression provided by responses to items 21 and 23 would suggest that are generally satisfied with the amount of time spent in the FBE. This result is contrary to a number of other studies (e.g., Ratsoy, Babcock, and Caldwell, 1978) which stated that the amount of time attributed to the FBE may be too limiting.

The responses to item 30 (Works with the university supervisor in planning STs' program) is somewhat disconcerting but consistent with other studies that have expressed concern over the relationships within this triad. Neither FSs nor STs are particularly in agreement with this behavior. Working with the US is one of the few behaviors in which FSs are less likely than STs to perceive as beneficial. Indeed, this is one of the only behaviors that FSs feel to be a detriment to supervision. Only 36% of the FSs perceive this behavior to be effective in supervision. Some 18% of the FSs believe this is actually an ineffective behavior.

One FS indicated that FSs must be prepared to "tolerate lack of organization from U of C". Another stated "One of the most frustrating aspects of being a field site supervisor is not being fully aware of the responsibilities, authority of the position... I think more guidance could be given regarding the expectations in the workplace, not only to the supervisor, but to the student." These results reinforce the concerns previously encountered regarding the rapport with USs. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) indicate that the relationship between USs, STs, and FSs does not constitute a genuine working partnership. The interaction is more competitive than cooperative. There is a wariness and distrust of the US and this becomes more negative as FBE increases. STs are often dissatisfied with role of US and tend to seek legitimization from FSs more than from USs. Duquette's (1993) study demonstrated a low regard for university personnel by both STs and FSs. It would seem that, as in other FBEs, the STs and FSs in the C/W setting do not recognize working with USs to be an effective supervisory behavior.

It is in the category of evaluator (items 34-55) that FSs and STs expressed the largest portion of their disagreements (32% of the responses (n=7) demonstrated a significant difference). This is typical of those results found in other studies (Castillo, 1971; Copas, 1984; and Grimmatt and Ratzlaff, 1986) that indicate evaluation is a major concern and most likely to cause upheaval within the FS-ST relationship. Other researchers have

indicated that the area of evaluation is especially difficult for both STs and FSs to address and perhaps both groups would benefit from assistance in this domain.

While FSs were strong proponents of the evaluation component of supervision, ST responses suggested that STs did not perceive the merits of evaluation from the C/W FSs. Items 36 (Clearly defines all ST evaluation criteria), 37, (Clearly defines lines of authority to deal with problems), 38 (Regularly observes the ST), 40 (Provides the ST with both written and verbal evaluations), 41 (Follows up on advice to ST to ensure success), 42, (Tactfully makes ST aware of strengths and weaknesses), 48 (Provides a fair, honest, direct and unbiased evaluation), and 55 (Provides appropriate encouragement and praise) demonstrated significant differences in the responses between FSs and STs. In each case the FSs were more strongly in agreement with these statements while the STs were less so.

STs indicated that FSs should provide STs with both written and verbal evaluations based on relevant objectives (e.g., items 40, 46, and 47) but STs seemed less inclined to be involved with assessment of their competencies in the C/W FBEs. STs responses indicated that they did not endorse feedback mechanisms such as follow up advice or regular observations to be applicable to their learning as strongly as FSs. FSs are more likely to agree with behaviors such as making STs aware of strengths and weaknesses and providing appropriate encouragement and praise than STs. It appears that the FSs are more prepared to provide the requisite effort to ensure that the STs are adequately assessed than STs would appreciate.

Again, these results are in direct contrast with other studies which commonly state that lack of effective evaluation is a major deficiency in most FBEs and is more likely to be expressed by STs than FSs. Previous researchers report that STs request more feedback regarding their knowledge and skills than FSs are often prepared to provide (Ratsoy, Babcock, and Caldwell, 1978; Lamb, 1997). STs have demonstrated a strong need for effective feedback and frequently request more active participation in the evaluation process.

It appears as though STs in the C/W setting do not discern feedback as being particularly important to their learning. It is unclear as to what kind of evaluation STs

expect. It may be that they perceive the process of evaluation to be essential only because it fulfills the needs of the university and is of little personal importance. It may also be that STs do not receive the quality and/or quantity of assessment required for them to perceive the usefulness of these behaviors.

Zeichner (1987) would be encouraged by the responses to item 49 which support the need for FSs to assist STs to reflect upon personal teaching philosophies, styles, and abilities. One ST stated that a strength of her FS was the ability to “encourage critical thought about my beliefs in teaching”.

In the category of evaluation behaviors only item 50 (Works with university supervisor to assess the ST) demonstrates a mutual disagreement with the stated behavior. Some (11%) of the STs find this behavior to be ineffective and 11% do not consider this behavior to be pertinent to their learning. Almost one-quarter (24%) of the FSs consider this behavior to be a detriment to supervision and another 24% deem interaction with the US to be inapplicable to their supervisory role. This reiterates the tenuous rapport suggested by item 30 responses that suggest that STs believe that interaction with the university supervisor is detrimental to their education and that FSs feel that interactions with the US is extraneous to their teaching. These results also coincide with those reported by Turney (1994) which indicated that evaluation is done primarily by the FSs and secondarily by faculty members.

Flexibility in expectations and workload is a paramount supervisory practice (item 51). As one FS indicated “I believe this (flexibility) to be the most important characteristic necessary for both supervisors and ST in a C/W setting”. One ST noted that she “felt overwhelmed by everything (she) was expected to do”. In accord with previous research, written comments from FSs and STs indicated that it is critical to design learning objectives and activities based on the individual STs’ needs and experiences (item 14): “a FS must not be a “rule-stickler” but be flexible to student needs and interests”; “students ... are supervised based on need”; “C/W sites which agree to having student teachers should have programs in place to accommodate the goals of the ST”; FSs must “able to identify the true value of what the students are capable of doing for your organization”. STs agree: “There must be more student input/choice into deciding

where/which C/W sites we go to... I see no positive merit in being placed at C/Ws wherein STs are not accommodated". Some complained that FSs "ignored my requests for placement" and "did not help change my work place setting when it became evident that it was an inappropriate site for MT (Master of Teaching) students". It is imperative that the FS be cognizant of the skills and needs of the ST and adjust the learning environment accordingly.

While both groups expect that feedback to the ST should be provided in a confidential manner (item 52), STs are only in moderate agreement that such feedback should include staff or client interactions (items 53 and 54). Further investigation is required to ascertain those areas which STs expect to be evaluated.

In the category of counselor/consultant (items 56-61) FSs and STs responded almost uniformly. In each instance both groups were more than 80% in agreement with the stated behavior. It would seem that both groups (the FSs in particular) are highly in agreement that these nurturing behaviors facilitate ST learning. Both groups felt that there should be an emphasis on interpersonal relationships and that these behaviors are essential to supervision.

As identified by previous research, the personality of the FS appears to be an important component of supervision. Characteristics such as a sense of humor (89), self-confidence (64), a friendly and pleasant attitude (59), patience (56), sensitivity (57), and enthusiasm (65) were consistently rated highly by both STs and FSs. Several STs wrote that meritorious FSs were "very easy to get along with"; "easy to talk to"; and "personable". The ability to be "open-minded" and "approachable" was of paramount importance to several STs. STs felt that respect for them was important and FSs could exhibit respect for STs through the "ability to learn from student teachers as well as teach them."

Role modeling behaviors (items 62-94) were largely endorsed by C/W participants; especially the FSs. These results correlate well with other authors such as Duquette (1993) who calls for increased ST opportunities for experimentation and Zeichner (1987) who advocates a critical review of FS personal and professional practices.

Only three items demonstrated significant disagreement between STs and FSs; 63 (Exhibits sound decision-making skills), 74 (Associates with ST socially outside the site environment) and 83 (Handles stress and change effectively).

It is apparent that both STs and FSs perceive positive personal interactions as important supervisory behaviors (e.g., items 66 and 67). FSs are expected to communicate a personal perception of teaching to the ST (68).

The survey data strongly supports the contention that the FS must be available to and spend adequate time with the ST (item 69). This behavior (or lack thereof) was commented upon by several respondents. There were times when STs are assigned to a site despite the fact that the FS had “asked not to have (STs) on (site)”. FSs recognize the difficulties involved with effectively supervising a ST. As one FS points out “I would have liked to spend sometime with the university supervisor. However, I have found that having a student here has been an incredible drain on my time. I found that I was being asked to devote most of my time to the student ... This was an awesome commitment”. Other FSs wrote: “(FSs) must be willing to have them (STs)”; the “workload generated by a student in the workplace can cause stress. ... I feel that ... far too much is expected of the supervisor.”

STs indicated that a major weakness of the program was a lack of FS availability. A common complaint was that the FS was “too busy with own schedule to provide ample time for ST”. Other STs concur: “my supervisor had little time for me as a ST”; the FS was “not happy to have ST at site”; the FS must be “interested in having student teachers present (and) not see it as a chore!”; “I was left alone for 2 days with no work to do; or no direction by my supervisors. This is both frustrating and de-moralizing.”; “we really don’t have much supervision at all ... we worked on our own time and at our own place”; “I have no supervisor – I show up, introduce myself to instructors and ask if I can watch their class ... I was given a tour by the secretary and left to my own devices”; “at times he was busy off site” and “did not have a great deal of time for me”.

A lack of time commitment appears to be a chronic problem in FBEs (e.g. Castillo, 1971; Lamb, 1997). In almost every study on the subject of ST supervision there is an expressed concern that STs may not receive adequate supervision as a result of the FS

being engaged in other daily activities. This seems to be particularly manifest in the C/W scenario in which FSs are discipline-specific practitioners first and educators second. They may simply not have the time to accommodate for the ST when they are already over-burdened with the needs of clients. I was told repeatedly that the ST needs are accommodated only if time and resources are available after the obligations to the clients have been met first.

As a competent and experienced practitioner, the FS is expected to be organized (70) and be sufficiently self-confident to allow the ST to take risks and make certain errors while learning (71). The FS does not become flustered when mistakes are made (within limits) but recognizes that this an integral part of learning and a requirement for testing one's own abilities and limitations.

FSs are expected to invite STs to participate in staff activities (item 72). However, more than 20% of the FSs and STs agreed that this involvement does not extend into extracurricular activities in the local community or the profession. Both groups were particularly resolute that associating with the ST socially outside the site environment is not an effective supervisory technique. It would appear that interactions between FSs and STs are perceived as being purely professional and not a social enterprise. Castillo's study suggested that involvement in extracurricular activities required considerable effort from both STs and FSs and may not be supported.

A number of authors would concur with the FSs that authenticate a need to be actively involved in constructive changes to their own practice and the program as a whole (items 75, 77, and 78). They also agree that they should critically reflect upon their own practice and make suitable adjustments. Unfortunately, these behaviors may not always be expressed. One FS stated that a weakness of the field site was that "There is no visible attempt to screen supervisors since so many placements are required" and one ST complained "there is 0 communication, assessment or evaluation into the success or failure of placements."

Some STs were not so inclined. Eleven percent of the STs state that the FSs' self-reflection is not relevant to their own learning. It may be that STs do not recognize the impact FSs may have on C/W program improvements.

STs and FSs indicate that experience and age factors impact supervision only moderately. It was not important to either FSs or STs that the FS be older than the ST (item 82) although the demographic data indicates that this is the case. One wonders how such experience can be achieved without the benefit of being older than the novice. In fact, a substantial number of respondents indicate that for the FS to be older than the ST is actually detrimental to learning.

Interestingly, items concerning experience (79 and 81) are rare examples of instances in which STs are more likely to agree with the behavior than the FSs. More than 20% of the FSs indicate that experience in supervision and in the site are detrimental to supervision. This may suggest that FSs are not really teachers and are not expected to assist the STs to actually teach.

FSs were adamant that effective supervision included adequate management of stress and change. Several commented on the added burden that supervision placed on their workload: “(the) supervisor should not be cynical, jaded or burnt out in their profession” and “I feel that ... far too much is expected of the supervisor. This is a voluntary position which should be a positive experience. I have found that having a student here has been an incredible drain on my time. I found that I was being asked to devote most of my time to the student ... This is an awesome commitment and I think more guidance could be given regarding the expectations in the workplace, not only to the supervisor, but to the student.” Fourteen percent of the STs indicated that the ability of the FS to handle stress and change effectively need not be necessary for effective supervision. One can only assume that these respondents are not aware of the stresses inherent to supervision and think that, since they have not encountered undue anxiety, the process always runs smoothly. Other STs did seem to recognize the need for the FS to be prepared to deal with program changes and manage stress so that, as one ST stated, the “ST is not a dumping ground for supervisor’s problems”.

A number of authors, particularly in clinical supervision, have suggested that FSs should promote outstanding STs to administration and to assist the ST to obtain employment in the profession. This is not the case in the C/W scenario. Items 86 (Promotes the ST to administration within the institution) and 87 (Assists the ST in

obtaining employment in the profession) indicated that neither FSs nor STs expect that FSs should aid the ST in procuring a position in the C/W site. In fact, a number of FSs perceive this behavior to be detrimental to supervision.

Responses to items 86 and 87 have at least two important implications. First, it appears that the FS-ST relationship is not a mentoring type of interaction. FSs are sometimes spoken of as acting as mentors to the ST. Since a prime requisite of a mentorship is that the FS support the protégé's attempts to enter the discipline (Alleman, 1990), it is evident that the ST-FS relationship in the C/W setting is not that form of association.

Secondly, these results are unlike those found in the K-12 setting in which most of the STs expect to find employment in the traditional teaching field. Responses to item 91 corroborate this interpretation in that only just over half of the FSs and STs perceive active participation in the activities of a professional association as being an effective supervisory strategy. It may well be that neither STs nor FSs recognize these settings as teaching environments and therefore do not expect STs to gain access to employment to them. If the STs are not expected to work in the C/W discipline then it would make sense that involvement in an irrelevant profession may be deemed superfluous. These results are also somewhat inconsistent with the expectations of the university which states that these FBEs will "Allow students to explore non-traditional career employment opportunities" (Handbook, 1997-1998). The university should be made aware that their expectations that STs access these sites as a potential job market is unreasonable.

Though item 88 (Explains advantages/disadvantages of working in the profession) was deemed an effective supervisory behavior by only 66% and 73% of the STs and FSs respectively several participants commented favorably on this behavior.

Responses to items 91 and 92 would suggest that neither FSs nor STs expect FSs to be involved with continuing professional education. Only about half of the STs and FSs believe that in-service training for FSs is an effective supervisory strategy. FSs were more likely to agree that participation in in-service training is an effective supervisory practice. Almost one-quarter of the FSs felt that participation in professional activities and in-service training was actually detrimental to supervision. Similar numbers of STs

stated that these activities were not applicable to their learning. The percentage of FSs that agreed with these activities (59%) is similar to the percentage of FSs who have attended such seminars or workshops (53%). These results may suggest that respondents do not perceive FSs to be professional teachers and, therefore, feel that educational and professional involvement would be not be appropriate for perspective teachers.

Other authors (e.g., Hudson, 1994) have demonstrated that workshops are highly beneficial in areas such as roles clarification and in providing skills to work better with STs. Multiple studies (Wideen and Holborn, 1986) have demonstrated that such training can improve the FSs' communication and instructional skills, can enhance the STs' learning, and that these benefits were in evidence at least several weeks after acquisition. Researchers are adamant that training the FSs is essential and have highly encouraged FSs to engage in professional education. It is unfortunate that the C/W participants do not perceive continued professional education in a similar light. Further investigations are required to understand why participants do not advocate membership in professional associations and in-service training. The program would be strongly advised to act to minimize constraints to these practices.

Respondents did not support assisting STs to develop educational research interests/skills (item 94). Again, almost one-quarter of the FSs deemed this behavior to be an ineffective supervisory skill. This is contrary to a number of authors who advocate endeavors in this area.

CHAPTER SIX: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES

This study has identified effective supervisory strategies in the C/W FBE. The next step would be to ascertain the frequency with which such behaviors are actually implemented by FSs. MacKinnon (1989) cautions that given the stated importance of FBEs and its potential for facilitating or thwarting the transfer of theory into knowledge, teacher educators should never assume that FBEs are inherently worthwhile. Nor should it be assumed that what is intended to happen during the FBE actually occurs. Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) have found that the perceived regularity of effective supervisory practices differs considerably from the consistency with which they are truly implemented. They have shown numerous disparities between behaviors which FSs indicate they routinely practice and those behaviors which ST reportedly observed. Of the effective behaviors reported by FSs as being actually practiced, less than 35% were reported as being actually observed by STs. This study also demonstrated that although FSs believe certain characteristics to be important, these same FSs reported that they were unable to practice 70% of them more than occasionally. Items which were deemed important but were never or only occasionally practiced include such basic fundamentals as acting as a resource person, identifying principles basic to practice, being objective in evaluation, assisting the learner to understand professional responsibilities, being honest with the learner, correcting the learner tactfully, demonstrating concern for the learner, telling the learner she has done well, being available to the learner in stressful situations, helping the learner to identify individual needs, demonstrating enthusiasm, encouraging the learner to ask for help, clearly defining expectations, stimulating the learner to engage in research, encouraging critical thought, assisting the learner to apply theory to practice, setting realistic expectations, providing helpful and timely feedback, facilitating learner self-evaluation, assisting the learner to see alternatives, asking stimulating questions, being organized, and assisting the learner to recognize her own mistakes. By identifying supervisory behaviors which are deemed effective but infrequently employed an awareness of important practices can be increased by FSs. Improved awareness of such practices has significant potential to improve the cognitive, affective, and psychological learning of STs (Dunlevy and Wolf, 1992).

Many FSs are typically selected solely on the basis of availability. FSs frequently have little or no educational background in supervision. Rikard, and Veal (1996) indicate a very real need for training FSs to provide the ST with appropriate feedback, guidance, and opportunities for reflection. Ludlow, *et al.* (1989) have demonstrated significant improvements in FS's observational and evaluation skills when FSs have been properly trained for such activities. Trained FSs are better received by STs. STs are more likely to see educated FSs as mentors rather than authority figures. Guyton and McIntyre (1990) cite multiple examples of research that indicate that training FSs improves their skills in observation, data collection, analysis, providing feedback, and conducting conferences. Paese (1984) has found that qualified FSs are more likely to act as change agents for FBEs. FSs who have been properly indoctrinated into the FBE process tend to accept STs more eagerly and are more comfortable when dealing with STs. Wideen and Holborn (1986) have noted a number of improvements in the supervisory behavior of FSs who have undergone some preparation for their position in the FBE. They are predisposed to move toward a more collegial approach with the ST. They are less controlling, inclined to be less directive, and demonstrate more supportive behaviors than those FSs who are left to their own devices. Well-informed FSs are apt to engage the ST in divergent evaluative dialogue. They tend to clarify participants' roles more clearly. They spend more time with the ST and communicate with the ST more effectively. They demonstrate more initiative and spend more time on self-reflection. Such features have been shown to remain a part of the FS's repertoire when dealing with future STs. O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee (1994) have shown that training FSs promotes consistency and quality within the supervisory process. Hence, it is vital that effective supervisory behaviors be recognized so that appropriate training can be provided to FSs.

While this study has identified foundational effective supervisory behaviors, it is now imperative that further research employ the results of studies such as this to offer practical suggestions for the implementation and improvement of effective FBEs. Once these effective behaviors have been identified researchers can start working to develop instructional opportunities for FSs to learn how to improve the quality of their supervision in everyday practice (Shellah, 1986). As Dunlevy and Wolf (1992) suggest,

implications for further research include the development of curricula and material designed to assist FSs in implementing supervisory behaviors identified as being effective. An emerging trend in the United States that has the potential to address some of the problems of supervision is that of "professional development schools" (Turney, 1994). These institutions would be specifically designed to allow university faculty, FSs, and STs to work together to achieve best practices in the induction for new professionals and to inquire into educational problems and issues.

Once the criteria for effective supervision is affirmed standards of FS accountability must be developed. These behaviors should be used to assess the suitability of individuals to act as FSs. Procedures must be evolved that will assist FSs deficient in the ways of effective supervision. A means of discriminating between effective and ineffective FSs must be developed. Individuals who are unwilling or incapable of demonstrating superior supervisory practices should not be permitted to oversee STs. On the other hand, policies that recognize professionals proficient in the techniques of supervision should be designed to encourage and reward their efforts so that an adequate number of quality FSs can be maintained.

FSs are not the sole bane of FBEs. Further research must be performed to recognize barriers to implementation of effective supervisory behaviors. Only once these barriers have been identified can a means of providing FSs with adequate support be actualized. As Ralph (1993) states, supervision does not transpire within a vacuum. It is important to recognize which difficulties can and which cannot be attributed to FSs. Applegate and Lasley (1982) studied problems that FSs confront as they attempt to carry out their roles. The supervisory scenario is significantly (and often negatively) impacted by a series of complex contextual, cultural, social, political, economic, organizational, and psychological variables not under the control of FSs. These may be globally, nationally, locally, institutionally, organizationally, and/or individually based. Glickman and Bey (1990) and Guyton and McIntyre (1990) recognized important organizational constraints and suggested that institutional and power issues must be addressed if innovations are to improve organizational patterns. Once these variables have been identified then appropriate efforts must be made to break these barriers. For example, Glickman and Bey

(1990) indicate that a reward system should be developed for quality FSs. Adequate time should be allocated for supervision even at the expense of daily routine protocols.

This study employed a survey approach to identify effective supervisory behaviors in the FBE. Further research may employ other strategies and criteria such as ethnography, case studies, or participant observation that may further clarify such behaviors and begin to understand the reasons for such actions.

It is essential to ascertain the effects of changes to the supervisory practices of FSs. What is the actual impact of supervision on the professional development of STs? Further research is required to determine what STs truly learn in the field. Do they learn more efficiently under the tutelage of a competent FS or is the quality of supervision moot? How will strong supervisory skills affect the eventual career success of STs? How are clients affected by the supervision of STs? Does the presence of a strong FS have any discernible effect on the social or economic issues of the institution? There is some evidence that the supervision by FSs does affect the skills acquisition of STs (O'Reilly, Renzaglia, and Lee, 1994). They claim that the thought processes of STs are also enhanced by strong FS supervision. Further investigation should be conducted to discern what other affects competent supervisory skills have on the FBE, its participants, and cooperation institutions.

This study described supervision perceived to be effective in the C/W setting. The effective supervisory practices identified in this study are situational and contextually-based and are not intended as dogmatic prescriptions. Further research should be conducted to assess the applicability of these results to other disciplines and scenarios.

Efforts should be made to discern the impact on ST learning on other professional staff members in the FBE. It may also be enlightening to understand their perceptions of strong supervisory behaviors and to elucidate discrepancies with those behaviors outlined by STs and FSs.

Douquette (1993) has shown that STs with previous work experience possess different expectations of FSs as do STs who have backgrounds in elementary and secondary specialties. Worthington and Roehike (1979) indicate that experienced and inexperienced STs express different needs from and expectations of FSs. Douquette

(1993) has also demonstrated differences in the supervisory style of FSs with masters and bachelors education degrees. It is recognized that FBEs are not static and it is therefore important to investigate how the expectations of STs and FSs change with time, various levels of experience, and stages of ST readiness (Olk and Friedlander, 1992).

Finally, it is hoped that results of this research will encourage other investigators be to develop various supervisory models to guide practice and to develop the profession.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a list of conclusions and corresponding recommendations founded upon the results of this study:

1. The first step in developing supervisory competencies is to identify behaviors that have demonstrated effectiveness (Schuster and Stevens, 1991). This study provides an extensive record of both effective and ineffective supervisory behaviors in the C/W setting (as perceived by FSs and STs). These behaviors can now be utilized to guide the development, refinement, and enforcement of FS training standards and program policies to ensure optimum learning in the field. Ideally, this data will be implemented to support, train, assess, and credential FSs similar to the supervisory standards used in other disciplines (e.g., Dye, 1990).
2. This study has provided some insight into the similarities and uniquely different perspectives between participants in the C/W setting and those in other FBEs and thereby adds to the nascent body of knowledge regarding supervisory practices of FSs. The results of this survey generally support the supervisory behaviors outlined by previous research in a variety of disciplines such as education (Grimmett and Ratzloff, 1986), medical technology (Dunlevey and Wolf, 1992), and counseling (Dye, 1990). The affinity with the results of previous research corroborates Grimmett and Ratzloff's assertion that many of the behaviors "transcend the bounds of time and context". Comparisons with the results of researchers in other disciplines allows for a more generalized understanding of the supervisory process as a whole while still remaining cognizant that supervisory behaviors in the C/W setting demonstrate some unique perspectives which need to be addressed. Continued research may provide insight into *why* participants consider these behaviors to be effective.
3. C/W FSs seem to be more willing to acknowledge effective supervisory behaviors than FSs described by researchers in other settings and disciplines. It would be useful to ascertain what factors encourage this endorsement and to determine if these FSs actually practice such behaviors.

4. The responses of FSs and STs demonstrate a number of differences in perceptions. It is essential that each group become more understanding of the needs and expectations of one another (and of the USs) to ensure a more cohesive triad interaction. Enhanced communications should be a personal and program imperative. By sharing this data with FSs and USs teacher training programs can better communicate their expectations and assist the FSs in determining if supervision is an appropriate choice for them.
5. Responses from the FSs suggest that they are more prepared to provide exemplary supervision than some STs actually desire or expect. It is important to maintain this level of enthusiasm and to assist STs to understand the need for such guidance.
6. It is apparent that the C/W FSs do not possess the same experience, training, or perceptions as FSs in the traditional K-12 scenario. Though well versed in their respective disciplines, these individuals are not professional teachers. They require guidance and direction to ensure adequate fulfillment of their supervisory functions. The university must be prepared to provide these FSs with formalized assistance towards the development of effective supervisory behaviors. FSs must be willing to accept and take advantage of this assistance. Inexperienced FSs should not be expected to be fully responsible for ST supervision but should be expected to participate in supervisory workshops.
7. The impact of FS inexperience on ST learning is not well defined by this study but FSs (especially those with minimal experience) should not be expected to supervise more than one ST at a time.
8. The optimum number of STs for a particular site should be determined and this quantity should not be exceeded even in the face of limited site availability. The quality of the experience should take precedence over the quantity of sites.
9. Previous experience in supervision, teaching, and in a particular site are important assets to the FS. A FS is more than merely an available "warm body". Adequate supervision requires that the FS is knowledgeable and experienced in supervision

and the specific discipline. Teacher education programs are cautioned against using sites that do not sustain an adequate number of experienced FSs.

10. Further investigations should seek to determine the affect of the level of FS formalized education on ST learning. If it can be demonstrated that FSs with degree improve the site experience for the STs then only those FSs with appropriate credentials should be utilized. Conversely, if it comes to light that the educational background of the FS does not impact on the ST's learning then the site-specific expertise of the FS should be adequate.
11. The C/W STs may be older, more educated, and emotionally mature than their K-12 counterparts. Certainly, their reliance on the FSs tends to be more limited than the traditional ST. The C/W FSs tend to be more supportive of STs than the STs expect or desire. Both the FS and the US must become aware of these needs and adjust the teaching/learning appropriately.
12. It is essential that STs be provided with a comprehensive orientation to the field site so that they quickly become comfortable with the learning environment. FSs should become familiar with the ST's background to prepare in advance for the arrival of the ST. The program would be well advised to standardize such activities and assist FSs to implement them.
13. It must be recognized that FSs typically perceive themselves as discipline-specific practitioners first (with concomitant client responsibilities) and educators second. There is often a scarcity of time to deal effectively with STs. Program administration must determine exactly what resources (time and personnel) are necessary for adequate supervision and then seek to work with site administration to alleviate the barriers to effective supervision.
14. C/W STs are not supervised by FSs at all times. Many STs spend a great deal (if not the majority) of their time left to their own devices. Some do not spend the requisite eight hours a day in the FBE. It is important for program administrators to recognize discrepancies between the stated expectations and actual practice and either accept the reality (modifying expectations appropriately) or institute changes that will ensure policies are adhered to. It is also essential that the

- program determine what STs are doing during the FBE and direct them towards an efficient and effective use of their time and efforts.
15. Though survey items did not cluster into recognizable pattern of categories, a factor analysis of behaviors suggests that effective supervisory behaviors can be classified into five functions: social integration, teaching, evaluation, counseling/consulting and role modeling. This scheme is consistent with previous researchers and may facilitate a further understanding and improvement of supervision.
 16. This program seems to be relatively free of the personality conflicts between STs and FSs or other field staff which adversely affect other disciplines. The underlying etiology of this harmony should be ascertained and shared with other FBEs.
 17. STs often do not interact with clients in the C/W setting. If it is the program's intent that STs learn how to deal with students then program modifications are required.
 18. C/W program administrators should be made aware of the results of this study and modify the program according to the needs and expectations of the participants. For example, many C/W STs do not teach clients in the traditional sense. Instead, they may be involved with projects that may be of ambiguous educational value. A number of STs and FSs expressed a concern that STs act merely as extra laborers which may detract significantly from the learning environment. It is evident that there are a number of incongruencies between the stated expectations in the C/W handbook and those expressed by FSs and STs. These inconsistencies need to be addressed.
 19. FSs value ST contributions to the development of learning goals and activities (perhaps more than the STs realize or desire). FSs recognize that the needs choices, previous knowledge, skills, and experiences of the ST directly affect supervision. STs should be made aware of the important impact they can have on supervision and program management. The program should encourage ST input and involvement in program modifications and facilitate this participation.

20. Most STs are satisfied with the amount of time they spend in the C/W FBE. It is doubtful that extending this time would prove educationally useful.
21. As indicated by most researchers, evaluation of the ST by the FS is problematic. It is essential that the C/W program administrators recognize the difficulties inherent in assessment and assist both STs and FSs to formulate a positive and constructive assessment process.
22. The results of this survey concur with previous research that FSs and STs appear to be rather dissatisfied with relationships with the US. Specifically, neither FS nor STs perceive working with USs in planning the STs' program or assessing the ST to be effective supervisory behaviors. It may be of value for the program to reconsider the ST assessment protocol. It is vital that each member recognize their own and respective functions to ensure an effective triad relationship.
23. FSs are stronger proponents of evaluation than STs. STs seem not to desire assessment by the FS. It is unclear as to what criteria STs expect to be evaluated upon. It is essential clear assessment criteria are established and that participants are aware of and accepting of their respective functions in this process.
24. FSs and STs agree that the FS must be flexible with respect to expectations and ST workload requirements. The program should consider ways to allow for this flexibility in terms of granting FSs adequate authority and moderate control over client care responsibilities. It is also essential that FSs be constantly available to the ST. A heavy client load may not allow the ST to easily access the FS at appropriate times. The site must ensure that the FS is not overburdened but has adequate time and resources to deal with the ST. This may require that the level of commitment to clients be reduced.
25. It is quite apparent that the counselor/consultant function of the FS is essential for effective supervision. Personal characteristics such as patience, sensitivity, and a sense of humor are as important to supervision as any other behavior. The program is encouraged to choose FSs who demonstrate a positive personality. Both FSs and STs expect that FSs exhibit a nurturing and supportive personality. While it may be difficult to assess such traits, they are important supervisory

characteristics and should be considered in the selection and maintenance of supervisory personnel.

26. Communication between various members of the program is absolutely critical for effective supervision. FSs are responsible for ensuring on-site positive personal and professional interactions between self, the ST, and staff. FSs are expected to share with the ST a personal perspective of teaching and to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of working in the profession.
27. The FS must be organized and sufficiently self-confident to allow the ST to make and learn by individual mistakes.
28. Both FSs and STs expect that their C/W relationship will be professional. FSs should encourage STs to participate in staff activities. However, very limited social or extracurricular interaction is desired.
29. FSs are convinced that they should have input into program modifications and improvements. This perception is not as fully supported by STs. Given the impact of FSs on the STs and the relevant experience possessed by FSs, this author promotes the process whereby the FSs become an integral part of the development and maintenance of the FBE. Program administrators should encourage FSs to commit to personal and professional reflection and to use this process as a foundation for program improvements. STs should be made aware of the process.
30. Neither STs nor FSs perceive the age of the FS to be particularly relevant to supervision. However, it should be recognized that age may play a role in experience and previous site and supervisory experience was noted by the STs to be of importance. Hence, it is recommended that the program provide inexperienced (young?) FSs with additional resources in the initial phases of supervision.
31. The program should be cognizant that some FSs become quite stressed by their supervisory role. They are particularly concerned about their supervisory inexperience, their lack of understanding of their roles and expectations, and the scarcity of time they can devote to the ST. Teacher education programs should attempt to minimize these stresses by ensuring that only those FSs with adequate

resources are involved with supervising STs. Field sites that do not provide FSs with sufficient time to oversee their charges should not be utilized. It is also recommended that a working group of FSs be formed which could act as a resource base for all FSs in the program. This group could act as a means for sharing ideas amongst all FSs and could also provide advice and direction to any FS who may be experiencing difficulties.

32. Neither FSs nor STs expect to promote the ST to their field institution. The university should be made aware of this perception so that there is not an unwarranted expectation of future career involvement in that field. Alternatively, this author would advocate that FSs and STs should be encouraged to work toward prospective employment in these alternative sites.
33. The FSs and the STs in the C/W setting do not perceive the need for in-service training or active participation in professional associations. Given the demonstrated utility of supervisory training by other researchers it should become mandatory that FSs participate in supervisory in-service training to become a competent supervisor and familiar with specific program policies.
34. Neither STs nor FSs strongly support the need for assisting the ST to develop educational research interests and goals. Perhaps FSs should be encouraged to promulgate such skills amongst STs in an effort to facilitate a better understanding of FBEs and learning in general.

This research has provided a more thorough understanding of the effective supervisory behaviors in the C/W environment. It is now up to the practicing FSs and administrators to recognize and facilitate those behaviors that support educationally sound FBEs. I suggest that it is incumbent upon all FSs, to review their personal practices and to adapt to the needs of the individual ST. Only through an accurate understanding of effective supervisory behaviors can FSs expect to achieve the goals of the C/W program.

Dear Colleague:

I am requesting your voluntary participation in gathering data for the preparation of my PhD. thesis under the direction of Dr. Alice Boberg (220-7520) and Community and Workplace (C/W) coordinator Dr. Robert Stamp (220-6442). As an experienced professional and a C/W field-site supervisor, you have recently provided a participatory and practical educational experience for a student teacher (ST) in the Faculty of Education's Master of Teaching Program. You are to be commended for the generous time and efforts that you have given to the ST and program as a whole.

I am particularly interested in identifying your perceptions of effective supervisory practices in C/W field experiences. I seek to discern those behaviors and characteristics which you have found to facilitate a successful learning environment. This information may be valuable in developing and enhancing future C/W teaching and learning.

Please complete the enclosed "Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire" that identifies those behaviors you have found to be educationally effective during your interactions with the ST. This form is intended to be as complete and inclusive as possible so do not be 'put off' by the large number of items. Also, please take the time to complete the extended response questions on the back of the form. Your detailed answers will be especially important in understanding areas that you deem important. Return the completed form in the enclosed SASE by Dec. 15, 1998. Your replies will not be used to assess individuals or the C/W program but may facilitate program improvements through a more thorough understanding of optimum supervisory strategies.

You cannot be identified by any of your individual responses. You can be assured of complete anonymity. Your replies will not be used for any purpose other than this project. Written comments will only be used to validate or expand global responses and cannot be attributed to individuals. Data sheets will be destroyed at the end of the project. Computerized summaries will be available from the Faculty of Education at the completion of my thesis. This data may assist you to identify effective supervision useful in your future dealings with STs.

I would like to thank you in advance for your role in improving professional practice in teaching. Your participation will be of major significance in achieving the goals of this important study.

Sincerely,

Terry Ell
PhD. Candidate (282-6613)

APPENDIX ONE**CONSENT FORM**

By completing and submitting this computer-scored sheet and written responses I consent to participate in the research of a PhD thesis titled *The Identification of Effective Supervisory Behaviors in the Community and Workplace Experiences* conducted by Terry Ell under the supervision of Dr. A. Boberg (220-7520) in the Department of Education.

The invitation to participate letter informs me, to an appropriate level of understanding, about the purpose and methodology of this research project, the nature of my involvement, and any possible risks to which I may be exposed by virtue of my participation.

I understand and agree that:

My participation is voluntary. I may decline to participate or to discontinue my participation at any time without penalty. Participation or non-participation will have no effect on my position within my agency or my status with the University of Calgary

The researcher has the right not to use my responses in this research

All data will be kept secure and accessible only to the researcher

I am assured of complete anonymity. I cannot be personally identified; there are no individual distinguishing marks on the answer sheets. All responses (computer and written) will be used only in a global aggregate format.

All data will be confidentially destroyed at the end of all publications (within 2-3 years)

I may obtain computer-generated aggregates of items after the project

There are no risks to participation greater than those ordinarily incurred in daily life

The benefits to this study are at my discretion but may include enhancement of my supervisory skills.

I understand this data may be compared to existing research. Subsequent use of this data will conform to the above parameters. I understand the results of this research may be used for thesis dissertation, publication, scientific presentations, etc. If I have any questions I may contact:

Dr. Michael Pyryt
Chair of Ethics Committee
Faculty of Education
220-5625

Miss Karen McDermid
Office of the Vice President
Research
220-3381

Terry Ell, Researcher
Doctoral Student, Graduate Division of Educational Research
Faculty of Education, University of Calgary
282-6613

APPENDIX TWO**Effective Supervisory Behaviors Survey Questionnaire**

Instructions: Please use the computer score answer sheet to identify those *field-site supervisor* behaviors and characteristics that you have found to be effective (beneficial) in the supervision of student teachers (ST) in Community and Workplace (C/W) experiences. Respond to all items. Use only one letter for each item. Do not blacken any spaces except for numbers 1-103. Use only a regular HB pencil (no pens).

- A. Very Effective (Very Beneficial)
- B. Somewhat Effective (Somewhat Beneficial)
- C. Ineffective (Detrimental)
- D. Neither Beneficial nor Detrimental (Not Necessary)
- E. Is not applicable to my teaching/learning situation

ST = Student Teacher

clients = those being taught

BEHAVIORS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIELD-SITE SUPERVISOR
1. Provides the ST with a place for personal belongings.
2. Encourages the ST to participate in non-instructional tasks
3. Establishes clear lines of communication.
4. Explains all institutional routines, rules, policies to the ST.
5. Explains the institutional goals and objectives to the ST.
6. Acquaints ST with set-up of the learning environment prior to teaching.
7. Acquaints ST with available resources (e.g. parking, cafeteria, AV equipment, photocopying, etc.)
8. Introduces ST to staff and administration.
9. Allows ST time to observe and learn from other staff.
10. Assists ST in dealing with conflicts with other staff.
11. Introduces ST to clients.
12. Explains responsibilities of ST to clients.
13. Explains specific ST roles/responsibilities to ST.
14. Designs learning objectives and activities based on the STs needs, choices, previous knowledge, skills, and experiences.
15. Directs ST towards supplementary resources or personnel as required.
16. Develops teaching goals and activities mutually with ST.
17. Demonstrates a variety of teaching styles and techniques to the ST.
18. Explains the principles of instructional techniques to the ST.
19. Demonstrates adequate knowledge of the subject material.
20. Instructs ST on how to establish a close rapport with clients.
21. Allows adequate time for the ST to learn and prepare for teaching.
22. Reviews and approve ST activities before teaching.

23. Allows ST adequate time to teach clients.
24. Advises ST on how to improve presentation and teaching techniques.
25. Allows ST to develop and implement client evaluations.
26. Assists ST to develop client management skills.
27. Allows ST increasing levels of responsibility and autonomy.
28. Encourages ST to explore unique, individualized teaching methods.
29. Encourages ST to think critically and apply theory to practice.
30. Works with university supervisor in planning ST program.
31. Allows ST input into when to assume full teaching responsibilities.
32. Discusses client's interests and abilities with ST.
33. Supplies ST relevant course materials (e.g. texts, guides/manuals).
34. Discusses specific objectives/expectations with ST prior to teaching.
35. Regularly schedules time to discuss ST questions and concerns.
36. Clearly defines all ST evaluation criteria.
37. Clearly defines lines of authority to deal with problems.
38. Regularly observes ST.
39. Uses a variety of data-gathering techniques for ST evaluation.
40. Provides ST with both written and verbal evaluations.
41. Follows up on advice to ST to ensure success.
42. Tactfully makes ST aware of strengths and weaknesses.
43. Protects clients from ST inexperience.
44. Advises ST about proper grooming and decorum.
45. Encourages ST input into discussions and acts upon this feedback.

46. Consistently evaluates ST progress against stated and relevant objectives and expectations.
47. Keeps accurate and comprehensive records of ST activities and evaluations.
48. Provides a fair, honest, direct, and unbiased evaluation.
49. Encourages ST to self-evaluate and reflect upon personal teaching philosophies, styles, and abilities.
50. Works with university supervisor to assess the ST.
51. Demonstrates flexibility in expectations and workload.
52. Provides feedback to ST in a confidential manner.
53. Provides feedback on STs' interactions with staff.
54. Provides feedback on STs' interactions with clients.
55. Provides ST with appropriate encouragement and praise.
56. Exhibits patience.
57. Exhibits sensitivity.
58. Develops trust and a close rapport with the ST.
59. Demonstrates a friendly and pleasant attitude.
60. Motivates ST.
61. Demonstrates respect for the ST.
62. Acts as a competent and proficient professional.

63. Exhibits sound decision-making skills.
64. Demonstrates self-confidence.
65. Demonstrates interest and enthusiasm in everyday practice.
66. Demonstrates a positive rapport with clients.
67. Demonstrates a positive rapport with colleagues.
68. Communicates personal perception of teaching to ST.
69. Spends adequate time with ST and is available to the ST as needed.
70. Demonstrates strong organizational skills.
71. Allows ST to make mistakes and take risks (within reason).
72. Invites ST to participate in staff activities.
73. Facilitates ST interactions in extracurricular activities in the local community And the profession.
74. Associates with ST socially outside the educational environment.
75. Promotes evaluation and constructive changes into the C/W experience.
76. Speaks professionally of colleagues, the institution, and the educational community.
77. Requests feedback from ST regarding supervisory practices and makes appropriate changes.
78. Reflects critically on own practices and makes suitable changes.
79. Possesses previous experience in supervision of STs.
80. Possesses previous experience in teaching the subject area.
81. Possesses several years of experience at the particular site.
82. Is older than the ST.
83. Handles stress and change effectively.
84. Handles personality conflicts effectively.
85. Protects ST from conflicts with other staff members.
86. Promotes the ST to administration within the institution.
87. Assists the ST in obtaining employment in the profession.
88. Explains advantages/disadvantages of working in the profession to ST.
89. Demonstrates a sense of humor.
90. Respects cultural/gender diversity amongst staff and clients.
91. Actively participates in the activities of professional associations.
92. Participates in in-service training for field supervisors.
93. Demonstrates professional image and acts as a positive role model.
94. Assists ST to develop educational research interests/skills.

Student Teacher's Demographic Form

DEMOGRAPHICS					
	A	B	C	D	E
95. How many years of work experience do you have?	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
96. How many years of formal teaching experience do you have?	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
97. How many STs are at your site?	1	2	3	4	>4
98. Highest level of Formal education you have achieved	Bachelors (Education)	Bachelors (not in Education)	Masters	Diploma	Grade 12
99. Your Gender	Female	Male			
100. Your Age	<25	26-35	36-40	41-50	>50
101. Hours you spend on C/W at work each day?	1	2-3	4-5	6-8	>8
102. Hours you spend each day on C/W program outside of work	<1	1-2	3-4	5-6	>6
103. Have you attended a seminar or workshop on ST supervision?	Yes	No			

Field Supervisor's Demographic Form

DEMOGRAPHICS					
	A	B	C	D	E
95. How many years of work experience do you have?	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
96. How many years of formal teaching experience do you have?	0-1	2-5	6-10	11-15	16-20
97. How many STs have you taught?	1	2	3	4	>4
98. Highest level of formalized education you have achieved	Bachelors (Education)	Bachelors (not in Education)	Masters	Diploma	Grade 12
99. Your Gender	Male	Female			
100. Your Age Group	<25	26-35	36-40	41-45	>45
101. Hours you spend on the C/W program each day	1	2-3	4-5	6-8	>8
102. Hours you spend per day on the C/W program outside of work	<1	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8
103. Have you attended a seminar or workshop on ST supervision?	Yes	No			

EXTENDED RESPONSE QUESTIONS

1. Please detail any effective or ineffective supervisory behaviors or characteristics not yet identified.
2. What would you consider to be particular strengths or weaknesses of field site supervisors in the C/W program?

Thank you for your time. Your efforts are truly appreciated and will certainly enhance future learning experiences in the C/W setting.

REFERENCES

- Adams, W. (1996). "A Teacher Apprenticeship Program: A New Model for Teacher Recruitment and Pre-service Training." *Education Canada*. 36 (1), 10-16.
- Allen, D. (1976). "Extending the practicum: Problems in integrating theory and practice." *Canadian Journal of Education*. 1, 45-51.
- Alleman, E. (1990). Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire Manual. Leadership Development Consultants, Inc. 5819 S. Shandle Blvd. Mentor, OH.
- Andrews, L. O. (1964). *Student Teaching*. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Applegate, J. (1987). "Early field experiences: Recurring dilemmas." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 36 (2), 60-64.
- Applegate, J. H. and Lasley, T.J. (1982). "Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 33 (2), 15-18.
- Awender, M. and Harte, A. (1986). "Teacher education: What's wrong with preservice field experience students?." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 23, 15-18.
- Babbie, E. (1990). Survey Research Methods, 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Babbie, E. (1992). The practice of social research, 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Barnetson, Robert James. (1997). Marketing the University of Calgary. Master of Arts Thesis. University of Calgary.
- Basom Mararet et.al. (1994). "Pre-Service Identification of Talented teachers through Non-Traditional Measures: A Study of the Role of Affective Variables as Predictors of Success in Student Teaching." *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 21 (2), 47-57.
- Bean, Thomas. (1997). "Preservice Teachers' Selection and Use of Content Area Literacy Strategies." *Journal of Education Research*. 90 (3), 154-63.
- Ben-Peretz, M. and Rumney, S. (1991). "Professional thinking in guided practice." *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 7 (5/6), 517-530.
- Bergman, K. and Gaitskill T. (1990). "Faculty and student perceptions of effective clinical teachers: and extension study." *Journal of Professional Nursing*. 6(1), 33-44.
- Berliner, D. (1986). "Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36 (6). 2-8.
- Beynon, Carol and Onslow, Barry. (1992). "Teacher education centres: A collaborative model for future growth in pre-service teacher education." *Education Canada*. 32 (4), 39-47.
- Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervision and Teachers: A private Cold War (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Bowman, N. (1979). "College supervision of student teaching: A time to reconsider." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 30 (3), 29-30.
- Bunting, Carolyn, (1988). "Cooperating teachers and the changing views of teacher Candidates". *Journal of Teacher Education*, 9, 75-84.

- Campbell, L. P and Williamson, J. A. (1983). "Supervising the student teacher: What is really involved?". *NASSP Bulletin*. 67 (465), 77-79.
- Capra, F. (1996). The Web of Life: A New Scientific Understanding of Living Systems. Toronto, ON: Anchor Books.
- Castledon, W.M. (1999). "An audit of clinical teaching: an approach to one performance indicator of educational competence." *Journal of Medical Education*. 22 (5), 433-437.
- Castillo, J. B. (1971). "The role expectations of cooperating teachers as viewed by student teachers, college supervisors, and cooperating teachers." *Dissertation Abstracts International*. 32, 1374.
- Chandler, B. (1971). *Levels of Thinking in Supervisory Conferences*. New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 049 186)
- Chickerella, B.G. and Lutz, W.J. (1981). "Professional nurturance: preceptorships for undergraduate nursing students." *American Journal of Nursing*. 81, 107-109.
- Clarke, Anthony (1995). "Professional development in practicum settings: Reflective practice under scrutiny." *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 11 (30), 243-261.
- Clifton, R.A. (1979). Practice teaching: Survival in a marginal situation." *Canadian Journal of Education*. 4 (4), 60-74.
- Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cole, A. and McNay, M. (1989). "Induction programs in Ontario schools: Raising questions about preservice programs and practice." *Education Canada*. 29, 4-9.
- Conant J. B. (1963). *The Education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Cooper, J. M. (1994). Supervision in Teacher Education. in Husen, Torsten and Postlethwaite, T. Neville (Eds.) The International Encyclopedia of Education 2nd ed. pp. 6000-6004 New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Copas, E.M. (1984). "Critical requirements for cooperating teachers." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 35 (6), 49-54.
- Cope, E. (1973). "School Experience and Student Learning." in Lomax, D.E. (Ed.) The Education of Teachers in Britain. London: Wiley.
- Copeland, W.D. (1982). "Student teacher's' preferences for supervisory approach." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 33 (2), 32-36.
- Cotton, Eileen G. (1981). "A Student Teacher! What do I do Now?". *Kappa Delta Pi Record* (April) 17, 100-101.
- Covert, J.R. and Clifton, R.A. (1983). "An examination of the effects of extending the practicum on the professional dispositions of student teachers." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 29 (4), 297-307.
- Daresh, John C. (1990). "Learning by Doing: Research on the Educational Administration Practicum. *Journal of Educational Administration* 28(2), 34-47.
- Defino, M.E. (1983). *The Evaluation of Student Teachers*. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 103).
- Diem, R. A. and Schnitz, J. E. (1978). The instructional alliance in student teaching. *Contemporary Education*. 49 (2), 72-74.

- Ducharme, E.R. (1994). "Supervision in Teacher Education." in Husen, Torsten and Postlethwaite, Neville T. (Eds). The International Encyclopedia of Education, 2nd Ed. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Duquette, Cheryl. (1993). "A school-based teacher education program: perceptions and attitude." *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 39 (4), 419-432.
- Dunlevy, C.L. and Wolf, K.N. (1992). "Perceived differences in the importance and frequency of practice of clinical teaching behaviors." *Journal of Allied Health*. Summer, 177-183.
- Dye, H. Allan and Border, L. DiAnne. (1990). "Counseling Supervisors: Standards for Preparation and Practice." *Journal of Counseling and Development*. 69 (1), 27-29.
- Ellenberg, F.C. (1981). "You can pay me now or you can pay me later." *Clearing House*. 54, 200-205.
- Emans, R. (1983). "Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 34 (3), 14-18.
- Evertson, C. M., Hawley, W.D., and Zlotnik, M. (1985). "Making a difference in educational quality through teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 36 (3), 2-12.
- Fallon, S.M., Croen, L.G., and Shelov, S.P. (1987). "Teachers' and students' ratings of clinical teaching and teachers' opinions on use of student evaluations." *Journal of Medical Education* 62 (5), 435-538
- Fereshteh, Hussein (1996). "The Nature of Teaching, Effective Instruction, and Roles to Play: A Social Foundation's Perspective." *Contemporary Education*. 68 (1), 73-75.
- Fiebus, R. J. (1977). "Agents of socialization involved in student teaching." *The Journal of Educational Research*. 71, 263-268.
- Flanagan, J. C. (1954). "The critical incident technique." *Psychological Bulletin*. 51, 327-358.
- Freeland, K. (1979). "Assessing student teaching." *Teacher Education*. 15 (2), 11-16.
- Funk, F.F., Hoffman, J.L., Keithley, A.M., and Long, B.E. (1982). "Student teaching program: Feedback from supervising teachers." *Clearing House*. 55, 319-321.
- Giltin, A. (1981). "Horizontal evaluation: An approach to student teacher supervision." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 32 (5), 47-50.
- Glickman, C.D. and Bey, T. M. (1990). Supervision. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 549-566). New York: Macmillan.
- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H., and Krajewski, R.J. (1980). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. (2nd ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gregory, Susan A. (1971). "Criteria for Selecting Supervising Teachers." *Clearing House*. 46 (3), 178-182.
- Griffin, G.A., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., and Hukill, H. (1983). Clinical Preservice teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

- Grimmett, Peter P. and Ratzlaff, Harold C. (1986). Expectations for the cooperating teacher role." *Journal of Teacher Education* 27 (6), 41-50.
- Guyton, E. (1987). "Working with student teachers: Incentives, problems, and advantages." *Professional Educator*. 10 (1), 21-28.
- Guyton, Edith and McIntyre, D. John. (1990). "Student Teaching and School Experiences." in Houston, W. Robert (Ed). Handbook of Research on Teacher Education Association of Teacher Education. N.Y: Macmillan Pub. Co.
- Handbook for New Teacher Preparation Program Year I 1997-1998 Faculty of Education The Division of Teacher Preparation University of Calgary.
- Haviland, C.P. and Haviland, M.G. (1981). "Student teacher evaluations and inflation." *Journal of College Placement*. 42 (1), 67-69.
- Henry, Marvin A. and Beasley, W. Wayne. (1989). Supervising Student teachers the Professional Way. 4th ed. Terre Haute, IN: Sycamore Press Inc.
- Heppner, Paul P. et al (1994). "Dimensions that characterize supervisor interventions Delivered in the Context of Live supervision of Practicum Counselor." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 41 (2), 227-235.
- Hicks, E. P (1969). "Changing the role of the cooperating teacher." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 20 (2), 153-157.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers*. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Hooper, D. and Johnston, T. (1973). "Teaching practice: Training or social control." *Education for Teaching*. 92, 25-30.
- Horton, L. and Harvey, K. (1979). "Preparing cooperating teachers: The role of the university supervisor." *Peabody Journal of Education*. 57, 56-60.
- Hoover, Nora L. et.al. (1988). "The Supervisor-Intern relationship and Effective Communication Skills." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39 (2), 22-27.
- Hudson, P. et. al. (1994). "The role of peer coaching in teacher education programs." *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 17 (4) 224-235.
- Jacknicke, K. and Samiroden, W. (1991). "Some perceptions of an internship program." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 37, 99-118.
- Johnson, J.S. (1969). "Change in student teacher dogmatism." *Journal of Educational Research*. 62 (5), 224-226.
- Johnson, James. (1977). "The Student Teacher as Self: or How Am I Doing." *Kappa Delta Pi Record*. 13 (February), 70-72.
- Johnson, Lawrence J. (1986). "Factors that Influence Skill Acquisition of Practicum Students During a Field Based Experience." *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 9 (3), 89-103.
- Johnson, L.J. (1987). "The role of the university supervisor. Perceptions of practicum students." *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 10, 120-125.
- Johnson, J. and Yates, J. (1982). *A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 963).
- Joyce, B.R. (1988). "Training Research and preservice teacher education: A reconsideration." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39 (5), 32-36.
- Joyce and Weil. (1980) Models of Teaching 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

- Kagen, D. (1992). "Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers." *Review of Educational Research*. 62, 129-169.
- Kalekin-Fishman, D. and Kronfeld, G. (1991). "Construing Roles: Co-operating Teachers and Student Teachers in TEFL: An Israeli Study." *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 17 (2), 151-163.
- Kaltsounis, T. and Nelson, J.L. (1968). "The mythology of student teaching." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 19 (3), 277-281.
- Karmos, A.H. and Jacko, C.M. (1977a). "The role of significant others during the student teaching experience." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 28 (5), 51-55.
- Karmos, A. H and Jacko, C.M. (1977b). "Coping with Stress During the Teaching Practicum: The Student Teacher's Perspective." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 39 (4), 407-418.
- Kilgore, A.M. (1979). "Pilot project shows definite link between pre- and inservice education." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 30 (4), 10-12.
- Koehler, V. (1985). "Research on preservice teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 30 (4), 23-30.
- Koerner, M.E. (1992). "The cooperating teacher: An Ambivalent participant in student teaching." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 43: 46-56.
- Lamb, Eila (1997). "Final Evaluation of the Prototype Program Year I 1996-1997). Faculty of Education The Division of Teacher Preparation. University of Calgary.
- Leavitt, H.B.(1991). "Worldwide issues and problems in teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 42 (5), 323-331.
- Limon, S., Bargagliotti, L.A., and Spencer, B.J. (1982). "Providing preceptors for nursing students: what questions should you ask?" *Journal of Nursing Administration*. 12, 16-19.
- Lipton, A. and Lessor, E. (1978). "Teacher training at Stoney Brook: A model for conflict." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 29 (6), 57-60.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *School Teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ludlow, Barbara L. et. al. (1989). "Training Teachers to Supervise their Peers: A Pilot Practicum Project." *Teacher Education and Special Education* 12 (1-2), 27-32.
- Lyon, G. Reid et. al. (1989). "Teachers' Perceptions of their undergraduate and Graduate Preparation." *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 12 (4), 164-169
- MacDonald, C.J., McKinnon, M., Joyce, M., and Gurney, P. (1992). "Institutional constraints and role expectations: Perspectives on field experiences in an on-site teacher education program." *McGill Journal of Education*. 27, 45-60.
- MacKinnon, J. David. (1989). "Living with Conformity in Student Teaching." *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* .35 (1), 2-19.
- Manning, D. T. (1977). "The influence of key individuals on student teachers in urban and suburban settings." *Teacher Education*. 13 (2), 2-8.
- McAteer, J.F. (1976). "Student teaching supervision: Roles and routines." *Clearing House*. 50, 161-165.
- McIntyre, D.J. and Morris, W.R. (1980). "Research on the student teaching triad." *Contemporary Education*. 51 (4), 193-196.

- Miklos, E. and Greene, M. (1987). "Assessments by teachers of their pre-service preparation program." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 33, 191-205.
- Milliken, G.A. and Johnson, D.E. (1992). Analysis of Messy Data Volume 1: Designed Experiments. London: Chapman and Hall
- Mitchell, Murray F. and Schwager, Susan (1993). "Improving the Student Teaching Experience: Looking to the Research for Guidance." *Physical Educator*. 50 (1), 31-38.
- Morine-Derschimer, G and Leighfield, K. (1994). Student Teaching and Field Experiences. in Husen, Torsten and Postlethwaite, T. Neville (Eds.) The International Encyclopedia of Education 2nd ed. pp. 5808-5812 New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Olk, Mary, Friedlander, Myrna L (1992). "Trainees' Experiences of Role conflict and role ambiguity in supervisory relationships." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 39 (3), 389-97.
- O'Reilly, Mark F., Renzaglia, Adelle, and Lee Suzanne. (1994). "An Analysis of Acquisition, Generalization and Maintenance of Systematic Instruction Competencies by Preservice teachers Using Behavioral Supervision Techniques." *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Development Disabilities*. 29 (1), 22-33.
- Paese, Paul C. (1984). "Student teaching Supervision: Where We Are and Where We Should Be." *Physical Educator*. 41 (2), 90-94.
- Potthoff, Dennis and Kline, Frank. (1995). "Supervision of Early Field Experiences: Exploring Three Alternative Models." *Teacher Education Quarterly*. 22 (1), 103-111.
- Price, R. D. (1961). "The influence of supervising teachers." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 12 (1), 471-475
- Quimby, Donald E. (1985). "Student Teaching - A Principal's Perspective." *NASSP Bulletin*. 69 (October), 114-18.
- Ralph, Edwin G. (1993). "Sensitive, Sensible practicum Supervision: A Contextual Application in Saskatchewan." *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 39 (5), 283-296.
- Ratsoy, E., Babcock, G. R., and Caldwell, B.J. (1978). *Evaluation of the education practicum program 1977-1978* (Program Evaluation Report No. 1) Edmonton: University of Alberta, Faculty of Education.
- Richardson-Koehler, Virginia. (1988). "Barriers to the Effective Supervision of Student Teaching: A Field Study." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 39 (2), 28-34.
- Rikard, G. Linda and Veal, Mary Lou. (1996). "Cooperating Teachers: Insight Into Their Preparation, Beliefs, and Practices." *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* 15 (3), 279-296.
- Rogers, Judy L. (1992). "Graduate Student Views of Leadership Education in College Student Personnel Preparation Programs." *NASP Journal* 29 (3), 169-180.
- Salzillo, F and Van Fleet, A. (1977). "Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 28 (1), 27-31.
- Schon, D. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Schuster, John W. and Stevens, Kay B. (1991). "Supervising Practicum Students Establishing Competencies." *Teacher Education and Special Education*. 14 (3), 169-176.
- Seperson, M. and Joyce, B. (1973). "Teaching styles of student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers." *Educational Leadership*, 31(2), 146-151.
- Seirferth, Bernice B. and Samuel, Marie. (1984). Cooperating Teacher. Why not the Best? ERIC document reproduction services ED 264 176.1984
- Shamian, Judith and Inhaber, Rosalind. (1985). "The concept and practice of Preceptorship in contemporary nursing: a review of pertinent literature." *International Journal of Nursing Standards*. 22 (2), 79-88.
- Shellah, Allan. (1986). "Quality Control: The Key to the Success or Failure of an Internship Program." *Education Canada*. 26 (3), 38-40.
- Siedentop, D. (1981). "The Ohio State supervision research program summary report." *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. Introductory Issue, 30-38.
- Silberman, C.E. (1970). Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House.
- Smith, Douglas James. (1990). "Intern Satisfaction with Cooperating Teacher Supervision." *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 36 (2), 133-140.
- Smith, Mary Lee and Glass, Gene V. (1987). Research and Evaluation in Education and the Social Sciences. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Stenack, Richard J. and Dye, H. Allan. (1982). "Behavioral Descriptions of Counseling Supervision Roles." *Counselor Education and Supervision*. 21 (4), 295-304.
- Susi, Frank D. (1992). "Using Clinical Supervision Techniques with Student Art Teachers." *Art Education*. 45 (6), 45-51.
- Tabachnick, B.R. (1980). "Intern-teacher roles: Illusion, disillusion, and reality." *Journal Of Education*. 162, 122-137.
- Tabachnick, B.R., Popkewitz ,T.S. and Zeichner, K.M. (1979). "Teacher education and The professional perspectives of student teachers." *Interchange*. 10(4), 12-29.
- Tardif, C. (1985). "On becoming a teacher: The student teachers' perspective." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 31, 13-20.
- Thies-Sprinthal, L. (1980). "Supervision: An educative or mis-educative process." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 31 (4), 17-20.
- Thies-Sprinthal, L. (1984). 'Promoting the developmental growth of supervising teachers: Theory, research programs, and implications." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 3 (3), 53-60.
- Thies-Sprinthal, L. (1986). "A collaborative approach for mentor training: A working model." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 31, 139-148.
- Tittle, C.K. (1974). Student Teaching: Attitude and Research bases for Change in School and University. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.
- Turney, C. (1994). Supervision of the Practicum in Teacher Education. in Husen, Torsten and Postlethwaite, T. Neville (Eds.) The International Encyclopedia of Education 2nd ed. pp. 4921-4931 New York: Pergamon Press Ltd.
- Turney, C., Cavins, L. G., Eltis, K.J., Hatton, N., Thew, D. M., Towler, J., and Wright, R. (1982). The practicum in teacher education: Research, practice and supervision. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press.

- VanLeuvan, Patricia. (1995). "Using Concept Maps of Effective teaching as a Tool in Supervision." *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. 30 (4), 261-77.
- Webb, C.D., Gehrke, N., Ishler, P., and Mendoza, A. (1981). *Exploratory field experiences in teacher education: A report of the commission exploratory field experiences of the Association of Teacher Educators*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 205 482).
- Weller, L. David. (1983). "Essential Competencies for Effective Supervision of the Student." *Teacher Education*. 104 (2), 213-218.
- Wideen, Marvin F. (1986). "Research in Canadian Teacher Education: Promises and Problems." *Canadian Journal of Education* 11 (4), 557-583.
- Wideen, M. and Holborn, Y. (1986a). "Change and survival in faculties of education." *Interchange*. 17, 33-47.
- Wideen, M. and Holborn, Y. (1986b). "Research in Canadian teacher education." *Canadian Journal of Education*. 11, 557-583.
- Worthington, Everett L. Jr. and Roehike, Helen J. (1979) "Effective Supervision as Perceived by Beginning Counselors-in-Training." *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 26 (1), 64-73.
- Yates, J. W. (1981). "Student teaching in England: Results of a recent survey." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 32 (5), 44-47.
- Yee, A. (1969). "Do cooperating teachers influence attitudes of student teachers?" *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 60 (4), 327-332.
- Yoder, W. H. and Arms, W.E. (1981). "Student teacher supervisors can be educated!" *Teacher Educator*. 16, 39-44.
- Zeichner, Kenneth M. (1980). "Myths and realities: Field-based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(6), 45-55.
- Zeichner, Kenneth M. (1983). "Alternative paradigms of teacher education." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 34, 3-9.
- Zeichner, K. (1987). Preparing reflective teachers: An overview of instructional strategies which have been employed in preservice teacher education. *International Journal of Educational research*, 11, 565-575.
- Zeichner, K., and Tabachnick, R. (1982). "The belief system of university supervisors in an elementary student teaching program." *Journal of Education for Teaching*. 8, 34-54.
- Zimpher, N. L. (1987). Current Trends in Research on University Supervision of Student Teaching. in Haberman, M. and Backus, J.M. (Eds). Advances in Teacher Education, vol 3, pp 118-150. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Zimpher, N.L., DeVoss, G.G., and Nott, D.L. (1980). "A closer look at university student teacher supervision." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 31 (4), 11-15.