

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 655

EA 018 030

AUTHOR Glickman, Carl D.
TITLE Development as the Aim of Instructional Supervision.
PUB DATE 25 Mar 85
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Chicago, IL, March 22-26, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; *Administrator Role; *Cognitive Development; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Inservice Teacher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Supervisors; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Collegiality

ABSTRACT

Effective teacher supervision for successful schools seeks to remove obstacles in the work environment that hinder teachers from seeing each other at work, receiving feedback from others, engaging in professional dialog, and participating in decisions about collective instructional actions. Just as teachers try to encourage the cognitive development of students, so supervisors should try to develop the thinking abilities of teachers. Supervisory tasks that can be planned to provide teachers with these developmental opportunities include direct one-on-one assistance to teachers, inservice education for groups of teachers, curriculum development activities, and action research. Adopting uniform supervisory and teaching practices fails to allow for or to encourage the mediating effects of thought. This paper reviews the role of the supervisor (that is, of the many people involved in supervision), the importance of the supervisor's activities as models for the teacher's, the characteristics of different types of conceptual thinking, and the difficulties (often growing out of the historical development of American education) that beset educational improvement efforts. The central focus of the paper is on the nature of teacher development strategies that supervisors can employ. A list of 38 relevant resources is attached to the document. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED263655

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it. Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carl D. Glickman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DEVELOPMENT AS THE AIM OF
INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION*

By

Carl D. Glickman, Professor
Department of Curriculum and Supervision
University of Georgia (Athens)

*Adapted from a presentation of the same title to the Annual Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Chicago, Illinois, March 25, 1985

BACKGROUND

Since 1979 I've been concerned with how supervisors can work with teachers to enhance teacher thought, autonomy, and commitment. In 1981, I wrote a monograph entitled Developmental Supervision which described a theory of providing one-to-one direct assistance to teachers by matching a supervisor's conference approach to stages of teacher thought (Glickman, 1981). Since then, to my knowledge, eight studies have been conducted to examine various facets of developmental supervision (five of those studies have been conducted at the University of Georgia) and the results have been predictably mixed. However, I can say that a supervisor responding in alternative ways to teachers based on variables of teacher thought does show some positive results (Calhoun, 1985; Gordon, 1985). Meanwhile, during the last four years, after working with numerous school districts, I've altered my thinking about the scope of supervision. I used to think that the vehicle for enhancing teacher thought was with one-to-one direct assistance or what is usually referred to as clinical supervision. I'm now convinced that increased thought, knowledge, and improved practice on the part of teachers can be accomplished by supervisors also directing their efforts at group interactions of teachers revolving around common, professional concerns.

In effect, my thinking about teacher thought and the related school and classroom instructional improvements puts supervision

into a larger arena than preconferencing, observing, and post conferencing. Instead my own explorations of successful schools provides evidence that there are at least four tasks of supervision that increase teacher professional thought. They are: 1) direct assistance, 2) curriculum development, 3) inservice education and, 4) action research. Each task is related to each other and a supervisor who is concerned with a successful school, rather than a single successful classroom, must attend to each of these tasks to see that teachers are interacting with each other on concerns that are broader than their own classrooms.

Immediately, some supervisors might suspect that I'm talking about an inordinate, if impossible, demand - supervisors have a difficult time keeping up with one task, such as providing direct assistance to every teacher on a regular basis, let alone becoming involved in all four tasks.

I would agree that it is virtually impossible for one person to do all these supervisory tasks, but the point is that research shows that in successful schools these tasks are being attended to in a continuous fashion and that one person usually does not do it all. Rather, supervision in successful schools can be viewed as a distributed function, consisting of four tasks carried out by many persons such as principals, department heads, instructional lead teachers, peer teachers, master/mentor teachers, central office personnel, and consultants. The secret of successful schools is not finding the supervisor but instead finding if supervision is functioning. The question is not so

much who does it but is it being done by anyone? The persons or combination of persons will vary from school to school (Pratzner, 1984).

The result of my change in thinking about supervision as an enlarged function has enabled me to look at alternative ways of working with teachers and school staffs across all four tasks (Glickman, 1985). This paper will attempt to explain how supervisors might employ the four tasks of supervision to stretch teacher's thinking.

The title, Development as the Aim of Supervision has been taken from the title of a 1972 paper by Kohlberg and Mayer called Development as the Aim of Education. In that paper, Kohlberg and Mayer argued that cognition as defined by Dewey, Piaget, Brunner and others is the only adequate basis for understanding what we are attempting to do with students. In effect, the goal of education in a democratic society means teaching students to be able to reason in an abstract manner, to be able to gather information from many sources, to be able to consider alternative ways of action, and to be able to make decisions based on principles larger than their own immediate, self-interest. Without the ability to think for oneself and empathize with others, a democracy runs the risk of becoming a society enslaved by ignorance, dogmatism, and dependence on authority. Thomas Jefferson's support for public education during the formative time of our country's development was to insure the very survival of democracy. Jefferson believed that a democracy can only function

well when citizens are educated individuals who can freely and wisely make decisions for themselves.

If development of thought is the aim of education for students, shouldn't development of thought be the aim of supervision for teachers? I can't help but wonder how we intend to produce reflective and autonomous students if we don't intend for their teachers to be reflective and autonomous? Ernest Boyer in his Carnegie study entitled High School (1983) wrote of the impoverished intellectual climate in schools. He pointed out that if we really desire to improve schools then schools must become what he termed "centers of inquiry." John Goodlad (1984) also noted the lack of intellectual aliveness in schools in his massive study of schooling. He similarly decreed that we don't encourage or support teachers to interact, disagree, and fight over ideas. My premise is that development of teachers' abilities to think about what they do should be the aim of supervision. As teachers are challenged with new and divergent information, possibilities of improvement emerge and classrooms become better places for students. I do not subscribe to the more prevalent theory of supervision today, that says teachers need to be trained and controlled in prescribed "effective" behaviors, allocations of teaching time, and recipes of curriculum, management and discipline practices. Indeed most teachers can do what they are told to do but what happens is that their ability to think for themselves diminishes and they often become regulated, and apathetic about their own teaching.

Bluntly put, prescriptions control actions and might achieve the predicted results but do not promote teacher thought and subsequently teachers who do not think for themselves will not be able to help students think for themselves. Such practices might result in our losing the very teachers that we want to keep.

John Dewey (1929) wrote

Exact quantitative determinations are far from meeting the demands of ...situations, for they presuppose repetitions and exact uniformities. Exaggeration of their importance tends to cramp judgments, to substitute uniform rules for the free play of thought... (1929, p. 65-66).

I would like to explain further why development of teacher thought should be the goal of supervision. A study of 52 teachers just completed by one of our doctoral students, Emily Calhoun, found that teachers of high conceptual thought were able to provide more corrective feedback to students, more praise, less negativity and less punitiveness. They were more varied in their instructional strategies, and they were able to elicit more higher order conceptual responses from their students than teachers of moderate and lower levels of conceptual thought. The results of the Calhoun study of high conceptual thought teachers is consistent with the research of many others. Harvey (1967) found that high-concept teachers have students with higher achievement, more cooperation, and more involvement in their work than low-concept teachers. Hunt and Joyce (1967) found

correlations between teacher conceptual level and ability to use learners' needs as the basis for planning and evaluation and that high-concept teachers used a greater range of learning environments and teaching methods. Murphy and Brown (1970) found that high-stage teachers could help students theorize and express, and could encourage more student exploration and group involvement than low-stage teachers. Parkay (1979), in a study of inner-city high school teachers, found that high-concept teachers stimulated positive student attitudes and student achievement gains and were less susceptible to professional stress. Witherell and Erickson (1978, p. 232) found that teachers of highest levels of ego development demonstrated greater complexity and commitment to the individual [student] self-reflection, greater generation and use of varieties of data in teaching, and greater understandings and practices relating to rules, authority, and moral development. The research is fairly conclusive that successful teachers are thoughtful teachers. When classroom problems occur they can stand back from their current practice that is not working and think of and choose new practices that have the likelihood of greater success. Furthermore, it is clear in the research that thoughtful teachers stimulate their students to be thoughtful.

It is one matter to explain why the aim of supervision should be the development of teacher thought and another matter to demonstrate what supervisors need to know about schools and cognitive learning to actually promote greater thought in one's own faculty. I believe that we need first to understand why it

is so very difficult to create a reflective school environment for teachers before we can apply adult learning theory to the work we do with teachers in the tasks of direct assistance, curriculum development, inservice education, and action research.

The Difficulties

To mention a few of the significant difficulties of the teacher work environment as being less than optimal is relatively easy. More than ten years ago, Lortie (1975), Jackson (1968), and Sarason (1971) pointed out the entrenched norms of the work environment and the 1984 book by Lieberman and Miller entitled Teachers, Their World and Their Work, updates us on those realities.

First, the legacy of the one-room schoolhouse permeates our schools: The vestige of pioneer times when most schools were one teacher, one group of students, within one physically confined area is still evident in many of our schools today. In many cases, we have the one-room schoolhouse repeated every few yards down the school corridor. The attitude among many a teacher is that this is my classroom, my students, my materials, and my professional world and others should leave me alone. In contrast, Judith Little (1982) demonstrated in her study of successful schools how teachers spoke of our students, our materials, our goals and what we are trying to do.

Second, Inverse Beginner Responsibilities: Related to the one-room schoolhouse mentality is the territoriality of experienced teachers protecting their own turf and passing their leftovers on to new teachers. Usually when a teacher resigns, the remaining teachers in the school descend upon the classroom and remove any materials, equipment, or furniture of value and replace it with their discards. The new teacher enters a classroom equipped with what no one else wanted. In addition, administrators often place the most difficult and lowest achieving students with the new teacher. New teachers, therefore, are often left with the most demanding students in the most poorly supplied classrooms. Meanwhile teachers with experience have the inverse situation--the least demanding students in the best equipped classrooms. The message to beginning teachers is, "Welcome to teaching. Let's see if you can make it." This professional environment is hardly conducive to support and sharing. If new teachers do make it, they tend to pass their initiation rites onto the next group of beginners.

Third, again related to the legacy of the one-room schoolhouse is invisibility and isolation: In a recent 1984 study in the Southeast, Blankenship and Irvine (1985) found that approximately 50% of all experienced teachers have never been observed for purposes of instructional improvement and 76% of all experienced teachers have never been observed by a peer teacher. Synergistic theory premises that a group can accomplish its tasks efficiently and effectively when energy is flowing in the same

direction. If teachers do not receive feedback and if they are not aware of what each other is doing, it is difficult to understand how they can possibly know how they are complementing, reinforcing, and directing their energies towards the same goals for students.

Fourth, lack of professional dialogue: Since most classrooms are closed from one another, teachers do not engage in much professional dialogue. DeSanctis and Blumberg (1979) found that professional talk among teachers usually lasts less than two minutes per day. Teachers have few opportunities to speak with each other, and when they do, it is usually when passing in the hall or during a break in the teachers lounge. Such dialogue is frequently of a social and not professional nature. Teachers spend an overwhelming amount of their time speaking to students and socializing with each other but not solving instructional problems. Rarely does anyone in the school engage teachers in mutual problem-solving.

Fifth, restricted choice. Teachers have little choice over their working lives, which are often bureaucratic and restricted (Lortie, 1975). Schedules are set, teachers are told what they will teach and when they will teach. Minimum competencies, mandated curricula, and externally developed policies further restrict their choices. Goodlad (1984) found in his national sample that teachers have virtually no involvement in schoolwide decisions.

With a work environment characterized by the mentality of the one-room schoolhouse, with inverse beginner responsibilities, with isolation and invisibility, with a lack of professional dialogue and restricted choice, it is little wonder that it is a very difficult task for supervisors to promote teacher thinking.

COGNITION

Cognitive learning theorists posit that we become more abstract in our thinking by what Hunt refers to as optimal mismatch, that is when we are provided with novel stimuli that is capable of being processed by our present mental structure of organizing information (Piaget calls this assimilation) and over time with repeated exposure to such novel stimuli the mind eventually finds itself unable to process some of the increased information with it's existing mental structure and therefore has to reorganize itself to deal with increasing divergent and difficult stimuli- (Piaget referred to this reorganization of mental structure as the process of accommodation). Assimilation and accommodation are twin processes that enable a person to make sense from increasingly complex stimuli. Therefore, teachers (as any learners) can be stretched to think about their teaching by a supervisor identifying their present mental structure of organization, whether it be concrete or symbolic and gradually introducing new information that the teacher is capable of grasping and acting upon. With enough new information over time, the teacher will be able to alter his/her previous way of

thinking of problems and begin to make totally new departures in thought and action. Obviously a teacher who thinks unilaterally and concretely should be introduced to relatively few new practices and these practices should be explained, shown and demonstrated before the teacher can think of whether they would improve his/her classroom. On the other hand a teacher whose thinking is of moderate abstraction can deal with new ideas at the verbal level and with actual trial, determine the fit of the new idea within his/her already established classroom. The teacher whose thinking is of high abstraction can listen and process new ideas at a mental imagery level and juxtapose what actions will provide greater student success. The point is that if teachers' thinking is to be promoted as the aim of supervision then the legacy of the one-room schoolhouse must go, teachers must be challenged to discuss the why and hows of what they do, they must be aware of how each other performs, they must be given graduated experiences into teaching, and they must be given some choice over what they will improve. Such alteration of the work environment creates a school place that is intellectually alive, characterized by what the authors of the 15,000 hours study call a social ethos of people being purposefully and professionally engaged with each other (Rutter et al., 1979).

Some of the mistakes that have been made in the past in attempting teacher choice and autonomy and why such past reforms premised on such goals for teachers such as the open classroom, team teaching, differentiated staffing, and individualized

instruction have failed and fallen out of favor is that autonomy, reflection, and collective teacher action are not reached all at once but in graduated steps. As educators we all seem to agree with the saying "more structure than less" with students. Students once they have a grasp of basic skills, rules, and procedures gradually should be given more responsibility for their own learning. Yet developmental learning theory applies to all of us, children and adults. Rarely, however, do we as supervisors determine an individual or staff's level of cognitive operations or self-responsibility and aim to increase over time their own autonomous thinking.

By using the tasks of supervision that we have under our own control, we can alter the school work environment and apply cognitive learning theory to the work that we do with teachers. I believe that we sort of know how to promote teacher thought and I'll briefly explain how this might be done. I've underlined sort of because we're talking about the ragged world of human behavior, social reality, and that unique, frustrating, and tremendously complex world of schools. I admit that my own writing, research, and experience in supervision and how to promote teacher thought leaves me with an incredibly smug attitude that there will never be an algorithm for this endeavor, rather it will remain a field of applying what we currently seem to know out there to our own current school situation in here and see what happens. Fortunately, what always gets in the way of

precise and neatly written plans for instructional improvement are those darn humans.

Please resist with me the idea that research or researchers can solve your problems, please resist what Dewey spoke of as
". . .the tendency. . .to convert scientific findings into recipes to be followed."

(pg. 44)

rather the role of scientific explanation, (and the following explanation of how to think about and use supervision tasks would qualify as a scientific explanation) is instead in Dewey's words

"sources to be used, through the medium of the minds of educators, to make educational functions more intelligent" (pg. 32-33).

By stretching our own thinking about what might work in our own schools we may indeed stretch the thinking of those with whom we work. Let's now turn to each of the four supervision tasks. As we do, I would like you to keep in mind three categories of teacher thought that I label

Low abstract: Confusion about instructional problems-

Lack of ideas about what can be done-

Often asks to be shown-

Habitual and unilateral responses to varying situations.

Moderate
Abstract:

Dependent on authority or expert to make change.
Identification of instructional problems by focusing on one dimension of problem but does not use multiple sources of information.
Generation of one to three ideas about what can be done.
Needs assistance from authority or expert in weighing consequences of action.
Needs assistance from authority or expert in planning how to implement the change.

High
Abstract:

Identification of instructional problems from various sources of information.
Seeks and generates multiple sources of ideas about what can be done.
Visualizes and verbalizes consequences of various actions.
Chooses for oneself the action(s) most likely to improve the situation and plans implementation.
Makes own change.

Developing Thought via Direct Assistance to Teachers

A developmental approach to direct assistance to teachers is what I wrote about in 1981 (Glickman, 1981). Since then I have made some modifications but the basic principles remain the same.

When a supervisor works one-to-one with a teacher, he/she has basically three conferencing approaches to use; directive, collaborative, and non-directive. A directive approach is whereby the source of problem identification and problem solution primarily comes from the supervisor with the end result being a concrete and limited assignment of objective, activities, and expected criteria of success given by the supervisor to the teacher. The directive approach results in a supervisor assignment to the teachers. A collaborative approach is where there is an exchange of perceptions about problems, a generation of possible actions by supervisor and teacher and a negotiated agreement about what changes will be forthcoming. The result is a mutually developed and agreed upon contract between supervisor and teacher. A non-directive approach is where there is active facilitation by the supervisor of the teacher's perceptions of instructional concerns, questioning the teacher of what he/she might do, probing the teacher to think about consequences, and finally asking the teacher to choose a course of action. the result is a teacher self plan.

The initial match is fairly obvious of conference approach to abstract thought of teachers. A low abstract teacher is appropriately matched with a directive conference approach, a moderate abstract teacher is appropriately matched with a collaborative conference approach, and a high abstract teacher is appropriately matched with a non-directive conference approach. Stretching a teacher's thinking occurs after the initial match

has resulted in teacher change. Follow-up conferences should gradually move up the ladder of directive to collaborative to non-directive giving increased responsibility for the teacher to think and plan for him/herself (see Gordon and Glickman, 1984, for a fuller explanation of this directionality).

There are other important avenues for extending teacher thought via direct assistance other than one-to-one supervisor and teacher conferences. They include such simple avenues as designating a particular after school time for teachers with instructional concerns to meet with a group leader to discuss ways to help each other or more complex avenues as setting up peer observations and conferences with teachers who would like to find out how each other teaches as well as receive feedback from another teacher.

Developing thought Via Curriculum Development

Curriculum is the core of a school's existence, what is to be taught to our students is a matter that must by definition exist outside the province of an individual teacher or individual classroom. Within the province of the school, it is a relatively nonthreatening avenue of bringing teachers together to discuss, debate, and change. When we look at curriculum, we are not looking at a teacher's practice but rather we are looking at the creation of a document that unites us all. Unfortunately, the potential of using curriculum to extend teacher's thinking is

diminished by the imposition of curriculum developed and imposed from the outside. Today, most curriculum is developed at levels furthest away from the users such as at the state and commercial publishing levels. If we can continue to think of teachers along a continuum of abstraction, defined for purposes of this paper in three stages, Tanner and Tanner's work (1980) on levels of curriculum development makes much sense. They speak of imitative, mediative, and generative curriculum. Imitative curriculum is developed outside of the school and prescribes what each teacher will teach, when they will teach, what activities to follow and what tests to give. The imitative curriculum is a complete package that every teacher is expected to use in the same way, we used to refer to this type of curriculum in the 1960s as supposedly "teacher proof". Many of our textbooks, guides, and curriculum kits are intended to be exactly that, "teacher proof," that is intended to be used, not thought about. The second level of curriculum development according to the Tanners is mediative which is defined as externally developed curriculum which is revised, altered, and changed by practitioners to their local conditions. In other words, teachers are asked to make modifications, change sequences, and substitute topics and activities according to the needs of their students. Mediative curriculum provides teachers with an established structure to work within, but at the same time demands that they improve upon it. The highest level of curriculum development according to the Tanners is generative which is a faculty

creating its own curriculum. Teachers first establish their own objectives for students and then either search out existing texts, kits, and guides that fit those objectives or make their own materials and activities where suitable ones do not exist.

Again, the initial match of curriculum development to levels of abstract thought can be made by first determining a level of group abstraction of staff. Imitative curriculum are initially appropriate for a group of low abstract teachers, with little experience, concern, or knowledge about curriculum. Mediative curricula are initially appropriate for moderate abstract teachers who question the total suitability of packaged curricula and generative curricula are appropriate for high abstract teachers who frankly can do a better job in identifying needs, objectives, activities and materials than experts from the outside.

Many schools have teachers with large variability in thought when it comes to curriculum. In such situations, I am not advocating the splitting of faculty into bluebird, robin, and scarecrow curriculum development groups. Instead, the strategy should be to establish heterogeneous groups and match curriculum development to the highest abstract reasoning of the majority of the staff. Moral reasoning research has shown that individual students and the group as a whole are pulled to higher order of thinking when the majority of persons are not of the lowest stages. In your own schools, you might make an assessment of the abstract functioning of your staff and determine where initial

matching should take place and then again, over time as teachers gain more insight and experience with curriculum provide them with greater opportunities of curriculum mediation and generation.

If we value development of teacher thought as the aim of supervision then curriculum development is a wonderful vehicle. However, if we keep the current level of curriculum development as imitative then as Sir Alex Clegg wrote

". . .any system which recruits high powered thinkers to contour and foist a curriculum on the schools. . . cannot work unless we believe that the teacher of the future is to be a low-grade technician working under someone else's instructions rather than a professional. . . (cited in Tanner and Tanner 1980, p. 629).

Developing Thought Via Inservice

Bob Jeffries, director of staff development, calls six school principals into his office to plan for the upcoming in-service day. He begins by explaining that the in-service program will begin with a morning session attended by the entire school system faculty, to take place in the high school auditorium. The afternoon will consist of individual school activities, with the principal being responsible for whatever transpires. He asks the principals: "What might we do for the morning session?" One principal suggests that at this time of year teachers could use an emotional lift, and that an

inspirational speaker would be good. Another principal adds that he had heard a Dr. Zweibach give a great talk entitled "The Thrill of Teaching" at a national principal's conference last summer. She thinks he would be a terrific speaker. Bob Jeffries likes these suggestions and tells the principals he will call Dr. Zweibach and make arrangements for his appearance.

On the in-service day 238 teachers file into the auditorium and fill all but the first eight rows of seats. Mr. Jeffries makes a few introductory remarks about how fortunate "we" are to have Dr. Zweibach with "us" and then turns the session over to Dr. Zweibach. A ruffled, middle-aged university professor, walks to the microphone and launches into his talk on the thrill of teaching. Within ten minutes, signs of restlessness, boredom, and bitterness are evident throughout the audience. Twelve of the teachers are sitting through a talk they had heard Dr. Zweibach deliver verbatim two years earlier at a teacher convention. Fifteen others are thinking about the classroom work they could be doing to prepare for next semester and wondering, "Why in the world are we sitting through this talk?" Another twenty-two teachers have become impatient with Dr. Zweibach's continual reference to the academic high school settings where he found teaching thrills. Their own work settings are vocational, special education, and elementary; they can't relate what he is saying about high schools to their world. Eventually some teachers begin to correct papers, read, or knit; a few appear to fall asleep. On the other hand, nearly half the members of the audience remain attentive and give Dr. Zweibach a rousing ovation when he concludes. The other half appear relieved that the talk is finally over and they can return to their own schools. Upon leaving the auditorium one can overhear such remarks as "What a great talk!" and "Why do we have to put up with all this in-service crap?"

This depiction of an in-service day is typical of many school systems. Some teachers find it valuable, but many do not. In-service days have been referred to as "the slum of

American education, neglected and of little effect" (Wood and Thompson 1980). In-service is often viewed by supervisors, administrators, and teachers as a number of days contracted for in the school calendar that simply need to be endured.

Glickman, 278-279

In discussing how in-service education can be planned to avoid what has just been described and instead extend teacher's thinking, I'm going to lean heavily on the work of Gene Hall and his associates (1973, 1978) at the Research and Development Center at Texas as well as Ben Harris (1980) and Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers (1983). By in-service, I mean the learning activities that can be provided in a formal way by the individual school or school system to teachers for the purpose of improving their instruction. It is fairly well established that successful in-service that translates into classroom practice has a series of activities over a period of time that include:

1. Lecture and explanation
2. Demonstration
3. Roleplaying and feedback
4. Classroom trial and feedback
5. Peer discussion (with possibly peer observation)

Hall has shown that teachers think about innovations in their classroom and schools at different levels of concerns. I've simplified those levels into (1) orientation concerns (i.e., what is the innovation and why should I do it?), (2) integration concerns (i.e., I'm interested in the new ideas, know something

about it, how do I do it?), and (3) refinement concerns (i.e., I'm doing it and want to make it better). These three levels of teacher concerns can be considered along with three levels of abstraction (low abstract - no understanding of improvement, moderate abstract - perceive problems-limited in generating ideas and thinking through actions, and high abstract - perceive problems, multiple ideas and actions).

Hall and Associates have shown that a supervisor can plan in-service with teachers to match their particular stage of concern. Teachers of orientation concern are best matched with in-service that focuses on expert testimonial, information about what other teachers have found to be useful about the new actions, and a demonstration by an expert on how the new skills and activities are used. The orientation teacher will now be able to more fully understand and consider a particular classroom change. On the other hand, teachers of integration concerns are best matched with in-service that emphasizes the doing part of the innovation in their own classrooms. Therefore, the in-service activities of demonstration, role playing, and feedback to teachers within the workshop setting; followed by trial of the innovation in their own classroom, with trainer observation and feedback is most appropriate for integration teachers. Teachers of refinement concerns are best matched with in-service that allows them to share their own experience of using the

innovation, be engaged in peer observation, and meet regularly to brainstorm on how they can help improve and strengthen each other's skills.

Mismatches are obvious when integration teachers who are already knowledgeable and using the practices receive in-service that is primarily lecture and demonstration or orientation teachers who have reservations about a new practice receive in-service that primarily focuses on trying out the new practice. The supervisor might plan in-service to be more in line with where teachers are in regard to a particular improvement idea and plan the sequence and the pacing of the sequence accordingly.

This is where level of abstraction can be useful. A teacher with orientation concerns but a high level of abstraction can move quickly from in-service of lecture/demonstration to role playing and trial to peer observation, sharing and brainstorming while a teacher with similar orientation concerns but a low level of abstraction will need to spend more time with lecture/demonstration. The supervisor also might think of ways to cross fertilize in-service by using teachers of integration concerns to work with teachers of refinement concerns and teachers of refinement concerns to work with teachers of orientation concerns.

Many school staffs will be mixed in regard to teacher level of concerns and abstractness which would suggest a main sequence of activities for all with small group or individual activities for those teachers who are behind or ahead of the group. We ask teachers to provide supplemental and enriching activities for

students who are far behind or ahead, why should we as supervisors not do the same for teachers? As in-service activities move from the expert lecturing and demonstrating to teachers doing and discussing so does thought move from low abstract to high abstract.

Developing Thought Via Action Research

Action research is a simple concept that comes from the writing of Lewin (1948) and Corey (1953). Basically action research is when teachers meet to identify common instructional problems, determine what current evidence they have about meeting the instructional needs of their students, propose changes that might be more successful, implement changes, and finally, judge the success of their endeavors. Action research makes no pretense to find results that are pure, experimental, or generalizable to other schools, instead it purports to answer the questions of whether the students and teachers in that one school are better off doing something instructionally different today than what they had been doing yesterday. Action research has been resurrected in recent times under the various name of quality circles, organizational development and problem solving groups. The name is not important, what is important is whether groups of teachers are given the opportunity to take on more responsibilities for instructional improvement beyond their own individual classrooms.

The way that supervisors might plan to engage faculty groups as a vehicle for extending teacher thought can be derived from the classic work of Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1977) entitled situational leadership or life cycle of leadership. Life cycle of group leadership moves from a supervisor controlling the content, structure, and procedures of a group to the group assuming its own responsibilities for deliberations and actions. Some matches of leader interventions into groups based on levels of abstraction, as well as previous experience of members in working in a group can be proposed. Teachers who are not used to working together either to make instructional change and are low in abstraction when it comes to identifying and solving instructional problems are best given a limited and well defined topic with the active participation by the leader in structuring meetings and seeing that the group either has resource persons knowledgeable in the topic or the group members have done previous homework on the topic under consideration. Those groups of teachers with moderate levels of abstraction are best given leadership that shares already possessed group member knowledge and the supervisor clarifies group procedures, i.e., work as a facilitator of group process. Groups of teachers with high levels of abstraction are best given leadership that emerges from the group with the formal leader simply acting as an individual group member with the same developing rights and responsibilities as any other member.

The way for developing teacher thought, autonomy, and collective action is by gradually increasing the arena of choice for a group and allowing them to function in a more participatory, democratic way. For example, a staff that has just begun to work in groups might best tackle decisions that deal with limited changes (such as extracurricular scheduling or addressing smoking procedures in the teacher's lounge) as they experience success the topics of change can become more school-wide such as increasing instructional time in the school or planning a schoolwide discipline procedure. Again, the idea is to aim the action research focus at the highest level of abstraction by the majority of group members.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, I've tried to outline the expansion in my own thinking about supervision as a function rather than an isolated task or individual person. Supervision for successful schools attempts to remove the obstacles in the work environment so that teachers can see each other at work, receive feedback from others, engage in professional dialogue, and have the opportunity to make decisions about collective instructional actions. The tasks of direct assistance to teachers, in-service education, curriculum development, and action research are interrelated supervision tasks that can be purposefully planned to increase teacher thought.

My premise is that the development of teacher thought should be the aim of instructional supervision in the same manner that Kohlberg and Mayer argued in 1972 that development of student thought should be the aim of education. It is my belief that you can't have one without the other. The way that supervisors work with teachers becomes the umbrella model for how teachers work with students.

Supervision which treats all teachers the same, which treats them in isolation to each other, and which expects them to all perform the same prescribed set of behaviors is counterproductive to enhancing teacher thought. There are many questions about effective classroom practice research. There are questions of overgeneralizations. There are mysteries of high performing teachers who do not teach according to "effective practice" and low performing teachers who teach in accordance to "effective practice" (Doyle, 1984 and Stodolsky, 1984). There are student outcomes other than academic achievement such as problem solving, cooperation, and creativity that have not been correlated with "effective practice" (Peterson, 1979). Besides these questions, my greatest reservation about uniform supervision and teaching practices is that a technology of supervision and teaching attempts to bypass the mediation of thought of those who are expected to act. To say that supervision should proceed in a certain way and that teachers should teach in a certain way is to use research to create classroom and school mindlessness. Research used as prescriptions of actions diminish

thought. Instead if such research is used as information for developing ones own plans than thought is enhanced.

A dramatic example of this use of prescription versus information is a study conducted by Deci, Spiegel, Ryan, Koestner, and Kaufman (1982) in their human research laboratory at the University of Rochester. They conducted an experimental study of supervisors with teachers. One group of teachers was given imposed standards by a supervisor. The other group was given information without prescriptions. The group of teachers "prescribed" were significantly more controlling toward students, they dominated teacher to student talk and used words such as "you should" and "must" to their students more frequently than the group of teachers who were given the same supervisor information without such prescribed standards. When supervisors attempt to control teacher behaviors, teachers tend to control student behaviors. What loses out is the capability of thought on the part of both teacher and students. If that is what we want, then by golly, that is what our practices of prescribed supervision and classroom practices are achieving.

Finally, I'd like to dwell on a final point when I talk about the development of thought as the aim of instructional supervision. I always have a panicky feeling that when I complete a paper that people might in fact do what I have advocated. This, frankly, scares me to be perceived as one who knows the answers to other people's predicaments, problems and situations. I would characterize the first fourteen years of my

career as trying to convince others that I was right. I would characterize the present era in my career as trying to convince people that I could be wrong. Dewey wrote that there is

the human desire to be an "authority" and to control the activities of others. This tendency does not, alas, disappear when a (person) becomes a scientist

(Dewey, 1929, p. 44)

I do not wish for my work to connote to others step by step procedures. I have no exactness to my theory, no paper and pencil test to administer to supervisors or teachers. What is written on paper, displayed on charts, and reported as research suggests a way for me to understand and organize the world of supervision. Please realize that such paper clarity does not exist in the real world of action, people, and schools. Instead I'd rather you accept my position about the aim of supervision as the development of teacher thought as a relatively well developed, empirically justified, and logical theory for generating ways to plan and act with teachers. It is one source of information among other competing sources of information about supervision.

By reading and considering all of these competing notions of supervision, the supervisor will have the opportunity to think and plan for oneself. Alas, that is the aim!

References

- Blankenship, Jr., G. and Irvine, J. I. (1985). Georgia teachers' perceptions of prescriptive and descriptive observations of teaching by instructional supervisors. Georgia Educational Leadership 1 (1): 3-7.
- Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Corey, S. M. 1953. Action research to improve school practices. New York: Teachers College Columbia University.
- Calhoun, E. F. 1985. Relationship of teachers' conceptual level to the utilization of supervisory services and to a description of the classroom instructional improvement. A presentation to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April.
- Deci, E. L., Spiegel, N. H., Ryan, R. M., Koestner, R., and Kauffman, M. 1982. The effects of performance standards on teaching styles: The behavior of controlling teachers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 74, 852-859.
- DeSanctis, M., and Blumberg, A. 1979. An exploratory study into the nature of teacher interactions with other adults in the schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April.
- Dewey, J. 1929. The Sources of a science of education. New York: Horace Liveright.
- Doyle, W. 1984. Effective teaching and the concept of master teacher. University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

- Glickman, C. D. 1985. Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Newton, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D. Developmental supervision: Alternative approaches for helping teachers to improve instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Goodlad, J. I. 1984. A place called schools: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gordon, S. P. and Glickman, C. D. 1984. Applying developmental supervision: tactical and strategic dimensions. Thresholds in Education. 10 (2): 24-26.
- Gordon, S. P. In progress. Developmental supervision, supervisor flexibility and the postobservation conference. Ed. dissertation, University of Georgia (Athens).
- Hall, G. E., and Loucks, S. 1978. Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record 80 (September): 36-53.
- Hall, G. E.; Wallace, R. C., Jr., and Dossett, W. A. 1973. A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas.
- Harris, B. M. 1980. Improving staff performance through in-service education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Harvey, O. J. 1967. Conceptual systems and attitude change. In C. Sherif and M. Sherif, eds., Attitude, ego involvement and change. New York: Wiley.
- Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. H. 1969. Life-cycle theory of leadership. Training and Development Journal 23(5):26-34.

- 1977. Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall.
- Hunt, D. E., and Joyce, B. R. 1967. Teacher trainee personality and initial teaching style. American Educational Research Journal 4(3):253-255.
- Jackson, P. W. 1968. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Joyce, B. R., and Showers, B. 1983. Power in staff development through research on training. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Kohlberg, L. and Mayer, R. 1972. Development as the aim of education. Harvard Educational Review 42(4): 449-496.
- Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. 1984. Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Little, J. W. 1982. Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal 19(3):325-340.
- Lewin, K. 1948. Resolving social conflicts. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Lortie, D. C. 1975. School teacher: A sociological inquiry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Murphy, P., and Brown, M. 1970. Conceptual systems and teaching styles. American Educational Research Journal 7(November):529-540.

- Parkay, F. W. 1979. Inner-city high school teachers: The relationship of personality traits and teaching style to environmental stress. Paper presented to the Southwest Educational Research Association, Houston.
- Peterson, P. 1979. Direct instruction reconsidered. In Research on Teaching. Edited P. Peterson and H. J. Walberg. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pratzner, F. C. 1984. Quality of school life: Foundations for improvement. Educational Researcher 13(3):20-25.
- Rutter, M.; Maughan, B.; Mortimore, P.; Ouston, J.; and Smith, A. 1979. Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Sarason, S. 1971. The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stodolsky, S. S. 1984. Teacher evaluation: The limits of looking. Educational Researcher, 13(9), 11-18.
- Tanner, D., and Tanner, L. N. 1980. Curriculum development theory into practice, 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Witherell, C. S. and Erickson, V. L. 1978. Teacher education as adult development. Theory into Practice 17(June):229-238.
- Wood, F. W., and Thompson, S. R. 1980. Guidelines for better staff development. Educational Leadership 37(5):374-378
- Witherell, C. S., and Erickson, V. L. 1978. Teacher education as adult development. Theory into Practice 17(June):229-238.