1986

Effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated approach to training school administrators to conduct postobservation conferences

Ronald Max Rice
Iowa State University

Rice, Ronald Max

EFFECTIVENESS OF A SYSTEMATIC, MEDIA FACILITATED APPROACH TO TRAINING SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS TO CONDUCT POSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCES

Iowa State University PH.D. 1986

Effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated approach to training school administrators to conduct postobservation conferences

by

Ronald Max Rice

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Educational Administration)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of ~~Major~~ Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Teachers and supervisors alike look forward to postobservation conferences with dread. Gordon (1977, p. 240), writing about private sector supervisory conferences, said, "Supervisors avoid evaluation conferences because they know they will be unpleasant." Blumberg (1970) found that teachers also see little productive merit in the supervisory conference, suggesting that time and money could be saved by the elimination of such conferences. These reports paint an extremely negative picture of conference conducting as a means to improve the teaching behaviors of teachers in the classroom.

Little evidence exists to support the use of the postobservation conference as an effective tool in the improvement of teaching, supervisors continue to view conferences as being important. They also suggested that the failure of postobservation conferences to be an effective tool lies in the lack of ability on the part of supervisors to effectively conduct the conferences, rather than in the conferences themselves. Cawelti (1982) found that the number one leadership problem identified by administrators was motivating teachers to accept new ideas, a problem inherent in the postobservation conference. Brandt (1982) and Olivero (1982) reported that supervisors rated the need for improvement of their conferencing skills as one of the highest needs they had in terms of professional development. This researcher, on the basis of many discussions with supervisors and teachers, concluded that the underlying reason for a large portion of the ineffectiveness of conferencing was not that supervisors lacked information about what needed to be done to increase conference effectiveness, but that the

supervisors had not had adequate practice in the techniques of conferencing to the extent that they were comfortable "trying out" those skills in real life conferences. This fear may be well founded. Salek (1975), for example, found that teachers viewed evaluation conferences as personal attacks and therefore approached them with the idea they must defend themselves. This was certainly a situation in which only a very few, very confident, supervisors dared risk "trying out" new or unpracticed supervisory behaviors.

Some knowledge of the various components of effective conferences was evident in the literature. Maier (1976) found that successful supervisory conferences had a good opening, a body, and a good closing. Blumberg (1970) and Sullivan and Walker (1981) found that the climate of the conference, the match between verbal and non-verbal communication, was important to conference success. Effective probing and questioning was found to be important by Lefton et al. (1981). Hunter (1982) suggests that feedback and reinforcement are necessary in any learning endeavor, such as the supervisory conference. Meyer et al. (1965) found in the private sector that subordinate participation in setting improvement goals was more likely to improve performance, than the setting of improvement goals by the supervisor without consulting with the subordinate. While the findings of these studies were not all inclusive and it was apparent that more work needed to be done to explicate the relationships between these components, it was important that what was known be placed into the working repertoire of supervisors in the field. It was this problem of how to get supervisors to apply what was known to be effective that was addressed by this study. Its

purpose was to examine the relationship between conference effectiveness and the methods used to train supervisors in conference conducting techniques.

Improving the methodology used in inservice training had recently been given a great deal of attention. Joyce and Showers (1980), for example, had developed a training model, comprised of five components, they believed would impact considerably on the positive transfer of newly learned skills from the training sessions to application of the skills in the classroom. The five components were:

1. Presentation of the theoretical basis or rationale for the skill being taught.
2. Modeling of the skill by someone who was relatively expert in applying the skill.
3. Simulated practice of the skill in a protected environment.
4. Practice of the skill in a real life context, followed by feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the performance.
5. Coaching (i.e., analysis of application and psychological support) by colleagues.

This model was adapted for use in the present study as the CCCI (Coaching and Counseling for Conferencing Improvement) model for supervisor training. The CCCI model contained three distinct elements: <u>direct instruction</u>, <u>self inspection</u>, and <u>feedback.</u> Presentation of theory and modeling were combined under the rubric, <u>direct instruction.</u> Hunter (1982) suggested that these elements, in combination, would increase the likelihood that students, in this case supervisors, would learn what was intended that they learn. The intended learning for

supervisors in this study was the theory and rationale for the conferencing skills presented and how to use the skills in conducting conferences. Direct instruction is the first of the three elements of the CCCI model.

The second element, self-inspection, referred to the practice of skills in real life contexts (which were videotaped), followed by the viewing of the videotaped practice sessions by the learner, who, in turn, conducted a self critique of his or her application of the newly learned skills. Bailey (1981) found that videotaping and reviewing of one's behavior allowed for a systematic analysis of one's strengths and weaknesses relative to the skill being learned. Moritz and Martin-Reynolds (1980) cited several studies regarding the effectiveness of videotaping as a tool for changing behavior, particularly when self analysis was followed by goal setting and a sharing of progress towards the goals with one's supervisor. This process of self-analysis became the second element in the CCCI model, self-inspection.

The third element of the CCCI model was feedback. Tuckman (1976) found peer observation and analysis of videotaped performances led to changes in behavior. He suggested conditions which made the changes likely involved the use of a peer group which would share their perceptions of a subject's behavior with the subject following a review of the videotaped performance. He also suggested that the group then share in the setting of goals for the elimination of deficiencies observed in the performance. This process was labeled feedback in the CCCI model.

Statement of the Problem

Assisting teachers to become more effective in promoting student learning is an important objective of nearly all supervisors. In order to accomplish that objective the supervisors must encourage teachers to examine their teaching behavior in the classroom and to set goals for improvement. The setting in which these issues are generally addressed in the conference that follows the supervisors' observation of the teachers' performance in the classroom, the postobservation conference. Unfortunately, the little understanding of effective supervisory behavior in the postobservation conference which had begun to emerge at the time of this writing has not found its way into the working practices of supervisors in the field. More importantly, very little had been done to study the relationship between the training of supervisors in conferencing techniques and conference effectiveness. There was, therefore, a need to examine supervisor training if the postobservation conference is to become a meaningful tool for teacher improvement.

Purposes of the Study

The primary purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated, approach for training supervisors to conduct postobservation conferences. Specifically, the study examined the relationship between the following: the training of supervisors in selected conferencing techniques, using a systematic approach in which training input was followed by: 1) videotaping of practice conferences, and 2) structured feedback; and conference effectiveness. The expressed

purpose, then, was to examine the training of supervisors and the relationship of that training to efficacy in supervisory conferences.

Research Hypotheses

1. Supervisors trained via CCCI will receive significantly higher posttest ratings in conference effectiveness than pretest ratings as assessed on criterion-based measures of conference effectiveness by trained raters.
2. Supervisors trained via CCCI will exhibit significantly more self confidence in their ability to conduct postobservation conferences than supervisors trained via direct instruction only as measured by posttest assessments of supervisor confidence.
3. Supervisors trained via CCCI will rate themselves significantly higher on their perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth than supervisors trained via direct instruction only as measured by posttest supervisor assessments of the conference impact on potential teacher growth.
4. Supervisors trained via CCCI will be judged by teachers as developing significantly different conferencing climates than supervisors trained via direct instruction only as measured by posttest teacher assessments of conference climate.
5. Supervisors trained via CCCI will be rated significantly higher on measures of their conference conducting skills than supervisors trained via direct instruction only as measured by posttest teacher assessments.

6. Teachers of supervisors trained via CCCI will indicate significantly higher ratings relative to the impact of the conference on their potential teacher growth than will teachers of supervisors trained via direct instruction only as measured by posttest teacher assessments of the conference impact on potential teacher growth.

Delimitations of the Study

The following factors limited the scope of the investigation:

1. The study was conducted using a small sample of North Central Iowa teacher supervisors.
2. The subjects were volunteers.
3. All supervisors had received some prior training in conference techniques.
4. Experimental group subjects came from one moderately sized North Iowa school district. Control group subjects came from several smaller sized North Iowa school districts.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms give clarity to their use and meaning in this study:

1. Coaching—colleagial psychological support and assistance in analyzing the application of newly learned behaviors.
2. Conference climate—the feeling tone (supportive/nonsupportive) of a conference.
3. Conference effectiveness—teacher's or supervisor's perception of the usefulness or productivity of the conference.

4. Direct instruction—instructor lead presentation and modeling of theory and/or skills.
5. Feedback—colleagial sharing of perceptions regarding the supervisor's conferencing behaviors.
6. Goal setting—the establishment of performance improvement objectives.
7. Media facilitated observation—the use of videotaping of one's conferencing behavior for the purpose of analyzing the behavior.
8. Postobservation conference—the conference held between a teacher and a supervisor following lesson observation with the purpose of improving the teacher's teaching performance.
9. Probing—techniques (questioning, active listening, pausing, etc.) used to find out what somebody knows, thinks, or feels.
10. Teacher supervisor—principal or administrative department head who has responsibility for supervision of teachers.
11. Self-confidence—the perception of competence the supervisor has in his/her skill in conducting postobservation conferences.
12. Self-inspection—self analysis or critique of one's own conferencing behavior.

CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This study investigated the effects of a systematic, media facilitated, model for training administrators to conduct postobservation conferences. This review was limited to literature essential to the study, addressing several subtopics related to postobservation conferences and school administrator training.

Postobservation Conferences Literature

This section of the review of literature will focus on four constructs central to postobservation conferences. Those constructs are (a) purpose of the conference, (b) structure of the conference, (c) conference climate, and (d) conference effectiveness. The literature related to these constructs has recently been carefully reviewed by Spencer (1985). That which follows is a summary of Spencer's review emphasizing information particularly germane to this study.

Purpose of the Conference

The postobservation conference, the conference held between a teacher and supervisor following the classroom observation of a lesson, is the milieu in which the supervisor and teacher meet to discuss the teacher's behavior in the classroom. Depending on the quality of the lesson observed in the classroom and the unique characteristics of the supervisor and the teacher, different types of conferences may be held. The conference may be designed to identify effective teaching behaviors for the teacher, investigate the use of more effective teaching behaviors, identify unsatisfactory teacher behaviors and develop

alternatives to those ineffective behaviors, or reward good teaching. Regardless of the type of conference, however, the principal outcome of postobservation conferences is to improve or maintain the instructional behavior of the teacher and, subsequently, student learning. Conferences may be designed, then, to stimulate critical thinking, share ideas and suggestions regarding the implementation of proven instructional practices, discuss and set instructional goals, correct information, analyze teacher difficulties and/or assist the teacher in the development of his/her own instructional analysis skills.

Not all authorities in the field believe that postobservation conferences result in the improvement of teaching practices. Some maintain that conferences are often used to discuss unimportant aspects of teaching and that the conferences have little impact on the improvement of teaching. Critics attributed this to inadequate training of supervisors. Most authorities in the field, however, viewed the conference in a positive manner with potential for improving teaching behaviors.

In summary, the postobservation conference between a supervisor and a teacher is designed to analyze and evaluate the teacher's instructional behavior in the classroom. The type of conference held is dependent upon the lesson observed and the characteristics of the supervisor and the teacher. Types of conferences may include: the identification of effective teaching behaviors, the investigation of more effective teaching behaviors, the identification of unsatisfactory teaching behaviors, the development of improvement goals, the correction of misinformation, and the recognition of good teaching performance.

Structure of the Conference

The structure of the conference is comprised of four elements--preparation for the conference, how the conference is opened, what is contained in the body of the conference, and how the conference is closed. Below is a summary of Spencer's review of the literature related to these four elements.

Preparing for the conference is an important element in the conference conducting process. Appropriate planning should include gathering of factual and objective data, analysis of data related to the teacher's abilities and background, identification of concerns, formation of a conference agenda, development of a plan for asking strategic questions, assembling necessary professional materials, and scheduling a time and place for the conference. Failure to plan appropriately for the conference may result in an ineffective conference and leave the teacher confused and resentful.

The opening of the conference sets the stage for a successful conference. In the successful opening, the supervisor develops rapport with the teacher, thus motivating him/her to participate freely in the conference. Since some conferences fail as a result of incongruity between the teacher's expectations for the conference and that which actually occurs the opening should include an explanation of the conference procedures and purpose. This prepares the teacher to form realistic and accurate expectations about the conference format and content.

Interaction between the supervisor and the teacher during the conference is the most significant element in an effective conference

body. The more freely the teacher interacts in all aspects of the conference, the more effective the conference. Consequently, the supervisor shares control of the conference with the teacher. The role of the supervisor is to provide specific and factual feedback to the teacher regarding that which was observed in the classroom and encourage, through skillful questioning, the teacher's analysis of that feedback. The number of information items shared with the teacher should be limited to four or five. The supervisor should be sure to discuss both postive and negative teaching behaviors, if observed. The effective supervisor must listen actively to the teacher's responses and, where appropriate, assist the teacher in problem-solving.

The close of the conference should be brief, with care taken to maintain rapport with the teacher. The teacher should be encouraged to examine alternative teaching behaviors which result in improved instruction, try the new strategies out in the classroom, and set goals for improvement. The main points of the conference should be summarized, including agreements or assignments which were formulated during the conference.

In summary, it is important that conferences have a good opening, body, and close. Conference purposes and procedures should be stated. The supervisor should provide specific information about and guide the teacher through the problem-solving process by appropriately questioning and actively listening to the teacher's responses. The conference should close with the main points of the conference summarized, and any agreements and assignments made during the conference reduced to writing.

Climate of the Conference

Conference climate refers to the "feeling tone" of the conference. Spencer identified and described supervisor attitudes and behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal, which result in a positive climate.

Supervisors who create a positive climate in working with teachers are generally described as warm, empathetic, responsive, and encouraging and caring. They develop a collegial relationship with the teachers, actively involve them in planning to meet both the teacher's needs and the institution's goals. They serve as a facilitator and resource person for instructional improvement. The development of a supportive climate creates a less threatening environment, which enhances teacher growth.

Nonverbal behavior greatly influences the messages communicated to the teacher by the supervisor. Nonverbal messages, such as eye contact, body lean, and proximity, may have more impact on the teacher than what is actually being verbalized. In general, nonverbal behavior tends to influence verbal messages in the direction of the nonverbal message. The physical setting also effects the conference climate. Sitting arrangements which have the participants facing each other at right angles or facing each other in relatively close proximity are favored over the typical arrangement where the supervisor conducts the conference over his or her desk. A private location for the conference, free of disruptions, substantially adds to a positive conference climate.

In summary, a supportive climate is one in which the supervisor is empathetic, is a colleague of the teacher, facilitates teacher

involvement in the process, and creates a positive feeling tone. A positive climate influences teachers to be less anxious and defensive in the conference. Further, it is important for supervisors to attend to messages conveyed to teachers through nonverbal behavior. Nonverbal cues must be consistent with the verbal messages sent to the teacher. Finally, the physical setting of the conference should be non-threatening, free from disruptions, and arranged in such a way to minimize communication barriers.

Conference Effectiveness

Conference effectiveness, as discussed in Spencer's review of the literature, can best be ascertained through feedback from teachers. If the goal of the postobservation conference is to improve instruction through changing teacher behavior, then the most accurate way to determine the effectiveness of the conference is by asking teachers how effective the conference was. To the degree that a teacher is willing to examine or, more importantly, change his/her behavior as a result of conferencing, the greater is the likelihood the conference was effective. If the supervisor was effective in presenting pursuasive data, developing a positive climate, facilitating problem-solving and assisting the teacher develop a plan for improvement, it seems logical that the teacher will want to consider changing his/her behavior. Since it is difficult, if not impossible, for researchers to measure changes in teaching behavior in this type of study, the most reliable measure of effectiveness appears to be the teacher's report of how the conference will influence his/her behavior.

This section has described various elements of the postobservation conference. A summary of Spencer's review of the literature related to the purpose, structure, climate, and effectiveness of the conference was provided. The next section of this chapter focuses on school administrator inservice training.

School Administrator Inservice Training Literature

Cawelti (1982) reported that the number one leadership problem identified by administrators was motivating teachers to accept new ideas. Since the postobservation conference is seen as an important and frequent supervisory activity, it seems logical that it would be an important element in motivating teachers. The supervisor's skill in preparing for and conducting postobservation conferences is a critical one. According to Barth (1980), supervisors often left the university setting - the sight of their preservice preparation - with insufficient skills. He further stated that the ineffectiveness of university preparation was due, in part, to the fact that fledgling supervisors were often unsure of what they would face in the field until the actual situations or problems presented themselves. Consequently, it seems that much of the actual training of supervisors must occur in the field. Therefore we must develop methods for training effective supervisors in the field.

The remainder of this chapter presents some of the literature related to effective inservice training. The review focuses on direct instruction and coaching, feedback and goal setting, the use of video recordings, and the impact of self confidence on performance.

Direct Instruction/Coaching

Since direct instruction/coaching was the fulcrum for the CCCI Model, much of the review centers on this component. Hunter (1982) reports that direct instruction - or as she labels it, input - is critical for essential learning. The teacher, whether instructing elementary students or adults, must present content to the student and model it in such a fashion as to insure the learner will have a clear understanding of the processes and products to be mastered. Joyce and Showers (1980) reported that, in order for inservice to be successfully implemented, the participants must study the theoretical basis or rationale for the methodology to be learned, observe the methodology being implemented by an expert, practice the methodology and receive feedback from colleagues on the strengths or weaknesses of their performance. This direct instruction and coaching model, according to Joyce and Showers, produced significant results in transfer of that which is learned to actual practice in the classroom.

Coaching, according to Joyce and Showers (1982), involves the use of colleagues to provide technical feedback and assistance in analyzing personal performance. Others (Biles, 1979, Holly, 1982, and Ngaiyaye and Hanley, 1978) also supported the use of peer groups in the implementation of adult training. Coaching, as seen by Joyce and Showers, incorporates five elements: 1) providing companionship or working closely with peers by sharing, observing, and providing feedback and support; 2) providing colleagues technical feedback as they implement the new methodology in a variety of settings. This allows each of the coaching peers to provide feedback which focuses on specific

elements of the new process; 3) giving feedback regarding when and when not to use a new technique; 4) helping the colleague to adapt the new methodology to his/her particular subjects; and finally, 5) facilitating or helping each other feel good about the trials of early practice.

Providing direct instruction and a support system for trainees results in better integration of the new concepts into the day-to-day behavior patterns of the trainees, as coached trainees have been more successful in adapting skills learned to the characteristics of their clients than were uncoached trainees (Showers, 1984). The quality of feedback provided to the trainee and goal setting also significantly impacted changes in trainee behavior. Essential points concerning feedback and goal setting will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Feedback/Goal Setting

Feedback - information provided to a practitioner about the strengths and weaknesses of teaching or administrative performance of a new methodology or skill - is often unclear, subjective, inaccurate, or irrelevant according to McGeoch and Lindsey (1967) and Acheson and Gall (1980). When specific, objective, and accurate data have been provided, however, "It can provide an incentive to perform better or internal satisfaction for a job well done" (Camman, 1982).

Tuckman (1976) developed twelve rules for providing useful feedback: 1) discuss concrete behaviors, 2) provide clear "incontrovertible" evidence of exactly how one appears to behave, 3) be reputable and believable, 4) state in terms the recipient can understand and to which he/she can relate, 5) present a clear model for the

recipient of the behavior to be exhibited, 6) provide the recipient with information of what others' expectations of him/her, 7) assist the recipient to make a commitment to change, 8) be sufficiently clear for the recipient to commit to change publicly, 9) create some tension (dissonance), 10) not require or place the recipient in a high risk situation, 11) provide a model for change and support for the changes required, and, 12) continue providing feedback in order that accountability can be maintained.

The relationship between feedback and goal setting has been reported in other studies. For example, Ivancevich (1982) in a study involving professional engineers, found when supervisors were trained to give specific feedback to subordinates on their performance and then collaboratively set goals for performance improvement, the subordinates felt that the accuracy, fairness, and clarity of the appraisal interview improved. Additionally, Meyer, Kay and French (1965), as a result of a study conducted at General Electric found that performance improvement occurred when specific goals were established. They also found criticism had a negative effect on achievement, while praise had little or no effect. When performance feedback was translated into improvement goals, there was an observed 65% improvement rate in employee performance. However, when performance feedback was not translated into goals, the improvement rate was 27%.

Coaching, the process of providing feedback and setting goals, has demonstrated value for improving performance. There is an obvious need to collect accurate data regarding a person's performance so that

feedback and goal setting can be accurate. This was best accomplished in this study through video recording, which will be discussed below.

Video Recording

The use of video recording as a tool to provide accurate feedback in training is well documented. Hung and Rosenthal (1981) and Bailey (1981) described video feedback as a way to systematically analyze performance strengths and weaknesses and as a medium which invites new or more rigorous standards and efforts towards adaptive behavior. Moritz and Martin-Reynolds (1980) concurred and reported video taping was an excellent medium for self analysis, goal setting and sharing performance with one's supervisor.

Videotaping has often been used in training, to which it has added several important dimensions. Fuller and Manning (1973), for example, found that video taping performance allowed the observer to focus the observed staff member on important issues in their performance. He found that feedback without focus did not change the observed staff member's behavior. Franck and Samaniego (1981) studied the use of video recording in the supervision of teaching assistants and found video recordings resulted in a reduced time commitment on the part of the supervisor since the observational data were, in essence, collected by the subordinate. He also found that the precision and effectiveness of critical commentary was increased, and the need for much of the difficult criticisms was eliminated. The teaching assistants, in Franck's study, "saw" their own problems on the videotapes, and thus, eliminated the need for the supervisor to print out the problem, thus lessening the defensiveness by the teaching assistants. Videotaping

also appears to have much potential for training in the area of nonverbal behavior. Caskey and Trang (1981) reported that video taping increased the viewer's understanding of both the overt and covert elements of the messages being conveyed. Consequently, the use of video recordings allowed the supervisor and the trainee to analyze nonverbal as well as verbal messages.

The use of video recording in training permits observers to observe behavior, to stop the action, and to make a more objective analysis of performance strengths and weaknesses. Video recording also allows observers to analyze covert or nonverbal messages imbedded in the trainee's performance. The practical benefits of using video recording are a reduced time involvement by supervisors, increased precision of critical commentary, and the reduction (due to self analysis) of some of the more traditionally difficult feedback issues.

Most of this section has dealt with strategies for improving the performance of administrators through training. The final element reviewed focuses on an indirect outcome of the training on the supervisor. The impact of the training on the self confidence of the administrator will be discussed.

Self Confidence

In nearly every endeavor, certain situations create hesitancy and anxiety, particularly when first encountered. For teacher supervisors, conducting postobservation conferences typically fall into this category. Blumberg and Amindon (1965), Salek (1975) and Gordon (1977) reported that supervisors find performance evaluation conferences unpleasant. It is not surprising that Blumberg, for example, found that

teachers saw little merit in the supervisory conference, and that Salek found they viewed the activity in an adversarial light. It is understandable then, that the untrained supervisor approaches the postobservation conference with apprehension and anxiety, and that he/she will need a strong self concept to function effectively.

Self-confidence, according to Saunders (1984) is basic to success. How one views oneself is the result of others' interpretations of our behavior and affects our morale and the degree to which we are enthusiastic, courageous, and ambitious. Bandura (1977) reported that expectations of personal efficacy are derived from several sources, personal accomplishments being the most important. He (1978, page 141) further stated that efficacy expectations "determine how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles." The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the more active will be the efforts to persist. It follows then, if we train administrators well in the conduct of postobservation conferences, the self-confidence of the administrators will increase and they will be more willing to participate and persist in this most important supervisory activity.

Even more important is the relationship between self-confidence and performance. Feltz and Mugno (1983), for example, found that a change in self-efficacy, as a result of training, improved performance levels of trainees (in this case novice swimmer learning the back dive) involved in unpleasant tasks. She found a reciprocal effect between self-efficacy and performance. This effect was found to be greatest in the initial stages of training and was characterized by improvements in

self-confidence followed by increased performance which, in turn, produced additional positive changes in self-confidence. The process seemed to produce a cycle much like the commonly known self-fulfilling prophesy. Improved performance influences self-concept which, in turn, influences performance.

Self-confidence, then, seems to be a variable worthy of inclusion in training and research. It appears to influence the amount of energy we allocate to an activity, the extent to which we persist in the activity, and our performance in the activity. In summary, then, it appears that increased self-confidence is critical to improving the skill performance of supervisors in conducting postobservation conferences, particularly if they view them as being unpleasant.

This section has focused on the review of the elements of effective administrator training. Direct instruction and coaching, feedback and goal setting, the use of video recording and the impact of self-confidence on performance were discussed.

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter has focused on two areas: previous research on effective postobservation conferences and elements of effective administrator inservice training. The literature divulges that much is known about the conduct of effective postobservation conferences and the elements of effective adult training.

The present study examines the delivery to supervisors of content related to effective postobservation conferences, the effects of that training on the supervisors themselves, and the effects of training on the supervised teachers.

CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methods and procedures used in analyzing the effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated, approach to training administrators to conduct postobservation conferences. This chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) research design; (2) sample; (3) instrumentation; (4) treatment; and (5) analysis of the data.

Research Design

This study was conducted using the non-equivalent control group pre-test/post-test design. This design was chosen because randomization of subjects was not possible; the lack of ready accessibility to video taping equipment in the more rural areas prevented obtaining subjects for both the experimental and control groups from the general population.

Sample

The data for this investigation were collected from twenty-four teacher supervisors in North Central Iowa. The schools in which these supervisors worked are located in a rural area, where agribusiness is the dominant economic enterprise.

The experimental group supervisors were from one school district of approximately five thousand students. Control group supervisors were from several smaller districts within forty miles of the district of the experimental supervisors.

Each of the participating supervisors had experienced six days of in-service training regarding the elements of effective classroom instruction in the year immediately preceding the study. This training

was designed to give the supervisors skills in identifying and labeling effective teaching behaviors.

All participating supervisors were directly responsible for the supervision and evaluation of teachers. Table 1 presents the distribution of supervisors by job function. Three of the supervisors were district-wide (grades K-12) departmental chairpersons. These departmental chairpersons, while primarily responsible for subject matter content (i.e., mathematics, social studies, language arts), supervised and evaluated teachers in the district in which they were employed. Four supervisors were high school principals or assistant principals. Seven were middle school building administrators and ten were elementary principals. All supervisors had previous experience observing teacher classroom performance and conducting postobservation conferences.

Table 1. Characteristics of supervisors participating in the study

	Departmental Chairpersons	High School Principals	Middle School Principals	Elementary Principals
Experimental Supervisors	3	3	4	4
Control Supervisors	0	1	3	6
Total	3	4	7	10

Instrumentation

Several survey instruments were utilized in the study. Instruments with previously established validity and reliability were used to measure:

(1) the supervisor's perception of the conferences effect on changing teacher behavior; (2) the teacher's perception of conference climate; (3) the teacher's perception of the conference conducting skills of the supervisor; and (4) the teacher's perception of the conferences effect on changing their teaching behavior. Other instruments were developed by the researcher to measure: (1) the supervisor's confidence in his/her conference conducting skills and (2) independent rater's perception of the supervisor's conference conducting skills. Following are descriptions of instruments which were developed prior to this study.

Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory

Spencer (1985) developed this instrument to measure principal perceptions of effectiveness of a just completed postobservation conference. The instrument measured supervisor responses on a scale from 1, "strongly disagree" to 4, "strongly agree", to six statements regarding the extent to which they thought the conference contributed to the professional growth of the teacher, gave the teacher the opportunity to express feelings and opinions, helped the teacher learn about his/her teaching behavior, was a real exchange of ideas, made the teacher think about changing his/her teaching behavior and, made the teacher want to change his/her teaching behavior. Total scores from the instrument were then aggregated, higher scores indicating more effective conferences. Spencer reported reliability for this instrument using the coefficient alpha which produced a coefficient of .65. The coefficient alpha was used in the present study and produced a coefficient of .69 on the pre-test and .67 on the post-test. This instrument is found in Appendix D.

Impact Message Inventory

The Impact Message Inventory (IMI) was developed by Kiesler (1979) to measure affective, behavioral, and cognitive reactions of one person to another following a just-completed interaction with the other. The original IMI, as developed by Kiesler, contained fifteen interpersonal subscales: detached, affiliative, dominant, agreeable, competitive, inhibited, submissive, succorant, abrasive, deferent, hostile, mistrusting, sociable, exhibitionistic, and nurturant. Westerberg (1983) submitted these fifteen subscales to a panel of five Iowa State University education professors identified six subscales which, in their judgement, would reflect a teacher's perception of the climate of a just-completed postobservation conference with his/her principal. Three of the subscales, affiliative, agreeable, and nurturant, reflected positive dealings and three subscales, dominant, hostile, and mistrusting, reflected negative feelings.

Spencer (1985) reported use of the adapted IMI. Spencer combined subscales to represent the dichotomy of open and closed climate. The agreement, nuturant, and affilative subscales were combined to represent and open climate and the dominant, hostile and mistrusting subscales were combined to represent a closed climate. Spencer reported reliability, using the coefficient alpha of .91 of the open climate scale and .94 for the closed climate scale.

The present study utilized the adapted IMI which consists of six items per each of the six subscales for a total of thirty-six items. Subject responses were coded on a four point scale with high scores indicating the perception of a more open climate and low scores indicated

the perception of a more closed climate. High scores on the Open Climate subscale would indicate that the teacher perceived the climate of the just-completed conference to be more open and less closed. An open climate could be characterized by a supervisor who shows liking, warmth, and friendship to the teacher and is cooperative, helpful, considerate, sympathetic, and is one who gives helpful advise to the teacher. The closed climate would be characterized by a supervisor who leads, directs, controls, criticized, ridicules, punishes, and doubts or suspects the attitudes, feelings, and intentions of the teacher. Alpha coefficients were generated for the present study and are shown in Table 2. The instrument is found in Appendix E.

Table 2. Alpha coefficient reliabilities of open and closed subscales of the Impact Message Inventory

Impact Message Inventory	Pretest	Posttest
Open Climate Subscale	.74	.78
Closed Climate Subscale	.55	.89

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey

Spencer (1985) developed the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey to measure three variables:

1. Pedagogical Structuring Moves - The amount of structure used in the conference, including stating the conference purpose, using probing questions, pausing, reflecting, summarizing main points, discussing areas for improvement, and setting goals for improvement.

2. Humanistic Qualities - The degree to which the supervisor was supportive and exhibited qualities such as empathy, praise, encouragement, acceptance of teacher ideas, etc.
3. Directive Behavior - The extent to which the principal dominated the conference discussion and decisions.

The inventory consists of twenty-four items which require the subject to respond to a semantic differential scale of one, low effectiveness, to seven, high effectiveness. One item, for example, requires the subject to respond on a scale of one, "during the conference the principal gave general feedback," to seven "during the conference the principal gave specific feedback." This instrument is found in Appendix F.

Spencer reported a reliability coefficient, using the coefficient alpha of .66. Using the coefficient alpha, reliability coefficients for the present study were computed at .94 for the pre-test and .84 for the post-test.

Subscale coefficients were also computed and they may be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Alpha coefficient reliabilities of subscales of the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory	Pretest	Posttest
Pedagogical Structuring Moves Subscale	.88	.67
Humanistic Qualities Subscale	.87	.89
Directive Behavior Subscale	.68	.46

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory

This instrument was developed by Spencer (1985) to measure the perception of teachers regarding the effectiveness of the postobservation conference. Spencer reported a coefficient alpha reliability of .54. The instrument is comparable to the supervisor conference effectiveness inventory in that the teacher is asked to respond on a four point scale from one, "strongly disagreee," to four, "strongly agree." Using that scale, teachers were asked to indicate their level of agreement relative to the conference contributing to their professional growth, allowing opportunities to express feelings, learn about teaching behavior, participate in a real exchange of ideas, think about changing teaching behaviors, or being made to want to change teaching behaviors. Coefficient alpha reliabilities were computed for the present study resulting in a .76 for the pre-test administration of the instrument and a .58 for the post-test administration of the instrument. This instrument is found in Appendix G.

Two instruments were specifically designed for use in this study. The Supervisor Pre-conference Survey and the Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory were developed and field tested at Iowa State University for use in this study.

The instruments specifically developed for this study were designed after a thorough examination of literature. Select Iowa State University staff members, and other with demonstrated expertise in teacher evaluation, consulted with the researcher in their development. The instruments were field tested in graduate classes at Iowa State University. Following the field tests, necessary modifications were made.

Supervisor Preconference Survey

The Supervisor Preconference Survey was developed to assess the supervisor's feelings of confidence, or perceived self efficacy, in his/her skill at conducting postobservation conferences. The seven item survey asked supervisors to respond on a seven point semantic differential scale their assessment of their skill in conducting elements of postobservation conferences. For example, in response to an item requesting that the supervisor assess his/her skill in ending or closing supervisory conference, the supervisor could respond on a continuum from one, "no skill," to seven, "well-developed skill." The Supervisor Preconference Survey may be seen in Appendix H.

Reliability coefficients, using the alpha coefficient computation, were computed for both the pre-test and the post-test. The pre-test alpha coefficient was computed to be .68 and the post-test alpha coefficient was computed to be .80.

Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory

In order to analyze experimental group pre-test and post-test videotapes, the Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory was developed. The instrument consisted of thirteen items which were clustered to form five major components of postobservation conferences. The components were structure of the conference, climate of the conference, probing, goal setting, and data presentation.

A four member team, one Iowa State University professor and three Iowa State University graduate students, were trained to use the Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory to independently rate pretest and posttest experimental group videotapes. The raters met on two occasions

to view videotapes of supervisors conducting postobservation conferences unrelated to this study. The raters used the Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory to rate the performance of the supervisors on these nonrelated tapes. The raters then discussed their ratings with each other to encourage less variability in the ratings among the raters. Following this training, the study videotapes were independently rated by each rater and were unaware of others' ratings or of the pretest or posttest nature of the videotapes they were rating. Inter-rater reliability was calculated using the Pearson correlation. Table 4 shows the correlations among the raters. The average pre-test correlation among raters was calculated to be .61. The average post-test correlation among raters was calculated to be .50. The Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory may be found in Appendix I.

Table 4. Correlation among videotape raters using the Conference Analysis/Rating Inventory

	Rater 2	Rater 3	Rater 4
Rater 1	(.66) .45	(.58) .75	(.65) .68
Rater 2		(.54) .44	(.54) .21
Rater 3			(.70) .44

(.XX) = Pretest .XX = Posttest
Average Pretest Correlation = .61
Average Posttest Correlation = .50

Treatment

Permission to conduct the study was secured from the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research in August,

1983. Supervisory participants in the study were selected from a pool of north central Iowa administrators who had previously completed a one year inservice program designed to increase their skill in identifying effective teaching behavior in the classroom. This area-wide training was conducted on-site at Northern Trails Area Education Agency, an intermediate education agency, by staff members from the University of California at Los Angeles and focused on the elements of effective instruction. All supervisory participants in the present study had participated in a minimum of seventy-two hours of such instruction. In early September, 1983, forty-five principals were contacted by telephone in order to ascertain their interest in participating in the study. Supervisors indicating an interest in the study were sent a packet of information detailing the elements of the study. Due to a limited number of video recorders needed for video taping the experimental group, it was decided to assign all Mason City, Iowa, administrators to the experimental group and all other supervisors to the control group. Sixteen of twenty-three eligible Mason City administrators chose to participate in the study and were assigned to the experimental group. Two Mason City administrators failed to complete the survey instruments and the post-test video taping and were eliminated from the study. The final number of supervisors included in the experimental group was fourteen. Twelve of twenty-two eligible supervisors from outside of Mason City chose to participate in the study and were assigned to the control group. Two control group supervisors failed to return study instruments and were eliminated from the study. The final number of supervisors in the control group was ten.

Following the supervisors' agreement to participate in the study, the study evolved in four phases: selection of participating teacher, collection of pre-test data, training cycle, and collection of post-test data. The phases were somewhat different for the experimental and control groups and therefore are explained separately.

Experimental Group

PHASE ONE - Selection of Teacher Participants

Experimental group supervisors who elected to participate in the study were required to recruit two teachers to participate in the study with them. The supervisors were asked to solicit volunteers to participate in the study from teachers whom they supervised. The supervisors were encouraged to select this teacher, called the study teacher, from teachers in their building with less than five years of teaching experience. In buildings where no teachers had less than five years experience, supervisors were asked to select a teacher with the least teaching experience. The study design required that the supervisors practice learning the conference conducting techniques in settings as realistic as possible, therefore they used actual postobservation conferences with teachers in their practicing efforts. A problem with that arrangement was that the teacher being "practiced on" may have learned the intent of the training and therefore contamination of the post-test data was possible. This factor was controlled through random assignment of one of the volunteer teachers as "study teacher" and the other as "guided practice teacher." The supervisor observed and conducted a postobservation conference with the "study teacher" prior to the training of supervisors and following the completion of the training.

The supervisor observed and conducted postobservation conferences with the "guided practice teacher" as a part of the practice sessions associated with the training cycles.

PHASE TWO - Collection of Pre-Test Data

Prior to September 15, 1983, the supervisors conducted classroom observations of their "study teachers." Prior to the subsequent postobservation conference, the supervisor was asked to complete the Supervisor Preconference Survey. The supervisor then conducted the postobservation conference, which was videotaped, and following the conference, the supervisor completed the Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory and the study teacher completed the Impact Message Inventory and the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory and the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey.

PHASE THREE - Training Cycle

The experimental group participated in three training cycles. Each training cycle consisted of a half-day group instruction session conducted by Dr. Jim Sweeney, an Iowa State University professor. A few days after the group instruction the supervisor practiced the skills learned in the group instruction session by observing and conducting a videotaped conference with their "practice teacher." Curing the next few weeks this was followed by a peer group coaching session in which the supervisor, and two colleagues, viewed and analyzed the practice videotape. The following explains each of these components in more detail.

The group instruction sessions were held on a monthly basis beginning in mid-September, 1983. Other sessions followed in mid-October and mid-November. The content of these sessions was as follows:

September Session:

Comprehensive training in all phases of conference conducting, such as: planning, climate, opening and closing the conference, etc.

October Session:

Indepth training focusing on the specific components of conferencing, such as: probing, questioning, spinning up receptivity, goal setting, etc.

November Session:

More indepth training focusing on the specific components of conference conducting, similar to that dealt with in the October session. Several practice tapes were also critiqued in the November large group session.

Soon after the group instruction session, each supervisor observed their "guided practice teacher" in the classroom and conducted a postobservation conference with that teacher, applying the skills and techniques learned in the group instruction session. This conference was videotaped. The supervisor then critiqued his/her videotape using the conference critique sheet (Appendix C) in preparation for the peer group coaching session. The peer group coaching session was designed to provide the experimental group supervisors an opportunity to view and analyze the videotapes of themselves and their colleagues conducting conferences in which they applied the techniques learned in the group instruction sessions. The peer groups, usually triads, were formed after each group instruction session. Members of each peer group arranged to meet the other members of his/her group following the completion of each member's

videotaped practice conference. Each group used the steps in the Peer Group Training Cycle Handout (Appendix C). Each peer group member was then asked to list effective conferencing techniques identified by the group and to list no more than two areas for improvement. Following this peer group session, each supervisor was asked to complete the Peer Group Report Form (Appendix C) and submit it to the researcher. On the form, the supervisor was asked to list effective conference techniques they used in the practice conference, no more than two possible areas for improvement and set a personal goal for improvement.

This training cycle of group instruction, videotaped postobservation conference, and small group coaching was repeated three times during the study. Post-test data were collected beginning in mid-December, 1983, following the third training cycle.

PHASE FOUR - Collection of Post-Test Data

When the final training cycle was completed, the supervisor once again observed their study teacher's classroom performance and conducted a videotaped postobservation conference. Prior to the conference the supervisor completed the Supervisor Pre-Conference Survey and following the conference the supervisor completed the Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory. The study teacher, following the conference, completed the Impact Message Inventory and the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory and Survey.

Control Group

The procedures for the control group also included four phases.

PHASE ONE - Selection of Teacher

Control group supervisors were required to recruit one volunteer, from the teachers whom they supervised, to participate with them in the study. They were encouraged to recruit a volunteer with less than four years of teaching experience.

PHASE TWO - Collection of Pre-Test Data

Control group supervisors observed their participating teacher in the classroom and followed up with a postobservation conference. Prior to the conference, the control group supervisor completed the Supervisor Pre-Conference Survey and following the conference the supervisor completed the Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory. The participating teacher, following the conference, completed the Impact Message Inventory and the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory and Survey.

PHASE THREE - Training

Control group supervisors participated in a half-day training session in mid-September, 1983. The content of that session involved comprehensive training in all phases of conferencing, such as planning, climate, opening and closing the conference, probing, questioning, spinning up receptivity, and goal setting. The information was presented in lecture format. There was no follow-up contact with the control group supervisor relative to the training information.

PHASE FOUR - Collection of Post-Test Data

In mid-December, 1983, control group supervisors were sent packets of information relative to collection of post-test data. The supervisors again observed their study teacher, and conducted a postobservation conference following their observation. Prior to that conference, the

supervisor completed the Supervisor Pre-Conference Survey and following the conference the supervisor completed the Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory and the teacher completed the Impact Message Inventory and the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory and Survey.

Analysis of Data

The statistical analysis of data was performed by the Iowa State University Computational Center which used SPSS-X. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) were computed to examine the relative value of study variables. The t-test was used to determine significant differences between control and experimental groups and between the pre-test and post-test videotape rating.

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of the investigation of the Coaching and Counseling for Conferencing Improvement (CCCI) model on: 1) effectiveness ratings of conferences conducted by supervisors; 2) supervisor perceptions of self confidence in conducting a conference and the impact of the conference for potential change of teacher behavior; and 3) teachers' perceptions of conference climate, the supervisors' skill in conducting the conference, and the degree to which the classroom teaching behavior changes as a result of the conference. The six operational hypotheses which provided focus for this study are in Chapter I. They provided the framework for the six null hypotheses tested for significance at the .05 level. All but Hypothesis 4 are directional hypotheses and were tested using the one-tailed test. Hypothesis 4 is nondirectional and was tested using a two-tailed test. The equivalency checks for Hypotheses 2-6 were performed using two-tailed t-tests. Pooled or separate independent t-tests were used to analyze differences between experimental and control groups and paired t-tests were used to test treatment effects on the experimental group.

Supervisor Effectiveness/Raters

Supervisors in the experimental group, as assessed by trained raters, were expected to increase their effectiveness in conducting postobservation conferences as a result of the training. The paired t-test was used to test the null hypothesis. The pretest and posttest

composite mean scores were compared for mean difference to determine the treatment effects on the experimental group.

Ho_1: Supervisors trained via CCCI will receive equal to or significantly lower posttest ratings in conference effectiveness than pretest ratings as assessed on criterion-based measures of conference effectiveness by trained raters.

The pretest mean for the fourteen CCCI supervisors, as shown in Table 5, indicates that their conference performance prior to training was 1.76, somewhat less than effective. The posttest mean score for those same supervisors falls above the midpoint of the effective rating category.

Table 5 shows a significant increase in the conference effectiveness of the supervisors after the CCCI training as assessed by the trained raters. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

Table 5. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of CCCI supervisors' overall conference effectiveness rating as assessed by trained raters

Conference Analysis/ Rating Inventory	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	t-value
Experimental Group Supervisors, N=14	1.764	0.385	2.300	0.471	5.46***

Scale: 0=not present, 1=ineffective, 2-effective, 3-highly effective

*** $p<0.001$.

It is important to note that the average posttest correlation between the raters was calculated to be .50. Therefore, caution should be exercised in interpreting these results.

Supervisor Self Confidence

Prior to conducting each postobservation conference used in collecting data for this study, experimental and control group supervisors were asked to complete the Supervisor Pre-Conference Survey which measured their perceptions of self efficacy relative to their ability to conduct the conferences. Since an equivalency check, the t-test run on pretest scores, showed no significant difference between experimental and control groups prior to training ($t(22) = 0.91$), the t-test was used to test the null hypothesis using the composite mean scores on posttest data.

Ho_2: Supervisors trained via CCCI will rate themselves equal to or significantly lower regarding their self confidence in their ability to conduct postobservation conferences than supervisors trained via direct instruction only, as measured by posttest assessments of supervisor confidence.

Table 6 presents the results of the Supervisor Pre-Conference Survey on which supervisors were asked to rate their confidence level prior to each conference. The pretest means of both experimental and control groups fell at the midpoint of the scale indicating that the supervisors were somewhat confident in their ability to conduct postobservation conferences prior to training. The difference in means from pretest to posttest indicates both groups became significantly more self confident in their conference conducting ability after training. The experimental group rated themselves significantly more confident and there was less variability in their ratings as well. There was a significant difference between groups, therefore, Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Teacher Growth-Perception of Supervisors

Supervisors trained via CCCI were expected to indicate that the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth was greater after training than supervisors who had received only direct instruction in conference conducting skills. The null hypothosis was tested using the t-test procedure comparing the means of the experimental and control groups for differences to determine the treatment effects.

Table 6. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of experimental and control group supervisors' perception of self confidence between and within groups

Supervisors Preconference Survey	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	Within Group t-value
Experimental Group Supervisors N=14	4.153	0.650	5.714	0.317	7.83***
Control Group Supervisors N=10	4.414	0.745	5.043	0.716	3.26**
Between Groups t-value	0.91		2.78**		

Scale: 1-not confident, 4-somewhat confident, 7-extremely confident

*** $p<0.001$.
** $p<0.01$.

Ho_3: Supervisors trained via CCCI will receive equal to or significantly lower posttest ratings of their perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth than supervisors trained via direct instruction only.

Table 7 presents data for testing the third hypothesis. The equivalency check on pretest mean scores revealed a significant difference between the experimental and control groups prior to the

training; the experimental group rated their perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth significantly lower than the control group prior to the training. The t-value (1.63) computed using posttest scores was not significant at the .05 level.

Table 7. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of experimental and control group supervisors' perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth between and within groups

Supervisors Effectiveness Inventory	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	Within Group t-value
Experimental Group Supervisors N=14	2.810	0.252	3.321	0.179	7.22***
Control Group Supervisors N=10	3.133	0.407	3.100	0.402	0.25
Between Groups t-value	-2.41*		1.63		

Scale: 1=did not contribute to growth, to 4=contributed very much to growth

*** $p<0.001$.
* $p<0.05$.

Paired t-tests were run to determine changes within experimental and control groups. There was no significant change between the control group pretest mean score and posttest mean score. The experimental group, however, exhibited a highly significant, positive change from pretest to posttest. They perceived themselves as having much more impact on potential teacher growth. Since these supervisors viewed themselves as less skilled than the control group prior to the training,

these results suggest that the training may have been effective for them and gives indirect support to the third hypothesis.

Conference Climate

Teachers being supervised by CCCI supervisors were expected to rate the conference climate differently on the Impact Message Inventory, than teachers being supervised by supervisors who were trained via direct instruction only.

Ho_4: There will be no difference in the perception of conference climate between teachers being supervised by CCCI supervisors and teachers being supervised by supervisors trained via direct instruction only.

The high ratings (3.0+ on a 4 point scale) on the open subscale of the instrument and low ratings (<1.3) on the closed subscale by both experimental and control group teachers suggests they perceived the climate of the conferences in which they participated to be much more open than closed.

As can be seen in Table 8, the equivalency check on pretest mean scores revealed no significant differences between experimental and control groups on either the open or closed subscales of the Impact Message Inventory. Therefore, the t-test was used to test the null hypothesis using the composite mean scores on posttest data. Since the posttest differences were not statistically significant, Hypothesis 4 was not rejected.

Supervisor Skill-Perception of Teachers

The fifth hypothesis was designed to measure teachers' perceptions of the skill of their supervisor in conducting postobservation conferences. The teachers were asked to indicate their perceptions of the conference conducting skills of their supervisors by responding to the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey.

Ho_5: Supervisors trained via CCCI will receive equal to or significantly lower posttest ratings on teachers' perceptions of their conference conducting skills than supervisors trained via direct instruction only.

The equivalency check run on pretest means, as seen in Table 9, revealed no significant differences between the experimental and control group teachers on the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey. Therefore, the t-test was used to test the null hypothesis using the composite mean scores on posttest data. Since the difference was statistically significant in favor of the experimental group, Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

The pretest mean of experimental teachers' responses on the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey was high, 5.47 on a 7 point scale. Therefore, a paired t-test was run to analyze the significance of the gain in mean scores within the experimental group. The difference of .46 points is significant beyond the one percent level, indicating highly significant growth from pretest to posttest.

Table 10 shows the analysis of mean scores of the three components of supervisors' skill measured by the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey. No significant differences were seen between groups on the pedagogical structuring moves and directive behavior subscales. On the

Table 8. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of experimental and control group teachers' perceptions of conference climate

Impact Message Inventory	Open Subscale				
	Pretest		Posttest		Within Group
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Experimental Group Supervisors N=14	3.258	0.285	3.318	0.288	-0.87
Control Group Supervisors N=10	3.210	0.326	3.144	0.309	0.72
Between Group t-value	0.37		1.30		

Scale: 1=trait not at all evident, to 4=trait very much evident

Closed Subscale				
Pretest		Posttest		Within Group
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-value
1.292	0.176	1.271	0.481	0.17
1.244	0.221	1.261	0.242	-0.32
0.57		0.06		

Table 9. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of experimental and control group teachers' perceptions of the conference conducting skills of their supervisors between and within groups

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.	Within Group t-value
Experimental Group Teachers N=14	5.468	0.666	5.925	0.375	2.96**
Control Group Teachers N=10	5.500	0.702	5.523	0.613	
Between Groups t-value	0.11		2.00*		

Scale: 1=poor skill, to 4=average skill, to 7=exemplary skill

** $p<0.01$.
* $p<0.05$.

humanistic qualities subscale, however, the posttest difference between the experimental and control group was statistically significant. Examination of within group change shows no significant change on any subscale for the control group, while significant changes were noted in all three subscales for the experimental group.

Teacher Growth-Perceptions of Teachers

Following conferences with their supervisor, teachers were asked to respond to questions about how the conference contributed to their professional growth. T-tests run on pretest scores showed no significant difference between the experimental and control groups on the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory therefore, the t-test procedure for comparison of group differences on the posttest was used.

The null hypothesis was tested using the composite mean scores on posttest data for each group.

Ho_6: Supervisors trained via CCCI will be rated equal to or significantly lower on posttest ratings on teachers' perceptions regarding the impact of the conference on their teaching behavior than teachers' perceptions of supervisors trained via direct instruction only.

The pretest means (Experimental Group = 2.86, Control Group = 3.03) indicate teachers in both groups felt that conferences impacted favorably on their teaching behavior prior to the training. The posttest means showed a slight increase in the strength of the teacher's perception of the conference impact on their teaching behavior. As shown in Table 11, however, the posttest difference between groups means was not significant at the five percent level. Therefore, Hypothesis 6 cannot be rejected.

Table 10. Analysis of Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey subscale mean scores by experimental and control group teachers

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey	Pedagogical Structuring Moves				
	Pretest		Posttest		Within Group
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-value
Experimental Group Supervisors N=14	5.611	0.784	6.022	0.506	2.48*
Control Group Supervisors N=10	5.706	0.800	5.653	0.719	0.31
Between Groups t-value	-0.29		1.39		

Scale: 1=negative perception, to 7=positive perception

** $p<0.01$.
* $p<0.05$.

Humanistic Qualities					Directive Behavior				
Pretest		Posttest		Within Group	Pretest		Posttest		Within Group
Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-value	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-value
6.060	0.598	6.571	0.422	2.81**	3.921	1.206	4.593	0.876	2.56*
5.950	1.063	5.817	0.914	0.70	4.360	0.908	4.430	0.916	0.25
0.29		2.73**			-1.02		0.44		

Table 11. Analysis of pretest and posttest mean scores of experimental and control group teachers' perceptions of the impact of the conference on their willingness to change their teaching behaviors

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Posttest Mean	Posttest S.D.
Experimental Group Supervisors N=14	2.857	0.402	2.987	0.276
Control Group Supervisors N=10	3.033	0.422	3.222	0.391
Between Groups t-value	-0.104		-1.66	

Scale: 1=no impact, to 4=much impact

CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to examine the effectiveness of a systematic, media facilitated, approach for training supervisors to conduct effective postobservation conferences. In this chapter, conclusions from the study based on an analysis of the data are reported, and recommendations for further research are made. The chapter has been organized into two sections: 1) summary and conclusions, and 2) recommendations for further research.

Summary and Conclusions

Findings

A summary of the findings based on data gathered in the fall of 1983 from teachers and supervisors regarding the conference conducting skills of the supervisor follows:

1. Supervisors in the experimental group increased their effectiveness in conducting postobservation conferences as a result of the training according to trained raters.

2. Experimental group and control group supervisors increased their self confidence levels as a result of training. The gains made by experimental group supervisors, however, were significantly greater than that of the control group supervisors.

3. There was no significant difference between the posttest mean scores of the experimental and control groups relative to their perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth. The control group, however, mean score on the pretest was significantly higher than that of the experimental group. The experimental group, then, had to show significant growth from pretest to posttest in order

to catch up to the control group in mean score. This indirect evidence supports the notion that the CCCI training resulted in experimental group supervisors changing significantly in their perceptions of the positive impact of the conference on potential changes in teacher behavior.

4. The conference climate did not change according to the perception of teachers in both the experimental and control groups.

5. Supervisors trained via CCCI were perceived as more effective in conducting conferences than were control group supervisors.

6. Potential for changing teacher behavior as a result of the conference was not affected by the training as reported by the teachers.

Discussion

The following will amplify on the above findings and conclusions will be drawn relative to each finding. In discussing the ratings of the videotapes, consideration must be given to the relatively low correlations between the raters of the supervisors' conference conducting skills. Perhaps the low correlations are a function of the difficulty in consistently judging complex behaviors, such as a supervisor's skill in conducting a postobservation conference. In any case, the positive difference between the pretest mean score and posttest mean score of 0.54 indicates potential for the training of supervisors as the performance level of the supervisors prior to training was rated below the midpoint of the rating scale and, following the training, the performance level was rated above the scale midpoint.

The most significant change as a result of training came in the supervisors' perception of self confidence. The analysis of data showed both groups increased in self confidence as a result of their particular training model. However, the CCCI group grew more than one and one-half points on a seven point scale, from the somewhat confident level to the very confident level. The control group grew approximately one-half point only as a result of their training. Given the relationship between perceived self efficacy and the persistence with which one will face obstacles, as reported by Bandura (1978), this significant rise in the self confidence level of supervisors has implications for how these supervisors might approach the task of conducting postobservation conferences. It would seem that supervisors would approach conferences with much less hesitancy and anxiety as a result of CCCI type training.

It is is unclear whether or not CCCI trained supervisors showed greater gain in their perceptions of the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth following their training model than did control group supervisors as the groups were demonstrably different in their perceptions prior to training. Differences between the groups are obvious, however, when one compares the gains within each group. The control group lowered their mean score somewhat following their model of training while the experimental group gained more than one-half point on the four point scale as a result of their training. This significant gain by the experimental group would certainly suggest that the training was effective in improving the perceptions of the CCCI supervisors.

The conference climate, as perceived by teachers, did not change for either group as a result of their particular training model. The

teachers rated both groups high on the open subscale of the Impact Message Inventory indicating that they felt trust and closeness with their supervisor prior to the training. This closeness and trust was also seen on the teachers' responses to the humanistic quality subscale of the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey. The teachers' scores on that subscale were also high, approximately 6 on a 7 point scale. On the humanistic quality subscale, however, supervisors were perceived to gain in their supportiveness of the teacher as a result of the CCCI training. No such gain was seen on the teachers' responses to the Impact Message Inventory. In trying to explain this difference in findings, the individual instrument items were examined. The Impact Message Inventory requires the respondent to react to statements of a more abstract nature, such as "the principal made me feel...appreciated...loved...that I could join in the activities...etc." The Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey, on the other hand, requires the respondent to react to slightly more concrete statements, such as "the principal praised or commended frequently...gave me encouragement...etc." A more detailed analysis of the climate issue is beyond the scope of this study.

Even though there is indirect evidence to support significant change by the CCCI supervisors in their perception of how the postobservation conferences impacted on teacher growth, the teachers in both groups indicated no such change in their perceptions of the conference impact on their willingness to change teaching behaviors. Perhaps, as noted by Ivancevich (1982), the motivation to change "...is such an internal process that it cannot be expressed in a self report

form as easily as other factors." Another possibility which may explain why teachers did not perceive there to be an impact on their potential growth may be found in the fact that all teacher participants in the study were volunteers. Generally, one would find that volunteers in a study such as this would find see themselves in a positive light. If that is the case in this study, then these volunteers may have felt that they were already very good teachers and thus needed very little improvement. The fact that the supervisors felt that the teacher, as a result of the conference, was more willing to change is a positive sign that the postobservation conferences may contribute to instructional improvement if conducted by skilled supervisors.

It is interesting to note that teachers perceived the conference conducting skills of both the CCCI supervisors and the direct instruction only supervisors as being well above average prior to their training. The perception of teachers relative to the significant growth in skill of the CCCI group does lend support to findings from the trained videotape raters that, in fact, the skill of the supervisors to conduct conferences can be improved via appropriate training.

The findings of this study clearly support the advantages of the CCCI training over the "one shot" direct instruction only model of training. The significant findings regarding the conference conducting skill of the supervisor, the supervisor's confidence in their abilities, and the supervisor's own perception of the willingness of the teacher to change as a result of the conference support that conclusion.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are provided for those considering a similar research project.

1. The sample size of the groups was extremely small (experimental = 14, control = 10). Statistical analyses are difficult, if not at times impossible, with such a restricted sample size. Sample size should be increased in any replication effort.

2. A more precise study of conference climate and the impact of supervisor training on improving climate is warranted.

3. More intensive training of the videotape raters or development of more precise rating procedures should be considered. The difficulty in observing and rating the skills being studied requires more indepth training and practice for raters or improved rating procedures in order to increase the reliability with which they perform the rating task.

4. Several of the instruments used four point Likert scales. The compactness of those scales may have limited the preciseness of the respondent's ratings. It is suggested that all instruments utilize the seven point scale.

5. The conference conducting skill of supervisors used in the present study were rated highly by teachers prior to the training. It is suggested that a replication of the study be done using supervisors who are less skilled in order to study the impact of the model on supervisors exhibiting a full range of skill.

6. The teachers used in the present study were all volunteers. Teachers who felt that their teaching skills were inadequate may not have volunteered for the study. Therefore, the instrument used to

measure the impact of the conference on potential teacher growth might need to be modified to ask if the conference helped them maintain their high level of performance rather than simply ask if they would be willing to change as a result of the conference.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, Keith A.; and Gall, Meridith D. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers, Preservice and Inservice. New York: Longman, 1980.

Bailey, Gerald. "Learning How to Self-Critique Using Audiotape and Videotape in Teacher Self-Assessment." Educational Technology 21, (February 1981): 41-5.

Bandura, A. "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change." Advances in Behavior Research and Therapy 1 (1978): 139-161.

Bandura, A.; Adams, N. E.; and Beyer, S. "Cognitive Processes Mediating Behavioral Change." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35 (1977): 125-139.

Barth, Roland S. "How to Ensure an Effective Principalship." The National Elementary Principal 59 (March 1980): 10-20.

Biles, Cheryl F. "Determining the Effectiveness of Administrator In-service." Thrust for Educational Leadership 8 (March 1979): 19-21.

Blumberg, Arthur. "Supervisor-Teacher Relationships: A Look at the Supervisory Conference." Administrator's Notebook 19 (September 1970): 1-4.

Blumberg, Arthur; and Amindon, Edward. "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Interaction." Administrator's Notebook 14 (September 1965): 1-4.

Borg, Walter R.; and Gall, Meridith D. Educational Research. New York: Longman Inc., 1979.

Brandt, Ron. "On Improving Teacher Effectiveness: A Conversation with David Berliner." Educational Leadership 40 (October 1982): 12-4.

Camman, C. "Feedback Systems for Teachers." In J. L. Bess (Ed.), Motivating Professors to Teach Effectively. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Caskey, Owen L.; and Trang, Myron. "Videotape in Instructional Improvement: Using Interpersonal Process Recall." Educational Technology 20 (October 1981): 44-47.

Cawelti, Gordon. "Training for Effective School Administrators." Educational Leadership 39 (February 1982): 324-9.

Elkins, Aaron. "Some Views on Management Training." Personnel Journal 56 (June 1977): 305-306, 311.

Feltz, Deborah L.; and Mugno, Denise A. "A Replication of the Path Analysis of the Causal Elements in Bandura's Theory of Self Efficacy and the Influence of Autonomic Perceptions." Journal of Sports Psychology 5 (June 1983): 263-277.

Fielding, Glen D.; and Schalock, H. Del. Promoting the Professional Development of Teachers and Administrators. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1985.

Franck, Marion R.; and Samaniego, Fabian A. "The Supervision of Teaching Assistants: A New Use of Videotape." The Modern Language Journal 65 (Autumn 1981): 273-80.

Fuller, Frances F.; and Manning, Brad A. "Self Confrontation Reviewed." Review of Educational Research 43 (1973): 493-496.

Gall, Meridith D.; and Renchler, Ronald S. Effective Staff Development for Teachers. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1985.

Gordon, Thomas. Leadership Effectiveness Training. New York: Wyden Books, 1977.

Hinkle, Dennis E.; Jurs, Stephen G.; and Wiersma, William. Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1979.

Holly, M. L. "Teachers' Views on Inservice Training." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (1982): 417-18.

Hung, J. H.; and Rosenthal, T. L. "Therapeutic Videotaped Playback." In Videotherapy in Mental Health, p. 37. Edited by J. L. Fryear and B. Fleshman. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1981.

Hunter, Madeline. Mastery Teaching. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications, 1982.

Ivancevich, John M. "Subordinates' Reactions to Performance Appraisal Interviews: A Test of Feedback and Goal Setting Techniques." Journal of Applied Psychology 67 (October 1982): 581-587.

Joyce, Bruce; and Showers, Beverly. "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980): 379-85.

Joyce, Bruce; and Showers, Beverly. "The Coaching of Teaching." Educational Leadership 40 (October 1982): 4-10.

Kiesler, Donald J. Manual for the Impact Message Inventory. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University, 1979.

Lefton, R. E.; Buzzota, V. R.; and Sherberg, Manuel. Improving Productivity Through People Skills. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing, 1981.

Maier, Norman R. F. The Appraisal Interview: Three Basic Appoaches. LaJolla, CA: University Associates, Inc., 1976.

McGeoch, Dorothy M.; and Lindsey, Margaret. "Supervisory Conferences and the Analysis of Teaching." The Study of Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching, 1967.

Meyer, Herbert H.; Kay, Emanuel; and French, Jr., John R. P. "Split Roles in Performance Appraisal." Harvard Business Review 43 (January-February 1965): 123-9.

Moritz, William; and Martin-Reynolds, JoAnne. "Split Screen Videotaping: The Genie in the Bottle." Educational Leadership 37 (February 1980): 396-9.

Ngaiyaye, M. S. W.; and Hanley, J. L. "What Teachers Want From Inservice Education." North Central Association Quarterly 53 (1978): 305-311.

Olivero, James L. "Principals and Their Inservice Needs." Educational Leadership 39 (February 1982): 340-4.

Perlberg, Arye. "When Professors Confront Themselves: Towards a Theoretical Conceptualization of Self-Confrontation in Higher Education." Higher Education 12 (December 1983): 633-63.

Salek, Charles J. "Helping Teachers vs. Evaluating Teachers." NASSP Bulletin 59 (September 1975): 34-8.

Saunders, Mauderie. "The Interrelationship of Self Concept and Morale Building." The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin 50-2 (Summer 1984): 28.

Showers, Beverly. Peer Coaching: A Strategy for Facilitating Transfer of Learning. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1984.

Spencer, Karen. "Analysis of Post-Observation Conferences." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1985.

Sullivan, John J., and Walker, Joseph J. "Irritating Habits - How Would Your Teachers Rank You?" NASSP Bulletin 65 (November 1981): 35-7.

Sweeney, Jim. "Improving the Post-Observation Conference." NASSP Bulletin 66 (December, 1982): 38-40.

Tuckman, Bruce. "Feedback and the Change Process." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (January 1976): 341-4.

Wedman, John. "Time Management and Instructional Supervision." Clearing House 55 (March 1982): 297-9.

Westerberg, Timothy R. "The Importance of Classroom Observations to the Supervisory Process." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1983.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with pleasure I thank those individuals whose advice, expertise, and support made this study possible. I am most appreciative of the guidance and support provided me by Dr. Jim Sweeney throughout the study.

I am also indebted to the many Iowa State University staff who have been so helpful during this work, particularly my doctoral committee, Dr. Ross Engel, Dr. Dan Reschly, Dr. Fred Borgen, Dr. Mary Huba, and Dr. Jim Sweeney. A special thanks goes to Dr. Huba for her special assistance with the study data analysis.

A great deal is also owed to the staff in the R.I.S.E. office. Bob Crawford must be singled out for special recognition as he provided expert interface between the computers and me.

Special thanks must also go to my secretary, Joan Gribben, who provided not only technical assistance, but a great deal of moral support as well.

I must also acknowledge the love and support of my family. The moral support of my brothers, Bob and Dick, and my parental equivalents, Erwin, Bob and Bonnie, is much appreciated. A special acknowledgement must go to my mother, Irma Rice Eden, who has been so supportive in all I've attempted. Thanks, Mom!

Last, but not least, none of this would have been possible without the love, encouragement, support, and sacrifice of my immediate family. To Lindsey and Cassie, my precious daughters, thanks for sacrificing your dad while he completed this study. To Becky, my patient and steady wife, thanks for all you've endured.

APPENDIX A: SELECTED SAMPLE OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for willingness to participate in the research to improve postobservation conferences. The purposes and procedures are outlined in three procedure sheets that are included with the packet accompanying this letter. Please refer to those procedure sheets ("Pre-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors," "Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors," and "Post-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors") for details regarding your part in the study. These sheets, along with the "Procedure Sheet for Teachers," will also be helpful as you explain the study to faculty members when you are attempting to secure teacher volunteers for the study.

As you know, it has been only recently that we have begun to develop a clear understanding of which conferencing behaviors of the supervisor will increase the liklihood that teachers will improve their classroom teaching performance. This knowledge, however, creates a special problem for even though we now know something about what works and what doesn't in the conference setting, we know very little about how to effectively transmit what we know to supervisors in the field. There is little empirical data available to confirm the efficacy of any of the present training methodologies. This study is designed to examine supervisor training methodology, specifically as it relates to the training of supervisors in the important area of conducting postobservation conferences. It is hoped that the results of the study will improve the field training of supervisors in conferencing skills and other skills as well.

Please request two volunteer teachers for the study. Two teachers are necessary in order to control the effects of supervisor training as it occurs and to keep the training effects from contaminating the pre and posttest data. Ideally, the volunteers should come from teachers who are new to the profession, or those that are new to your building. The reason for this is that it is these teachers who generally receive the most intensive supervision because of their probationary status. If you find this to be too restrictive in recruiting volunteers, please disregard this suggestion.

You will, throughout the period of the study, be videotaping five postobservation conferences. The first and last of these will be used for data collection and will be returned to me. The second, third and fourth videotaped conferences are for use in critiquing your newly applied conferencing skills, and I am requesting that you erase these conference videotapes as soon as possible after the small group critiquing sessions.

The procedure sheets indicate that you and the "study teacher" will both be required to complete some survey instruments at the time of your conferences. These survey instruments are relatively brief and should take no more that twenty minutes of your time and thirty minutes of the teacher's time.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. The data collected for this study will be aggregated and only a summary of the results will be provided to the study participants.

The dates for the large group sessions with Dr. Jim Sweeney, of Iowa State University, have now been set. Those dates are as follows:

September 15, 1983	Thursday	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI
October 20, 1983	Thursday	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI
November 21, 1983	Monday	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI

Please bring the materials in this packet with you to the first large group session.

If you have questions regarding the study or procedures, please contact me at 423-7249 during working hours, or at 423-2389 at home. Call, too, if you need assistance in arranging videotaping equipment. Once again, thank you for assisting me with this study. I sincerely believe that your help will result in improved training methodology for in-service supervisors.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University

(S)

Dear Colleague:

The time has come to bring to a close the particular phase of my research, that phase you have been participating in, which is being conducted to improve postobservation conferences. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your willingness to participate in my study.

The details for closing out your participation in the study are outlined on the sheet entitled, "Post-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors." You need not refer back to documents provided you at the beginning of the study, as this sheet will give you all needed information.

Please note that the sheet refers to the "study teacher." This is the teacher that you made the first videotaped conference with for the study. The "study teacher" was the one that you had fill out the survey instruments for me following the conference. It is extremely important that you use this same teacher for the final conference, so if you are unsure about who your study teacher is, please call me and I will give you the teacher's name.

The procedure sheets indicate that you and the "study teacher" will both be required to complete some survey instruments at the time of your conferences. These survey instruments are relatively brief and should take no more that twenty minutes of your time and thirty minutes of the teacher's time.

One final note, please complete the final cycle of practice conference/small group feedback/goal-setting before you begin the procedures outlined on the "Post-Training Procedure Sheet."

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. The data collected for this study will be aggregated and only a summary of the results will be provided to the study participants.

If you have questions regarding the study or procedures, please contact me at 423-7249 during working hours, or at 423-2389 at home. Call, too, if you need assistance in arranging videotaping equipment. Once again, thank you for assisting me with this study.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University

(SF)

Supervisor Consent Form

Procedures

The supervisor will be asked to videotape a postobservation conference with a teacher, fill out two survey instruments, participate in the training workshops, videotape another postobservation conference with the same teacher, and fill out an additional two survey instruments. Before each conference the supervisor fill out the "Supervisor Pre-conference Survey". Following each conference, the supervisor will fill out the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory." The conference videotapes and these instruments will be sent directly to the researcher upon their completion.

Purpose

The study is to examine the effects of the postobservation conference and factors that may improve them.

Risks

There are no risks in this study. If one feels uncomfortable participating, he/she may choose not to volunteer.

I, _____, have read and understand the points above. I agree to having the conferences videotaped with the understanding that confidentiality and my anonymity is guaranteed. I understand that the videotapes and the other materials I send in will be coded for research purposes only. I understand that any questions I have regarding this study will be answered by the researcher. I also understand that I can choose not to participate in this study at any time. I further understand that I will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research.

Signed _____

Date _____

Ronald M. Rice, Researcher (S)

Dear Colleague:

Soon your supervisor will be observing your teaching and holding a postobservation conference with you to give you feedback on what he/she observed. It is generally agreed that these conferences are an important element of the supervisory process.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine the effects of postobservation conferences and some of the factors which affect how they are conducted. The ultimate goal of the study is to provide information that will aid supervisors in conducting effective postobservation conferences.

Your supervisor has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to participate as well. If you agree to participate you will be asked to have an upcoming postobservation conference with your supervisor videotaped. Following the conference you will complete two survey instruments which will take no more than thirty minutes of your time. In about three months you will again be asked to videotape a postobservation conference and to complete two survey instruments, again taking no more than thirty minutes to complete.

The videotapes and the survey instruments will be seen and analyzed only by researchers and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity. To insure that the information you record on the survey instruments remains completely confidential, I am providing a self-addressed envelope in which you are to return the materials to me.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to participate you need only inform your supervisor. Should you decide not to participate, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions about the study or procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 423-7249 during the day, or at (515) 423-2389 in the evenings.

Thank you for your consideration. I am confident that those participating in the study will contribute much to assisting supervisors in the conduct of future postobservation conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
(S)

Teacher Consent Form

Procedures

The teacher will be asked to participate in a videotaped postobservation conference with his/her supervisor on two occasions, separated by several months, and to fill out two survey instruments on each occasion. Following each videotaped conference, the teacher will fill out the "Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory" and the "Impact Message Inventory." These instruments will be mailed directly to the researcher upon their completion.

Purpose

The study is to examine the effects of the postobservation conference and factors that may improve them.

Risks

There are no risks in this study. If one feels uncomfortable participating, he/she may choose not to volunteer.

I, _____, have read and understand the points above. I agree to having the conferences videotaped with the understanding that confidentiality and my anonymity is guaranteed. I understand that the materials I send in will be coded for research purposes only. I understand that any questions I have regarding this study will be answered by the researcher. I also understand that I can choose not to participate in this study at any time. I further understand that I will not be revealed in any publication, document, recording, computer data storage, or in any other way which relates to this research.

Signed _____ Date _____

Ronald M. Rice, Researcher (S)

Dear Colleague:

Soon your supervisor will be observing your teaching and holding a postobservation conference with you to give you feedback on what he/she observed. It is generally agreed that these conferences are an important element of the supervisory process.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine the effects of postobservation conferences and some of the factors which affect how they are conducted. The ultimate goal of the study is to provide information that will aid supervisors in conducting effective postobservation conferences.

Your supervisor has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to participate as well. If you agree to participate you will be asked to have three upcoming postobservation conferences with your supervisor videotaped. Following each conference your supervisor and several of his/her colleagues will use the videotape to analyze your supervisor's conferencing behavior. Once this analysis has been completed, the videotape will be erased. The videotapes will be seen and analyzed only by your supervisor and his/her colleagues and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to participate you need only inform your supervisor. Should you decide not to participate, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions about the study or procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 423-7249 during the day, or at (515) 423-2389 in the evenings.

Thank you for your consideration. I am confident that those participating in the study will contribute much to assisting supervisors in the conduct of future postobservation conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
(P)

Dear Colleague:

Soon your supervisor will be observing your teaching and holding a postobservation conference with you to give you feedback on what he/she observed. It is generally agreed that these conferences are an important element of the supervisory process.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine the effects of postobservation conferences and some of the factors which affect how they are conducted. The ultimate goal of the study is to provide information that will aid supervisors in conducting effective postobservation conferences.

Your supervisor has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to participate as well. If you agree to participate you will be asked to have three upcoming postobservation conferences with your supervisor videotaped. Following each conference your supervisor and several of his/her colleagues will use the videotape to analyze your supervisor's conferencing behavior. Once this analysis has been completed, the videotape will be erased. The videotapes will be seen and analyzed only by your supervisor and his/her colleagues and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to participate you need only inform your supervisor. Should you decide not to participate, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions about the study or procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 423-7249 during the day, or at (515) 423-2389 in the evenings.

Thank you for your consideration. I am confident that those participating in the study will contribute much to assisting supervisors in the conduct of future postobservation conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
(P)

Dear Colleague:

Soon your supervisor will be observing your teaching and holding a postobservation conference with you to give you feedback on what he/she observed. It is generally agreed that these conferences are an important element of the supervisory process.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine the effects of postobservation conferences and some of the factors which affect how they are conducted. The ultimate goal of the study is to provide information that will aid supervisors in conducting effective postobservation conferences.

Your supervisor has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to participate as well. If you agree to participate you will be asked to complete two survey instruments, which will take no more than thirty minutes of your time, following the upcoming postobservation conference with your supervisor. In about three months you will again be asked to participate in a postobservation conference and to complete two survey instruments, again taking no more than thirty minutes of your time.

The survey instruments will be seen and analyzed only by researchers and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity. To insure that the information you record on the survey instruments remains completely confidential, I am providing a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which you are to return the materials directly to me.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to participate you need only inform your supervisor. Should you decide not to participate, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions about the study or procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 423-7249 during the day, or at (515) 423-2389 in the evenings.

Thank you for your consideration. I am confident that those participating in the study will contribute much to assisting supervisors in the conduct of future postobservation conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
(C)

Dear Colleague:

Early last fall you and your supervisor agreed to participate in a study I am conducting to examine the effects of postobservation conferences. The ultimate goal of the study is to provide information that will aid supervisors in conducting effective postobservation conferences. I indicated at that time that I would ask your assistance again in a few months. That time has now arrived.

Your supervisor has expressed an interest in continuing in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to continue as well. If you agree to continue your participation you will again be asked to complete the two survey instruments, taking approximately thirty minutes of your time, following an upcoming postobservation conference with your supervisor.

The survey instruments will be seen and analyzed only by researchers and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity. To insure that the information you record on the survey instruments remains completely confidential, I am again providing a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which you are to return the materials directly to me.

Participation is completely voluntary. If you wish to participate you need only inform your supervisor. Should you decide not to participate, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions about the study or procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 423-7249 during the day, or at (515) 423-2389 in the evenings.

Thank you for your consideration. I remain confident that those participating in the study will contribute much to assisting supervisors in the conduct of future postobservation conferences. I look forward to your continued participation in the study.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
(CPO)

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for willingness to participate in the research to improve postobservation conferences and administrator inservice training. The purposes and procedures of the study are outlined in the "Procedure Sheets for Supervisors" that is included with the packet accompanying this letter. Please refer to that procedure sheet for details regarding your part in the study. These sheet, along with the "Procedure Sheet for Teachers," will also be helpful as you explain the study to faculty members when you are attempting to secure teacher volunteers for the study.

As you know, it has been only recently that we have begun to develop a clear understanding of which conferencing behaviors of the supervisor will increase the liklihood that teachers will improve their classroom teaching performance. This knowledge, however, creates a special problem for even though we now know something about what works and what doesn't in the conference setting, we know very little about how to effectively transmit what we know to supervisors in the field. There is little empirical data available to confirm the efficacy of any of the present training methodologies. This study is designed to examine supervisor training methodology, specifically as it relates to the training of supervisors in the important area of conducting postobservation conferences. It is hoped that the results of the study will improve the field training of supervisors in conferencing skills and other skills as well.

Please recruit a volunteer teacher for the study. Ideally, the volunteer should come from teachers who are new to the profession, or those that are new to your building. The reason for this is that it is these teachers who generally receive the most intensive supervision because of their probationary status. If you find this to be too restrictive in recruiting volunteers, please disregard this suggestion.

The procedure sheets indicate that you and the teacher will both be required to complete some survey instruments at the time of your conferences. These survey instruments are relatively brief and should take no more that twenty minutes of your time and thirty minutes of the teacher's time.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. The data collected for this study will be aggregated and only a summary of the results will be provided to the study participants.

I feel the information and instruction concerning how to conduct effective postobservation conferences the you will receive from Dr. Jim Sweeney, of Iowa State University, will be well worth the efforts you make on behalf of this study. Dr. Sweeney is nationally known for his expertise in the

conferencing process and he is also a very dynamic presenter. The workshop will be held on Thursday, September 15, 1983, from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. in the Conference Room of the Northern Trails Area Education Agency (NTAEA). NTAEA is located on the grounds of the Mason City Municipal Airport.

If you have questions regarding the study or procedures, please contact me at 423-7249 during working hours, or at 423-2389 at home. Once again, thank you for assisting me with this study. I sincerely believe that your help will result in improved training methodology for inservice supervisors.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice, Graduate Student
Iowa State University (C)

Dear Colleague:

Early last fall you agreed to participate in a study I am conducting to examine the effects of training on the supervisor's conduct of postobservation conferences. I had indicated at that time that I would be asking you to conduct another conference, in several months, with the same teacher and to complete some survey instruments. That time has now come! I hope you are willing and able to continue your participation in the study, as I very much need your continued support.

It is critical that you conference with the same teacher that you had conferenced previously in the study. Please visit with that teacher to confirm his/her continued participation.

The procedure sheets indicate that you and the teacher will again both be required to complete some survey instruments at the time of your conference. These survey instruments are relatively brief and should take no more that twenty minutes of your time and thirty minutes of the teacher's time.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. The data collected for this study will be aggregated and only a summary of the results will be provided to the study participants. I am in hopes that all data collection for the study can be completed by January 20, 1984, and would appreciate your returning all materials to me by that date.

If you have questions regarding the study or procedures, please contact me at 423-7249 during working hours, or at 423-2389 at home. Once again, thank you for assisting me with this study. I sincerely believe that your help will result in improved training methodology for inservice supervisors.

Sincerely,

Ronald M. Rice, Graduate Student
Iowa State University (CPO)

APPENDIX B: PROCEDURE SHEETS FOR STUDY PARTICIPANTS

ANALYSIS OF POSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCE

Instrumentation

TEACHER

Following the pretest and the posttest conferences:

Impact Message Inventory
Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory

SUPERVISOR

Prior to the pretest and posttest conferences:

Supervisor Pre-conference Survey

Following the pretest and posttest conferences:

Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory

Suggested return dates for the experimental group videotapes:

Pretest - September 15, 1983

Posttest - December 15, 1983

Training Dates

Large Group:	Sept. 15, 1983	Thurs.	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI
Small Groups:	Week of Oct. 3, 1983		(to be scheduled)	
Large Group:	Oct. 20, 1983	Thurs.	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI
Small Groups:	Week of Nov. 7, 1983		(to be scheduled)	
Large Group:	Nov. 21, 1983	Mon.	8:30-11:30	Madison LGI
Small Groups:	Week of Dec. 5, 1983		(to be scheduled)	

ANALYSIS OF POSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS

Procedure Sheet for Supervisors

Purpose

The study is designed to examine the effects of training on the supervisors' conduct of postobservation conferences.

Content

This packet contains the following:

Supervisor Letter
Procedure Sheet for Supervisors
Instrumentation
Procedure Sheet for Teachers
Teacher Consent Form
Supervisor Pre-conference Survey
Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory
Teacher Packet
Supervisor Consent Form
Self-Addressed Envelope

Outline of Procedues

1. Meet with the teachers you supervise and explain the purposes and procedures of the study and ask for volunteers to participate in the study (the Procedure Sheet for Teachers will be helpful as you explain the study). Please encourage teachers that have less than four years of teaching experience or are new to your building to volunteer. Be sure to confirm that all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

2. Participation in the study must be voluntary. Among the volunteers, randomly select a teacher to participate in the study. Inform the volunteer teachers not selected for the study that they were not selected and thank them for their interest.

3. Give the Teacher Packet to the teacher selected and, after the teacher has had an opportunity to review its contents, confirm the teacher's willingness to participate in the study.

4. Observe the teacher presenting a lesson to the class and arrange a postobservation conference. This observation is to be done as close to the "normal" way you conduct observations as possible.

5. Before the teacher comes to the conference complete the "Pre-conference Survey". This instrument should take about ten minutes to complete.

6. Immediately prior to the conference, have the teacher review the Teacher Consent Form. Please emphasize that the participation is voluntary. Review with the teacher the study procedures and purposes and answer any questions that he/she might have. Then ask the teacher if he/she wishes to proceed with the conference.

7. If he/she wishes to continue, proceed with the conference as you normally would.

8. At the conclusion of the conference, once again advise the teacher that participation in the study is voluntary. If the teacher still wishes to participate, have the teacher sign the Teacher Consent Form and give it to you to return to the researcher.

9. Remind the teacher to complete the two instruments in the teacher's packet and to return them to the researcher, within two days, in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided in the Teacher Packet.

10. Sign the Supervisor Consent Form and complete the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory."

11. Return ,in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided with this packet, the signed Teacher Consent Form, the signed Supervisor Consent Form, the completed "Pre-conference Survey," and the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory" to the researcher within two days.

12. Attend the 1/2 day workshop on conferencing skills which will be held from 1:00-4:00 p.m. on September 15, 1983, in the Conference Room at the Northern Trails Area Education Agency.

13. In approximately three months, you will receive a packet of materials and instructions for completing the second, and final, observation/conference of the study.

(C)

ANALYSIS OF VIDEOTAPED postobservation CONFERENCE

Procedure Sheet for Teachers

Purpose

The study is to examine the effects of the postobservation conference.

Content

This packet contains the following:

Teacher Letter
Procedure Sheet for Teachers
Impact Message Inventory
Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory
Informed Consent Form

Outline of Procedure

1. Your supervisor will observe one of your lesson presentations to your class in his/her normal way and prepare to conduct a postobservation conference.

2. Immediately prior to the beginning of the conference, your supervisor will review the study purposes and procedures with you and will answer any questions you might have. Remember that the videotaping is voluntary and the supervisor will only proceed with it upon your approval.

3. At the conclusion of the conference your supervisor will again remind you that release of the videotape is voluntary. If you still wish to participate in the study, you may do so by signing the Informed Consent Form and by giving it to your supervisor.

4. Please complete the "Impact Message Inventory" and the "Teacher Conference Effectiveness Inventory" as soon as possible following the conference. Please note that when the survey refers to "principal," it is intended that that term also apply to department chairpersons.

5. Please send the two inventories to the researcher using the self-addressed envelope provided within two days. Your supervisor will check back to be sure that you have sent the forms.

Your time and effort are greatly appreciated. Thanks so much for your help.

(S)

ANALYSIS OF POSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS

Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors

Outline of Procedures

1. Attend each of the three large group training sessions (each session will be 1/2 day in length and they will be held approximately one month apart) conducted by an Iowa State University professor.

2. Following each of the large group sessions, observe the "practice teacher" presenting a lesson to the class and arrange a postobser ation conference. You are to apply the skills learned in the large group session in these conferences.

3. Set up the videotape recorder before each conference, checking that the volume and focus are correct for quality audio and video recording.

4. Immediately prior to each conference, have the teacher review the informed consent form. Please emphasize that the videotaping is voluntary. Review with the teacher the study procedures and purposes and answer any questions that he/she might have. Then ask the teacher if he/she wishes to proceed with the videotaping.

5. If he/she wishes to continue, turn on the video recorder and proceed with the conference in which you apply the skills learned in the large group session.

6. At the conclusion of each conference, once again advise the teacher that participation in the study and release of the videotape is voluntary. If the teacher still wishes to participate, have the him/her sign the Teacher Consent Form (P) and give it to you. Return the signed informed consent form to the researcher in the envelope provided.

7. Review your practice videotape and conduct a self-critique of your conferencing performance using the form that will be provided by the researcher for that purpose.

8. Approximately two weeks after each large group session, the researcher will schedule a small group session (1/2 day in length) in which your videotape will be critiqued by peers. This critique, when taken in conjunction with the self-critique completed earlier, will be used to collectively set goals for improving your conferencing behavior. You will also participate in critiquing other small group member's videotapes and in setting their improvement goals.

9. Improvement goal statements from each of the small group members will be collected by the researcher at the close of each small group session.

10. Following the three training cycles, you will again observe and conference with the "study teacher." Please refer to the "Post-training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors" for details.

Content of Conferencing Skills Workshops
Fall 1983

Planning for the Post-Observation Conference

Setting a Positive Climate for Change

How to Effectively Give Feedback

Coaching and Counseling

- Ground Rules
- Listening
- Questioning
- Receptively
- Timing

Conference Closure

ANALYSIS OF postobservation CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS

Pre-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors

Purpose

The study is designed to examine the effects of training on the supervisors' conduct of postobservation conferences.

Content

This packet contains the following:

Blank Videotape Casette
Supervisor Letter
Pre-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors
Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors
Post-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors
Instrumentation
Supervisor Consent Form
Supervisor Pre-conference Survey
Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory
Procedure Sheet for Teachers (S) - for "study teachers"
Procedure Sheet for Teachers (P) - for "practice teachers"
Teacher Consent Form (S) - for "study teachers"
Teacher Consent Form (P) - for "practice teachers"
Study Teacher Packet
Practice Teacher Packet
Self-Addressed Return Envelope

Outline of Procedures

1. Meet with the teachers you supervise that have less than four years of teaching experience or are new to your building, explain the purposes and procedures of the study and that two teachers are needed (use the Procedure Sheet for Teachers as a basis for the explanation of the study), and request volunteers. Be sure to confirm that all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

2. Participation in the study must be voluntary. Among the volunteers, randomly select two teachers to participate in the study, randomly assign one teacher to the role of "practice teacher" and the other to the role of "study teacher." Inform the volunteer teachers not selected for the study that they were not selected and thank them for their interest.

3. Give the appropriate teacher packets, Practice Teacher Packet or Study Teacher Packet, to the teachers assigned to those roles.

4. Observe the "study teacher" presenting a lesson to the class and arrange a postobservation conference. This observation is to be done as close to the "normal" way you conduct observations as possible.

5. Set up the videotape recorder (please use 1/2 inch videotape format) before the conference, checking that the volume and focus are correct for quality audio and video recording.

6. Before the teacher comes to the conference complete the "Pre-conference Survey". This instrument should take about ten minutes to complete.

7. Immediately prior to the conference, have the teacher review the informed consent form. Please emphasize that the videotaping is voluntary. Review with the teacher the study procedures and purposes and answer any questions that he/she might have. Then ask the teacher if he/she wishes to proceed with the videotaping.

8. If he/she wishes to continue, turn on the video recorder and proceed with the conference as you normally would.

9. At the conclusion of the conference, once again advise the teacher that participation in the study and release of the videotape is voluntary. If the teacher still wishes to participate, have the teacher sign the Teacher Consent Form (S) and return it to you.

10. Remind the teacher to complete the two instruments in the study teacher's packet and to return them to the researcher within two days.

11. Sign the Supervisor Consent Form and complete the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory."

12. Return ,in the self-addressed envelope, the signed Study Teacher Consent Form, the signed Supervisor Consent Form, the completed "Pre-conference Survey and the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory", and the videotape to the researcher within two days.

13. The training phase of the study will now begin. Please refer to the "Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors" for details regarding this phase.

ANALYSIS OF POSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS

Post-Training Procedure Sheet for Supervisors

Outline of Procedures

1. Following the conclusion of the training phase, you will observe the "study teacher" presenting a lesson to the class and arrange a postobservation conference.

2. Set up the videotape recorder before the conference, checking that the volume and focus are correct for quality audio and video recording.

3. Before the teacher comes to the conference complete the "Pre-conference Survey". This instrument should take about ten minutes to complete.

4. Immediately prior to the conference, have the teacher review the informed consent form. Please emphasize that the videotaping is voluntary. Review with the teacher the study procedures and purposes and answer any questions that he/she might have. Then ask the teacher if he/she wishes to proceed with the videotaping.

5. If he/she wishes to continue, turn on the video recorder and proceed with the conference as you normally would.

6. At the conclusion of the conference, once again advise the teacher that participation in the study and release of the videotape is voluntary. If the teacher still wishes to participate, have the teacher sign the Teacher Consent Form (S) and return it to you.

7. Remind the teacher to complete the two instruments in the study teacher's packet and to return them to the researcher within two days.

8. Sign the Supervisor Consent Form and complete the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory."

9. Return ,in the self-addressed envelope, the signed Study Teacher Consent Form, the signed Supervisor Consent Form, the completed "Pre-conference Survey and the "Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory", and the videotape to the researcher within two days.

10. Your participation in the study is now complete. Thank you for your assistance.

APPENDIX C: PEER GROUP COACHING MATERIALS

STEPS IN THE FINAL SMALL GROUP TRAINING CYCLE

Step 1. - Review your notes from the large group sessions led by Dr. Jim Sweeney of Iowa State University.

Step 2. - Apply the skills and techniques learned in the large group sessions in a videotaped conference with a teacher you have recently observed in the classroom. (Practicing the skills and techniques in other conferences is encouraged.)

Step 3. - Meet with your small group members to view and critique each others videotaped conferences. Bring your Small Group Report Form and your videotape to this meeting. (You may wish to preview your videotape prior to the meeting.)

- Critique your videotape, and those of your other small gruop members, using the Conference Critique Sheet.

- Following the showing of each videotape, discuss the effective conferencing techniques seen on the tape. When the group discusses your videotape, you should list the effective techniques they identify in your conference on the Small Group Report Form.

- Suggest areas where conferencing techniques could be improved for each videotape. (Don't nit-pick. If it isn't important, don't mention it!) When the group makes suggestions relative to your performance, you should list no more than two of the suggestions, presumably the most significant, on the Small Group Report Form.

Step 4. - Following the meeting, review the critique of your conference videotape and set one goal for improving your conferencing behavior. Record this goal on your Small Group Report Form.

- Return your completed Small Group Report Form to Ron Rice by December 20, 1983.

Step 5. - ERASE THE TAPE! Please do not retain the tapes of practice conferences completed for this project unless you have specific written permission from the teacher involved.

Small Group Members (to be selected at the large group session):

_____ _____ _____

Bring the following to each small group session:
-the videotape of you conferencing a teacher
-the Conference Critique Sheet
-your Small Group Report Form

CONFERENCE CRITIQUE SHEET

Things to Look for While Observing the Conference

Conference Opening

1. Did the supervisor set the teacher at ease?
2. Did the supervisor state the purpose of the conference?
3. Did the supervisor explain how the conference would be conducted?
4. Was there a smooth transition into the discussion of performance?
5. Did the supervisor check the teacher's readiness to listen?

Conference Body

6. Did the supervisor accept the teacher's input when appropriate?
7. Was the observation data presented in specific terms?
8. Was the focus on important teacher behaviors?
9. Did the supervisor share judgements or specific observations?
10. Was the timing appropriate?
11. Were alternative discussed?
12. Was the focus on things the teacher could change?
13. Was the amount of information discussed appropriate?
14. Did the supervisor check for understanding?
15. Did the supervisor listen when appropriate?
16. Did the supervisor effectively check the willingness of the teacher to change?

Conference Closing

17. Did the supervisor effectively summarize areas of agreement/disagreement?
18. Did the supervisor summarize the main points of the conference?
19. Did the supervisor get the teacher to set goals for improvement, or schedule a follow-up conference?

Conference Climate

20. Did the supervisor attend to the following climate elements:
    Elimination of interruptions?
    Eye contact?
    Body lean?
    Nods and smiles?
    Physical barriers (i.e. desk)?
    Positive setting?

SMALL GROUP REPORT FORM

NAME_____ DATE_____

Small Group Members Present_____

Effective Conferencing Techniques Observed (the group identifies as many as possible):

Areas for Improvement (no more than two):

1.

2.

Goal for Improvement (to be developed following the small group session):

THIS FORM IS TO BE RETURNED TO RON RICE BY _____.

APPENDIX D: SUPERVISOR CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS INVENTORY

Supervisor Conference Effectiveness Inventory

The following statements are designed to gather information about the conference. Using the scale below, respond to each of the following statements by placing the number corresponding to the appropriate descriptor in the blank to the left.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4

The conference:

_____ 1. contributed to the professional growth of the teacher.

_____ 2. gave the teacher the opportunity to express feelings and opinions.

_____ 3. helped the teacher learn about his/her teaching behavior.

_____ 4. was not a real exchange of views. It seemed to me that the teacher was playing a role, rather than acting like him/herself.

_____ 5. made the teacher think about changing his/her teaching behavior.

_____ 6. made the teacher want to change his/her teaching behavior.

APPENDIX E: IMPACT MESSAGE INVENTORY

APPENDIX F: TEACHER CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY

APPENDIX G: TEACHER CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS INVENTORY

APPENDIX H: SUPERVISOR PRECONFERENCE SURVEY

APPENDIX J: ITEM KEYS FOR INSTRUMENT SUBSCALES

Item Keys for Instrument Subscales

1. Item Key for Impact Message Inventory Subscales

Open Subscale	Closed Subscale
Affiliative 3A, 12A, 3B, 12B, 3C, 12C	Dominant 1A, 10A, 1B, 10B, 1C, 10C
Agreeable 4A, 9A, 4B, 9B, 4C, 9C	Mistrusting 2A, 11A, 2B, 11B, 2C, 11C
Nurturant 6A, 8A, 6B, 8B, 6C, 8C	Hostile 5A, 7A, 5B, 7B, 5C, 7C

2. Item Key for Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey

Pedagogical Structuring Moves Subscale
1, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23

Humanistic Qualities Subscale
3, 5, 10, 13, 15, 22

Directive Behavior Subscale
2, 7, 11, 18, 21

3. Item Key for Conference Analysis/Rating Sheet

Structure of Conference 1, 2, 10	Climate of Conference 8, 14
Probing 4, 7, 9, 15	Goal Setting 11, 12, 13
Data Presentation 5	

APPENDIX K: UNREPORTED TABLES

TABLE 12. Correlation of pretest and posttest open and closed subscales of the Impact Message Inventory

Impact Message Inventory	Closed Subscale	
	Pretest	Posttest
Open Subscale	-.54	-.44

TABLE 13. Correlations among pretest and posttest subscales of the Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey

Teacher Conference Effectiveness Survey	Humanistic Qualities		Directive Behaviors	
Pedagogical Structuring Moves	(.63)	.61	(.38)	.18
Humanistic Qualities			(.39)	.21

(.xx) = Pretest .xx = Posttest