

AN EXAMINATION OF THREE THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON SUPERVISION: PERCEPTIONS OF PRESERVICE FIELD SUPERVISION

WANDA T. MAX, *University of North Carolina, Charlotte*
NANCY L. ZIMPHER, *The Ohio State University*

In the face of massive criticism about the teacher preparation enterprise, there can be little doubt that we agree on at least one aspect of the process—the field-based (clinical) component. Citing a litany of references, Zeichner notes, "... there is one component in preservice teacher education that until fairly recently has escaped the attacks of the critics. field-based (clinical) experiences."¹ Other scholars validate this point. Joyce, Yarger, and Howey survey current practice, concluding that educationists, lay people, and students alike confirm field experiences as necessary and useful program components.² Conant's review cites student teaching as "indisputably essential,"³ and Lortie reflects teacher reports on the centrality of field experience to the process of becoming a teacher.⁴

With such overwhelming consensus on the value of field experiences and the recent national trends toward increasing the amount of field contact, we might assume that our knowledge about the nature and purpose of these experiences has increased concomitantly. Such does not appear to be the case. According to Howey, "research and development into teacher education practice is rare in most of the institutions that prepare teachers"⁵ Haberman laments the nature of student teaching inquiry as "meager, diverse, and trivial."⁶ Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall summarize the noticeable lack of theories or even promising conceptual frameworks for teacher education.⁷ Shutes

¹Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Myths and Realities: Field-Based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 31 (November-December 1980), 45.

²Bruce R. Joyce, Sam J. Yarger, and Kenneth R. Howey, *Preservice Teacher Education* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Center for Educational Research, 1977).

³James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963).

⁴Daniel C. Lortie, *School Teacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

⁵Kenneth R. Howey, "Teacher Education: An Overview," in *The Education of Teachers*, ed. Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 14.

⁶Martin Haberman, "Research on Preservice Laboratory and Clinical Experiences: Implications for Teacher Education," in *The Education of Teachers*, ed. Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 98.

⁷Norman A. Sprinthall and Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "The Need for Theoretical Frameworks in Educating Teachers: A Cognitive-Developmental Perspective," in *The Education of Teachers*, ed. Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner (New York: Longman, 1983), pp. 74-97.

underscores this theme as he argues that our practice suffers because it is "guided at best by folk wisdom and unevaluated experience, and is noncumulative in building a growing body of reliable, replaceable information"⁸ "The result is a practice and a profession which wanders between the cosmic and the trivial, without necessarily knowing one from the other"⁹

Our task in this article is to analyze the supervision process that guides the field experience component of the teacher education program. Again, we are stymied by the state of the art. Griffin, Hughes, Defino, and Barnes report that rarely in the literature on student teaching and field experiences does university supervision become central to the discussion.¹⁰ Even in small sample studies, "what attention is given is usually peripheral or a small part of one of the other participant's perceptions of the supervisor's role in such typical events as assignments, evaluation, or reporting processes."¹¹ Given these conditions, we believe a contribution could be made through the exploration and examination of the theoretical roots of supervisory practice with regard to field experiences in teacher education.

Although many varieties of supervisory practice are described in the literature, few *explicit* theoretical orientations are presented within such discussions. The reader must search descriptions and research findings to ascertain any implied theoretical orientation and to judge the quality or meaning of the presentations. There are a few visionaries in the field of teacher education who help us recognize theoretical orientations, such as Hartnett and Naish, Tom, and Zeichner.¹² But rarely do we look at the theoretical orientations of supervisory practice. By doing so, perhaps we can begin to distinguish modes of thought and their implications for practice. Although there may not exist "pure" paradigms¹³ of thought in practice, there are distinguishing factors

⁸Robert E. Shutes, "Needed: A Theory of Teacher Education," *Texas Tech Journal of Education* 2, 1 (1975): 85

⁹Norman A. Sprinthall and Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "The Need for Theoretical Frameworks in Educating Teachers: A Cognitive-Developmental Perspective," in *The Education of Teachers*, ed. Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner (New York: Longman, 1983), p. 75

¹⁰Gary A. Griffin, Robert Hughes, Maria E. Defino, and Susan Barnes, *Student Teaching: A Review* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1981)

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 121

¹²Anthony Hartnett and Michael Naish, "Techniques or Social Bandits? Some Moral and Political Issues in the Education of Teachers," in *Teaching Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the Schools*, ed. Peter Woods (London: Croom Helm, 1980); Alan R. Tom, "Curriculum Theory and Personal Responsibility," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May-June 1983): 3-9

¹³The choice of the term "paradigm" for use in discussing conceptions of the world is taken from Thomas Kuhn's essay on *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), and is used interchangeably with terms presented by Richard Bernstein in *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), such as "life-world" and Nelson Goodman's *Ways of Worldmaking* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett Publishing Company, 1978). The authors do not intend to enter the still fluid debate on the definition of "paradigm" but only wish to acknowledge the use of this term in recent conceptualizations of teacher education programs and practices

among paradigms, particularly with regard to the *purposes* for supervision and the implied *roles* for participants. We propose an analysis of the theoretical roots of supervisory practice through an understanding of paradigms or world views that reflect philosophical perspectives on understanding phenomena.

Paradigms or world views frequently are removed from the popularized labels of supervision and practice, and this distance tends to distort both philosophical roots and decision making in practice. The practical enterprise of supervision yields a number of labels or models of supervision that should inform both theory and practice. Popularized models or approaches to supervision often carry such labels as, behavioristic, clinical, counseling, cognitive-developmental, humanistic and/or personalistic, hermeneutic or interpretive, critical inquiry, craft/apprenticeship, moral-craft, or horizontal. We contend that most approaches to supervision seem to be rooted in three major world views, or paradigms, presented and discussed frequently in other educational areas and the social sciences reflecting the perspectives of, (1) *positivism*, (2) *phenomenology*, and (3) *critical theory*.¹⁴ Conceptualizations of supervisory practice from these three perspectives are found in several educational fields where paradigmatic thinking is discussed (e.g., teacher education, curriculum, instruction, and educational administration). In these fields one finds proponents of one or the other of these three paradigms with regard to popularized models of supervision representative of a more eclectic or integrative approach to supervision.¹⁵

Before discussing supervisory practice and world views, we wish to review briefly a conceptualization of field experiences in teacher education that has informed our analysis. Specifically, discussions of field experience reflect a distinction between habits that help the teacher become thoughtful and alert as a student of teaching and those that make the teacher immediately proficient but not necessarily reflective about teaching. Dewey describes these approaches to teaching as being either apprenticeship in nature (having more of a utility character) or more laboratory oriented (fostering more personal

¹⁴Richard Bernstein, *The Restructuring of Social and Political Theory* (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1978). Eric Bredo and Walter Feinberg, eds., *Knowledge and Values in Social and Educational Research* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982). Thomas Popkewitz and B. Robert Tabachnick, *The Study of Schooling* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1981). Barry Smart, *Sociology, Phenomenology, and Marxian Analysis: A Critical Discussion of the Theory and Practice of a Science of Society* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976). Jonas F. Soltis, "On the Nature of Educational Research," *Educational Researcher* 13 (December 1984): 5-10.

¹⁵Myron Atkins and James D. Rath, "Changing Patterns of Teacher Education," in *New Patterns of Teacher Education and Tasks: Country Experience* (Paris: Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, 1984). Bruce R. Joyce, "The Teacher Innovator: A Program for Preparing Educators," in *Perspectives for Reform in Teacher Education*, ed. Bruce R. Joyce and Marsha Weil (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972). Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Toward a Theory of Supervisory Practice: Integrating Scientific, Clinical, and Artistic Views," in *Supervision of Teaching*, ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982). Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, *Supervision: Human Perspectives*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

inquiry and reflection).¹⁶ Others conceptualize the reflective process as a distinction between teacher actions and teacher intentions. We offer these conceptual perspectives to suggest that an analysis of supervisory practice must necessarily include a determination of the presence or absence of this reflective process in the design of supervisory practice. When we look at the activities of student teaching and field experience and the roles individuals play in these experiences, we need to consider the intentions and outcomes of the interactions that constitute the totality of these experiences and assess these interactions against a continuum that ranges from utilitarian to critical.

These dimensions rarely are addressed explicitly in models of teacher education or supervision; most often they are implied. Therefore we have to assume that what we want for preservice teachers in the nature of role-taking implies a role for the supervisor as well. Starting from a consideration of such issues as role definition, we can then move inductively toward an implied theoretical orientation that will ultimately illuminate the purpose of supervisory practice. Such an inductive inquiry is necessary if belief systems remain masked under popular labels. How then might the popularized models of supervision used in teacher education fit into the larger theoretical frameworks of positivism, phenomenology, or critical theory? We will now discuss these three major paradigms or belief systems in light of popularized models of supervision, with the caveat that such a classification of models within world views is more for the purpose of explicating intentions than to offer a strict category system for viewing supervisory practice.

THE POSITIVIST PERSPECTIVE

A positivist's perspective suggests that there exists a natural reality that only needs to be discovered either empirically or through the rigors of logic and mathematics. The scientific method is a given procedure for advancing knowledge from this perspective. Explanations are held to be verifiable through objective means and public scrutiny within a scientific community. Persons and their behaviors are perceived as objects in the social world that can be studied as objects in the natural world. Researchers "distance" themselves from that which they observe and maintain a subject-object dichotomy. Such an approach to social science is said to be "value-neutral," and variables can be manipulated to predict and prescribe practice by developing law-like generalizations concerning teaching and learning.

The role of positivism in supervisory practice can be seen as behavioristic, technical, rationalistic, and concerned with efficiency and effectiveness. Means are to be defined (variables, processes, or treatments) to achieve specific ends,

¹⁶John Dewey, *The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education*, *The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education* (Bloomington, Ill: Public School Publishing Company, 1904), p. 15

as in the process-product model for teacher effectiveness research¹⁷ Practical examples that suggest a positivistic viewpoint reflect an acute interest in teacher skill development wherein the complex teaching process is reduced to incremental skills to be practiced until mastered. the emphasis on competency testing and accountability based upon an assumed knowledge-base; standardized teaching or learning, the competency movement from the 1960s, which has maintained a faithful following and gathers new converts under the guise of "excellence", and the teacher effectiveness movement, which centers on student achievement and thereby narrowly defines and confirms teacher effectiveness and competence through such measures.

Supervision practices that fall within this paradigm are *behavioristic* in orientation, calculated toward prescribed ends after needs have been diagnosed, and evaluative to assess the accomplished goal. Knowledge in the field is perceived as "certain" or given, based upon previous empirical research and the undergirding philosophical beliefs inherent in this world view. In this approach, the supervisor and preservice teacher are to apply the knowledge base, both having been, for the most part, passive recipients and consumers of this knowledge within the university environment. The supervisor diagnoses "problems" during observation, prescribes a more efficient or effective course of action with reinforcement, and evaluates to see if these objectives are mastered or met.¹⁸ The preservice teacher is expected to modify his or her behavior toward this prescribed end.

Those who view teaching as a *craft* or *apprentice-oriented* activity reflect a positivistic view in that the primary source of learning and teaching is by imitation and modeling, as haphazard as this learning may appear to the "pure" positivist. Zeichner claims that the craft orientation is a separate entity all its own, unattached to positivistic notions¹⁹ However, within any category is a continuum, and one could easily suggest that the normal school tradition, trial-and-error learning, academic rationalism, or craft-apprenticeship notions about teaching are mutant strains of a positivistic tradition. In this instance prescriptions are in the form of folk wisdom, which replaces law-like principles. "Don't smile until Christmas" is a folk wisdom principle taken as fact by beginning student teachers who are concerned with their own survival and classroom management. That preservice teachers in the field imitate their

¹⁷David C. Berliner, "Instructional Time in Research on Teaching," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1977, Michael J. Dunkin and Bruce J. Biddle, *The Study of Teaching* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1974), Nathaniel L. Gage, *The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1978), Barak Rosenshine, *Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement* (London: National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971), B. Othanel Smith, *A Design for a School of Pedagogy* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1980)

¹⁸Daryl Siedentop, "Supervision Research," *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education* (Spring 1981): 30-38.

¹⁹Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May-June 1983) 3-9.

cooperating teachers and adopt their ways and beliefs has been well documented in research.²⁰

Likewise, some educators who claim to hold a *clinical* orientation to supervision represent a positivistic orientation when they concentrate more on "the method" or cycle component than on the collegial/collaborative aspects of the model. In its primary emphasis on observable teacher behaviors (and in some instances with regard to the kinds of observation instruments used to gather "objective" data during observation), the clinical approach could be construed as positivistic. The medical metaphor implied in its name befits the scientific tradition. Needless to say, there are numerous variations on the theme of clinical supervision that should be examined in relation to the original model.²¹

"Clinical" implies "the salient operational and empirical aspects of supervision in the classroom"²² or the "real world [as] the clinic" or classroom.²³ Using the medical metaphor "clinical" connotes something in need of careful diagnosis and a prescribed course of action toward improved "health" (or more effective teaching). The following questions determine the degree of positivism embedded in the clinical supervision model. *Who* determines that there is a problem? *How* is this determined? How is "improvement" defined? Toward what *ends* (e.g., what *kind* of teacher or learner behaviors)? "Supervision" itself implies a hierarchical relationship. How this relationship is defined is another clue to a particular theoretical orientation, purposes, and roles.

The *cognitive-developmental* orientation in supervision also can be construed as positivistic. Its initial humanistic concern frequently is overridden by dogmatic practice. In its most exaggerated form, persons can be readily pigeonholed into a lockstep progression of stage development; and after labeling students, supervisors then can attempt to manipulate variables or persons toward more "self-actualized" behavior or a higher stage of devel-

²⁰Nancy L. Zimpher, "Current Trends in Research on University Supervision of Student Teaching," in *Advances in Teacher Education*, Vol. III, ed. Martin Haberman and Julie Backus (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Press, in press).

²¹Keith A. Acheson and Meredith D. Gall, *Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers: Preservice and Inservice Applications* (New York: Longman, 1980); Arthur Blumberg, *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1980); Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973); Noreen B. Garman, "The Mousetrap Study: A Three-Paradigm Research Effort on Practice in Clinical Supervision," in *1980-81 Proceedings of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision Annual Conference* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, 1982); Robert Goldhammer, *Clinical Supervision* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969); Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Toward a Theory of Clinical Supervision," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 9 (Winter 1976): 20-29.

²²Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973).

²³Noreen B. Garman, "The Mousetrap Study: A Three-Paradigm Research Effort in Practice in Clinical Supervision," in *1980-81 Proceedings of the Council of Professors of Instructional Supervision Annual Conference* (Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, 1982).

opment. The term *deliberate psychological education*²⁴ suggests that there is a desire to reorganize the perceptions and beliefs of preservice students in a most calculated way, stage manipulation could be positivistic in tone, even though on the surface this orientation appears to be more responsive to individual needs and concerns.

Stages of moral reasoning, cognitive complexity, teacher development, and adult development exemplify the cognitive-development tradition, which can be as mechanistic and narrow in definition as it can be humanistic and broad. When stages become prescriptions for changes in behavior, the model reflects a more positivistic orientation. On the other hand, as this tradition takes on a more personalistic perspective, it more likely approximates a conception of the world referred to as *phenomenology*.

In summary, positivism in supervision practice can be reflected along a continuum of practice from the ends/means orientation of applied behavioral analysis and prescriptive clinical supervision to more humanistic and developmental orientations, which assume changes in stage development as an intended outcome of this type of supervisory practice. If we were to construe a continuum of supervisory practice using the models suggested above, we might see a continuum that leads us from perspectives or paradigms for supervision models that are more positivistic, to an alternative world view referred to as more phenomenological.

THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Phenomenologists perceive that a natural reality exists, but place importance on the perceptions and multiple realities that are socially construed by individuals and groups. These "realities" can be discovered through an "emic" or insider's perspective, much as anthropologists seek the shared understanding of a culture. Advancing knowledge from this perspective occurs through naturalistic or qualitative inquiry, and the essential question undergirding this perspective is, "What does it mean to be a member in this particular situation?" There is no subject-object dichotomy as in the positivistic tradition. Rather, the intersubjective nature of shared meanings of members brings to social events and actions a certain facticity or objectivity.²⁵ By recognizing the reflective nature of social inquiry, phenomenologists recognize and account for their participation in the "world" that they are studying. Inquiry is field-based, long term, and rich with description and analysis.

The role of phenomenology in supervisory practice is better translated as a *humanistic* concern. The supervisor is concerned with how preservice teachers make sense of their field experiences—what they value, what they

²⁴Norman A. Sprinthall and Lois Thies-Sprinthall, "The Need for Theoretical Frameworks in Educating Teachers: A Cognitive-Developmental Perspective," in *The Education of Teachers*, ed. Kenneth R. Howey and William E. Gardner (New York: Longman, 1983), pp. 74-97.

²⁵Alfred Schutz, *Alfred Schutz on Phenomenology and Social Relations* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970)

feel, what they describe, what it means to be a preservice teacher. Values and attitudes pervading the classroom setting, the hidden curriculum, and the interpersonal relationships involved in teaching and learning—both at the university and field site—are of interest. The preservice teacher and supervisor work toward understanding the qualities of life in classrooms to develop their own teaching or supervisory styles, toward self-actualized behavior, and toward becoming increasingly aware and appreciative of individual student differences and needs. The themes of nurturing, growth, personality, perceptions, and symbol systems dominate this world view. The supervisor's role is to be more of a counselor in a helping relationship than a "trainer."²⁶

Supervision from a phenomenological viewpoint tends to be more indirect, and preservice teachers become active participants in their own learning. They help construct the teacher education curriculum and evaluate their own performance, reflecting upon their experiences.²⁷ Knowledge is perceived to be highly individualized, personal, or tacit.²⁸ There are numerous representatives of the phenomenological perspective in the teacher education and supervision literature.²⁹

Further, it is possible to delineate models that have attributes consonant with a phenomenological world view. Within a *clinical* model of supervision, this phenomenological perspective might be evident when emphasis is placed

²⁶Joseph J. Caruso, "Phases in Student Teaching," *Young Children* 33 (November 1977) 57-63; Willis D. Copeland, "Student Teachers' Preferences for Supervisory Approach," *Journal of Teacher Education* 33 (March-April 1982) 32-36; Willis D. Copeland and David R. Atkinson, "Student Teachers' Perceptions of Directive and Nondirective Supervisory Behavior," *Journal of Educational Research* 71 (January-February 1978) 123-126; Peter F. Oliva, *Supervision for Today's Schools*, 2nd ed (New York: Longman, 1984); D. John McIntyre and William R. Norris, "The State of the Art of Preservice Teacher Education Programs and Supervision of Field Experiences," *Action in Teacher Education* 2 (Summer 1980) 67-69; Ralph Mosher and David Purpel, *Supervision: The Reluctant Profession* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972); Susan R. Sacks and Giselle N. Harrington, "Student to Teacher: The Process of Role Transition," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1982; B. Robert Tabachnick, Kenneth M. Zeichner, Kathleen Densmore, Susan Adler, and Kathleen Egan, "The Impact of the Student Teaching Experience on the Development of Teacher Perspectives," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1982.

²⁷Noreen B. Garman, "Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision. A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice," in *Readings: Clinical Supervision as Reflection in Action* (Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University, 1984).

²⁸Michael C. Diamonti, "Student Teacher Supervision. A Reappraisal," *Educational Forum* 41 (May 1977): 477-486; Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension* (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1966); Robert Yinger and Chris Clark, *Reflective Journal Writing. Theory and Practice* (East Lansing, Mich.: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1981).

²⁹Anne M. Bussis, Edward A. Chittenden, and Marianne Amarel, *Beyond Surface Curriculum* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1976); Arthur Combs et al., *The Professional Education of Teachers* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1974); Francis F. Fuller, "A Conceptual Framework for a Personalized Teacher Education Program," *Theory Into Practice* 13 (April 1974) 112-122; Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, *Teachers, Their World, and Their Work* (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development 1984); O. Lofaro, "An Interactive Model of Supervision from a Developmental Perspective," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Detroit, March 1982; Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, *Supervision. Human Perspectives*, 3rd ed (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

more on interpersonal skills, the helping relationship, reflectivity, trust, rapport, and the collegial/collaborative relationship than on "the method" of diagnosing and prescribing. Thus, some popularized models of clinical supervision can fit into this phenomenological category, depending on the degree of emphasis placed on the personalistic nature of teaching and the efficacy of the individual.

The *cognitive-developmental* model of supervision also evolves from a phenomenological position. Categories or stages of teacher development derived primarily from field-based studies have focused on teacher thinking and learning,³⁰ *action research*,³¹ and *reflection* or *practical reasoning*.³² Also, several educators have focused on *adult cognitive structures* or *cognitive and moral development*.³³

Supervisory models that appear to reflect these notions of reflectivity and changes in professional, personal, or cognitive development are represented in Copeland's notion of nondirective supervision, in which teachers become less dependent on prescribed practice and begin to diagnose their own needs,³⁴ in Garman's emphasis on reflection,³⁵ and in Gitlin's process of

³⁰Richard H Bents and Kenneth R. Howey, "Staff Development. Change in the Individual," in *Staff Development/Organizational Development*, ed Betty Dillon-Peterson (Alexandria, Va. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), D Hogben, "Research on Teachers, Teaching, and Teacher Training," *Australian Journal of Education* 24 (1980): 56-66; Judith W Little, "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation Workplace Conditions of School Success," *American Educational Research Journal* 19 (Fall 1982): 325-340, and Robert J Shavelson, "Research on Teachers' Pedagogical Thoughts, Judgments, Decisions, and Behavior" Washington, D C National Institute of Education, 1980 (Mimeographed)

³¹A. Borthwick, "A Collaborative Approach to School Focused Inservice for Teacher Development and Curriculum Improvement," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Brisbane, 1982, Wilfred Carr and Stephen Kemmis, *Becoming Critical Knowing through Action Research* (Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University, 1983), Mary L Holly, "Teacher Reflections on Classroom Life Collaboration and Professional Development," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1982, Jon Nixon, *A Teacher's Guide to Action Research Evaluation, Inquiry, and Development in the Classroom* (London: Grant McIntyre, 1980).

³²John Dewey, *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Education Process* (Chicago Henry Regnery Co, 1933), Freema Elbaz, *Teacher Thinking A Study of Practical Knowledge* (New York: Nichols, 1983), Sharon Feiman, "Technique and Inquiry in Teacher Education. A Curricular Case Study," *Curriculum Inquiry* 9 (Spring 1979) 63-79 Padraig O Hogan, "The Central Place of Prejudice in the Supervision of Student Teachers," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 9 (January 1983): 30-45, Joseph Schwab, *The Practical A Language for Curriculum* (Washington, D C National Education Association, 1970); Max van Manen, "Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical," *Curriculum Inquiry* 6, 3 (1977): 205-228.

³³Sally Glassberg and Norman A. Sprinthall, "Student Teaching A Developmental Approach," *Journal of Teacher Education* 31 (March-April 1980): 31, 35-38, Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Moral Development," *Psi Delta Kappan* 56 (June 1975) 670-677, William Perry, *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years A Scheme* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970)

³⁴Willis D. Copeland, "Student Teachers' Preferences for Supervisory Approach," *Journal of Teacher Education* 33 (March-April 1982): 32-36

³⁵Noreen B Garman, "Reflection, the Heart of Clinical Supervision. A Modern Rationale for Professional Practice," in *Readings Clinical Supervision as Reflection in Action* (Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University, 1984).

determining intentions in relation to actions through horizontal supervision.³⁶

In order that stages do not become prescriptions for change, supervisors must be cautious not to label stages in an attempt to oversimplify the complexity of the teaching and learning process. In adapting stage theory to supervision models, the critical questions are: *How* are labels, stages, or styles created and defined? *Who* created these, and what perceptions do these persons hold with regard to learners? Who uses labels and stages, and *for what purposes*? And how do labels help or hinder teaching or learning? There is little evidence in the literature that confirms or disconfirms cognitive-developmental theory in relation to student teachers. We have few longitudinal studies of our students, based upon this particular belief, and we do not know if teaching to a student's "stage" or cognitive level makes him or her a better teacher in field experiences or in the long run.³⁷

Other research suggests that the reality of contextual constraints and influences in the field may have more sway than the professional knowledge we attempt to convey to preservice teachers. Some studies are particularly illuminating with regard to this.^{38,39} For example, in the Griffin study, student teachers reported their experiences in personal rather than professional dimensions, and supervisor talk was more of a personal nature than professional or classroom-relevant.⁴⁰ In the Koehler study, university supervisors believed that their impact on preservice teachers fell more into the personal dimensions than the professional or critical dimensions, and supervisors' sense of role efficacy seemed determined largely by school-based institutional affiliation rather than university affiliation.⁴¹

The *hermeneutic or interpretive* perspective in supervision recognizes the dialectical relationship between the individual and the social contexts that help shape him or her. The research from this perspective examines the socialization process of teachers, the taken-for-granted attitudes in various contexts, who influences the preservice teacher the most in field experiences,

³⁶Andrew Gitlin, Rodney T. Ogawa, and Ernest Rose, "Supervision, Reflection, and Understanding: A Case for Horizontal Evaluation," *Journal of Teacher Education* 35 (May-June 1984) 46-52.

³⁷Donna E. Alvermann, "The Possible Values of Dissonance on Student Teaching Experiences," *Journal of Teacher Education* 32 (May-June 1981) 24-25, Sally Glassberg and Norman A. Sprinthall, "Student Teaching: A Developmental Approach," *Journal of Teacher Education* 31 (March-April 1980) 31, 35-38.

³⁸Gary A. Griffin, Susan Barnes, Robert Hughes, Sharon O'Neal, Maria E. Defino, Susan Edwards, and Harry Hukill, *Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983).

³⁹Virginia Koehler, "University Supervision of Student Teaching," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984.

⁴⁰Gary A. Griffin, Susan Barnes, Robert Hughes, Sharon O'Neal, Maria E. Defino, Susan Edwards, and Harry Hukill, *Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983).

⁴¹Virginia Koehler, "University Supervision of Student Teaching," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984.

the nature of the interpersonal relationship of the preservice teaching triad (student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor); or it adopts an ecology perspective. The hermeneutic or interpretive perspective is also informed by the socialization literature, which focuses on what it takes to "fit into" the schooling context successfully and how preservice teachers' attitudes change (or even regress conservatively) as a result of their field experiences.⁴² And there are those who have explored the milieu of the teacher education institution itself as a socializing agent.⁴³ Others call this an "ecological" perspective, acknowledging the social-political contexts in which preservice teachers must work.⁴⁴

From this perspective, the supervisor's role ranges in style from nondirective to collaborative. In nondirective supervision, the supervisor listens, encourages, clarifies, presents, and solves problems with the teacher utilizing a "self-plan."⁴⁵ Collaborative supervision requires presenting, clarifying, listening, problem solving, and negotiating with the teacher and supervisor using a contract system. Other collaborative endeavors focus on communication, reciprocity, group decision making, platforms, and human relations.⁴⁶

In summary, the phenomenological perspective of supervision reflects primarily a humanistic, interpersonal, and individualized endeavor. Concerns

⁴²Sharon Felmen-Nemser, "Learning to Teach," in *Handbook of Teaching and Policy*, ed Lee S. Shulman and Gary Sykes (New York: Longman, 1983), Gary A. Griffin, Susan Barnes, Robert Hughes, Sharon O'Neal, Maria E. Defino, Susan Edwards, and Harry Hukill, *Clinical Preservice Teacher Education: Final Report of a Descriptive Study* (Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983), D. John McIntyre and William R. Norris, "The State of the Art of Preservice Teacher Education Programs and Supervision of Field Experiences," *Action in Teacher Education* 2 (Summer 1980): 67-69, Robert F. Peck and James A. Tucker, "Research on Teacher Education," in *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*, ed Robert M. W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973), Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Ethical Problems in Personalizing Instruction During the Student Teaching Experience," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Dallas, February 1981.

⁴³Colin Lacey, *The Socialization of Teachers* (London: Methuen, 1971), James D. Rath and Lilian G. Katz, "The Best of Intentions for the Education of Teachers," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 8 (October 1982): 275-283, Kenneth M. Zeichner and B. Robert Tabachnick, "The Belief Systems of University Supervisors in an Elementary Student-Teaching Program," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 8 (January 1982): 34-54.

⁴⁴Willis D. Copeland, "Affective Dispositions of Teachers in Training toward Examples of Supervisory Behavior," *Journal of Educational Research* 74 (September-October 1980): 37-42, Walter Doyle and Gary Ponder, "Classroom Ecology: Some Concerns about a Neglected Dimension of Research on Teaching," *Contemporary Education* 46 (Summer 1975): 183-188, Daniel C. Lortie, *School Teacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), Ann H. Karmos and Carol M. Jacko, "The Role of Significant Others during the Student Teaching Experience," *Journal of Teacher Education* 28 (September-October 1977): 51-55; Nancy L. Zimpher, Gary G. de Voss, and Deborah L. Nott, "A Closer Look at University Student Teacher Supervision," *Journal of Teacher Education* 31 (July-August 1980): 11-15.

⁴⁵Carl D. Glickman, *Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers Improve Instruction* (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981).

⁴⁶Arthur Blumberg, *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley: McGraw-Hill, 1980), Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), and Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, *Supervision: Human Perspectives*, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

of supervisors relate to the preservice teacher's attitudes, values, belief system, anxieties, personal development of teaching style, cognitive development, and development of human relations skills in the school context. The supervisor is concerned about his or her own belief system and how this might influence neophyte teachers. The phenomenological supervisor is interested primarily in developing a greater understanding of individuals, establishing rapport and communication in the student teaching triad, and seeing that individual preservice teachers fulfill themselves in personally meaningful ways, as defined by those individuals.

THE CRITICAL THEORIST PERSPECTIVE

Critical theorists address the question of "ought." This view claims and acknowledges a value position that is oriented toward praxis and the making of a better world. A better world, in the eyes of critical theorists, is one in which there is equal access to knowledge, reflective action, and persons who are "liberated" through questioning that which is taken-for-granted. By illuminating the taken-for-granted, people can take charge of their own lives through action and change. The central question from this viewpoint is determining which educational goals, experiences, and institutional arrangements lead to forms of life that are mediated by justice, equality, and happiness. The primary purpose of teacher education from this perspective is to understand the relations among value, interest, and action and to change the world—not merely describe it or explain it. Inherent in this position (as in phenomenology) is a dialectical relationship—that of being changed and changing, of evolving with and creating, of being responsive to and reflective about what has been, what is, and more importantly, what *should* be in the context of schooling.

The critical theorist's primary interest is personal and social enlightenment through critical inquiry. The researcher's inquiry can use questions posed by positivists or phenomenologists to render that which is taken-for-granted as problematic so that such can be evaluated and acted upon. However, critical theory is closer to phenomenological concerns than to those of positivism.

Dewey's *reflective action* concerned developing teachers' abilities to examine the moral, ethical, and political issues (as well as the instrumental issues) that are embedded in everyday thinking and practice.⁴⁷ Developing "habits of inquiry" has a long tradition in teacher education. This represents an attempt to prepare teachers to analyze what they are doing in terms of their effects upon children, schools, and society.⁴⁸ "Advocates of this position

⁴⁷John Dewey, *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1933)

⁴⁸Sharon Feiman, "Technique and Inquiry in Teacher Education," *Curriculum Inquiry* 9 (Spring 1979): 63–79; Alan R. Tom, "Teaching as a Moral Craft: A Metaphor for Teaching and Teacher Education," *Curriculum Inquiry* 10 (Fall 1980): 317–323; Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alter-

express a concern for helping prospective teachers assume a greater role in shaping the direction of educational environments according to purposes of which they are aware and which can be justified in moral and ethical terms.⁴⁹

Institutions can be seen as controlling human conduct,⁵⁰ wherein existing structures serve as barriers to experimentation with alternative structures.⁵¹ Thus, the teacher education institution itself is called into question for critical analysis. If one takes a more Marxist perspective, knowledge is perceived as cultural capital in a technological society. Thus, equal access to knowledge and personal empowerment are of considerable importance to critical theorists.⁵²

Practical examples of critical theory in supervision are the belief that teaching is a reflective, moral, and ethical action nested within a socially constructed framework, the belief that technical skills are important only as a means toward objectives—not as ends in themselves, and that these objectives are obtained through critical analysis and discussion, and the belief that observation, reflection, and critical discussion concerning the culture of a school and its relationship to a community are important to uncover influences on the teaching and learning process and the very future of a society. The notion of reflection involves not only reflection about one's own beliefs and choices in practice, but also relates to consciousness-raising about the socio-political contexts in which one must act and even transform.

Supervision from a critical theorist perspective can be directive and prescriptive because of the degree to which value-laden goals drive reflection, informed practice, and equity. However, much of the curriculum content is developed actively by the students from their observations and inquiries in the field. The supervisor and students question the knowledge base of the

native Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May–June 1983) 3–9; Kenneth M. Zeichner and Kenneth Teitelbaum, "Personalized and Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 8 (May 1982) 95–117

⁴⁹Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May–June 1983) 6

⁵⁰Peter Berger and Thomas Luchmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967)

⁵¹Seymour Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982)

⁵²Jean Anyon, "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work," in *Curriculum and Instruction. Alternatives in Education*, ed. Henry A. Giroux, Anthony N. Penna, and William F. Pinar (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981); Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979); Ann Berlak and Harold Berlak, *Dilemmas of Schooling: Teaching and Social Change* (London: Methuen, 1981); Anthony Hartnett and Michael Naish, "Techniques or Social Bandits? Some Moral and Political Issues in the Education of Teachers," in *Teacher Strategies: Explorations in the Sociology of the Schools*, ed. Peter Woods (London: Croom Helm, 1980); Thomas S. Popkewitz, B. Robert Tabachnick, and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Dulling the Senses Research in Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 30 (September–October 1979) 52–60; Alan R. Tom, "Curriculum Theory and Personal Responsibility," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 1984, and Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May–June 1983) 3–9

field and the taken-for-granted practices observed both in the university environment and the school context, rendering such problematic for critical analysis. This view in the teacher education literature is represented by those who hold a *critical inquiry* position. Less time is spent on teaching in the field (because of the potential for indiscriminately and uncritically accepting and adopting poor practices), more time is involved in ethnographic inquiry (e.g., participant observation in classrooms and field settings, doing field studies, examining the cultural aspects of a school and its community, and exploring the hidden curriculum and the daily life-world of teachers and students) Through conducting field studies, reading other studies conducted in the same spirit, and holding critical discussion in seminars, preservice teachers would become more competent and thoughtful teachers, and they would see ways to change and improve practice.⁵³

As in the humanistic or personalistic supervision model, critical theorists wish to assist prospective students in the development of personal beliefs about teaching, schooling, children, and themselves without their becoming mere imitations of their teachers in the field. The horizontal model of supervision⁵⁴ requires teachers to examine their intents and practice in a reflective process. In this model teachers are guided by a set of questions to help them trace the philosophical and historical meanings of their intentions. This examination of intentions can be viewed as more phenomenological in nature unless once intentions are understood, they are also critically examined and questioned. The *critical inquiry* model espoused by Zeichner and others takes us further away from phenomenological concerns and closer to the critical theory perspective. Critical theory is not merely *hermeneutic* or *interpretive* in orientation. It is one thing to learn to uncover, recognize, and describe the taken-for-granted in a reflexive process, and it is quite another to actively critique a situation and make changes toward improved practice. The implicit message from the critical theorist is that inequality exists, that certain groups are oppressed, and that these social "facts" need to be illuminated and critiqued so that oppressed groups can emancipate themselves from the taken-for-granted. In this sense, critical theory is prescriptive, although teacher "effectiveness" is defined quite differently here than it is from a positivistic orientation.

Positivism frequently is viewed by critical theorists as representative of a larger, oppressive, taken-for-granted context—the scientific community. This larger community sanctions a particular view of what kind of knowledge counts and how to best arrive at it and dispense with it. The arguments one hears regarding dichotomies such as hard-soft science, quantitative-qualitative research, or questions related to what is empirical or generalizable are visible

⁵³Kenneth M. Zeichner, "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education," *Journal of Teacher Education* 34 (May–June 1983): 3–9.

⁵⁴Andrew Gitlin, Rodney T. Ogawa, and Ernest Rose, "Supervision, Reflection, and Understanding: A Case for Horizontal Evaluation," *Journal of Teacher Education* 35 (May–June 1984) 46–52.

bones of contention among such camps. Yet critical theorists can use positivistic or phenomenological methods to critique practice and call attention to the moral enterprise of education, to uncover inequalities in educational settings, and to improve practice. This method can adopt an emic (insider's) perspective to come to know a setting and its members well, and once having done so, adopt an etic (outsider's) stance to make sense of the situation and critique it within the larger sociopolitical context, to question the taken-for-granted and seek action toward improvement.

TAKING A POSITION

Supervision practice in teacher education programs can be said to be more eclectic than particularized or rooted in any one theoretical position. However, the proliferation of labels and models may continue to confuse us. For example, Glathorn recommends "differentiated" supervision, wherein the teacher chooses the most preferred supervisory interaction style of supervision: (1) clinical, (2) cooperative professional development, (3) self-directed development, and (4) administrative monitoring.⁵⁵ The previous discussion prompts us to ask whether Glathorn is an eclectic, or if he reflects a view that is really within a single theoretical perspective. It is the task of the reader and practitioner to move beyond the given and infer the assumptions undergirding yet a "new" model of supervision.

Positivism, phenomenology, and critical theory encompass particular arrays of beliefs, and these beliefs suggest particular kinds of interests and qualities of practice in teacher education and supervision. As we turn to subcategories and model labels within the field of supervision, fuzzy edges between paradigms become even fuzzier. We need a theory of practice. Sergiovanni suggests that supervisors need to cultivate the art of interpretation.⁵⁶ A theory of practice in the supervision of teaching is concerned with three major questions, each of which can be addressed in our three paradigms of thinking: What *is* going on in this classroom? What *ought* to be going on? And, what do these events, activities, and aspirations *mean*? Sergiovanni continues:

Meaning is the added dimension. Establishing what is requires the development of accurate descriptions and explanations of the real world of teaching. Establishing what ought to be requires that one give attention to stated values and attempt to discover those more implicit in teacher and teaching. Establishing what events mean requires a close study of classroom life and its events in pursuit of understanding.⁵⁷

⁵⁵Allan Glathorn, *Differentiated Supervision* (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).

⁵⁶Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Toward a Theory of Supervisory Practice: Integrating Scientific, Clinical, and Artistic Views," in *Supervision of Teaching*, ed. Thomas J. Sergiovanni (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 68.

Thus, different questions related to teacher education and supervision thrust us into different perspectives of thought. Meaning and interpretation that should guide our practice cannot be grasped without attending to social "facts" as well as those meanings rendered by the participants we observe. Nor can we interpret and fully understand such meanings without some sense of what we collectively *want* to be doing or *ought* to be doing in an educational context.

Confusion emerges in the denial of a value-base and a resistance to the historicity of our thinking and enterprise. We each have our implicit sense of "ought" because of a theoretical orientation or belief system. For example, as *positivists*, we can hold a social "fact" to be not only true but good (e.g., increasing academic learning time increases student achievement). Supervision can be oriented toward this fact because we believe students "ought" to achieve and preservice teachers "ought" to be able to control this achievement. But as positivists, we risk not asking the question of meaning; that is, examining what increased academic learning time means to students and their needs or feelings, or what it means with respect to teachers' beliefs, teaching styles, how teachers are evaluated, or the social constraints within which they operate. We may not question the quality or validity of the curriculum content being taught, learned, tested, or omitted. The method becomes the message, and goals that aim toward the "educated" person are subsequently narrowly defined.

As *phenomenological* supervisors, we can value feelings to the extent that we never have to provoke preservice students to question taken-for-granted attitudes in the educational context or encourage them to change anything but themselves. Certainly, it is important to come to know one's self better, to appreciate learner development, to move toward self-actualization, and to learn how to relate well to others. But there are contextual constraints that will impinge upon the individual, to which young teachers often succumb when they adopt a more conservative teaching behavior in order to simply survive. Can we train prospective teachers in teaching skills and social facts and remain true to the individual person? Will they, likewise, be able to do this with their students? Where is there a strong support system in the field that will nurture individualism, creativity, tentativeness, and pensive reflection about one's own practice and decision making in today's conservative and production-oriented educational climate?

As *critical* supervisors, we can promote enough cognitive dissonance in preservice teachers through an inquiry approach to undermine skill development or smooth transition into the stark reality of teaching contexts. Evaluation is an inevitable condition for the preservice teacher who receives a grade in student teaching or who must adapt well enough to get a job. Can a vulnerable person readily and thoughtfully be expected to change existing systems under the conditions of concern for survival—earning a grade, getting a job, developing teaching skills, or becoming familiar with curriculum content and the multifaceted nature of students and learning? Can 16 years of social-

ized, docile teacher-student behavior undermine this noble, reflective, and critical effort?

Further, a critical approach to supervision should be programmatic beyond a single event, such as student teaching. Such inquiry needs to merge with preservice teacher needs, concerns, abilities, and proclivities and the contextual constraints that do battle with reflective, autonomous action. We must examine the realities of educational contexts and the superimposed hierarchical relationship the neophyte teacher must enter. How might we help preservice teachers juggle and judge a delicate balance of change and stability in the role of change agents? What kinds of experiences will strengthen their autonomy and sharpen their visions, despite the realities of institutional contexts and the structural constraints that impinge upon *all* teachers and learners? Is it only the preservice teacher who must act as change agent?

Disturbing questions such as these are the very kind we should address. We cannot afford to indiscriminately accept one theoretical viewpoint over another. Teaching is a skillful, artistic, personally meaningful, and moral endeavor. Competent teachers throughout their careers will need to ask the questions, *What is*, *what ought* to be, and *what does it mean*? Our task is to provoke *all three* questions without assuming we know all of the answers. Only the possibilities that we ourselves envision can be shared, and we must encourage our students to actively pursue and critique the possibilities that they perceive.

Without such critical examination and dialogue, we ignore the important commitment we have made to an endeavor that is incredibly complex—individual, emotional, social, contextual, and political. To reduce such complexity to a single frame of reference or to mask our enterprise beyond moral recognition jeopardizes the rich and serious nature of our task. Our use of models and labels in the field of supervision requires more clarity and a disclosure of belief systems if different approaches are to be useful to theory-building and practice.

WANDA T. MAY is Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, North Carolina 28223

NANCY L. ZIMPER is Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, College of Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

Copyright © 1986 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.