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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

Improving the effectiveness of teachers in the classroom is a major goal for nearly all administrators. The key to that endeavor is the administrators' ability to stimulate teachers to examine their classroom behavior, a task typically addressed in the conference following lesson observation. Yet, despite the importance of the task and its obvious complexity, little has been done to examine supervisor and teacher behavior in the conference or the relationship between significant variables and conference effectiveness.

The sparse literature on supervisory conferences paints a rather dismal picture. Supervisory conferences have been found to be generally unproductive. For example, Blumberg (1970) found that teachers reported that the supervisory conference was unlikely to change behavior. Walker (1976) and Neville (1966) reported similar findings. If supervisors are to provide assistance to teachers, there is a pressing need to examine the post-observation conference in-depth and explicate those factors which appear to enhance conference effectiveness, as well as those which deter its success.

This study focused on technical aspects of the conference as well as the psychological context of the conference. Crews (1982) suggested the use of the following pedagogical structuring moves were important: stating the conference purpose, using probing questions, pausing, reflecting, discussing steps for teacher improvement, setting goals for improvement, and summarizing the conference's main points. But little
of the theory is supported with research. These and other pedagogical structuring moves employed by principals will be addressed in the study.

If principals are to have an impact on teacher improvement, a helping relationship appears to be beneficial. Rogers (1961) described the helping relationship as one which promotes the growth and improved functioning of another individual. To make the teacher-supervisor relationship a helping one, the principal must create a desire to understand the other person's meanings and feelings. The extent to which the supervisor is humanistic (i.e., empathic, accepting of teachers' ideas, praises or commends and gives encouragement) may affect the consequences of the conference.

Another area in which there was little research concerns the dynamics of the interaction itself; i.e., who controls the conference, the principal's objectivity in reporting information, and how well participants listen to each other. We know that feedback during the conference tends to be general rather than specific; subjective, not objective (McGeoch and Lindsey, 1967). What we don't know is how this affects the conference. There was a need to examine what takes place in the interaction and its relationship to conference effectiveness. In summary, the study investigated the relationship between three selected conference components which appear related to its success: principals' pedagogical structuring moves, humanistic qualities, directive behavior; and conference effectiveness.
What other variables may influence conference effectiveness? Given the psychological context of conferences, it seems likely that the psychological set which participants bring to the conference is important. For example, the extent to which they feel good about themselves may affect their perceptions and behavior. Cormier and Cormier (1979, p. 11) found "people who have negative views of themselves will "put themselves down and will either seek out or avoid types of interactions with others that confirm their negative self-image." Therefore, it seems that feelings of self-worth and "others'" feelings may be factors as well. Teacher and principal self-acceptance and its relationship to conference effectiveness was examined.

There was a great deal of give and take in a conference. The extent to which individuals are able to change their thoughts or behavior (dogmatism) may be a significant factor in conferences. It seemed reasonable to assume that closed-minded teachers' (those less able to accept new beliefs and to change old behavior) reactions to their supervisors' attempts at changing behavior would differ from open-minded teachers' responses. The degree of dogmatism of participants could possibly then affect the conference outcome.

Other important questions remain unanswered. Is supervisory behavior a function of the situation, or does it emanate from the attitudes and preferences which the principal brings to the conference? A host of researchers have posited that leadership style can be broken down into two concepts: concern for people and concern for task (Blake and Mouton, 1964; Halpin and Winer, 1952). But there was virtually no
information indicating what or how supervisors' preferences affect their behavior in the conference or its outcome. Principal life style preferences, which include their styles of thinking and behavior, could sway the post-observation conference results.

It seems that the information on climate, as related to the conference, is discrepant. Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969) concluded that to promote teacher discovery and experimentation one of the necessary ingredients in the conference was a supportive climate. Blumberg (1970) found little supportive behavior in conferences. In truth, we have little evidence as to what the "feel" of conference climate is, or what effect that "feel" will have on the eventual outcome of the conference.

The final area examined concerns the difference between what ought to be and what is; teacher perceptions as to how the conference should be conducted as opposed to what they perceive as actually happening in the conference. Conference effectiveness is in the eye of the beholder; it is a function of teachers' preferences and expectations. In other words, it is likely that conference effectiveness (whether teachers are disposed to change) is contingent upon the extent to which supervisory behaviors are congruent with teachers' expectations. This area, too, was examined in the study under the rubric conference dissonance.

There is no simple way to measure effectiveness in a post-observation conference. Given that changing teacher behavior is the primary purpose of the conference, it seems that teacher perceptions,
attitudes, and feelings are important since attitudinal change must precede change in behavior. Direct measurement then seemed appropriate. As Blumberg and Amidon (1965) noted,

the frame of reference chosen was that of the teacher because of the assumption that the teacher's feelings about the usefulness and productivity of the conference are affected by the manner in which they perceive the supervisors' behavior, regardless of the supervisors' actual or intended conduct.

Conference effectiveness was assessed by examining the perceptions of teachers.

Statement of the Problem

Few principals look forward to conducting post-observation conferences with teachers. Perhaps no activity in the school administrator's job description is more challenging than the conference following lesson observation. Yet, in an era where the public places a premium on effective teaching and student achievement, it appears that the post-observation conference is unlikely to be an occasion that produces teacher growth. On the basis of countless discussions with school principals and teachers, this researcher has concluded that a portion of the problem lies in the failure of the principal to effectively conduct the post-observation conference. To help administrators help teachers, there was a need for an in-depth examination of the post-observation conference.
Purpose of the Study

This study was designed to examine the supervisory behavior of principals and their teachers during the post-observation conference and the relationship between the following variables and conference effectiveness: (1) selected conference components—principal pedagogical structuring moves, humanistic qualities, and directive behavior; (2) conference climate; (3) principal and teacher self-acceptance; (4) principal and teacher dogmatism; (5) principal life style preferences; and (6) conference dissonance.

This research had two overarching purposes in the study of post-observation conferences: (1) to examine relationships between conference effectiveness as perceived by teachers and the following variables—conference climate, principals' life style preference, dogmatism, self-acceptance, pedagogical structuring moves, humanistic qualities, and directive behavior; and (2) to compare conference behavior of principals by the use of interaction analysis of audiotapes.

To address these issues, nine specific questions were addressed:

1. What actually occurs during principal-teacher supervisory conferences?

2. Is there a difference in teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness when principals are more structured in pedagogical moves?

3. How does conference dissonance affect teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness?
4. Is there a difference in teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness when principals are more supportive?

5. Is there a difference in teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness when principals are more direct?

6. What are the affects of principal and teacher self-acceptance on teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness?

7. What are the affects of principal and teacher dogmatism on teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness?

8. What are the affects of principals' life style preferences on teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness?

9. What part does conference climate play in teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness?

Research Hypotheses

This study was designed to gather data to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who employ greater structure in pedagogical moves during the conference.

2. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report less conference dissonance.
3. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more humanistic qualities during the conference.

4. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more supportive behaviors during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.

5. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are more direct during the conference.

6. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are more didactic during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.

7. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

8. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

9. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are less dogmatic.
10. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who are more dogmatic.

11. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are higher in people/satisfaction.

12. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are lower in task/security.

13. There is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more open climate.

14. There is a significant negative relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more closed climate.

15. There is a significant positive relationship among pedagogical structuring moves, open conference climate, closed conference climate, conference dissonance, and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness.
Delimitations of the Study

The following factors narrow the field of investigation:

1. The study was conducted with a limited number of principals, primarily from the state of Iowa.
2. The subjects were volunteers; it was not possible to select a random sample of principals and teachers.
3. Most of the principals had received some prior training in conference techniques.
4. Most conferences were conducted with what principals considered effective teachers.

Definition of Terms

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

1. Conference climate—the feel or tone of conferences; it may be open (supportive) or closed (nonsupportive).
2. Conference dissonance—the difference between how teachers preferred conferences to be conducted and what they perceived as actually happening in conferences.
3. Conference effectiveness—teachers' perceptions as to the usefulness or productivity of conferences.
4. Didactic principal behavior—ways in which principals offered opinions, suggestions and information to teachers. It may be direct or indirect. This was measured by the Principal-Teacher Supervisory Conference Interaction Analysis.
5. Directive principal behavior--principals' objectivity in reporting information, degree of controlling conferences and amount of teacher participation allowed in conferences. This was measured by the Teacher Perceptions Inventory.

6. Dogmatism--the extent to which principals and teachers are willing to change their thoughts or behavior. May be open-minded (more able to accept new beliefs and to change old) or closed-minded (less able to accept new beliefs and to change old).

7. Life style--style of thinking and behavior held by principals.

8. Humanistic qualities--behaviors exhibited by principals which show genuine concern and respect for teachers, as measured by the Teacher Perceptions Inventory.

9. Pedagogical-structuring moves--structuring moves exhibited by principals during conferences, as measured by the Teacher Perceptions Inventory.

10. Post-observation conference--conference held between principals and teachers following lesson observation with the intent of improving teacher behavior.

11. Self-acceptance--the extent to which principals and teachers feel good about themselves; feel of unique worth, and have a realistic awareness of their strengths and weaknesses.
12. Situational data—data specific to principals, teachers and each conference. This was completed by principals prior to conducting post-observation conferences.

13. Supportive behaviors—principals' behaviors which are typical of a helping relationship and promote growth and improved functioning of teachers. This was measured by Principal-Teacher Supervisory Conference Interaction Analysis.

14. Training data—demographic information collected about principals concerning their experience in conducting conferences and their experiences as principal.
CHAPTER 2—REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Literature related to post-observation conferences will be reviewed in this chapter. First, an overview will be presented, then the component parts including conference purpose, interaction, preparation, structure, principal attitudes and behavior, climate, conference dissonance, and conference effectiveness. Also presented are life styles, dogmatism, and self-acceptance, since they were examined in the study.

Post-Observation Conferences

In supervision, all roads lead to the conference. Given all the steps in the supervision cycle, the post-observation conference is the one step that must be handled effectively (Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski, 1980). Ideally, it is a dyadic interaction in which the supervisor and teacher examine and discuss the teacher's instructional behavior in the classroom. Hopefully it is an opportunity to share the mutual concern for students and how they may best learn (Stratemeyer and Lindsey, 1958).

Many aspects of the conference will be discussed in this section. The conference purpose, pertinent research related to supervisory conferences in education and the business world, the preparation and structuring of the conference, and supervisory behavior during the conference will all be addressed.
Purpose of the conference

The type of conference to be held is somewhat dependent on the quality of the lesson observed and is particular to the teacher and supervisor. Often conferences are designed to stimulate critical thinking about educational problems, to provide for the sharing of ideas, and to suggest creative ways to implement good teaching practices. Other purposes for holding conferences may include discussion of long and short-term goals, the development of teacher self-analysis skills, correction of misinformation and misunderstandings, analysis of teacher problems, and recognition of good work (Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski, 1980; Redfern, 1980; Stratemeyer and Lindsey, 1958). In sum, the conference should help the teacher to analyze, evaluate, and plan for the future (Leggitt, 1951).

Madeline Hunter (1980) suggested that every conference between a teacher and supervisor should have a primary purpose. If the conference purpose is instructional improvement, she recommends five possible approaches. Hunter encourages the supervisor and teacher to mix and match the different conference types as needed. The five conference types include:

1. Type A--to identify and explain to the teacher what effective behaviors were used during the observation and why they were effective. The teacher can then deliberately and appropriately use them in the future.
2. Type B--to explore potentially effective teaching techniques besides those frequently used by the teacher.

3. Type C--to identify alternative teaching techniques for those parts of the teaching episode which were not satisfactory to the teacher.

4. Type D--to identify less effective aspects of teaching that were not evident to the teacher, and to develop alternatives which would be more effective.

5. Type E--to promote continuing growth of excellent teachers.

The importance of the post-observation conference seems obvious. Conferences do receive mixed reviews, however, with respect to how effectively supervisors conduct them. Many conferences do not result in teacher change, often because the supervisor has not had sufficient training in conducting conferences. One of the leading authorities, Arthur Blumberg (1970), suggested that supervisory conferences were unlikely to be an occasion that produced teacher growth. Instead, it was often used to discuss routine housekeeping functions of teaching. McKnight (1971) concurred and noted that conferences had little influence on future teaching performances.

Most experts agree on its importance for teachers. According to Redfern (1980), conferences should help teachers view evaluation as a constructive process and not as a negative experience. Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1975, p. 255) concurred with Redfern on the importance of the conference. "Probably no single supervisory performance is more
critical to changing (if not advancing) the instructional process than the supervisory conference."

In summary, a post-observation conference is a dyadic interaction held between a supervisor and teacher to discuss, plan, and evaluate the teacher's instructional behavior in the classroom. Often the type of conference held is dependent on the lesson observed and particular to the teacher and supervisor. Reasons for holding a conference may include goal-setting, development of teacher self-analysis skills, teacher problem analysis, or recognition for good work.

**Conference interaction**

The dynamics of the interaction between the principal and teacher during the conference influence future teacher improvement. More specifically, who controls the conference, how actively teachers participate in the conference, and objectivity in reporting information can make a difference. Most agreed the conference should focus on areas which allow for maximal teacher growth.

The work of Stewart and Cash (1978) suggested that there are two approaches to interviewing. In the first, **directive**, the supervisor controls the conference. In the **nondirective** approach, the "other" person has more say in the conference purpose, subject matter, and pace of the interview. The nondirective approach allows for in-depth discussions and the development of ongoing relationships. But it also can be time consuming and require more insight and personal sensitivity.
It seems logical that learning theory approaches are as applicable to the post-observation conference as to a teaching/learning situation. Tuttle (1967), based on his experiences with student teachers, speculated on the learning theory approach most appropriate to use during conferences. He found that student teachers:

1. learned best when directly involved in learning
2. were more directly involved in their own learning when they perceived the learning to have value
3. were more inclined to change when they perceived support in searching for more effective behavior
4. derived greater understanding of the teaching-learning process when they operated on the basis of their own decisions
5. understood the teaching-learning process better if they were aided in focusing upon aspects pertinent to their unique needs

A study on conference interaction was conducted by Holton (1975). In this study, the degree of direct/indirect behavior of supervisors was examined using audiotapes. The sample consisted of 25 student teachers from Virginia and their university supervisors. The researchers found the supervisory conference to be more satisfactory for student teachers when interaction between the university supervisor and student teacher was indirect. In fact, the whole student teaching experience was judged to be more satisfactory when an indirect approach was used.
Acheson and Gall (1980) suggested that indirect supervisory behavior allowed teachers to participate more freely in conferences and tended to be more effective than direct supervisory behavior. Also, when teachers' ideas for change were reinforced by supervisors, behavior changes were more likely to occur than when teachers were forced to carry out someone else's ideas.

During the 1960s, Arthur Blumberg began a series of studies which investigated interaction during the post-observation conference. One of the earlier studies (Blumberg and Amidon, 1965) used a nonrandom sample of 166 in-service teachers who had been involved in a supervisory conference during the previous year. The teachers were given a questionnaire to complete which focused on supervisory direct and indirect behavior.

Interestingly enough, findings of the study showed greater productivity when the supervisor was highly indirect. Likewise, teachers reacted negatively to highly direct supervisory behavior or to behavior that was neither direct nor indirect. Teachers also reported greater learning about teaching behaviors when the supervisor used a highly indirect approach. It appeared that using a highly direct approach hampered teachers' freedom to communicate.

In 1970, Blumberg and Cusick collected and analyzed 50 audiotapes of supervisor-teacher conference interactions. An instrument was developed similar to Flander's Interaction Analysis for Teachers (1970) but instead measured supervisor-teacher interaction during the conference.
From the analysis of the 50 conferences, the researcher learned that supervisors spent most of their time telling or giving information (highly direct) and seldom asked the teacher for ideas or actions to take or used a group problem-solving technique (low indirect). Blumberg and Cusick also concluded that supervisors had very little or inadequate training, and that the interpersonal insights and skills possessed by many supervisors were inadequate as far as the helping relationship was concerned. They also reported little regard was given to behavioral demands of the job when filling such supervisory positions.

Providing specific feedback also emerged as an important activity in the conference interaction. McGeoch and Lindsey (1967) noted that feedback during the conference tended to be general rather than specific, subjective not objective. Similar findings were suggested by Acheson and Gall (1980). In other words, the feedback was often "soft," inaccurate, or irrelevant. The inherent defensiveness teachers felt toward what they perceived as an evaluation situation was heightened by information that, to them, was suspect and debatable. Providing "hard" data based on facts seemed to alleviate this problem.

Conference and supervisory skills were studied in the private sector as well as in education. Meyer, Kay, and French (1965) investigated the dynamics of manager and subordinate interactions during appraisal interviews. At a General Electric plant trained observers recorded the number of times criticism, praise, defensive comments, constructive reactions, and goals for improvement were used during
interviews. Second interviews were held 10 to 12 weeks after initial goal planning sessions to discuss job improvement. After the second appraisal session, managers and subordinates were interviewed separately to obtain estimates of goal achievement. The researchers concluded that annual performance appraisals were of questionable value. They also reported that participative goal-setting, not criticism, was more effective for improved performance.

In another General Electric study, Bassett and Meyer (1968) compared "manager-prepared" appraisals with "subordinate-prepared" ones. Thirty-five managers each conducted two appraisal interviews; one "manager-prepared" and the other "subordinate-prepared." Results of the investigation indicated managers often preferred "subordinate-prepared" appraisals because performance goals were more realistic and more often achieved.

In summary, the dynamics of the interaction between the principal and teacher play a major part in the conference. The research tended to support an indirect approach in which teachers freely participated in the conference. Teachers were more likely to change their behavior if an indirect approach was used rather than when forced to carry out someone else's decisions. Conferences were also considered more effective when conference feedback was specific and based on fact.

Preparation for the conference

Preparing for the conference is as important as the conference itself. A number of experts have supported the importance of planning.
Redfern (1980) concluded that the reason many conferences were not successful or rewarding was that ample preparation before the conference was not made. Gordon (1973, p. 463) also agreed on the importance of planning for the conference. "The successful conference does not just happen. It takes planning, implementation, and re-evaluation."

A poorly planned conference may leave the teacher resentful, bewildered, and with no plans for change (Bebb, Low, and Waterman, 1969). Carson (1970) speculated that when the conference was planned focusing on teacher strengths and weaknesses a balanced picture of teaching would result. Many researchers have given suggestions for planning the post-observation conference. A compilation of the research by Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969); Crews (1982); Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops (1978); and Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958) suggested that prior to the conference the supervisor should:

1. gather data in a factual and objective way, focusing on a few topics to be discussed
2. analyze the data, the teacher, his/her abilities and background
3. identify areas of concern
4. develop a conference agenda based on information and concerns
5. plan strategic questions to be asked
6. determine ways to assist the teacher, assembling professional materials if needed
7. schedule a time for the conference as soon after the observation as possible

In summary, in order for a conference to be successful, ample preparation is necessary. Data should be gathered and analyzed. Areas of concern should be identified and a conference plan or outline developed. Failure to do so may leave the teacher resentful, bemused, and with no further plans to change as a result of the conference.

**Structuring the conference**

After planning the conference and establishing the proper mind set, the next step is to conduct the conference. Many researchers have speculated on the proper structure to be followed in the conference. Maier (1976) contended that a successful dyadic interaction had a good opening, body, and closing. Stewart and Cash (1978) agreed; the opening can be the most important part of the interview--it helps to establish rapport and hopefully motivates the interviewee to communicate freely. The opening also explains the purpose and nature of the interview. When planning for the conference body, Stewart and Cash suggested developing an outline or checklist of topics to be covered. While the closing should be brief, it should still summarize main conference points and make no false promises. One should remember that abrupt closings may destroy the rapport and trust developed previous to or during the conference.

A study by Kyte (1962) investigated goals for improvement or job improvement targets set during the conference. Thirty audiotapes of conferences between elementary teachers and supervisors were analyzed.
From results of the investigation, Kyte concluded that no conference should include more than four or five items. The first item should always be used to establish rapport with the teacher, while the second, third, and fourth items should stress major conference points. The last item should be of minor stress or something of passing mention, all in all, having a pleasing affect on the teacher regardless of its influence on subsequent teaching.

The procedure to be followed during the conference is dependent on the people involved and the type of conference to be conducted. Therefore, the methodology suggested should be taken as such and modified for each conference situation. The most comprehensive series of guidelines was suggested by Crews (1982) and by Morgan and Champagne (1971, p. 3). The following have also contributed: Connette (1938); Davis (1963); Ford (1964); Leggitt (1951); Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops (1978); Neagley (1980); and Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958). A summary of the guidelines is presented below.

1. Provide a relaxed and quiet atmosphere.
2. Begin the conference on a positive note.
3. Review the procedure to be used during the conference with the teacher.
4. Specify the conference objectives.
5. Agree to focus on one or two areas of concern, beginning with what the teacher is most interested in.
6. Focus the conference on the teacher, allowing the teacher to talk openly and honestly.

7. Use skillful questioning and a problem-solving approach to discuss teacher behavior related to conference objectives.

8. Identify and reinforce positive, appropriate teacher behaviors related to the conference focus.

9. Cite openly weaknesses and lags, remembering to criticize methods and techniques, not individuals.

10. Listen actively.

11. Propose and examine alternative behaviors, encouraging the teacher to suggest alternatives.

12. Select the best alternatives.

13. Make a plan of action in writing. Include a summary of main points agreed upon and the assignments of responsibilities made by each party.

14. Practice the implementation.

15. Select criteria for achievement of the plan.

16. Have the teacher give feedback on the purpose and perceptions of the conference.

17. Review the commitments.

18. Summarize the conference.

19. Evaluate the conference outcome and supervisory effectiveness in order to improve future conferences.
In summary, the procedure to be followed in the conference is dependent on the people involved and the type of conference to be conducted. Most agree that a good conference has an opening, body, and closing. During the conference, the teacher should actively participate in the discussion and the setting of goals for improvement. The supervisor should ask questions and actively listen to what the teacher is saying. The conference should close with some kind of summary.

Principal conference attitudes and behavior

The behavior of the principal during the conference is, of course, critical. It is, therefore, necessary to examine what research tells us about appropriate supervisory behavior during the conference.

First, supervisors must have a commitment to helping teachers. They should be warm, empathic, responsive, appear as an equal, and not coerce or pressure the teacher (Connette, 1938; Ford, 1964; Leggitt, 1951; and Marks, Stoops, King-Stoops, 1978).

Jenkins (1951) contended that if a helping relationship was to occur one must begin by asking, "How can I best help this person to solve the difficulty?" Jenkins also suggested that a person could be effectively helped after the following conditions were met: 1) emotional security in dealing with the problem, 2) motivation to work through the problem, and 3) the use of a problem-solving process.

Rogers (1961) advocated a helping relationship which promoted the growth and improved functioning of another individual. He identified ten characteristics of client-centered helping relationships. To make
1. Can I (as a supervisor) be perceived by the other person (teacher) as being trustworthy, dependable, and consistent?

2. Can I (as a supervisor) be expressive enough as a person that what I am will be communicated unambiguously?

3. Can I (as a supervisor) let myself experience positive attitudes toward this other person—attitudes of warmth, caring, liking, interest, and respect?

4. Can I (as a supervisor) be strong enough as a person to be separate from the other?

5. Am I (as a supervisor) secure enough as a person to permit him (the teacher) his separateness?

6. Can I (as a supervisor) let myself enter fully into the world of his (the teacher's) feelings and personal meanings and see these as he does?

7. Can I (as a supervisor) receive him (the teacher) as he is? Can I communicate this attitude?

8. Can I (as a supervisor) act with sufficient sensitivity in the relationship so that my behavior will be perceived as a threat?

9. Can I (as a supervisor) free him (the teacher) of the threat of external evaluation?
10. Can I (as a supervisor) meet this other individual (the teacher) as a person who is in the process of becoming, or will I be bound by his past and my past?

Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969) noted that awareness of genuine concern and respect on the part of those who supervised helped teachers to change or improve behavior. They also felt it was important to learn to listen, to meet the teacher's needs through words or behavior that showed honest encouragement, to recognize the other person's feelings, and to maintain objectivity with teachers in discussion.

Abrell (1974) also encouraged a climate which created human growth and fulfillment of the teacher. A five-step process which the humanistic supervisor should take to achieve instructional improvement included:

1. establishment of an open collegial relationship
2. identification of the teacher's and institution's needs, aspirations, talents, and goals
3. development of a plan of what is to be done, how it is to take place, and when it is to occur, using active involvement
4. identify and empathize with the teacher
5. analyze teaching performance by holding a conference in which the supervisor plays the roles of questioner, facilitator, and resource person

In summary, principal attitudes and behavior during the conference are critical. Generally, a helping relationship is essential. The
supervisor should be warm, empathic, responsive, appear as an equal, and not coerce or pressure the teacher. A climate should be created which encourages human growth and fulfillment.

Climate

If supervision is to be effective, most say an essential element is the conference climate. Climate is often described as the "feel" or "tone" of the conference. It is difficult to accurately describe just what "feel" or "tone" means. Kindsvatter (1981) suggested that conference climate included feelings, attitudes, perceptions, and predispositions. Others suggested that climate encompassed principal-teacher rapport, nonverbal communication, and the physical setting (Kyte, 1962; Perkins, Kiesler, and Anchin et al., 1979). This section describes conference climate, its components, and the affect that "feel" or "tone" may have on the eventual outcome of the conference.

The information available on conference climate is somewhat limited and mostly speculative. Cogan (1973) noted that the extent to which a teacher faces up to inconsistencies in behavior may well depend upon the quality of the climate and the setting the supervisor provides. Likewise, Redfern (1978, p. 43) considered "the establishment of a climate of acceptance as paramount in the teacher evaluation cycle." Similarly, in the business field, Maier (1958) advocated creating a favorable interaction climate to remove any interference with problem-solving during the appraisal interview. Most all the research seems to
suggest that in order to create positive change in teacher behavior, administrators must begin by developing a supportive climate.

But what constitutes a supportive or defensive climate? A study by Gibb (1961) examined supportive and defensive climates over an eight-year period of time. Gibb listened to recordings of discussions occurring in a variety of settings and developed six pairs of defensive and supportive categories of climate commonly found in discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensive Climate Characteristics</th>
<th>Supportive Climate Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>problem orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategy</td>
<td>spontaneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neutrality</td>
<td>empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superiority</td>
<td>equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainty</td>
<td>provisionalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Gibb's groupings one can see that a defensive climate might be ego-threatening to the teacher, while a supportive climate might communicate empathy and be less threatening.

The nonverbal element of dyadic interactions has been repeatedly researched in the counseling field, but this author could not find data regarding nonverbal behavior and post-observation conferences. It seems, however, that one can assume that the research in counseling situations can be applied to educational situations.

Nonverbal behavior and levels of empathy have been studied by many researchers. Haase and Tepper (1972) studied counselor-client interactions by using counselors in role-play situations. The subjects were asked to respond to 48 combinations of eye contact, trunk lean,
body orientation, distance, and verbal empathy. Each role play situation was then judged by experienced counselors as to the level of empathy. Findings suggested that nonverbal cues greatly influenced the message communicated verbally by the counselor.

Another study on nonverbal communication and empathy resulted in similar findings. In this study, D'Augelli (1974) asked undergraduate students to examine nonverbal communication and empathy. Preselected nonverbal behaviors (smiling, nodding, leaning, staring away or down, and stammering) were tallied during helping interactions. Students also assessed empathic understanding, emotional honesty, and acceptance. Results of the study demonstrated that when counselors smiled and nodded they were judged by others to be more empathic, again signifying the importance of nonverbal behavior.

A third study in the area of nonverbal communication examined the inconsistencies between verbal and nonverbal counselor behavior and such traits as empathy, genuineness, and expertness in helping others (Tyson and Wall, 1983). One hundred and twenty women viewed one of four eight-minute videotapes of a role-played counseling situation. Results indicated that nonverbal behavior tended to influence verbal messages in the direction of the nonverbal message. It is evident that nonverbal messages clearly influence verbal messages. Administrators need to pay closer attention to the nonverbal cues they are sending if development of a favorable conference climate is desired.
The physical setting has a significant effect on the conference. If one expects honesty and openness during the conference, a place that is somewhat private must be used to conduct the conference (Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski, 1980). Regardless of the location, telephone and staff disruptions should be limited to extreme emergencies in order to provide continuity of thought and communication during the conference (Stewart and Cash, 1978).

If the conference is to be held in the principal's office, the seating arrangement must be considered. A communication barrier is often created when the principal conducts the conference behind his/her desk. A much more relaxed arrangement would be to have chairs at right angles or facing each other (Stewart and Cash, 1978; Sweeney, 1982).

In summary, from the information available on conference climate, it appears that a supportive climate is crucial in providing an atmosphere conducive to change. A supportive climate is defined by Gibb (1961) as being descriptive, centered on problem-solving, spontaneous, empathic, equal, and provisional. By creating such a favorable "feel" or "tone" in the conference, teachers will be less anxiety-prone and defensive in the conference.

Principals must also be aware of the nonverbal cues they are projecting during the conference. Remembering that nonverbal cues should be sincere and consistent with the verbal message sent and that when administrators use more nods and smiles, teachers will most likely feel the principal is more empathic.
The physical setting of the conference also plays a part in the climate which is created. The conference should be conducted in a nonthreatening, private place, where disruptions may be kept to a minimum. Chairs should be arranged at right angles or facing each other to prevent communication barriers.

Conference Dissonance

The amount of teacher dissonance during the conference may be a factor in conference effectiveness. Conference dissonance concerns the difference between what ought to be and what is. A teacher's perceptions as to how the conference should be conducted as opposed to what he or she perceived as actually happening in the conference comprise the degree of dissonance.

Although no research exists on conference dissonance, the related concepts of cognitive dissonance and role expectations shed light on the topic. Conference dissonance is a derivative of the cognitive dissonance theory which was first introduced by Festinger (1957). Cognitive dissonance is based on the assumption that if a person holds cognitions about him/herself or the environment which are inconsistent, dissonance may occur. A person feeling dissonance strives to reduce or get rid of this dissonance either by changing behavior to become consistent with thoughts or more likely by changing thoughts to become consistent with behavior.
Dissonance can be a motivating force leading to its own reduction. Those experiencing dissonance have a tendency to change the elements which contribute to the dissonance. The greater the magnitude of the dissonance, the greater the desire to reduce it and to change.

Westerberg (1983) studied cognitive dissonance in relationship to teacher growth during supervision. Results of the study reported that regardless of the number of principal observations there was a steady growth of a practical significance in cognitive dissonance. The growth was greater, however, when there were more observations.

Conference dissonance is different from cognitive dissonance in the ownership of change. In cognitive dissonance, the individual controls the choice to change behavior or thoughts, while with conference dissonance two individuals are involved and the teacher will unlikely be able to change the principal's behavior. To eliminate dissonance, then, the most likely recourse would be a change in the teacher's conception of the principal's role or behavior.

One needs to remember that conference effectiveness is a function of the teacher's preferences and expectations. In other words, it is likely that an effective conference is contingent upon the extent to which supervisory behavior is congruent with teacher expectations. In light of the importance of role expectations, a closer examination of the topic has merit. According to Burgoon et al. (1978), people have definite expectations they anticipate others to exhibit. Violations of those expectations can either facilitate or inhibit change in others. For example, if a person expects another to be negative but instead
demonstrates positive behaviors, the receiver will tend to over estimate how positive the unanticipated behaviors are. The reverse is true of a positive person exhibiting unanticipated negative behaviors. This could be applicable and troublesome to conference situations where the principal must inform the teacher of inappropriate classroom behavior.

Another reported study by Motowidlo (1979) suggested that behavior is determined by a person's expectancies about the consequences of an act. More specifically, the stronger the belief that desirable consequences will follow an act, the greater the likelihood that person will perform the task or change behavior in hopes of the desired outcome.

Knowledge of expected outcomes may also help to prevent anxiety and fear. Green and Sparks (1983) claim that a state of fear or anxiety may arise when someone is unable to identify behaviors which lead to expected successful outcomes. Perhaps we could assimilate this to the conference. If a principal would explain the conference purpose and procedures, fear and anxiety would be lessened and a change in behavior would more likely occur due to anticipated outcomes and a more open climate.

Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) also agreed on the importance of knowing and accepting each other's roles as teacher and supervisor. In doing so, roles may be better affected by both parties, creating a threat-free atmosphere in which both can accept, appreciate, and understand. Confronting role expectations also helps principals to more successfully cope with teachers' defense-mechanisms.
The induction of roles has also been studied in counseling situations. The role preparation of college students for counseling and its effects on communication during the counseling session was the basis for a study by Friedlander and Kaul (1980). Results of the investigation found role preparation did have an outcome on behavior. Role-prepared clients contributed substantively and took more responsibility for direct dialogue. The data also indicated that role-prepared clients perceived their counselors as more helpful. This is consistent with research by Hoehn-Saric et al. (1964) and Pope et al. (1972), who suggested that clients exposed to role-induction and thus role expectations were more verbal, expressive, satisfied, and successful in counseling. Perhaps, the same could be true in a post-observation conference situation. If a principal instructed the teacher as to each other's roles and expected outcomes in the conference, then the teacher might be more satisfied and feel the conference was more successful.

In summary, conference dissonance concerns teacher perceptions as to how the conference should be conducted (ideal) as opposed to what they perceived as actually happening in the conference (actual). Conference dissonance is similar to cognitive dissonance but focuses more on role expectations in a specific situation. From the research one can deduce that role expectations can facilitate or inhibit future change of teachers. It seems likely that one solution would be to help teachers understand roles and expectations in the conference which may result in a more successful conference.
Conference Effectiveness

Defining conference effectiveness is a challenging task. Researchers often advise practitioners on how to conduct the conference and the proper behavior for the principal to use during the conference, but nowhere in the literature could a definition of conference effectiveness be found. There are, however, some basic assumptions about the conference and supervision which may be helpful. First, it seems safe to assume that the primary purpose of supervision is to improve instruction (Gordon, 1973). Typically, to improve instruction a change in teacher behavior is necessary. Thus, the supervisor becomes a change agent who facilitates change and self-improvement (Blumberg, 1965). If teacher change is the ultimate goal of supervision, then the vehicle most likely used to achieve this goal is the post-observation conference. How else can one reach conciliation about change than by asking the teachers themselves? Who better knows how useful or productive the conference or of how effective the supervisor than the teacher?

In the few cases where effectiveness was addressed by researchers, most address the teacher's willingness to change their perceptions and thus their behavior. For example, Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) suggested that the central purpose of the post-observation conference was to provide the teacher with constructive feedback with hopes of effecting improvement in the teacher's performance. Similarly, Wilburn (1983) described the successful conference as one that results
in a change of the individual's behavior. Wilburn also noted that successful conferences do not just simply happen. First, the supervisor must decide what behavioral change is desired as a result of the conference. Next, the supervisor must use persuasive data, manage the climate, effectively use a helping relationship, develop alternatives, set goals for improvement, and close the conference. Hopefully, through skillful manipulation of these techniques the teacher will want to change.

Post-observation conferences with student teachers were studied by Stratemeyer and Lindsey (1958, p. 426). They noted that in conferences with student teachers:

The real proof of success and value of any conference is the change in action and behavior of the conferees. Has the conference or conferences deepened the student's insight into teaching? How has his/her teaching changed? In what ways is he/she growing? Answers to these questions provide the real test of the effectiveness of the conference as a teaching-learning situation.

In summary, conference effectiveness is not easily defined, but most experts agree that the ultimate goal of supervision is to improve instruction. Most often supervisors work to facilitate this change in the teacher, and the post-observation conference is the vehicle primarily used to accomplish this change. Teacher perceptions appear to be the best measure of effectiveness, since it is nearly impossible to measure what teachers do following the conference or why they do it.
Research indicates that life styles, inclinations, and tendencies influence the way we think and ultimately behave in the conference. Life styles are a combination of thinking styles and self-concept. More specifically, thinking styles are a mixture of values leading to attitudes, and thus to behavior, which has consequences for each individual's perceptions (Human Synergistics, 1981). Often these factors help contribute to the self-concept—the intellectual, social, psychological, and physical images people have of themselves. Together, thinking styles and self-concept influence job performance, interpersonal style, and leadership effectiveness.

There are 12 life styles in the instrument used in the study. They are partly based on Maslow's (1954) research on human needs, as well as the work of need theorist, McClelland (1953); management theorist, McGregor (1960); and psychologists Rogers (1961) and Sullivan (1953).

The 12 life styles are designed to reflect the complex nature of human behavior. They include: humanistic-helpful, affiliative, approval, conventional, dependent, avoidance, oppositional, power, competitive, competence, achievement, and self-actualize.

These life styles are not hierarchical. Some life styles are positively related to each other (e.g., avoidance and oppositional), while others are in opposition (e.g., power and affiliative). Other life styles are independent of each other, such as avoidance and conventional. The life styles are positioned around a clock, so that
positively related styles are close together and those not related further apart. Opposites are positioned across from each other on the clock. Appendix D illustrates the clock and includes an explanation of each life style.

An important aspect of the life styles approach is that most people have a primary style and one or more back up styles. This can be positive or present problems depending on how they interact. For example, problems may arise if an individual is power-oriented, yet high in approval. The two life styles do not mesh since the power-orientation would tend to be bossy, aggressive, and authoritarian, while the approval-orientation of the person would be overtly concerned with being liked.

The life styles are grouped into four broad areas of concern. Two compare the distinction between task and people while the other two distinguish between security and satisfaction. The four quartiles are people/satisfaction, people/security, task/satisfaction, and task/security.

The task and people dichotomy has been widely researched by many theorists studying leadership styles. Two theories in particular are prevalent—Blake and Mouton's (1964) concern for people and production and Katz, Maccoby, and Morse's (1950) distinction between employee and managerial styles. The security and satisfaction distinction is based on Maslow's (1954) higher and lower order needs.
The instrument has been used with 1,000 respondents randomly selected from a population of 5,000. The reliability of the 12 life styles ranged from alpha coefficients of .80 to .88 and averaged .84. There is also some evidence of construct, convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity.

Life styles could influence the manner in which the supervisor approaches and interacts with the teacher throughout the conference. Those high in the people quartiles would strive for a helping relationship with teachers. Contrary to the people quartiles, the task quartiles would be more concerned with immediate teacher change at any cost.

In summary, life styles are a combination of thinking styles and self concept. Together they reflect values and attitudes which affect behavior. There are 12 different life styles strategically positioned on a clock to reflect interrelationships as well as opposites. Life styles influence job performance, interpersonal styles, and leadership effectiveness and, therefore, it seems safe to assume, influence the manner in which a supervisor approaches and interacts with the teacher throughout the conference.

Dogmatism

The concept of dogmatism flows from the work of Rokeach (1960, p. 57) who defined it as "the extent to which a person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information on its own intrinsic merits
and unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation, arising from within the person or from the outside." According to Rokeach (1954, p. 195), a person high in dogmatism (closed-mindedness) would have a "closed cognitive system of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority, which in turn, provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others." Persons low in dogmatism (open-mindedness) have an open cognitive belief system and will be less willing to accept absolute authority.

The work of Rokeach and others suggested that those individuals who are closed-minded may be disadvantaged in situations requiring critical thinking, especially if unfamiliar ideas must be synthesized. Rokeach (1960) explored differences in thinking styles of closed-minded persons in reference to analysis and synthesis skills. Sixty subjects were given the "Doodlebug Problem" in which each subject had to temporarily adopt and use a set of rules organized in a way against procedures followed in daily life. Each subject had to discover how Joe Doodlebug could get food in exactly four jumps. Highly dogmatic subjects had more difficulty in synthesizing or integrating beliefs than did low dogmatics. However, they did not differ in their ability to analyze.

A replication of the Doodlebug study was done by Fillenbaum and Jackman (1961) using 49 subjects. Subject scores were also obtained for generalized anxiety using a derived form of Welsh's MMPI (1956). The results of the study confirmed what Rokeach had found earlier. The more
closed-minded a person, the greater the difficulty in synthesizing and organizing information.

Another area of dogmatism often studied involves critical thinking skills. From a sample of 500 college students Kemp (1960) sampled 150 of the most open and closed-minded. The subjects were given Form E of Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale and a 50 item critical thinking test. The results showed open-minded individuals were superior in critical thinking skills to those closed-minded. Kemp attributed the less efficient critical thinking skills of high dogmatics to:

1. difficulty in tolerating ambiguities leading to closure before full consideration was given to each piece of evidence
2. perceptual distortion of facts resulting in decisions not encompassing all elements of the problem
3. lack of recognition of significant parts or the whole problem, thus basing the solution on performed value patterns

Resistance to change is common among closed-minded individuals. They are inclined to be extremely resistant to change, due to the inability to synthesize additional information into pre-existing belief structures (Brightman and Urban, 1974). The influence of dogmatism in conflict resolution was examined by Druckman (1967). This work further illustrated the tendency of high dogmatics to resist change. Two hundred and forty subjects were selected based on their scoring in the upper or lower quartiles of a modified dogmatism scale. The subjects played a simulated bargaining game assuming the roles of union and management representatives. Regardless of roles held, high dogmatics
resolved fewer issues, were more resistant to compromise, and were more likely to view compromise as defeat. High dogmatics were also less willing to defect from their given positions.

Dogmatism has also been studied in regards to teacher behaviors. Emerson and Elford (1978) reported elementary student teachers in Ontario found high in dogmatism were less idealistic in their concept of the ideal teacher, were somewhat over-confident about their own teacher related qualities, and received lower student teaching marks. Low dogmatics were somewhat the opposite.

Change in teacher behavior, the ultimate goal in supervision, can also be affected by dogmatism. Kerr (1976) examined dogmatism, attitude toward supervision, and the change in teaching patterns of 20 elementary teachers who had experienced clinical supervision. Those scoring high in dogmatism indicated supervisors should provide concrete assistance to improve teacher performance and somehow reduce teacher anxiety and tension. High dogmatic teachers were also more willing to engage in direct two-way communication with their supervisors.

The interaction of dogmatics with authority figures has interesting implications for conferences. Rokeach (1960) found that the extent to which an individual is open or closed-minded may influence the individual's orientation toward authority. Contrary to what one might assume, when a person perceived as an authority figure is confronted by a more open-minded person, the open-minded person would tend to question the authority. Then, after reviewing the information provided by the
authority figure, the person would tend to act on the information according to personal best interests. While a more closed-minded person would rely on the authority and structure behavior accordingly.

Ehrlich and Lee (1969) explained the authority phenomena by claiming that it is more difficult for the closed-minded person to distinguish between the source of information and the quality of information. In other words, that person cannot distinguish between who said it and what the message was.

McGuckin (1967) also investigated the relationship of dogmatism to authority. In this study, two classroom groups were exposed to one of two, nine-minute taped speeches critical of policy during the Cold War. One tape had a low dogmatic appeal, the other high dogmatic. Attitudes toward the speaker were assessed by a ten-item instrument. Closed-minded subjects were more favorable to an authoritative speaker than open-minded subjects, especially if the appeal was dogmatic. Rokeach's (1960) research was consistent with that of McGuckin (1967) and Ehrlich and Lee (1969). He called the high dogmatic's tendency to conform to authority a "party-line thinker"; they not only resist change but can also change too easily.

In summary, the literature indicated that dogmatism is manifested in situations involving person-to-person communication. Those high in dogmatism are closed-minded, have difficulty in synthesizing and organizing new information, and tend to resist change. There is a strange phenomena, however, involving high dogmatics and authority
figures. High dogmatics tend to conform to what authority figures advocate. This has some interesting implications for post-observation conferences because of the tendency to conform to authority. Do teachers high in dogmatism readily accept principal criticism and suggestions for change without careful analysis or much resistance?

**Self-Acceptance**

It appears that self-acceptance may critically affect how principals and teachers perceive the post-observation conference. Self-accepting persons "accept what is, and govern themselves accordingly. They do not find it necessary to deny what they are" (Combs, 1958, p. 317). According to Jersild (1960), self-accepting persons feel worthy and have a realistic awareness of their strengths and weaknesses.

Berger (1952, p. 778), in defining self-accepting persons, modified the definition used by Scheerer (1949) and accordingly defined them as:

1. relying primarily upon internalized values and standards rather than on external pressures as a guide for behavior
2. having faith in their capacity to cope with life
3. assuming responsibility for and accepting consequences of their own behavior
4. accepting praise or criticism from others objectively
5. not attempting to deny or distort feelings, motives, limitations, abilities, or favorable qualities which they see in themselves but rather accepting them all without self-condemnation
6. considering themselves persons of worth on an equal plane with other persons
7. not expecting others to reject them, whether they gave reason to or not
8. not regarding themselves as totally different from others or generally abnormal in their reactions
9. not shy or self-conscious

Self-accepting persons were generally thought of as being adequate persons. Combs (1962) felt adequate persons were capable of accepting themselves as well as others. They willingly examined the nature of themselves and admitted what was reality. When making decisions, they were in command of the data and sure enough of themselves to be unafraid to commit to action. Goals were set in line with their capacities and were much more realistic. This resulted in a cyclic effect—the more goals they accepted, the more they were willing to try new experiences and to achieve.

Interaction during the conference appears also to be related to the ability of the principal and teacher to accept each other. Rogers, Scheerer, and Berger all studied the relationship of self-acceptance and acceptance to others. In his work with clients, Rogers (1961, p. 174) found that "as a client moved toward being able to accept experiences, he also moved toward acceptance of the experiences of others."

Modifying the definitions originally used by Scheerer (1949), Berger (1952, p. 779) described persons accepting of others as those who:
1. did not reject, hate, or pass judgment against other persons when others' behavior or standards seemed contradictory to their own
2. did not attempt to dominate others
3. did not attempt to assume responsibility for others
4. did not deny the worth of others or their equality as persons
5. showed a desire to serve others
6. took an active interest in others and showed a desire to create mutually satisfying relations with them
7. when attempting to advance their own welfare, were careful not to infringe on the rights of others

In summary, the research indicated that self-accepting persons were more inclined to look at themselves accurately, realistically, and in a positive manner. Therefore, they were capable of accepting themselves as well as others, were characterized as having an active interest in others, and desired to create satisfying relationships with them. It would seem, then, that the extent to which teachers and principals are or are not accepting may have an effect on the conference.

Summary of the Chapter

The post-observation conference is a dyadic interaction held to promote change in teacher behavior. The type of conference held is somewhat dependent on the quality of the lesson observed and particular to the teacher and supervisor. Often conferences stimulate critical
thinking about educational problems, provide for the sharing of ideas, and suggest creative ways to implement good teaching practices.

The dynamics of the interaction between the principal and teacher play a major part in the conference. Researchers tend to support an indirect approach in which teachers participate freely, especially if a change in behavior is desired. Feedback during the conference should be specific and based on facts to be considered more effective.

If a conference is to be successful, preparation beforehand is essential. Areas of concern should be identified and a plan of action developed. During the conference, most agree that a highly structured setting, previously explained to the teacher results in greater success.

Principal behaviors and attitudes during the conference are also critical. Generally, a helping relationship, in which the supervisor is warm, empathic, and responsive is considered essential. Similarly, an open climate, conducive to change is advocated by many.

Conference dissonance can inhibit or facilitate future change of the teacher. It is concerned with teacher perceptions as to how the conference should be conducted (ideal), as opposed to what teachers perceived as actually happening (actual) in the conference. Role expectations play a large part in conference dissonance. It seems likely, then, that knowledge of expected roles before the conference could result in a more successful conference.

Conference effectiveness is not easily defined. Most experts agree that the ultimate goal of supervision is to improve instruction. The
vehicle primarily used to accomplish this change is the post-observation conference. Since it is nearly impossible to measure what teachers do, often their perceptions appear to be the best measure of effectiveness.

While there are many other concepts which could impact on the conference, this study limited further discussion to life styles, dogmatism, and self-acceptance. Life styles are a combination of thinking styles and self-concept. They influence job performance, interpersonal style, and leadership effectiveness. Life styles could influence the manner in which the supervisor approaches and interacts with the teacher throughout the conference.

The resistance to change, or dogmatism, may be manifested in situations involving person-to-person communication, such as a conference. High dogmatics tend to conform to what authority figures advocate. This may have some interesting implications for the post-observation conference because of the tendency to conform to authority.

The extent to which teachers and principals are or are not accepting may have an effect on the conference. Research indicated that self-accepting persons were more inclined to look at themselves accurately, realistically, and in a positive manner. They are also capable of accepting themselves as well as others and have a desire to create satisfying relationships.
CHAPTER 3—METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methods and procedures used in the analysis of post-observation conferences. This chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) sample; (2) instrumentation; (3) procedures; and (4) statistical analyses of data.

Sample

The sample consisted of 17 school principals and 66 elementary and secondary school teachers. Most of the participants were from Iowa schools, but there was one principal and four teachers from Missouri and the same number from a Nebraska school. Many of the principals were enrolled in courses at Iowa State University and volunteered because of their interest in teacher performance improvement.

It was not possible to randomly select teachers; they volunteered and each principal then selected four teachers from volunteers in his/her building. An effort was made to select at least one probationary teacher, one needing considerable assistance, and two others.

Table 1 presents the distribution of principals and teachers by school level. Four of the principals were from the elementary level, eleven from the secondary level, and two were principals in comprehensive K-12 schools.

Table 2 reports the distribution of principal experience and years at the present school. Seven principals were fairly new at the
TABLE 1. Distribution of principals and teachers by school level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Principals n=17</th>
<th>Teachers n=66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive (K-12)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. Distribution of principal experience (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of principals</th>
<th>Less than 1 year</th>
<th>1 - 3 years</th>
<th>4 - 10 years</th>
<th>More than 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at present school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

principalship with one to three years of experience. The majority of principals (nine) had four to ten years of experience, and only one principal had more than ten years.
Information concerning the number of years principals had been at their present location was also collected. Two principals were new to their schools, eight had been at their present school for one to three years, and seven had been there from four to ten years. No principals had been at their present location more than ten years.

Table 3 reports the number of post-observation conferences conducted by principals during their careers. Most of the principals had considerable experience in conducting post-observation conferences; the majority (14) had conducted more than 30 conferences.

### Table 3. Number of post-observation conferences previously conducted by principals (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conferences conducted</th>
<th>Number of principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there was interest in examining the factors which affected each conference, data were collected from the principals before and after each conference. The information collected included: (1) type of
conference expected by the principal; (2) the teacher's years of teaching experience; (3) number of conferences previously conducted with teacher; (4) perceptions of teacher effectiveness; (5) principal rapport with teacher; and (6) teacher perceptions of the effect of audiotaping the conference.

Table 4 shows principals' perceptions of the type of conference conducted. Over 70 percent of the conferences were designed to provide positive feedback. Of these, 33 conferences were planned to review what went well in the lesson, and the remaining 14 were designed to commend teacher excellence. Thirteen were planned to identify problems in teaching and an additional six to cite negative aspects of the lessons presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of conference</th>
<th>Number of conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review what went well</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commend an excellent teacher</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify problems</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite negative aspects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows the years of teaching experience. Twenty teachers were probationary (having less than three years of experience); of these, ten were beginning teachers and ten others had taught for one to three years. The majority of teachers were nonprobationary (having 3 or more years of teaching experience); 27 teachers had 4 to 10 years of teaching experience and 18 had taught for more than 10 years. Information on years of teaching experience was not available for one teacher.

**TABLE 5. Years of teaching experience (n=65)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of conferences previously held between each principal and teacher is reported in Table 6. No previous post-observation
conference between principal and teacher was reported in 23 cases of the 66 conferences. Principals reported a previous conference with 43 teachers, with 1 to 3 conferences being the modal response.

TABLE 6. Prior post-observation conferences held between principals and study teachers (n=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of conferences</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 reports teachers' classroom effectiveness (compared to other teachers in the school). Thirty-two teachers were rated as highly effective, 22 moderately effective, and the remaining 12 as less effective than the other staff members.
TABLE 7. Principals' ratings of teachers' effectiveness in the classroom as compared to other teachers on the principal's staff (n=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of effectiveness</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly effective</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately effective</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less effective</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instrumentation

Several survey instruments were utilized in the study. Instruments with established validity and reliability were used to measure: (1) principal life style preference, (2) dogmatism, (3) self-acceptance, and (4) conference climate. Other instruments were developed by the researcher to measure: (1) principal and teacher perceptions of conference effectiveness; (2) teacher perceptions of principal conference behavior; (3) teacher preferred principal conference behavior; (4) verbal interaction during the conference; and (5) conference opening and closing procedures. A description of the established instruments used in the study follows.
Life Style Inventory

The Life Style Inventory (Lafferty, 1973) was used to measure principals' thinking and life style preferences. Thinking or life styles are a combination of values leading to attitudes, and thus to behaviors, which influence perceptions in relation to the environment. The inventory measures 12 different thinking or life styles:

1. humanistic—enjoys developing, helping, and teaching others; regards people as inherently good; accepts them unconditionally; likes people and understands them; needs to establish and maintain open, warm, and supportive relationships.

2. affiliative—cooperative, friendly, and open with others; high need for warm relationships and many friends; wants to like and be liked; regards people as more important than things.

3. approval—overly concerned with being liked; bases own opinions about self and things on what others think; frequently agrees with others to be accepted;

4. conventional—behaves according to status quo; takes little risk, covers mistakes, and follows rules; needs to gain acceptance by conformity; frequently does things according to the way they have been done in the past;

5. dependent—does what is expected without questions; compliant and eager to please others; highly influenced by others; strong need to follow without challenge;
6. avoidance—tendency to stay away from any situation that may pose a threat; needs to protect self-worth rather than experience life and grow; afraid of conflict and personal failure.

7. oppositional—needs to question things, sometimes to the point of opposing and resisting authority; critical tendencies may be a reaction against a need to be close to people; behavior can be antagonistic, causing defensiveness in others.

8. power—tends to be hard, tough, bossy, and aggressive; needs to gain prestige, influence, and control over people in order to maintain personal security; authoritarian or dictorial as a leader;

9. competitive—self-worth is based on winning; turns many situations into contests; strong need for commendation and praise; can be self-defeating because failure is unacceptable.

10. competence—driven need to appear independent, competent, and confident; sets high expectations for self to the point of being unreasonable, thus self-defeating; failure to meet perfectionistic standards can result in self-blame.

11. achievement—feeling that personal effort can make a difference in the total outcome; believe in cause-and-effect relationships; needs to set own standards of excellence and
pursue self-set goals; willing to take moderate risks if they may produce results.

12. self-actualize—concerned with personal growth and development; responsible, confident, relaxed, and unique; motivated by an internal need to accomplish self-set goals; perceptive and understanding of others; accepts life in the elegance of its simplicity and truth.

The original sample population for the instrument consisted of 1,000 respondents randomly selected from a population of 5,000. The reliability of the 12 Life Styles ranged from alpha coefficients of .80 to .88, and averaged .84.

There is some evidence of construct, convergent, discriminant, and criterion-related validity. The construct validity of the instrument had been tested, at least in part, by determining if the empirical relationships between the Life Styles were consistent with hypothesized relationships. Researchers found: (1) there were strong, positive correlations between Life Styles that were close to one another on the clock; (2) Life Styles that were strongly linked to higher-order needs correlated negatively with those strongly linked to lower-order needs; and (3) correlations between Life Styles on the right side of the clock (people-oriented) and those on the left side (task-oriented) were close to zero. Convergent and discriminant validity were also addressed. Correlations were run between each of the 240 items in the instrument and the 12 life style indices. The correlations of each item to the 12
indices then were compared to determine whether the item correlated more strongly with its own index than with any of the other 11 indices. The results of this analysis showed that the large majority of items correlated very strongly with their own indices.

The criteria used to establish concurrent and predictive validity included promotability and the problem solving effectiveness of managers. In one test, for example, the promotability of 26 line managers was examined using their achievement, self-actualizing, and humanistic-helpful scores. Predictions were consistent in 82 percent of the cases, with the judgments of a 3-person assessment team made on the basis of interviews, tests of intelligence, and managerial skills. Another test for criterion-related validity found that the Life Styles were significantly related to the number of problems reported by respondents. With the exception of two life styles (competence and conventional), the correlations between the indices and medical problems were in the predicted directions and were, in many cases, statistically significant. Reliability of the instrument in this study was measured using the coefficient alpha and analysis of variance which produced a coefficient of .83.

Two "quartiles" were of special interest in this study: the task/security quartile included the Life Styles of avoidance, oppositional, power, and competitive. The people/satisfaction quartile included the self-actualized, humanistic, affiliative, and approval Life Styles. These quartiles were selected because they are opposites on the
scale and suggest thinking styles which might affect the post-observation conference. Appendix D shows the Life Style Inventory.

**Short Form Dogmatism Scale**

The Short Form Dogmatism Scale (Appendix E) was used to measure principal and teacher dogmatism. It consists of 20 items which measure individual differences in "openness" or "closedness" of belief systems. Trodahl and Powell (1965) reduced the length of Rokeach's (1960) dogmatism scale so it could be more useful in survey studies. Rokeach's instrument has been revised several times in an attempt to improve reliability. There are five forms which vary in split-half reliability scores from .70 on Form A to .91 on Form D. Subjects for the five forms were college students and English workers.

Validity for the original Rokeach instrument was based on item analysis and intercorrelation of known groups. Intercorrelations between dogmatism, authoritarianism and ethnocentrism scales were tested with subgroups of English workers and college students from England, Michigan, and New York. Correlations ranged from .42 to .67 indicating that the scale tended to accomplish the purpose for which it was constructed. Further attempts to validate the scale were accomplished through the use of known groups. Two studies were done with known groups, with only the second study resulting in significant findings. In the first study, college professors were asked to select high and low dogmatic students from among graduate students with whom they have worked. No significant differences were found between the two groups.
The next study of known groups involved graduate students outside the psychology area selecting other graduate students thought to be high or low dogmatics. Scores this time were found to be significantly different for groups designated as high or low dogmatics. The researcher posited that the significant differences which were found in the second study were attributed to the students knowing their peers more intimately than professors did their students in the first study.

The short form was originally administered to 227 students in Boston, and to 84 adults in Lansing, Michigan. A corrected split-half reliability coefficient of .79 was obtained for the 20-item variation of the scale. Cross-validation of the Boston and Lansing studies yielded a validity coefficient of .94. Each of the 20 items requires use of a 7-point Likert scale which ranges from "disagree very much" to "agree very much." It takes approximately 15 minutes to administer the instrument. Responses are scored on a converted scale of 1 to 7, with 1 representing the lower end of the scale. Scores are then aggregated with a high score indicating a high degree of dogmatism.

Self-Acceptance Scale

The Self-Acceptance Scale (Berger, 1952) was used to measure the level of self-acceptance of principals and teachers, particularly in social contexts. The scale has been used with college students, adults, and stutterers and has had Spearman-Brown estimates of reliability equal to or exceeding .75 for several samples. Three methods were used to obtain validity for the instrument. The first compared judges' ratings
of freely-written material and the scores of the same subjects on the scale; correlations were found to be significantly different. The second approach involved comparison between different groups which were found to be significant at better than the one percent level tested for. Convergent validity with the Phillips Self-Acceptance Scale (1951) yielded a correlation of .73. There are 36 items which utilize a 5-point scale from 1, "not at all" to 5, "completely true." Self-acceptance is determined by an aggregated score; the higher the score, the higher the level of self-acceptance. Appendix F contains information on the Self-Acceptance Scale.

**Impact Message Inventory**

The Impact Message Inventory (IMI) developed by Kiesler (1979) assesses momentary emotional and other engagements of one person by another during a didactic transaction. It contains 15 interpersonal subscales: detached, affiliative, dominant, agreeable, competitive, inhibited, submissive, succorant, abrasive, deferent, hostile, mistrusting, sociable, exhibitionistic, and nurturant.

The IMI is a parallel structure to the Interpersonal Behavior Inventory (IBI) developed by Lorr and McNair (1965). The 15 interpersonal scales found in the IMI were adapted from the IBI. Inventory items for the IBI were correlated, factored, and arranged in a circular order. While there is little supportive evidence for the validity, reliability of the scale was reported by Stern (1958), Campbell (1959), and Leary (1957).
It should be pointed out that the initial sample for the IMI consisted of 451 introductory psychology under-graduate students. The problems inherent in developing instruments using psychological concepts are well-known; therefore, results in this area should be cautiously embraced.

Reliability of the study instrument, measured using the coefficient alpha and analysis of variance, was .91 for concepts comprising the open climate scale and .94 for those which make up the closed climate scale. The IMI may be seen in Appendix G.

The IMI was adapted for use in this study. An expert panel of Iowa State University professors identified six IMI subscales as representative measures of climate in a dyadic interaction. The six subscales utilized are:

1. affiliative—shows liking, warmth, and friendship to others
2. agreeable—cooperative, helpful, considerate, and equalitarian with others
3. dominant—leads, directs, influences, and controls others
4. hostile—criticizes, ridicules, uses punishment or aggression against others
5. mistrusting—doubts or suspects the attitudes, feelings, and intentions of others
6. nurturant—sympathetic, actively supports and gives helpful advice to others
While relationships within each subscale were analyzed individually, on the advice of the expert panel, subscales were also combined to represent a dichotomy of open climate (agreeable, nurturant, and affiliative) and closed climate (dominant, hostile, and mistrusting).

Instruments Designed Specifically for the Study

A number of instruments were designed specifically for this study. The instruments which were developed and field tested at Iowa State University included: (1) Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness, (2) Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness, (3) Teacher Perceptions Inventory, (4) Teacher Preference Inventory, (5) Principal-Teacher Supervisory Conference Interaction Analysis, and (6) Conference Opening and Closing Analysis.

The researcher used the following procedures in the development of instruments: (1) review of the literature, (2) development of an item bank for use in field testing, (3) consultation with an expert panel from Iowa State University, (4) administration of instruments to Iowa State graduate students in education classes consisting largely of principals and teachers (field test), and (5) analysis of items and refinement of instruments. A description of the instruments is provided below.

Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness was developed to measure perceptions of conference effectiveness as viewed by principals. Six statements measured the extent to which principals thought they
helped to change teacher behavior, contributed to teacher professional
growth, allowed expression of feelings and opinions, and the degree to
which there was a real exchange of views. For example, on a scale of 1,"strongly disagree" to 4,"strongly agree," one question asked
principals if "the conference made the teacher think about changing
his/her behavior." Scores from the instrument were then aggregated; the
higher the score, the more effective the conference. Reliability of the
instrument was measured using the coefficient alpha and analysis of
variance which produced a coefficient of .65. This instrument is found
in Appendix H.

Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

This instrument was developed to measure teacher perceptions of
supervisory conference effectiveness. Conference effectiveness was
measured in terms of teachers' reported tendency to change their
teaching behavior, the amount of professional growth resulting from the
conference, the extent to which there was expression of feelings and
opinions, and the degree to which there was a real exchange of views
rather than mere role-playing. For example, the teacher was given the
statement, "the conference contributed to my professional growth," and
was provided a response scale of 1,"strongly disagree" to 4,"strongly
agree" from which to indicate their choice. The higher the aggregate
score, the more effective the conference. Reliability was computed
using the coefficient alpha and analysis of variance and was found to be
.54. A copy of the instrument is found in Appendix I.
Teacher Perceptions Inventory and Teacher Preference Inventory

The Teacher Perceptions Inventory and the Teacher Preference Inventory were designed to gather information relative to three aspects of a supervisory post-observation conference. The three major variables measured included:

1. pedagogical structuring moves--(10 items) 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--(6 items) the degree to which the supervisor was supportive and exhibited qualities such as empathy, praise, encouragement, acceptance of teacher ideas, etc.

3. directive behavior--(5 items) the extent to which the principal dominated the conference discussion and decisions.

A semantic differential scale of 1 to 7 was utilized for each instrument. For example, on the Teacher Perceptions Inventory, the descriptors for one scale are 1, "strayed off task," to 7, "stayed on task." The higher the aggregate score for a variable, the more it existed in the conference.

The Teacher Perceptions Inventory specifically reports actual principal behavior during the conference as perceived by the teachers. Reliability of the instrument, computed using the coefficient alpha and analysis of variance was .66. This instrument is found in Appendix J.
The Teacher Preference Inventory is a parallel instrument which measures ideal behavior teachers would choose, if possible, during the conference. This instrument is found in Appendix K.

**Principal-Teacher Supervisory Conference Interaction Analysis**

To analyze the verbal interaction during the post-observation conference, a modification of Blumberg's (1970) "Supervisor-Teacher Interaction: An Analysis of Verbal Behavior" was used. While some of Blumberg's categories (asks for information, asks for opinion, and asks for suggestions) were combined as one, four other categories were added (off task behavior, rejects teacher's idea, checks for understanding, and principal interruptions) and one category was eliminated (positive social-emotional behavior). The categories support-inducing behavior, praise, silence or confusion, gives information, gives opinions, gives suggestions, criticism, and accepts teacher's idea were used, while the negative social-emotional behavior category was changed to teacher defensive reactions.

In the interaction analysis developed, three of the behaviors were principal and/or teacher, ten were principal behaviors and the remaining three were teacher behaviors. A description of each category follows:

**Principal and/or Teacher Behaviors:**

1. silence or confusion--no conversation or both the principal and teacher are talking simultaneously.

2. off task--discussion during the conference which is not related to the lesson observed.

3. support-inducing behavior--statements made by the principal or teacher which help to build a
"healthy" climate, but are not considered praise.

Principal Behaviors:

4. praise—positive or complimentary statements by the principal. Statements which bolster, encourage, or raise the teacher's status.

5. criticism—negative or disapproving comments made by the principal.

6. asks for information, opinions, or suggestions—principal asks the teacher for clarification of a problem or situation, for ways of handling them differently, or ways to solve problems together. Principal asks the teacher to analyze or evaluate something that occurred in the class or may occur in the future.

7. gives information—principal gives objective information to the teacher about behavior (teacher or student) that occurred during the lesson, i.e., effective teaching behaviors, what research has found, etc.

8. gives opinions—principal gives subjective information or expresses feelings to the teacher.

9. gives suggestions—principal suggests ways of handling a situation or doing things differently.

10. accepts or builds on teacher's idea—principal agrees with a statement or idea made by the teacher and/or encourages further amplification.

11. rejects teacher's idea—principal shows disapproval, denial, or opposition in response to a comment made by the teacher; the administrator may also ridicule, belittle, or make fun of the teacher.

12. checks for understanding—principal asks the teacher if information is understood or if further clarification is necessary.
13. principal interruptions--principal overrides the teacher's conversation or finishes his/her sentences.

Teacher Behaviors:

14. teacher asks for information, opinions, or suggestions--teacher asks the principal for help to analyze or evaluate something that occurred during the lesson, to help with problems, or how to handle situations.

15. teacher gives the principal information, opinions, or suggestions--the teacher gives information, opinions, or suggestions concerning the lesson.

16. defensive reactions--the teacher defends his/her behavior or position.

Categories were also used in combination to examine conference behaviors. The combined categories included: (1) supportive behavior (support-inducing behavior, praises, and accepts or builds on teacher's idea); (2) nonsupportive behavior (criticism and rejects teacher's idea); (3) didactic behavior (gives information, gives opinions, and gives suggestions); (4) indirect behavior (asks for information, opinions, and suggestions); (5) teacher talk (teacher asks for information, opinions, or suggestions, teacher gives information, opinions, or suggestions, and teacher defensive reactions); and (6) principal talk (support-inducing behavior, praise, criticism, asks for information; opinions, and suggestions, gives information, gives suggestions, gives opinions, accepts or builds on teacher's idea, checks for understanding, and principal interruptions).
Reliability was calculated using Scott's formula (1955, p. 323). Interrater reliability was established before analysis of the tapes began and after both raters had each coded a tape. Interrater reliability for the 63 audiotapes ranged from .83 to .99, with an average reliability of .90. Intrarater reliability was calculated once during the coding process, coefficients for the two raters averaged .85, meeting Flander's (1967, p. 166) recommendation that reliability coefficients be .85 or higher when multiple coders are used. The instrument can be found in Appendix L.

Conference Opening and Closing Analysis

The Conference Opening and Closing Analysis (Appendix M) measures how well the conference purpose was stated, how effectively goals for improvement were set, and if the conference was summarized. How clearly the conference purpose was stated and how effectively goals for improvement were set, each had a response scale ranging from 1 to 7. Summarizing the conference was rated on a two-point scale (yes or no). The assessment was completed by the researcher after careful analysis of each audiotape.

Procedures

Prior to beginning the study, permission was secured from the Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research. In August of 1981, 22 principals who had expressed a prior interest in improving teacher performance were contacted by telephone and the
prepared study was sent to them. Those indicating interest were sent information detailing the study. Twenty-one were interested in participating. Information packets (teachers—Appendix A, principal—Appendix B), complete with description, procedures, survey instruments, informed consent forms, and self-addressed return envelopes, were sent in October of 1981. The principals then shared information including study purposes and procedures about the study with their faculty. The principals who wished to participate and who had secured four teacher volunteers, including at least one probationary teacher and one needing considerable assistance, then notified the researcher of intent to participate (November 1981). Nineteen were willing to participate.

Starting in November of 1981, the 19 participating principals were asked to observe teachers in the classroom and to conduct a post-observation conference as they normally would. The conference was, however, to be audiotaped. The researcher assigned each school a code number and each perspective conference was also assigned a number. All instruments were coded with the appropriate code number by the researcher before distributing to the schools. Therefore, only the principals had knowledge of the teachers involved in the study.

Principals were asked to begin the study in November of 1981, and to do at least one audiotape monthly, for the next four months. If tapes were completed early, they were welcomed. Principals involved in the research agreed to provide their own audiotapes which would be returned upon completion of the study.
Although participants were asked to conduct one conference per month, tapes were returned sporadically, depending upon the principal. All tapes were finally received in March of 1982. Therefore, six months rather than four elapsed between the beginning and end of the data collection. Of a possible 80, sixty-six audiotapes and information packets were collected.

After principals observed the lesson, they then gave teachers a study packet. During the period of time between the lesson and the post-observation conference, teachers completed three survey instruments: (1) Self-Acceptance Scale, (2) Short Form Dogmatism Scale, and (3) Teacher Preference Inventory. As soon after the conference as possible, three additional instruments were completed, as well as an informed consent form. The three instruments completed following the conference were: (1) Impact Message Inventory, (2) Teacher Perceptions Inventory, and (3) Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness. To insure confidentiality, teachers were given stamped, self-addressed envelopes to return all survey instruments and informed consent forms they completed directly to the researcher.

Principals were asked to complete three survey instruments during the time between lesson observation and the first conference. The three instruments were: (1) Self-Acceptance Scale, (2) Short Form Dogmatism Scale, and (3) Life Styles Inventory. In addition to the survey instruments, principals were asked to provide situational data related to the extent of their prior training. At the conclusion of the first
conference, principals completed the Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness instrument, coded the tapes with the school and conference number, signed an informed consent form, and mailed all to the researcher in stamped, self-addressed envelopes. In subsequent conferences, only the Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness instrument, conference situational data, and the informed consent form were completed by principals and returned along with the audiotape.

Immediately prior to the conference, principals reviewed the informed consent form with teachers emphasizing that participation was voluntary. Principals then reviewed study purposes and procedures and answered any questions teachers had. At this point if teachers wished to participate, the tape recorder was turned on and the post-observation conference was conducted.

Tapes were then analyzed using interaction analysis. All data were coded and prepared for transfer to key-punched cards for computer analysis at the Iowa State University Computation Center.

Conference audiotape analysis

To analyze what occurred in the conference, two raters were trained to record the data. The raters had to memorize 16 categories until thinking in numbers became automatic. Every three-seconds one of the categories was recorded which resulted in 20 interactions per minute. The type of interaction which dominated the three-second interval was recorded on a 20 x 15 square matrix. A list of procedures for using the interaction analysis system was modified from the list developed by Blumberg (1970, p. 6). This can be found in Appendix L.
To help coders code the three-second intervals consistently, a separate audiotape which conveyed a signal every three-seconds was utilized. This method was slightly less accurate than directly recording the signals on each audiotape but prevented the possibility of the audiotape being erased by recording directly over it. The signals helped to synchronize the interactions recorded by the raters. The second audiotape with the signals was played simultaneously with the conference audiotape.

Following the coding of each tape, frequencies for each category were totaled and placed on another matrix. The frequencies for each category were then converted to a total percentage of the conference. Interrater reliability was established before actual analysis of conference audiotapes began. Two graduate students at Iowa State University were given the responsibility of analyzing tapes as part of a creative component for their Master's degrees. Prior to the first training session, raters were asked to memorize categories so well they would be automatic. They were also asked to review the procedures list, to look over examples of written transcripts, to proceed to analyze and categorize the written transcripts, and then to begin to code sample audiotapes.

During the first training session which took three hours, it was important to review and clarify categories so that raters would understand each and the range of variation well enough to make rapid decisions. The next step was to review the categorization of the
written transcripts of conferences using the interaction analysis system developed and to discuss areas of discrepancies. Following written transcript analysis, each rater analyzed audiotapes individually using the interaction analysis system. This was followed by a discussion of the process and differences in coding. The process was repeated—at first using the same tape, later using other tapes—until each rater felt confident of coding consistently. Interrater reliability was calculated at this time using Scott’s Formula (1955, p. 323) but was found to be below the .65 reliability coefficient recommended by Flanders (1970, p. 166). The raters agreed to meet at a later date to continue training. During the time between training sessions, raters again practiced with sample conference tapes.

At the second training session which lasted five hours, review of audiotapes continued, areas of discrepancies were discussed, tapes were coded, and interrater reliability was computed again. Interrater reliability at this point was at the acceptable level of .85.

After the training session, each rater took half of the audiotapes to code. Upon completion of coding each tape, raters transferred information onto the matrix. Both raters exchanged tapes until 63 audiotapes were analyzed. Two additional tapes were found to be inaudible, and one teacher decided against being audiotaped.
Statistical Analyses of Data

Frequencies and standard deviations are reported for all study variables. Pearson's Correlation was used to test study hypotheses. The affects of multiple independent variables on the dependent variable of teacher perceptions of conference effectiveness were examined using Multiple Regression. The asterisk (*) was used in tables to denote significant differences at the .05 level, double asterisks (**) were used to denote differences at the .01 level, and triple asterisks (***) were used to denote significant differences at the .001 level. The statistical analyses of data was performed by the Iowa State University Computational Center using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Computer Program.
CHAPTER 4—FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this chapter is to report the results of a study which focused on post-observation conferences. The chapter is divided into two sections: (1) descriptive data and (2) inferential statistics.

The data were collected from a sample consisting of 17 principals and 66 teachers located in Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. A number of instruments were used to collect data. Those with established validity and reliability measured: (1) principal life style preference, (2) dogmatism, (3) self-acceptance, and (4) conference climate. Other instruments were developed by the researcher to measure: (1) principal and teacher perceptions of conference effectiveness; (2) preferred and perceived principal conference behavior; and (3) verbal interaction during the conference.

Descriptive Data

Descriptive data were collected for each of the study variables. Each major variable will be briefly discussed and mean scores and frequencies presented for each.

Perceptions of conference effectiveness

Principals' and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness are reported in Table 8. The instruments used to measure effectiveness had a response scale of 1 to 5. Scores were summed to produce an aggregate score with higher scores representing more effective
TABLE 8. Conference effectiveness ratings as perceived by principals and teachers (n=65 conferences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference effectiveness score</th>
<th>Principal perceptions</th>
<th>Teacher perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale = 1, low to 5, high

conferences. Possible aggregate scores on the instrument ranged from 6 to 30. Scores for principals' perceptions of conference effectiveness ranged from 13 to 22 with a mean of 18 and a standard deviation of 2. Teacher perceptions of conference effectiveness were measured by an instrument parallel to that used to measure principal perceptions. Scores for teacher perceptions of conference effectiveness ranged from 12 to 24, with a mean of 17.8 and a standard deviation of 2.3. Data for one conference were not received.
Principal conference behavior

Principal preferred and perceived behaviors during the conference are shown in Table 9. Response scales for the two instruments ranged from 1 to 7. Mean scores were tabulated for each subscale, scores closer to 7 indicated a strong preference for that behavior which teachers preferred during the conference or that which teachers felt actually occurred to a great extent during the conference. Mean scores for each of three subscales: (1) pedagogical structuring moves, (2) humanistic qualities, and (3) directive behavior for perceived and preferred conference behavior are reported as are those for conference dissonance—the difference between the desired conference behavior of principals and that behavior which the teacher perceived during the conference. Table 9 also shows dissonance for each of the three subscales. A negative score indicates principals' conference behavior did not meet teacher expectations, while a positive score indicates principals' conference behavior surpassed expectations by teachers. Dissonance scores approaching zero reflect little discrepancy between preferred and actual behavior.

On the subscale pedagogical structuring moves (5.9), teachers tended to prefer a structured conference but perceived principals as providing less structure in the actual conference than what they preferred (5.6). Conference dissonance therefore was negative (-.3) for that subscale.
Humanistic qualities and directive principal behaviors during the conference yielded interesting results. It appears that teachers found principals to be even more humanistic (6.0) than what they said they preferred (5.9) and less directive than they would have liked them to be. The latter yielded the largest dissonance discrepancy (-.6). It also appears that while teachers do not want a highly directive principal in the conference, apparently the principals tended to be less directive (3.8) than teachers would have liked.

Self-acceptance

Table 10 reports levels of self-acceptance for principals and teachers. The self-acceptance instrument used for both teachers and principals had a five-point scale. Scores on the 36 items were summed,
higher scores represent greater levels of self-acceptance. Possible aggregate scores for the instrument ranged from 36 to 180. Principal self-acceptance scores ranged from 137 to 172, with a mean of 155.5 and a standard deviation of 9.7. Teacher scores were lower than principal scores, with a mean of 150.9, a range of 106 to 191, and a standard deviation of 16.1. Seventy-seven percent of the principals exhibited a self-acceptance score of 150 or more, compared to 61 percent of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-acceptance score</th>
<th>Principals n=17</th>
<th>Teachers n=64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-119</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-159</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-169</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170-179</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>155.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>150.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible scores: 36-180
teachers. While there were no principals who scored below 130, six of the 64 teachers did. The self-acceptance scale was not received from two of the teachers.

**Dogmatism**

Table 11 reports levels of dogmatism exhibited by principals and teachers. A response scale of 1 to 7 was used for all 20 items. Scores were then aggregated, higher scores represent greater levels of dogmatism. Possible aggregate scores ranged from 20 to 140. Principal scores ranged from 40 to 85, with a mean of 60.4 and a standard deviation of 10.8. Teacher scores were slightly higher and more spread with a mean of 61.9, a range from 30 to 93, and a standard deviation of 13. Two of the principals scored 50 or below on the dogmatism scale, compared to 12 of the 65 teachers. Eleven percent of the principals scored above 70 on the dogmatism scale, as compared to 27 percent of the teachers. One teacher failed to return the questionnaire.

**Conference climate**

Teacher perceptions of climate during the post-observation conference are reported in Table 12. The Impact Message Inventory was used to measure conference climate. This instrument has 36 items, each of which fits into 1 of 6 subscales. Each item has a response scale of 1 to 4. Scores were computed for the subscales of: (1) affiliative, (2) agreeable, (3) nurturant, (4) dominant, (5) hostile, and (6) mistrusting. A score of 4 on a subscale indicates the teacher felt this occurred more frequently during the conference; a 1 indicates the
TABLE 11. Principal and teacher dogmatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dogmatism scale</th>
<th>Principals n=17</th>
<th>Teachers n=65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td><strong>60.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td><strong>10.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible scores: 36-180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrusting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores were highest for the subscales of agreeable (3.4) and nurturant (3.3) and lowest for the subscales of hostile (1.1) and mistrusting (1.3). Scores for agreeable, affiliative, and nurturant subscales represent the extent to which there was an open climate. Scores for open climate (4 being very open) ranged from 1.8 to 3.8, with a mean of 3.2 and a standard deviation of .5. Scores on the subscales dominant, hostile, and mistrusting were combined to represent the extent to which the conference climate was closed. Scores for a closed climate ranged from 1 to 3 with a mean of 1.3 and a standard deviation of .3. The climate was seen as moderately open by 73 percent of the teachers. Only three teachers rated the climate as closed. The conference climate instrument was not returned by one teacher.

Thinking and life style preference

Scores for thinking and life style preferences of principals are shown in Table 13. The Life Style Inventory identifies twelve life styles as well as four quartiles representing a broader thinking style. Aggregate scores are converted to percentiles based on norms for a general population of 7,376 people comprised of teachers, managers, students, nurses, secretaries, salesmen, etc. The life styles of power, competitive and competence showed the highest percentile (75); while avoidance was lowest with 39 percent.

Table 14 presents a frequency distribution of raw scores for each of the quartiles. The quartiles are labeled as: (1) people/satisfaction (PESA), (2) people/security (PESE), (3) task/satisfaction (TASA), and (4) task/security (TASE). Sixteen of the 17 principals
TABLE 13. Life style preference of principals (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life style</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanistic</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-actualizing</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scored very high (above 75) in the people/satisfaction (PESA) quartile, while 12 were very high (above 75) in task/security (TASE). Conversely, the lowest scores were in people/security (PESE) and task/satisfaction (TASA), each with all 17 principals below 75.
TABLE 14. Frequency distribution of principals' life styles by quartiles (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>PEOPLE/ SATISFACTION</th>
<th>PEOPLE/ SECURITY</th>
<th>TASK/ SATISFACTION</th>
<th>TASK/ SECURITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-120</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \bar{X} \) 100.1 46.1 31.1 91.9

Verbal interaction during post-observation conferences

Verbal interaction during post-observation conferences is reported in Table 15. Each conference was analyzed by coders using interaction analysis. The percentage of the conference devoted to each of 16 categories was then calculated. One can see that the behaviors most frequently exhibited in the conference were the principal giving information (28.5) and the teacher giving information, suggestions and opinions to the principal (34.9). Rejecting teachers' ideas, checking
TABLE 15. Conference interaction analysis (n=63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPAL AND/OR TEACHER BEHAVIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Silence or confusion</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Off-task</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support-inducing behavior</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPAL BEHAVIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Praise</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criticism</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Asks for information, opinions, or suggestions</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gives information</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gives opinions</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gives suggestions</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Accepts or builds on teacher's idea</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rejects teacher's idea</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Checks for understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Principal interruptions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHER BEHAVIORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Asks for information, opinions, or suggestions</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gives principal information, opinions, or suggestions</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Defensive reactions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for understanding, and principal interruptions were not used at all and, therefore, have been accorded a 0 percent. Of the 66 conferences, again, two conference audiotapes were found to be inaudible and one teacher decided against being audiotaped; therefore, 63 audiotapes were analyzed.

The 16 categories of the interaction analysis were collapsed into grouped behaviors and can be found in Table 16. Fifty-five percent of the typical conference consisted of principal talk, while teacher talk accounted for approximately 35 percent of the interaction. Principal didactic behaviors (directly confronting) were found 47 percent of the time. Principals were supportive four percent of the time and nonsupportive less than one percent of the time. Sixty-three tapes were analyzed, two other tapes were found to be inaudible, and one teacher decided against being audiotaped.

TABLE 16. Conference interaction analysis group behaviors (n=63)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Percent of conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal talk</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher talk</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactic behavior</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive behavior</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsupportive behavior</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conference structure

Audiotapes were also analyzed to assess how effectively the conference purpose was stated, if there was a summary, and the extent to which goals for improvement were effectively set. Table 17 reports this information. In 25 of the 64 conferences (39%), the conference purpose was not stated at all. The conference purpose was not stated clearly in 15 (23%) of the conferences and stated somewhat clearly in 8 (13%) of the conferences. The conference purpose was stated clearly in 16 (25%) of the conferences. Conferences were not summarized in 46 (72%) conferences. Goals were not set in 35 (55%) of the conferences and not effectively set in 16 (25%) of the conferences. Goals were somewhat effectively set in 11 (17%) conferences, and in only 2 (3%) of the conferences, were they effectively set. Of the 66 conferences, one tape was found to be inaudible, and one teacher decided against audiotaping. Therefore, 64 tapes were analyzed for conference opening and closing structure.

Inferential Statistics

This section reports the results of the hypotheses tested, and highlights relationships of study variables not focused on in the hypotheses testing. Fifteen hypotheses were tested in this study. Each hypothesis was formulated to examine the relationship between an independent variable and the dependent variable, teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness.
TABLE 17. Conference opening and closing analysis (n=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONFERENCE STRUCTURING</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CONFERENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference purpose</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarized conference</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals for improvement</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 18 and 19 present correlation matrices for all study variables. Table 18 presents correlations for all variables in the study while Table 19 provides correlations for principal effects during the conference. It should be noted that Table 18 presents data from 66 conferences while data for the 17 principals in the 66 conferences are reported in Table 19. Variable names have been abbreviated in Tables 18 and 19 due to space limitations. A complete explanation of the
TABLE 18. Correlation matrix for post-observation conference variables (n=66)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCONEF (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCL (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLDCL (3)</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.67***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.58***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONSUP (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDAC (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTALK (10)</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTALK (11)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCONEF (12)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDOG (13)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAC (14)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDIS (15)</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>-.68***</td>
<td>-.77***</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP (16)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS (17)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
***Significant at the .001 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.96***</td>
<td>-.83***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19. Correlation matrix for principal effects during the postobservation conference (n=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCONEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLDCL</td>
<td>-0.57**</td>
<td>-0.83***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOALS</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>-0.59**</td>
<td>0.79***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-0.43*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td>-0.86***</td>
<td>-0.57***</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.62**</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUP</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONSUP</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDAC</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.76***</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTALK</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>-0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTALK</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.59**</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.81***</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAC</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDOG</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESA</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PESE</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASE</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASA</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
***Significant at the .001 level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.95***</td>
<td>- .88***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variables shown in Table 18 and Table 19 may be seen in Appendices N and O, respectively.

Conference behavior

Several significant correlations were found between study variables not included in hypotheses testing. For example, the more humanistic the behaviors of principals, the more open the climate reported by teachers (.41). Surprisingly, as principal behavior was reported as more directive, the conference climate was reported as more open (.32). Lack of support and goal setting had a negative affect on conference climate. When principals were nonsupportive or attempted to set more goals for improvement, teachers reported the climate as less open (-.31 and -.22, respectively). Significant negative relationships were found between a closed conference climate and humanistic qualities (-.58) and pedagogical structuring moves (-.34). The less humanistic and structured, the more closed the climate. Two other variables also had a significant affect on the climate. When principals were directive (-.24) or teachers had high self-worth (-.28), teachers viewed the conference climate as less closed.

Dogmatism (resistance to change) was significantly related to several variables. In particular, the data indicated that in conferences with teachers who were more dogmatic, principals were less humanistic. When teachers had high levels of dogmatism, the conference climate was also more closed (.25). It was interesting to note that teachers high in dogmatism had lower levels of self-acceptance (-.43).
Conference dissonance is defined as the difference between what teachers perceive as the expected behavior of principals and the principal behavior observed. The data indicated that conference dissonance decreased when the conference was more open (-.42), more structuring moves were introduced into the conference (-.68), principals became more humanistic (-.77), and when principals were more directive during the conference (-.36).

Finally, as expected, a relationship between goals for improvement and years of teaching experience emerged. More goals for improvement were set when teachers had less experience (-.24).

Table 19 shows the effects of principals on the conferences. Data from the 66 conferences were collapsed to show principal effects. Mean scores were computed for the conferences on each principal. For example, a mean score was computed on closed climate by using the four conferences conducted by a single principal.

Most of the correlations in Table 19 are higher than those in Table 18. For example, while the aggregate data correlation between conference effectiveness and an open climate are .56, when that same relationship is examined for the 17 principals, the relationship between those variables is stronger (.66). That tendency was consistent among many of the variables.
Hypotheses Testing

In this section the results of the hypotheses testing are reported. Fifteen hypotheses were stated in the null form. The first 14 were tested using Pearson's Correlation and can be seen in Tables 18 and 19. The last hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis and is shown in Table 20. The level of significance was set at .05.

Four of the hypotheses tested focused on principal effects on the conference while the other hypotheses examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and (1) self-acceptance, (2) dogmatism, (3) principal life style preference, (4) conference climate, and (5) conference dissonance. Significant relationships were then examined using multiple regression analysis with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness serving as the dependent variable. Below are the 15 hypotheses and the results for each test:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who employ greater structure in pedagogical moves during the conference.

The first hypothesis was designed to examine if the extent to which the principal structured the conference was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between pedagogical structuring moves (PED) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). A correlation
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coefficient of .42 was found between the variables, which was significant at the .01 level. Teachers found the conference to be more effective when principals used more structure in the conference. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.

\[ H_0^2: \text{There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report less conference dissonance.} \]

This hypothesis was designed to examine if the difference between ideal and perceived principal behavior was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 reports the relationship between teachers who reported less conference dissonance (CONDIS) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The negative correlation coefficient of -.52 was significant at the .01 level. The less dissonance reported by teachers, the more effective the conference was perceived. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.

\[ H_0^3: \text{There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more humanistic qualities during the conference.} \]

This hypothesis was designed to examine if principals' helping behavior was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between principals who exhibited more humanistic qualities (HUM) during the conference and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .19 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.
$H_0^4$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more supportive behaviors during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.

The fourth hypothesis examined if the extent to which principals were helpful during the conference was associated with what teachers perceived as conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between principals' supportive behavior (SUP) as measured by interaction analysis and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .02 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

$H_0^5$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are more direct during the conference.

This hypothesis was designed to examine if the extent to which straightforward principal behavior was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between directive principal behavior (DIR) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .19 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

$H_0^6$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are didactic during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.

This hypothesis examined if the extent to which principals sermonized was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between principals'
didactic behavior (DIDAC) during the conference and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .16 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

H07: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

This hypothesis examined if higher levels of principal self-worth were associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 19 presents the relationship between principals' level of self-acceptance (PSAC) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .10 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

H08: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

This hypothesis examined if higher levels of teacher self-worth were associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 reports the relationship between teachers who have increased levels of self-acceptance (TSAC) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .07 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

H09: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are less dogmatic.

Hypothesis nine examined if the extent to which principals were more open-minded was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 19 presents the relationship between principals...
who were less dogmatic (PDOG) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The negative correlation coefficient of -.05 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

\[ H_{010} \]: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who are more dogmatic.

The tenth hypothesis examined if the extent to which teachers were more closed-minded was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 reports the relationship between more dogmatic teachers (TDOG) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The negative correlation coefficient of -.07 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

\[ H_{011} \]: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are higher in people/satisfaction.

This hypothesis was designed to examine if the extent to which principals who were high in the people/satisfaction life style was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 19 reports the relationship between principals whose life styles are higher in people/satisfaction (PESA) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .12 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

\[ H_{012} \]: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are lower in task/security.
This hypothesis was designed to examine if the extent to which principals low in the task/security life style was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 19 presents the relationship between principals' whose life styles are lower in task/security (TASE) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The negative correlation coefficient of -.31 was not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Ho$_{13}$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more open climate.

This hypothesis was designed to examine if the extent to which teachers reported a more supportive climate was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the relationship between teachers who reported a more open conference climate (OPCL) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The correlation coefficient of .56 was significant at the .001 level. Teachers who reported an open climate perceived the conference as being more effective. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.

Ho$_{14}$: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more closed conference climate.

This hypothesis examined the extent to which a nonsupportive conference climate reported by teachers was associated with teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness. Table 18 presents the
relationship between teachers who reported a closed climate (CLDCL) and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness (TCONEF). The negative correlation coefficient of -0.36 was significant at the .01 level. When a closed climate was reported, teachers perceived the conference as less effective. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.

Ho15: There is no significant relationship among pedagogical structuring moves, open conference climate, closed conference climate, conference dissonance and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness.

This hypothesis was used to determine relative strength of significant variables. Results for this hypothesis are shown in Table 20. The prediction equation was significant; the four variables accounted for 35 percent of the variance. Open climate accounted for the largest portion of the variance (32 percent), while the others collectively accounted for approximately 3 percent of the variance. The null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative.

Summary

Chapter four has reported descriptive and inferential data related to study variables and hypotheses. First, descriptive data were presented on the means and frequencies for all major study variables. Then, hypotheses were tested using Pearson's Correlation and multiple regression analysis. Results of the statistical testing were then reported.
TABLE 20. Multiple regression analysis of teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness on pedagogical structuring moves, open conference climate, closed conference climate and conference dissonance (N=57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R SQUARED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open conference climate</td>
<td>.5378</td>
<td>26.07**</td>
<td>.3216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Dissonance</td>
<td>-.1490</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>.3449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical-structuring moves</td>
<td>+.1015</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>.3538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed conference climate</td>
<td>.0335</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>.3544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4 and 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.

The statistical testing failed to reject ten null hypotheses:

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more humanistic qualities during the conference.

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who exhibit more supportive behaviors during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are more direct during the conference.

H₀₆: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are more didactic during the conference as measured by interaction analysis.
Ho7: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

Ho8: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who have higher levels of self-acceptance.

Ho9: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who are less dogmatic.

Ho10: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who are more dogmatic.

Ho11: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are higher in people/satisfaction.

Ho12: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals whose life style tendencies are lower in task/security.

Four hypotheses were rejected in favor of the alternative:

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and principals who employ greater structure in pedagogical moves during the conference.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report less conference dissonance.

Ho13: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more open climate.

Ho14: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness and teachers who report a more closed climate.

Multiple regression was used to determine the relative predictive value of the significant variables.

Ho15: There is no significant relationship among pedagogical structuring moves, open conference climate, closed conference
climate, conference dissonance and teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness.

The four variables accounted for 35 percent of the variance and were significant at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. It should also be noted that open climate accounted for 32 percent of the variance, while the other three variables only accounted for 3 percent.
CHAPTER 5—SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The overarching purposes of this study were to: (1) examine the relationships between conference effectiveness as perceived by teachers and the following variables: conference climate, life style preference, dogmatism, self-acceptance, pedagogical structuring moves, humanistic qualities, and directive behavior; and (2) to compare conference behavior of supervisors by use of interaction analysis of audiotapes. In this chapter, the results of the investigation are discussed and recommendations for further research suggested. The chapter has been organized as follows: (1) conclusions from the data, (2) other significant findings, (3) recommendations for practice, and (4) recommendations for further research.

Conclusions from the Data

The data were collected from 17 school principals, and 66 elementary and secondary school teachers during the 1981-1982 school year. Most participants were from Iowa schools, but there was also one principal and four teachers from a Missouri school and the same number from a Nebraska school. Seven principals had between one and three years of administrative experience, while nine had four to ten years of experience, and one principal had more than ten years experience. Most of the principals had previous experience in conducting conferences, the majority having conducted more than thirty post-observation conferences. Over 70 percent of the conferences were designed to provide teachers with positive feedback. Approximately one-third of the study teachers
were probationary teachers (having less than three years of experience); the remaining were tenured teachers. Of the 66 teachers in the study, half were rated by their principals as highly effective in the classroom and less than 20 percent were considered to be less effective than most other teachers in their school. The results of the statistical testing led to the following conclusions which are presented in summary form followed by discussion.

Limitations of the study

Results of the study should be viewed with caution.

1. The subjects were volunteers; it was not possible to select a random sample of principals and teachers.

2. The sample consisted of one principal per four teachers/conferences. Principal characteristics may have influenced the results.

3. The reliability of some instruments was not high. "Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" was and the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory." In addition, reliability was not computed for the "Teacher Preference Inventory" due to the similarity between it and the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory."

4. The reliability of the subscales was not computed for the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory" or the "Teacher Preference Inventory." Therefore, it was difficult to say with certainty that these subscales are unitary.
Conference effectiveness

It was posited that principal behaviors, self-acceptance, dogmatism, and life style tendencies would make a difference in conference effectiveness, but they did not. In summary, none of the following made a difference in teachers' perceptions of conference effectiveness:

1. the degree of humanism exhibited by the principal
2. principal supportive behavior during the conference
3. the degree to which the principal was commanding and/or domineering (didactic)
4. principal directive behavior in the conference
5. principal level of self-acceptance
6. teacher level of self-acceptance
7. principal level of dogmatism
8. teacher level of dogmatism
9. principal "life style" tendencies

Three variables were significantly related to a productive conference. The findings explicated that, in the teacher's eyes, the following enhanced conference effectiveness:

1. open conference climate
2. structure
3. principal behavior which met teacher expectations

In addition, it was found that a closed conference climate had a negative affect on conference effectiveness.
The relative effects of the four variables were examined, using the regression equation. The results showed that an open climate was the best predictor of conference effectiveness. It accounted for 32 percent of the variance.

Discussion

What makes a post-observation conference successful? Practitioners and researchers have speculated on this for years. This researcher found four factors which appear to make a difference. An open conference climate stood out as the single most important factor. When teachers saw the principal as being agreeable, nurturant, and affiliative, they rated the conference as more effective. This supports research by Redfern (1978, p. 105) who noted "A climate that is positive and conducive to good interpersonal relationships gives evaluation a better chance of being successful." Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969) concluded that to promote a conference in which teachers discover and experiment with their behaviors, one of the necessary ingredients was a supportive climate. Conversely, when principals' conference behavior was reported as dominant, hostile, or mistrusting (closed), they rated the conference significantly less effective.

Structure was also found to be important. Teachers reported conferences were more effective when principals stated the purpose of the conference, asked probing questions, paused, reflected, summarized main points, discussed areas for improvement, and then set goals for improvement. This finding is consistent with Maier (1976) who stated
that a successful dyadic interaction has a good opening, body, and closing; and with Crews (1982) who advocated the use of structuring techniques similar to those found significant in the study. It appears that teachers want principals to have a plan of action and to follow that plan in an organized manner.

Conference dissonance or the principal's ability to meet teacher expectations also affected the outcome of the conference. Conference dissonance reflects the extent to which the conference met their expectations or preference. Teachers reported that conferences were more effective when principal behavior was more congruent with their expectations. This is consistent with research by Burgoon et al. (1978) who concluded that individuals have definite expectations they anticipate others to exhibit and that violations of these expectations can affect future change. Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) also agreed on the importance of knowing and accepting each other's roles of teacher and supervisor in the successful conference. Incidentally, principals were generally more humanistic than teachers expected but not as directive or structured as they would have liked them to be.

It was interesting to note that neither direct nor didactic principal behavior had an affect on the conference. These findings are somewhat in conflict with those reported by Gordon (1973) who used the critical incident technique with 122 supervisors to recall their most successful supervisory conferences. Forty-one percent of the
supervisors noted that advising and informing were the most important factors in successful conferences. Obviously, the difference lies in the eyes of the beholder; Gordon asked supervisors, not teachers.

Two other conference variables, humanism and support, were not significant. There was no direct relationship between these variables and conference effectiveness. This was inconsistent with Abrell (1974) and Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969) who all strongly encouraged development of the humanistic supervisor to promote change or improved teacher behavior.

It was surprising that neither self-acceptance nor dogmatism of either party (principal or teacher) had a bearing on conference effectiveness. While it was hypothesized that self-acceptance would influence the conference, in this investigation no significant relationship was found. This is in contrast to research by Coombs (1962) who reported the self-accepting person as willing to try new experiences and to work toward achievement.

Dogmatism, likewise, did not have a significant influence on conference effectiveness. From the research Ehrlich and Lee (1969), Rokeach (1960), and McGuckin (1967) did, it was assumed that high dogmatics would tend to conform to what authority figures advocated. While the low dogmatics would tend to question such authority and act according to best interests. It was interesting to note that such relationships did not emerge in the conference.
Leadership styles have traditionally been broken down into two concepts; concern for people and concern for task (Blake and Mouton, 1964; Halpin and Winer, 1952). The Human Synergistics Lab (1980) broke the leadership styles into thinking or life styles which reflect values and thus behavior. Life styles also influence job performance, interpersonal styles, and leadership effectiveness. In this research, such relationships were studied and no significant relationships were found.

Other Significant Findings

Conference climate

Conference climate appears to be the key element in effective conferences. But conference climate was also significantly related to many study variables not tested by hypotheses. In this section, several of these relationships will be discussed. Teachers viewed the conference climate as more open when:

1. Principals were more humanistic.
2. Principals were more directive.
3. Fewer goals for improvement were set.
4. There was a smaller gap between teacher expectations and principal behavior.
5. Principals were less nonsupportive.

The conference climate was likely to be seen as closed when:

1. Principals were less humanistic.
2. Principals became less directive.
3. Conferences were less structured.
4. Teachers had lower levels of self-acceptance.
5. Teachers had higher levels of dogmatism.

The research has shown that an open conference climate is the primary predictor of conference effectiveness. But what exactly makes for an open climate? Bebb, Low, and Waterman (1969) concluded that we needed a supportive climate, and Redfern (1978) concurred. Yet, researchers are speculative when defining climate. Perhaps this study will help paint a clearer picture.

When discussing climate, one must be cautious. It is diosynergetic (two particular participants working cooperatively together) and may differ depending on the individuals. But in general to create an open climate, supervisors should attempt to be more humanistic and supportive, yet somewhat directive, while avoiding to set too many goals for improvement. Climate still remains a hazy area, however. We need to learn more about the conference climate, what encompasses the climate feel or tone, and what makes the conference open or closed.

Recommendations for Practice

The study shed light on important questions regarding supervisory post-observation conferences. For those in the field, several recommendations seem appropriate given the results of this study and other literature. It is recommended that the following be considered by supervisors conducting post-observation conferences:
1. The supervisor should work very hard to create an open conference climate. A principal must pay closer attention to the type of climate created in the conference and how this climate can be manipulated for the betterment of effective supervision. The principal should be aware of the nonverbal cues he/she is providing, the physical setting of the conference, keeping disruptions to a minimum, and doing whatever possible to promote a positive feel.

2. The principal should try to lessen conference dissonance. Teachers need to be better informed about the post-observation conference and what it entails. The principal should discuss with each teacher the supervision process and what procedures will be followed during the conference. The principal should also try to meet the specific needs of each teacher. Early in the supervision cycle or in the preconference would be the ideal time to discuss role expectations.

3. The principal must provide structure in each conference. Procedures such as stating the conference purpose, setting goals for improvement, and summarizing main points are imperative. Such structuring moves can parallel the planning of a good lesson. The teacher first explains what will be studied, then the topic is taught, and later summarized. Hopefully, these structuring moves can be taught, and administrators can and will use them in conferences.
Recommendations for Further Research

The study raised many questions. More research is needed in this critical area. Others conducting research on post-observation conferences may want to consider the following for further study:

1. More in-depth research on conference climate—Conference climate clearly stood out as an important factor in conferences. Little research has focused on climate in the post-observation conference. A more intense study of the components of climate (such as nonverbal cues, disruptions, and the physical setting, etc.) and how they affect the conference would be helpful.

2. Examine the effects of principal training on conference skills and subsequent effectiveness—Few of the administrators in the study had previous training in conducting post-observation conferences. Can the conference skills deemed significant in this study be taught to principals, and, more importantly, will they use them regularly?

3. Examine the effect of nonverbal behavior on the conference—The study was done with audiotapes; the nonverbal behavior of supervisors and teachers during the conference could not be interpreted. When analyzing audiotapes, one could not determine what was happening by just listening. A pause in the tape did not accurately explain nonverbal behavior. If
conferences were videotaped and studied, nonverbal behaviors and their effects could be examined.

4. Further refine the Principal-Teacher Interaction Analysis--
Three of the areas; "rejects teacher's ideas," "checks for understanding," and "principal interruptions" were difficult for coders to interpret and were therefore not used. Perhaps the problem stemmed from the similarity between the aforementioned categories and the categories "asks for information, opinions, or suggestions," "gives information," and "gives opinion." The coders often were forced to select the latter categories. In future studies, researchers may want to eliminate these categories and concentrate on other behaviors.

5. Increase the sample size--A more appropriate sample would include a larger sample and the use of one principal per teacher/conference, as opposed to the one principal and four teachers used in the study. Using less principals may impact study results.

6. Further refine study instrumentation to increase reliability--Reliability for the "Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" instrument and the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory" were somewhat low. In addition, reliability for each subscale of the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory" and "Teacher Preference Inventory" should be examined.
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APPENDIX A—TEACHER PACKET
Dear Colleague:

Soon your principal will be observing your teaching and holding a post-observation conference designed to give you feedback on that lesson. It is generally agreed that these are important supervisory activities.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine post-observation conferences in-depth. The study will focus on what happens in a post-observation conference and the factors which affect conferences.

Its ultimate goal is to provide information that will aid principals in conducting effective post-observation conferences.

Your principal has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to be a participant. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete survey instruments which will take no more than forty-five minutes of your time, and then participate in audio-taping a post-observation conference.

The survey information and tapes will be analyzed by the researcher only and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity. To insure that the information you record in the survey instruments remain completely confidential, I am providing a stamped, self-addressed envelope for mailing which will be directly forwarded to me.

Participation is purely voluntary. If you wish to participate you have merely to inform your principal. Should you decide not to participate in the study, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 294-1172 during the mornings, or later in the day at (515) 292-7607.

Thank you for your consideration. I feel that those who participate will be a great help to principals responsible for conducting future conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
ANALYSIS OF POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES

Procedure Sheet for Teachers

Purpose

The study is designed to examine the post-observation conference in-depth.

Content

This packet contains the following:

- Teacher Letter
- Procedure Sheet for Teachers
- Self-Acceptance Scale
- Short Form Dogmatism Scale
- Impact Message Inventory
- Teacher Perceptions Inventory
- Teacher Preference Inventory
- Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness
- Informed Consent Form
- Check Sheet
- Self-addressed return envelope

Outline of Procedures

1. Your principal will observe one of your lesson presentations to the class, in his/her normal procedure.

2. Prior to the post-observation conference, please complete the "Self-Acceptance Scale," the "Short Form Dogmatism Scale," and the "Teacher Preference Inventory."

3. Immediately prior to the beginning of the conference, your principal will review the study purposes and procedures and answer any questions you might have. Remember that the audiotaping is voluntary; with your approval, your principal will proceed with the audiotaping.

4. At the conclusion of the conference, your principal will again remind you that release of the tape is voluntary. If you still wish to participate in the study, you may do so by signing the informed consent form.

5. Please complete the "Impact Message Inventory," the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory," and the "Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" instruments as soon as possible following the conference.
6. Mail all six instruments and the signed informed consent form to the researcher using the self-addressed envelope provided; it should be completed within two days of the conference. Your principal will be checking back to be sure you have mailed in the instruments, as will the researcher.

Your time and effort are greatly appreciated. Thanks so much for your help!
TEACHER CONSENT FORM

Procedures

The teacher will be asked to complete the "Short Form Dogmatism Scale," "Self-Acceptance Scale," and the "Teacher Preference Inventory" measurement devices before beginning the post-observation conference. Next the post-observation conference with the school administrator will be audiotaped. Following the conference, the teacher will be asked to complete the "Impact Message Inventory," the "Teacher Perceptions Inventory," and the "Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" survey instruments which the teacher will then mail to the investigators.

Purpose

To take an in-depth look at what happens in a post-observation conference and to determine how school administrators can improve them.

Risks

There are no risks involved with this study. If one feels uncomfortable participating, they may choose not to volunteer.

I, ____________________________, have read and understood the points listed above. I agree to have my post-observation conference audiotaped with the understanding that my confidentiality and anonymity will be guaranteed. I understand that the materials I send in will be coded for research purposes only. The tape will be used strictly for research purposes and will only be used by the investigator. 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 understand that all data will be kept confidential, and 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 ____________________________

Karen Spencer, Investigator
TEACHER CHECK SHEET

Before mailing back the packet, please check that the following are included:

_____ Self-Acceptance Scale

_____ Short Form Dogmatism Scale

_____ Impact Message Inventory

_____ Teacher Perceptions Inventory

_____ Teacher Preference Inventory

_____ Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

_____ Informed Consent Form
APPENDIX B—PRINCIPAL PACKET
Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your interest and willingness to participate in the research to improve conferences. The purposes and procedures for the study are outlined in the sheet entitled "Analysis of Post-Observation Conferences, Procedure Sheet for Principals." It will be helpful in explaining the nature of the study to your faculty.

As you know, there is a lack of empirical data confirming the effectiveness of the supervisory post-observation conference, or explicating the relationship between supervisory behaviors and significant variables related to conference effectiveness. This study is designed to examine the supervisory post-observation conference in-depth. The study will also focus on factors which affect conferences, such as: conference climate, conference effectiveness, conference behavior, self-acceptance, dogmatism (willingness to change), thinking/lifestyle preference and situational data.

This information will be used to help you and other principals as you work with teachers. What happens in your conference can be analyzed, summarized and I can give you personal and group feedback. I can provide information as to how your teachers perceived the conference in terms of effectiveness, and provide you with a profile of your style. If you wish to receive this information, please check the appropriate response on the "Training Data Sheet."

Please request four volunteers for the study. Ideally, the volunteers should include one probationary teacher, one needing considerable assistance, and two other teachers. I prefer that you hold a normal post-observation conference with four different teachers in the categories I've indicated. Although I prefer different teachers, should it be necessary to conference with the same teacher twice, this would be acceptable. I am asking you to audio-tape the conference that follows the observation of a lesson. Since I am interested in analyzing typical conferences, I would hope that the procedure be as routine as possible. As the procedure indicates, both you and the teacher will be required to complete some survey instruments and forms. It should take you no more than 45 minutes for the first conference, and less than 10 minutes for the remaining three. The teachers' instruments will also require about 45 minutes.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed. The data will be aggregated and a summary of the results for all study participants reported. Only those requesting feedback will receive individual school results.
I feel that this information will be of great assistance to you and other principals in future conferences; and once again thank you for your help.

If you have any questions regarding the study or procedures, please feel free to call me. I can be reached at (515) 294-1172 or later in the day at (515) 292-7607.

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
Dear Colleague:

Soon your principal will be observing your teaching and holding a post-observation conference designed to give you feedback on that lesson. It is generally agreed that these are important supervisory activities.

I am presently conducting a study designed to examine post-observation conferences in-depth. The study will focus on what happens in a post-observation conference and the factors which affect conferences.

Its ultimate goal is to provide information that will aid principals in conducting effective post-observation conferences.

Your principal has expressed an interest in participating in the study, and I'm hoping that you will choose to be a participant. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete survey instruments which will take no more than forty-five minutes of your time, and then participate in audio-taping a post-observation conference.

The survey information and tapes will be analyzed by the researcher only and you will be guaranteed complete anonymity. To insure that the information you record in the survey instruments remain completely confidential, I am providing a stamped, self-addressed envelope for mailing which will be directly forwarded to me.

Participation is purely voluntary. If you wish to participate you have merely to inform your principal. Should you decide not to participate in the study, you will in no way be forced to do so.

If you have any questions regarding the study or the procedures, feel free to contact me. I can be reached at (515) 294-1172 during the mornings, or later in the day at (515) 292-7607.

Thank you for your consideration. I feel that those who participate will be a great help to principals responsible for conducting future conferences. I look forward to your participation.

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Graduate Student
Iowa State University
ANALYSIS OF POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES

Procedure Sheet for Principals

Purpose

The study is designed to examine the post-observation conference in-depth.

Contents

This packet contains the following:

- Principal Letter
- Teacher Letter
- Procedure Sheet for Principals
- Procedure Sheet for Teachers
- Instrumentation
- Code Sheet
- Self-Acceptance Scale
- Life Style Inventory
- Short Form Dogmatism Scale
- Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness*
- Training Data (form)
- Situational Data (form)*
- Informed Consent Form*
- Principal Checklist*
- Self-addressed return envelopes*

*These items are also included in packets 2, 3, and 4. If any items are missing, please notify the researcher at once.

Outline of Procedures

1. Disseminate teacher letters to those teachers who you feel may wish to participate in the study. Be sure to confirm that all information will remain confidential and anonymous.

2. Participation in the study must be voluntary. Among the volunteers (if possible), select one probationary teacher, one needing considerable help, and two other teachers. If securing four different teachers presents a problem, more than one conference with a teacher is acceptable. (The teacher would not need to fill out the "Self-Acceptance Scale" or the "Short Form Dogmatism Scale" before the second conference. The other survey instruments would need to be completed again. The teacher's previous conference code number would also need to be included.)
3. Each school has been assigned a code number, and the four conferences have been assigned a conference number corresponding to the school number (i.e., school number 01, conference code numbers: teacher one: 011, teacher two: 012, teacher three: 013, teacher four: 014). The sheet entitled "Code Sheet" will list this information. Please place the names of the four teachers in the blanks under "Teacher's Name" so that a record of the teachers and their conference code numbers can be kept. Do not return the code sheet, but do keep it on file.

4. Observe the teacher presenting a lesson to the class, as you normally would.

5. After the lesson, give the teacher the packet containing the instruments. Be sure to give the teacher the packet corresponding to his/her conference code number.

6. Prior to the first conference, please complete the "Self-Acceptance Scale," the "Short Form Dogmatism Scale," the "Life Style Inventory," the "Training Data Form," and the "Situational Data Form." (For the second, third, and fourth conferences only the "Situational Data Form" will be completed prior to the conference.)

7. Set up the tape recorder before the conference, checking that the volume is sufficiently loud.

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

9. If he/she wishes to participate, turn on the tape recorder and proceed with the conference as you normally would.

10. At the conclusion of the conference, once again advise the teacher that release of the tape is voluntary. If the teacher still wishes to participate in the study, he/she may do so by signing the informed consent form.

11. Please sign an informed consent form at the completion of the conference. (This must be done for each of the four conferences.)
12. After the conference, complete the "Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" and code the audiotape using the conference code number recorded on the code sheet.

13. Within two days mail back the instruments and the audiotape to the researcher.
   a. After the first conference mail back:
      Self-Acceptance Scale
      Life Style Inventory
      Short Form Dogmatism Scale
      Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness
      Training Data
      Situational Data
      Informed Consent Form
      Audiotape (coded)
   b. After conferences two, three, and four, mail back:
      Principal Perception of Conference Effectiveness
      Situational Data
      Informed Consent Form
      Audiotape (coded)

14. Please check with each teacher after the conference to be sure the instruments have been mailed back.

15. The following dates are suggested for return of the audiotapes.

   Tape Number 1          October 15, 1981
   Tape Number 2          November 16, 1981
   Tape Number 3          December 15, 1981
   Tape Number 4          January 15, 1982

   If the tapes are completed before the return dates feel free to send them in early.

16. After completion of the fourth conference, you're done! Thanks for the help. When the study is completed, should you wish, your tapes will be returned to you.
### ANALYSIS OF POST-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES

#### Instrumentation

**TEACHER**

Prior to conference:  
- Self-Acceptance Scale  
- Short Form Dogmatism Scale  
- Teacher Preference Inventory

Following conference:  
- Impact Message Inventory  
- Teacher Perceptions Inventory  
- Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness  
- Informed Consent Form

**PRINCIPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAPE ONE</th>
<th>TAPES TWO, THREE, AND FOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to conference:</td>
<td>Prior to conference:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance Scale*</td>
<td>Situational Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Style Inventory*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Form Dogmatism Scale*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Data*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following conference:</td>
<td>Following conference:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Perceptions of</td>
<td>Principal Perceptions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Effectiveness</td>
<td>Conference Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent Form</td>
<td>Informed Consent Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Completed by the principal before first conference only.

**Suggested return dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First tape</td>
<td>October 15, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tape</td>
<td>November 16, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third tape</td>
<td>December 15, 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth tape</td>
<td>January 15, 1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An Analysis of Post-Observation Conferences

Code Sheet

Principal  

School Code Number  

Conference:  Code Number:  Teacher's Name:

#1  

#2  

#3  

#4  

This sheet is for your own use, and is not to be returned to the researcher. You may want to refer back to it as needed throughout the study. It is very important that you use the instruments specifically coded for each conference. Use the packet marked "Principal Conference #1" with the first teacher and conference, #2 with the second teacher and conference, etc. The instruments within the packets are precoded. Each teacher needs to be given the packet corresponding to his or her conference number. After the conference is over, please write the code number of the audiotape before mailing it in.
PRINCIPAL CONSENT FORM

Procedures

The principal will be asked to audiotape a post-observation conference with a teacher, and to fill out some survey instruments. Before the conference, the principal will fill out the "Self-Acceptance Scale," the "Short Form Dogmatism Scale," the "Life Style Inventory," and "Situational Data." Next, the post-observation conference with the teacher will be audiotaped. Following the conference, the administrator will fill out the "Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness" and code the tape. The conference tape and all instruments filled out by the administrator will then be mailed back to the researcher.

Purpose

To take an in-depth look at what happens in a post-observation conference and to determine how school administrators can improve them.

Risks

There are no risks involved with this study. If one feels uncomfortable participating, they may choose not to volunteer.

I, ____________________________, have read and understand the points listed above. I agree to have my post-observation conference audiotaped with the understanding that my confidentiality and anonymity will be guaranteed. I understand that the materials I send in will be coded for research purposes only. The tape will be used strictly for research purposes and will only be used by the investigator. 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 understand that all data will be kept confidential, and 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 ____________________________

Karen Spencer, Investigator
PRINCIPAL CHECKLIST

Before mailing back packet 1, please be sure that the following are included:

___ Self-Acceptance Scale
___ Short Form Dogmatism Scale
___ Life Style Inventory
___ Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness
___ Training Data
___ Situational Data
___ Informed Consent Form
___ Audiotape (with conference code number)

PRINCIPAL CHECKLIST

Before mailing back packets 2, 3, or 4, please be sure that the following are included:

___ Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness
___ Situational Data Form
___ Audiotape (with conference code number)
___ Informed Consent Form
APPENDIX C—TRAINING AND SITUATIONAL DATA
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Situational Data

Please respond to the questions below.

1. What type of conference do you perceive this one to be?
   One which primarily:
   a. identifies problems
   b. cites negative aspects
   c. reviews what went well
   d. commends an excellent teacher

2. How many years of teaching experience has this teacher had?
   a. less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 3 years
   c. 4 to 10 years
   d. greater than 10 years

3. How many post-observation conferences have you had with this teacher in the past?
   a. 0 conferences
   b. 1 to 3 conferences
   c. 4 to 10 conferences
   d. greater than 10 conferences

4. How would you assess this teacher's effectiveness in the classroom, in relationship to other teachers on your staff?
   a. top third
   b. middle third
   c. bottom third

5. How would you describe your rapport with this teacher?
   a. poor
   b. fair
   c. good
   d. excellent
   e. unsure

6. Did you feel this conference was affected by the audiotape?
   a. yes
   b. partially
   c. no
   d. uncertain
Training Data

1. What is the school type?
   a. elementary
   b. secondary
   c. K-12

2. How many years have you been a principal?
   a. less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 3 years
   c. 4 to 10 years
   d. greater than 10 years

3. How many years have you been a principal at your present location?
   a. less than 1 year
   b. 1 to 3 years
   c. 4 to 10 years
   d. greater than 10 years

4. Approximately how many post-observation conferences have you conducted during your career as a principal?
   a. 0 to 10
   b. 11 to 20
   c. 21 to 30
   d. greater than 30

5. Would you like feedback on your:

   Life Style Inventory
   Conference Effectiveness

   yes  yes
   no   no
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

Appendix D, pages 147-151
Appendix E, pages 153-154
Appendix F, pages 156-157
Appendix G, pages 159-161
APPENDIX D--LIFE STYLE INVENTORY
APPENDIX E—SHORT FORM DOGMATISM SCALE
APPENDIX F—SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE
APPENDIX G—IMPACT MESSAGE INVENTORY
APPENDIX H—PRINCIPAL PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 I—TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CONFERENCE EFFECTIVENESS

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conference:

____ 1. contributed to my professional growth.
____ 2. gave me the opportunity to express my feelings and opinions.
____ 3. helped me learn about my teaching behavior.
____ 4. was not a real exchange of views. It seemed to me that I was playing a role, rather than acting like myself.
____ 5. made me think about changing my teaching behavior.
____ 6. made me want to change my teaching behavior.
APPENDIX J—TEACHER PERCEPTIONS INVENTORY
Below are a series of descriptors designed to gather information about the supervisory conference. Please read each descriptor carefully and circle the number which best describes what occurred during the conference. Since the behaviors represented by the descriptors may not be necessary in every conference (i.e., clarifying confusing points), in some cases you may want to circle NA (not applicable).

For example, consider the descriptors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectured</th>
<th>Probed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circling a "1" indicates that the principal in your judgement lectured; a "7" indicates that the principal did a great deal of probing. The numbers "2" through "6" may be circled to describe the degree to which the principal lectured or probed during the conference. Circling NA indicates that the behaviors were not applicable to this conference. Please circle only one for each set of descriptors below.

During the conference the principal:

1. attempted to set goals for improvement
   - 1. attempted to set goals for improvement
   - 2. did not attempt to set goals for improvement

2. did most of the talking in the conference
   - 1. did most of the talking in the conference
   - 2. probed and listened during the conference

3. accepted my ideas and opinions
   - 1. accepted my ideas and opinions
   - 2. rejected my ideas and opinions

* 4. summarized areas of agreement or disagreement
   - 1. summarized areas of agreement or disagreement
   - 2. did not summarize areas of agreement or disagreement

5. praised or commended frequently
   - 1. praised or commended frequently
   - 2. criticized frequently

6. gave general feedback
   - 1. gave general feedback
   - 2. gave specific feedback
During the conference the principal:

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 7. gave solutions as to how to improve the lesson

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. did not clarify confusing points

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 9. appeared to know little about teaching

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. was cold and businesslike

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. was open and direct

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. summarized what was discussed in the conference

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. made me feel at ease

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. based the conference on the lesson observed

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. was empathic

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. strayed off task

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. did not set goals for improvement

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. analyzed and evaluated my teaching

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the conference the principal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. did not state the purpose of the conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. did not appear well prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. asked me about what occurred in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. gave me encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. gave feedback based on fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. exhibited reinforcing nonverbal behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversal Items*
APPENDIX K--TEACHER PREFERENCE INVENTORY
Below are a series of descriptors designed to explore your perceptions about the post-observation conference. Please examine the descriptors and circle one number on the scale, which represents what you feel the principal should do to maximize conference effectiveness. For example, consider the descriptors:

Lecture
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Probe
1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Circling a "1" indicates that to be effective the principal in your judgement, should primarily lecture the teacher, circling a "7" indicates that the principal should do a great deal of probing to be effective. The numbers "2" through "6" may be circled to describe the degree to which the principal should lecture or probe to maximize effectiveness in the conference.

Please circle only one for each set of descriptors below.

To maximize conference effectiveness the principal should:

1. attempt to set goals for improvement
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   not attempt to set goals for improvement

2. probe and listen during the conference
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   do most of the talking in the conference

3. accept my ideas and opinions
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   reject my ideas and opinions

* 4. summarize areas of agreement or disagreement
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   not summarize areas of agreement or disagreement

5. praise or commend frequently
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   criticize frequently

6. give general feedback
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   give specific feedback

*7. give solutions as to how to improve the lesson
   1    2    3    4    5    6    7
   seek solutions as to how to improve the lesson
To maximize conference effectiveness, the principal should:

8. not clarify confusing points
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

* 9. appear to know little about teaching
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

10. be cold and businesslike
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

11. be open and direct
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

*12. summarize what is discussed in the conference
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

13. make me feel at ease
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

*14. base the conference on the lesson observed
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

15. be empathic
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

16. stray off task
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

*17. not set goals for improvement
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

18. analyze and evaluate my teaching
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7

*19. not state the purpose of the conference
    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7
To maximize conference effectiveness, the principal should:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>not appear well prepared</td>
<td>appear well prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>ask me about what occurred in the lesson</td>
<td>tell me about what occurred in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>*give me encouragement</td>
<td>discourage me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>give feedback based on fact</td>
<td>give feedback not based on fact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>*exhibit reinforcing nonverbal behavior</td>
<td>exhibit distracting nonverbal behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversal Items
Interaction Categories

Teacher and/or Principal Behavior

1. Silence or Confusion
2. Off Task
3. Support Inducing Behavior

Principal Behavior

4. Praise
5. Criticism
6. Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions
7. Gives Information
8. Gives Opinions
9. Gives Suggestions
10. Accepts or Builds on Teacher's Idea
11. Rejects Teacher's Idea
12. Checks for Understanding
13. Principal Interruptions

Teacher Behavior

14. Teacher Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions
15. Teacher Gives Information, Opinions, or Suggestions
16. Teacher Defensive Reactions
Description of Interaction Categories

1. **Silence or Confusion**
   This category is used when there is no conversation or both the principal and teacher are talking simultaneously, making it difficult to categorize behavior.

2. **Off Task**
   Discussion during the conference which is not related to the lesson observed.

3. **Support Inducting Behavior**
   Statements made by the principal which help to build a "healthy" climate but are not considered praise.

4. **Praise**
   Positive or complimentary statements by the principal. Statements raise the teacher's status, encourages or bolsters.

5. **Criticism**
   Negative or disapproving comments made by the principal.

6. **Asks for Information, Opinions or Suggestions**
   Principal asks the teacher for clarification of a problem or situation, for ways of handling things differently, or ways to solve problems together. The principal asks the teacher to analyze or evaluate something that occurred in the class or may occur in the future.

7. **Gives Information**
   The principal gives objective information to the teacher.
8. **Gives Opinions**

   Principal gives subjective information or expresses feelings to the teacher.

9. **Gives Suggestions**

   Principal suggests ways of handling a situation or doing things differently.

10. **Accepts or Builds on Teacher's Idea**

    Principal agrees with a statement or idea made by the teacher and encourages further amplification.

11. **Rejects Teacher's Idea**

    The principal shows disapproval, denial or opposition; he/she may also ridicule, belittle, or make fun of the teacher.

12. **Checks for Understanding**

    Principal asks the teacher if information is understood or if further clarification is necessary.

13. **Principal Interruptions**

    Principal overrides the teacher's conversations or finishes his/her sentences.
14. **The Teacher Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions**

Teacher asks the principal for help to analyze or evaluate something that occurred during the lesson, to help with problems, or how to handle situations.

15. **Teacher Gives the Principal Information, Opinions, or Suggestions**

The teacher gives information, opinions, or suggestions concerning the lesson.

16. **Defensive Reactions**

The teacher defends his/her behavior or position.
Procedures for the Principal-Teacher
Supervisory Conference Interaction Analysis

1. On the sheet marked Recording Matrix write the following information:

- conference code number
- page number
- rater's name
- conference length

2. Starting in the upper left box (1,1) of the matrix, and working down each column and to the right, record in each box the interaction category numbers that occurred during that 3 second interval. After 15 seconds that matrix could look like this:

```
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Minutes (assuming 20 3-second intervals)

3. To insure reliability between raters please follow these ground rules:

a. Sequential behavior is the focus of this study, not that which occurs in isolation. Therefore interaction is recorded from the viewpoint of the recipient and not the giver.

b. Difficulty may arise in distinguishing between types of behavior. If such instances occur, it is best to replay the sequence for better understanding and make a decision. If there should still be a question in some cases the lower numbered category is preferred. In other words, if in doubt as to whether a behavior is category 3 or 4, choose 3. The following categories may present such problems:

- 3, Support Inducing Behavior / 4, Praise
- 10, Accepts or Builds on Teacher's Idea / 6, Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions
- 15, Teacher Gives Information, Opinions or Suggestions / 16, Teacher Defensive Reactions

C. Some categories may be used in combination with other categories. For example, off task behavior may be criticizing the teacher's dress; the rater would first write a 5 (criticism), then a hyphen and lastly a 2 (off task). This would appear on the matrix as 5-2.

Principal interruptions is the other category to be treated in this manner. If the principal interrupts and gives information it is coded as 7-13, or if he/she interrupts asking for information the code is 6-13.
d. More than one behavior may occur during a 3 second interval. When this happens each change is recorded within the same box of the matrix.

e. If no change occurs after a 3 second interval, repeat the previous category number until the behavior changes.

f. The use of "oooh-h" or "hum" by the principal is considered encouragement and placed in category 3. When "uh-huh" is followed by a rephrasing or use of the teacher's idea, category 10, accepting or building on the teacher's idea is used.

g. Start and end the tallying with "1" silence. First because it is assumed that the conference begins and ends in silence, and second, by using the "1" it is possible to insure that the total number of tallies in the rows and columns of the matrix will balance.

4. During the conference, major goals for improvement will be tallied. Each time a new major goal for improvement is discussed mark through or circle the appropriate number on the sheet marked Pedagogical Moves.

5. After the coding of the audiotape has been completed, review the question concerning Information Base on the Pedagogical Moves sheet. The degree to which facts or inferences were discussed by the principal, is to be noted by circling the appropriate number.
In order to analyze and interpret the data collected, the numbers written vertically are grouped in pairs. A pair consists of a behavior and reaction to it. In other words, each number and the one below it constitute a pair. Paired behaviors are tallied on the Recording Matrix, with the first number in the pair being the "row" number and the second the "column" number. A tally where the row and the column meet indicates the number of occurrences of that paired behavior.

In order to clarify this procedure, a brief part of a supervisory interview will be repeated below, tallied, and then put on a matrix. The situation involves a principal in conference with a third grade teacher a day after having observed a reading lesson. The conference begins:

Principal: "I'd like to discuss with you briefly the two reading groups I observed yesterday."

A 7 is recorded, giving or orientation.

Teacher: "Uh huh."

A 15 is recorded. Teacher agrees with orientation.

Principal: "The first group was your top group. Is that right?"

Record a 7 and a 6.

Teacher: "That's right."

Record a 15.

Principal: "And there are seven children there but altogether you have how many?"

Record a 7 and a 6.

Teacher: "Nine."

Record a 15.

Principal: "Nine."

Record a 10.

Teacher: "Uh huh."

Record a 15.

---

Principal: "I know the time wasn't good—2:15...It's not a real good time to visit."

Record two 3's.

Teacher: "Well, we were running a little late and...uh...we had just completed reading a story and with the questions along...page by page, and, uh, the summation was where you came in."

Record four 15's.

Principal: "I thought the session was good because..."

Record a 4 and an 7.

From this bit of interaction, the following sequence of numbers—each indicating a behavioral category—is tallied:

```
(  7  
15 )
(  7  
  6 )
( 15  
  7 )
(  6  
15 )
(10  
15 )
(  3  
  3 )
(15  
15 )
(15  
15 )
(  4  
  7 )
```

Linking the pairs of tallies together, as has been done in the above example, is an operation that is undertaken after all the tallies have been made and, as has been noted, this linkage is performed in order to denote the sequence of interaction and to enable tallies to be put on the matrix. In order to help the reader understand how this is done, it will be helpful to refer to the matrix on the following page as the process is explained. Note that the first pair of tallies in the interaction sequence is 7-15. The appropriate cell for this pair is found by going across row 7 until it intersects column 15. A "Hash" mark is put in this cell which means that there has been one behavioral sequence of the nature of 7-15. The next pair is 15-7. The same procedure is used to record this on the matrix and a mark is found in the row 15, column 7 cell. The complete sequence of interaction is thus recorded in Figure 1.

The next step is to again look at the Recording Matrix and determine the percentage of occurrence of each of the 16 categories. This is accomplished by:

```
Number of frequencies
Sum of the number of tallies
```
This determines the percentage of interaction time expended in each category. The percentage for all 16 categories should equal 100%.
FIGURE 1. Recording Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded Mainx Recorder Dafe
Code No. Mo-o-P Mino+es

Date ____________
No. of Minutes ________
Directions for Training Raters

Prior to training session

1. Raters memorize categories so well that the numbers become automatic.

2. Raters review procedures, categories and written transcripts, proceed to analyze and categorize the written transcripts, and later with greater proficiency the audiotapes.

During training session

1. Review categories with raters so they understand each and the range of variation so well that they can make rapid decisions.

2. Check analysis and categorization of written transcripts of conferences using the Interaction Analysis System developed. Review and discuss, especially areas of discrepancies.

3. Analyze audiotapes individually. Follow with a discussion. Repeat process at first using the same tape, later moving on to others; until each rater feels confident.

4. Discuss pedagogical moves and how to code them. Practice using audiotapes.

5. Establish interrater reliability with a $\rho$ of .85 or better during the meeting.

After training session

1. Each rater will take home 20 tapes and code them using the Recording Matrix. Tallies will then be recorded on the Interaction Matrix and the Frequency Sheet. The raters will switch tapes as needed, and additional tapes will be sent to each rater so that in all, they will each code 80 tapes.

2. Check interrater reliability after coding 20, 40 and 60 tapes. If the reliability correlation is below .85, retraining will be necessary.

3. Establish intrarater reliability at tape 35 by recoding a tape and comparing it against the first coding. If the reliability correlation is below .85, retraining will be necessary.

4. Raters will write a summary of results for the 80 tapes – each summarizing 40.
PRINCIPAL-TEACHER SUPERVISORY CONFERENCE INTERACTION ANALYSIS

Procedures for Analysis

Supportive Behavior

3. Support-Inducing Behavior
4. Praise
10. Accepts or Builds on Teacher's Idea

Nonsupportive Behavior

5. Criticism
11. Rejects Teacher's Idea

Didactic Behavior

7. Gives Information
8. Gives Opinions
9. Gives Suggestions

Indirect Behavior

6. Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions

Teacher Talk

14. Teacher Asks for Information, Opinions, or Suggestions
15. Teacher Gives Information, Opinions or Suggestions
16. Teacher Defensive Reactions

Principal Talk

3. Support-Inducing Behavior
4. Praise
5. Criticism
6. Asks for Information, Opinions or Suggestions
7. Gives Information
8. Gives Opinions
9. Gives Suggestions
10. Accepts or Builds on Teacher's Idea
11. Rejects Teacher's Idea
12. Checks for Understanding
13. Principal Interruptions
CONFERENCE OPENING AND CLOSING ANALYSIS

Directions

After listening to the first few minutes of the audiotape, turn off the recorder and circle the number which most nearly represents how clearly the conference purpose was stated.

Next, fast forward the recorder to near the end of the conference tape. Listen closely to how effectively the goals for improvement were set; and also whether or not the conference was summarized. Again circle the number which most closely represents what was heard on the tape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated Conference Purpose</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference purpose was not stated</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not clearly</td>
<td>purpose was not stated</td>
<td>purpose was stated some-what clearly</td>
<td>clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summarized Conference</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference was not summarized</td>
<td>Conference was summarized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Goals for Improvement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals for improvement were not set</td>
<td>Goals for improvement were not set</td>
<td>Goals for improvement were set somewhat effectively</td>
<td>very effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N--DEFINITION OF VARIABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TABLE 18
DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS

TCONEF -- teacher conference effectiveness, measured by Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

OPCL -- open climate, measured by Impact Message Inventory

CLDCL -- closed climate, measured by Impact Message Inventory

PED -- perceived principal pedagogical structuring moves during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

HUM -- perceived humanistic qualities exhibited by principals during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

DIR -- perceived directive principal behavior during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

SUP -- percent of principal supportive behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

NONSUP -- percent of principal nonsupportive behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

DIDAC -- percent of principal didactic behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

TTALK -- percent of teacher talk during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

PTALK -- percent of principal talk during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

PCONEF -- principal perceptions of conference effectiveness, measured by Principal Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

TDOG -- teacher dogmatism, measured by Short Form Dogmatism Scale

TSAC -- teacher self-acceptance, measured by Self-Acceptance Scale

CONDIS -- conference dissonance, measured by the difference between Teacher Preference and Teacher Perceptions Inventory

EXP -- years of teaching experience, measured by situational data (scale ranges from less than one year to more than ten years)

GOALS -- number of goals for improvement set during the conference
APPENDIX O--DEFINITION OF VARIABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN TABLE 19
DEFINITIONS OF VARIABLES AND ABBREVIATIONS

TCONEF—teacher conference effectiveness, measured by Teacher Perceptions of Conference Effectiveness

OPCL—open climate, measured by Impact Message Inventory

CLDCL—closed climate, measured by Impact Message Inventory

GOALS—number of goals for improvement set during the conference

PED—perceived principal pedagogical structuring moves during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

HUM—perceived humanistic qualities exhibited by principals during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

DIR—perceived directive principal behavior during the conference, measured by Teacher Perceptions Inventory

SUP—percent of principal supportive behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

NONSUP—percent of principal nonsupportive behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

DIDAC—percent of principal didactic behavior during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

TTALK—percent of teacher talk during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

PTALK—percent of principal talk during the conference, measured by interaction analysis

PSAC—principal self-acceptance, measured by Self-Acceptance Scale

PDOG—principal dogmatism, measured by Short Form Dogmatism Scale

PESA—people/satisfaction, measured by Life Style Inventory

PESE—people/security, measured by Life Style Inventory

TASE—task/security, measured by Life Style Inventory

TASA—task/satisfaction, measured by Life Style Inventory
APPENDIX P—CORRESPONDENCE
November 16, 1981

Dear Teacher

While reviewing my records, I noticed that I have not received any of the questionnaires you were to send after your post-observation conference with your principal.

The information is part of doctoral research on conference skills, which will be of value to your principal as we assess his and other administrators' skills.

It is crucial for the validity of the study that this information be returned. If the instruments have been misplaced or possibly lost in the mail, please notify me and I can send you additional copies. I can be reached at (515) 294-1172 in the mornings and at (515) 292-7607 later in the day; or you can write to me at 1236 Michigan, Ames, IA 50010.

The amount of time it will take to complete the instruments is minimal and part of it, the conference, is already over.

I hope to be hearing from you soon, and let me know if I can be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Graduate Student
Educational Administration
Iowa State University
November 16, 1981

Dear Principal,

The school year is passing by quickly, and the time to observe and conference with teachers is upon us.

In the beginning of the school year, you indicated that you would be willing to participate in my doctoral research concerning conference skills. As of today, I have not received from you, any of the packets you were to return.

I hope that you are still interested in participating. The data you and your teachers can provide, will be most beneficial to the research, and to you and other administrators.

Those principals who have already begun to turn in research data have indicated that the amount of time it took was minimal, and that overall it wasn't so bad!

I hope to be hearing from you soon and please call if I can be of assistance in any way. My phone numbers are (515) 294-1172 in the mornings and (515) 292-7607 later in the day.

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer
Graduate Student
Educational Administration
Iowa State University
February 2, 1982

Dear Principal:

Thanks so much for your help with my dissertation research on conference skills. I hope before long to begin analyzing the data from the audiotapes and survey instruments.

Yesterday, while checking my records, I found that all the packets from your school have not been returned. The bottom of this letter lists those packets which are missing. I would appreciate your help in securing these packets as this information is extremely important for the validity of the study and for the conference skills analysis requested by many principals.

Please feel free to contact me if any trouble should arise or if additional materials are needed. I'd be more than happy to help you in any way I could.

My phone number is 515/294-1172 in the mornings and 515/292-7607 later in the day. I hope to be hearing from you soon!

Sincerely,

Karen Spencer  
Graduate Student  
Education Administration  
Iowa State University

Data packets from your school which are missing include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX Q—HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE PROPOSAL
INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Analysis of Post Observation Conferences

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Karen Spencer 8-24-81
Typed Name of Principal Investigator
311 MacKay Hall
Campus Address
294-1172
Campus Telephone

3. Signatures of others (if any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.
   - Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
   - Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
   - Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
   - Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
   - Deception of subjects
   - Subjects under 14 years of age and (or) Subjects 14-17 years of age
   - Subjects in Institutions
   - Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.
   - Signed informed consent will be obtained.
   - Modified informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: 9 1 81
   Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: 12 15 82

7. If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and (or) identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments: 12 15 82

8. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit

9. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:
   - Project Approved
   - Project not approved
   - No action required

George G. Karas