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CHAPTER I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Supervision, as defined by Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001), is "people working together to build a democratic community of learning based on moral principles calling for all students to be educated in a manner enabling them to lead fulfilling lives and be contributing members of a democratic community" (p. 8). Sullivan and Glanz (2000) define supervision as the "process of engaging teachers in instructional dialogue for the purpose of improving teaching and increasing student achievement" (p. 24). Beach and Reinhartz (2000) define supervision as "supporting and sustaining all teachers in their goal of career-long growth and development which ultimately results in quality instruction" (p. 4). Each of these definitions portrays a slightly different purpose for supervision. In addition, every supervisor may have his or her own unique image of what supervision should be like. No matter what definition is followed, Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) suggest that, ideally, supervisory practices should be focused on engaging teachers in the teaching process and enhancing student learning.

Supervision appears to be rather simple but individuals find out that it is often complex. The complexity is derived from the teacher's perception and dislike of supervision. The dislike of supervision is usually caused by an unequal power relationship between the supervisor and teacher (Tsui, 1995). In addition, Edmeirer and Nicholas (1999) suggest that teachers' professional relationships with their supervisors may have a direct effect on their satisfaction with teaching. Moreover, how a supervisor defines supervision and the process of conducting a supervisory visit may/may not affect the happiness of the teacher.
Supervisory practice has changed significantly over the past 20-30 years (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000), and a variety of supervisory models are available. With these varied models, supervisors should be able to find a definition and model that best suits them. There also should be studies that have been conducted in a particular subject matter area to help supervisors with the supervisory process. However, in agricultural education there are a scarce number of research articles published on supervision. From 1976-2001, only three out of 803 articles in the *Journal of Agricultural Education* focused on instructional supervision. In addition, none of the articles described a theoretical framework for supervision, the supervisory practice in agricultural education, or using a technology tool as an enhancement for the supervision of student teachers.

**Purpose and Objectives**

The principal purpose of this dissertation was to explore supervision in agricultural education settings. The specific objectives of the dissertation were to:

1. Present a model that may be useful for the supervision of agricultural instruction.
2. Describe the practice of instructional supervision in agricultural education.
3. Describe student teaching concerns and experiences in agricultural education expressed through an Internet based communication tool.

**Dissertation Organization**

This dissertation is divided into six specific chapters. Chapter one is a general introduction to the dissertation; chapter two is an extensive literature review on some of the major components of supervision; chapter three is a theoretical article on supervision that proposes a model for instructional supervisors that may be useful for the supervision of agricultural instruction; chapter four is a research article that presents data on the current
supervisory practice in agricultural education; chapter five is a research article that focuses on using a technology tool as an enhancement to communicating and addressing student teachers' concerns related to teaching; and lastly, chapter six outlines the general conclusions that can be drawn from this dissertation.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Supervision has changed dramatically throughout the years, bringing new visions of supervision and how it should be practiced. In Chapter II, the history of supervision will be traced along with its impact on the field of education. Also, models of supervisory practice will be exhibited to illustrate the wide array of supervisory approaches used today.

This chapter will acknowledge some concerns about teaching. Since student teachers' often are faced with many challenges during their teaching experience (Reiman & Theis-Sprinthall, 1998), it is important that supervisors maintain open communication channels with each teacher. Developing positive and effective communication is often difficult but there are several approaches to making communication positive.

Chapter II will also focus on the most important aspects of supervision, leadership. Several leadership theories were researched and examined to provide a basis for understanding supervision from a leadership perspective.

History of Supervision

The history of supervision plays a significant role in the style of supervision that is used in the 21st century. The timeline of supervisory practices shows that early supervisory approaches tended to be directive. In the colonial period (1600-1865), supervisors often were ministers or selected teachers who came to the school to examine the teacher, pupils, and school system (Burton & Brueckner, 1955).

From 1865-1910, many changes occurred in school systems. By the end of the Civil War, cities expanded due to industrialization and caused the enrollments in schools to increase. This amplification in enrollments caused school systems to separate students by
grade level and assign one person to supervise the school (Pierce, 1935). Inspection was still the object of supervision but instead of a committee, one person had the duties (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000).

The period from 1910-1919 was known as the social efficiency era (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Since industry strategies were so popular, in 1913 Franklin Bobbitt took the management strategies used in labor and applied them to the field of education. He introduced the idea of social efficiency to the public school system. The concepts behind social efficiency were discovering the best methods in management and forcing supervisors to use those methods on teachers. However, like the previous decade, this approach was still directive and bureaucratic.

The bureaucratic process used by supervisors displayed an image that teachers did not appreciate. Newlon (1923) tried to change this image of supervision. He inquired of the public how supervision could best be achieved. The public’s advice was to organize supervisory councils to facilitate a more productive supervisory process. This organization promoted that teachers were individuals and not machines that performed monotonous tasks. Dewey (1929) contributed to this mentality of humans being individuals and introduced problem-solving approaches to help supervisors and teachers work through difficulties confronted in the educational system.

From 1930 to the late 1950’s, supervision shifted gears and focused on a new approach, scientific supervision (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). Scientific supervision studied the teachers, pupils, subject matter, teaching materials, and the school environment scientifically (Barr, 1931). Teachers and schools were studied scientifically through the administration of
surveys, and these ratings would determine whether a school or a teacher was doing “poor work” (Barr, 1931, p. 118).

From the late 1950s until 1970, the supervision era was known for its leadership qualities (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). The supervisor’s role shifted from directive to collaborative. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (1969) suggested that supervision should operate as a leadership function with both the teacher and supervisor. Essentially supervisors began assuming more curriculum tasks and “helping teachers meet the needs of students in their classrooms” (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000, p. 36). In addition, research on supervision and approaches started to evolve.

One approach, clinical supervision, became popular during the late 1960s and early 1970s. This era became known as the accountability era. The development of clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969) forced supervisors and teachers to be accountable for any observation discussed or lesson taught. Supervisors were required to meet with the teacher prior to observing a lesson and after observing the lesson. The purpose of these meetings was for the supervisor and teacher to diagnose any classroom problems before and after the lesson observed (Goldhammer, 1969).

The focus of supervision began to shift dramatically from 1980 until today. The farm crisis of the 1980s produced extreme budget cuts for most schools and school systems were confronted with the dilemma of supplementing education without increasing salaries (Beach & Reinhartz, 1984). These extreme budget cuts created more responsibilities for supervisors. These responsibilities included curriculum tasks, supervising teachers/school, managing the staff/school, and school discipline. Faced with many responsibilities, supervisors do not have ample time to devote only to the supervisory process. Glickman et al. (1995) suggest
that supervisors need to move toward teachers self-directing some of their own supervisory process. This would turn the supervisors' role into a team effort instead of superior-inferior relationship with the teacher.

Supervisory Models

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision is a form of inquiry designed to encourage teachers to reflect upon and analyze their own teaching methods and to develop and test hypotheses about what is effective and why (Cook, 1996). Several scholars have implemented and studied clinical supervision, but the founders were Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973). The five steps of clinical supervision are planning conference, classroom observation/data collection, analysis and strategy, supervision conference, and postconference analysis.

The planning conference is designed to inform the supervisor of the objectives for the lesson. The teacher should have prepared a detailed lesson plan for the supervisor to critique and on which to give suggestions (Acheson & Gall, 1980).

During the classroom observation/data collection phase, the supervisor observes the teacher teaching the lesson that was outlined in his/her lesson plan. The supervisor should use an appropriate observation instrument to collect data on the lesson being taught (Acheson & Gall, 1980). This procedure will provide written information to be shared with the teacher during the postobservation conference.

The analysis and strategy stage is the nucleus of clinical supervision because the supervisor conceptualizes what he/she observed in the classroom and converts the analysis into readable data for the teacher (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). The teacher then has a representation of how the supervisor perceived the lesson.
The supervision conference is designed for the supervisor to dialogue with the teacher on the lesson observed (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1973). This conference also is a time for the teacher to give input on the lesson. In addition, the supervisor and teacher work together to establish goals to be addressed during the next observation.

The postconference analysis is primarily for the supervisor. He or she must determine if the best supervisory practices were used with the teacher. The analysis also provides a reflection exercise to help the supervisor improve for the next observation (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969).

**Conceptual Model**

The conceptual model includes the following factors: teacher’s commitment to teaching, commitment to school, trust in administration, trust in teachers, and a desire for collaboration. The model is supported by the organizational theory (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989) that states that individuals are united by a common set of values and work together within a system of structure to accomplish specific goals and objectives. Edmeierer and Nicklaus’s (1999) conceptual model outlines organizational factors (role ambiguity, work overload, decision making, support from supervisor via supervision, classroom climate, role conflict, and support of colleagues) and personal factors (intrapersonal, life stage, teaching assignment, interpersonal, conceptual level, experience in education, and knowledge of subject) as having a direct influence on teacher performance.

The supervisor and teacher establish certain benchmarks based on organizational and personal factors that influence the teacher’s performance. If possible, changes in organizational and personal factors should be made, and the teacher’s improvements toward the benchmarks will be assessed in each supervisory visit. For example, if the teacher is
preoccupied with the notion that other teachers do not like him or her, the teacher’s teaching effectiveness may suffer. Edmeier and Nicklaus (1999) suggest the supervisor should help the teacher work through these feelings, whether they are warranted or not, because in the mind of the teacher they are reality. This type of supervision builds on a relationship and initially is used to develop trust between the supervisor and the teacher.

**Developmental Supervision**

Glickman et al. (2001) define developmental supervision as “the match of initial supervisory approach with the teacher or group’s developmental levels, expertise, and commitment” (p. 197). The supervisor in the developmental approach gives three types of assistance: directive, collaborative, and nondirective. Teachers who have low levels of conceptual thinking, expertise, and commitment to their teaching will be matched with directive supervision. Teachers at earlier stages of development have problems making decisions and defining problems, and they have few ways of responding to problems. Directive supervision places the supervisor as the expert and the one in charge of writing the goals for the teacher. The supervisor instructs the teacher regarding when and how the goals will be achieved.

Teachers at moderate levels of abstract thinking, expertise, and commitment are best matched with the collaborative supervisory approach (Glickman et al., 2001). In this approach, the supervisor and teacher establish goals to be achieved, how they will be achieved, and when the achievement should be noticed as a team.

Teachers who have high expertise, high levels of abstract thinking, and are highly committed to teaching are best matched with the nondirective approach (Glickman et al., 2001). The nondirective approach allows the teacher to be in control of how and when the
goals will be achieved. The supervisor is still involved in the supervision process but now establishes a more passive role. Glickman et al. (2001) describe the behaviors of the supervisor in this role as listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem solving.

*Contextual Supervision*

The contextual supervision model promotes professional growth of participants and individuals in the supervisory role. The supervisor will match his/her supervisory style to the supervisee's situation (Ralph, 1998). The model also has critical situational variables that refer to the development or readiness level of teachers to perform a particular teaching task. The levels refer to the confidence and competence of the teacher. Competence is the extent of the teacher's knowledge, skill, and ability to perform a certain task. Confidence is the degree of self-assurance, willingness, motivation, interest, or enthusiasm to become engaged in the task (Ralph, 1998). The contextual model of supervision requires that the supervisor have the ability to adjust and provide different leadership styles to match the teacher's developmental level of teaching.

*Differentiated Supervision*

Differentiated supervision allows the teacher to have a choice of one supervisory method given four options. Glatthorn (1997) suggest these four options: intensive development (special approach to clinical supervision), cooperative professional development, self-directed development, and administrative monitoring.

Glatthorn (1997) describes the first option, intensive development, as a systematic, sequential, and cyclic supervisory process that involves interaction between supervisor and teacher. Intensive development should be used with an inexperienced teacher, experienced teachers who are experiencing difficulty, and experienced teachers looking to improve their
teaching methods. If a teacher makes the wrong choice, he/she then is encouraged to
conference with the supervisor to change the supervisory option (Glatthorn, 1997).

Intensive development, designed by Glatthorn (1997), includes eight components that
involve five or more cycles and multiple observations. The first component is the taking
stock conference, which is held any time the supervisor and teacher want to discuss their
professional relationship or to reflect on what has been accomplished. The second (pre-
observation), third (diagnostic observation), fourth (analysis of diagnostic observation), and
fifth (diagnostic debriefing) components of the intensive development undergo the same
processes as the planning conference, classroom observation, analysis/strategy, and
supervision conference of the clinical supervision model. The sixth component of the
intensive development option, coaching session, provides an opportunity for the supervisor
and teacher to select one skill from the diagnostic process on which to focus. The seventh
component, focused observation, focuses on one skill using a form designed to collect
information about the teacher's use of that skill (Glatthorn, 1997). The focused debriefing
conference, the eighth component, allows the supervisor and teacher to review and analyze
the results of the focused observation.

The second option described by Glatthorn (1997), cooperative professional
development, is a collegial process in which a small group of teachers agree to work together
for their own professional growth. The teacher would be part of a two or three teacher team
who would go through the mentoring process together. The teachers would observe each
other's class and provide feedback on each other's teaching. This type of supervision is less
time consuming for the supervisor because the teachers are conducting the supervisory
process with the supervisor serving as a mediator. Cooperative professional development
can be used with more experienced teachers and supervisors who are seeking collegiality (Showers & Joyce, 1996). This option could provide a beneficial mentoring experience for teachers.

The third suggested option of the differentiated supervisory model is self-directed. Beach and Reinhartz's (2000) research suggests that self-directed supervision enables the individual teacher to work independently on professional growth and allows the supervisor to have a more relaxed supervisory role. In this case, the teacher would develop and carry out individualized plans for professional growth with the supervisor serving as a resource. This technique specifically is for the teacher who prefers to work alone, yet seeks the aid of the supervisor as a mentor (Glatthom, 1997). Glatthom (1997) and Beach and Reinhartz (2000) state that the teacher would self evaluate his/her teaching using videotapes, inventories, reflective journals, and portfolios to critique the teaching procedure. The supervisor does not need to evaluate the lesson, but through individual conferences the supervisor could provide feedback on improving the instruction, if the teacher so desires.

The final option available to teachers in the differentiated supervisory model is administrative monitoring. Glatthom (1997) defines administrative monitoring as a process by which the supervisor monitors the teacher's classroom with brief, unannounced visits. This option is used to monitor the activity in the classroom and enables the supervisor to be aware of any problems the teacher is having.

**Strategies for Development of Teachers**

Supervisors must remember that teachers go through many stages in their teaching careers. They develop their teaching skills in their preservice education program, continue to expand their skills through the student teaching experience, and then further develop their
teaching skills as they gain years of classroom experience. Since teachers do develop over an extended period of time, the supervisor should maintain communication with teachers, be aware of the teaching concerns, and be an effective leader. These are the some of the basics to help keep the supervision process simple but effective. In this section, communication practices will be discussed along with teaching concerns and leadership characteristics for the supervisor to consider.

**Effective Communication**

Effective communication is one asset that a supervisor can use extensively in working with teachers (Beach, 1989). Communication consists of more than talk. According to Beach (1989) effective communication can involve feelings, gestures, posture, and overall physical attitudes.

Jewell (1998) defines communication as “the exchange of information, ideas, or feelings between two or more individuals or groups” (p. 448). Ralph (1998) suggests that supervisors and teachers need to move from a one-way approach to communication to a more collaborative and interactive approach. Tracy and MacNaughton (1993) suggest that a supervisor can create barriers when communicating with individuals if the communication is not sincere. These barriers are: a) supervisor creating mixed messages, b) conflicting ideas between the supervisor and teacher, c) communication that uses slang language or creates double messages, and d) how communication is distributed within the organization.

Most individuals think that barriers are caused from verbal communication. However, written communication also poses some problems. For instance, in written communication there would be no nonverbal gestures or tone of voice to interpret the type of communication taking place. The difficult part is interpreting the text. Transactional distance, as Moore and
Kearsley (1996) point out. is based on dialogue and structure that takes place between the instructor and learner and occurs no matter if the communication is face-to-face, at a distance, or written. In addition, there is no guarantee that someone will interpret the meaning of a person's words the way the facilitator intended him/her to. Moreover, words can damage a "communication chain" (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000, p. 105).

Since communication is so critical, it needs to be used effectively. In the 21st century, individuals are fortunate to have many ways to communicate including face-to-face, by telephone, letters, and through the Internet. Technology has even become a means of communicating for education programs. In a recent study conducted by Chadwick (1999), individuals found it rewarding, effective, and satisfying to use technology to communicate with teachers and other students.

Asynchronous communication does not require people to be present at a particular time or place to communicate. Some examples of asynchronous communication are email and web-based programs. These are convenient communication tools especially for individuals who need to communicate but are geographically isolated.

One means of communication between individuals who are geographically isolated is the use of dialoging. Moore and Kearsley (1996) define dialoging as "a term that helps us focus on the interplay of words, actions, and ideas and any other interactions between teacher and learner when one gives instruction and the other responds" (p. 201). This dialog can take place using a computer network that would provide the learner and instructor (supervisor) an opportunity to communicate without being seen. They can use this type of communication to ask for advice, post ideas, talk about problems, or just read other individuals' input and concerns.
Everyone is different and the way they communicate are also different. With this in mind, a supervisor should consider every aspect of communication and identify how his/her suggestions or comments may affect a teacher.

*Teaching Concerns*

When student teachers enter the classroom they have many unanswered questions or concerns about teaching. Teaching concerns, particularly self-concerns, have an impact on their ability to teach and their effectiveness in the classroom (Fuller, 1974). These self-concerns, as Fuller’s (1974) research points out, only allows the student teacher to focus on survival. Student teachers are experiencing concerns with teaching and need an opportunity to have these concerns addressed before and during the student teaching experience.

Stoller (1996) identifies seven major areas of teacher concerns: classroom management, classroom interaction, affective factors, use of resources, teaching technique, methodology, and acquisition. Classroom management, which includes monitoring students, developing curriculum, and pacing activities tends to be a teacher’s biggest concern and may lead to failure (Stoller, 1996). Failure then becomes another concern of teachers. Schmidt’s (1994) study of four women who failed at teaching indicated that one teaching concern might disrupt an entire teaching career.

Classroom interaction and behavior of students also are a major concern. Teachers worry about student/teacher interaction and if this interaction will affect students’ learning. The behavior of students can often be a challenge (Schmidt, 1994).

A recent study conducted by Kyriacou and Stephens (1999) pointed out several student teaching concerns that were articulated during student teaching experiences. Several concerns were articulated but being supervised by a university supervisor caused high levels
of anxiety. They found that the expectations of the university supervisors were too high and critical. The student teachers wanted more of a supporter than an evaluator. Due to the large number of teacher concerns, a supervisor should focus on concerns that are specific to each teacher to help him/her work through the fears of teaching (Aiken & Day, 1999).

**Supervisory Leadership**

Effective leadership may be the most important characteristic of quality supervisors (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). Hersey and Blanchard (1969) describe leadership as “working with and through people to accomplish organizational and personal goals’ (p. 4). The type of leadership an individual uses may affect individuals differently within organizations. Many leadership theories need to be studied to best select the one that may fit an organization or individual. Discussed in the following paragraphs are several leadership theories that have been researched. These theories were studied to better understand leadership constructs and different perspectives to supplement the supervisory process.

Douglas McGregor (1960) proposed two leadership theories: Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X leaders see individuals as being lazy, need threatened to perform their jobs, need guidance, need to be told what to do, and may lack creativity. Theory Y leaders have a different perspective of individuals. Leaders view individuals as desiring to work, committed to the organization, responsible, creative, and self-directing.

Reddin's (1970) 3-D theory of leadership views leadership styles that consists of task and relationship emphasis. The managerial grid, developed by Blake and Mouten in 1964, is used and is divided into four quadrants with the task orientated dimension on the horizontal axis and the relationship orientated dimension on the vertical axis. The first quadrant, labeled dedicated, identifies leaders as placing an emphasis on directing and organizing the
work of others. The second quadrant represents the integrated leadership style. This style of leader motivates, partakes, and networks with others. The third quadrant represents the related leadership style. The leader with this style is considered to as being trustworthy, a good listener, and supporting of individuals. A leader with a separated leadership style represents the fourth quadrant. This style of leader is noted for exploring, assessing, taking charge, and maintaining.

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) proposed a leadership model called Situational Leadership. The model is constructed to focus on the maturity of the individual who is being supervised. Maturity is defined as “the capacity to set high but attainable goals, willingness and ability to take responsibility, and education and/or experience of an individual or a group” (p. 161). The model is divided into quadrants and represents an individual’s personality and how the individual progresses as he/she matures. The first quadrant, high task/low relationship, represents an individual that is more concerned with the tasks to be accomplished and is not concerned with the personal feelings of his/her cohorts. An individual that is concerned with the task of a project but also takes into consideration the feelings of his/her cohorts represents the second quadrant, high task and relationship. An individual who is concerned with his/her cohort’s personal feelings rather than completing the task represents the third quadrant, low task and high relationship. An individual who is not concerned with the task of the project or the personal feelings of his/her cohorts represents the last quadrant, low task and relationship. Supervisors need to adjust their leadership style as the individual matures.

Covey (1990) has spent the majority of his professional life focused on principle-centered leadership. Principle-centered leadership starts with the leader and works outward.
There are four levels associated with this. The first level is the leader and the relationship one has with himself/herself. The second level is interpersonal and the interactions the leader has with other individuals. The third level is managerial and the responsibility of the leader to collaborate with others to achieve goals and objectives. The fourth level is organizational and the leader has to solve problems, train individuals, build teams, etc. Covey (1990) also outlines characteristics of principle-centered leaders. The leaders are "continually learning, service orientated, positive, believe in others, lead balanced lives, see life as an adventure, synergistic and exercise for self-renewal" (p. 33).

Bass (1996) contends that leaders should be transformational. Transformational leaders "behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one of the four components of transformational leadership" (Bass. 1996, p. 5). The four components of transformational leadership are: 1) Idealized influence- transformational leaders are in positions to be role models for others. 2) Inspirational motivation-transformational leaders provide a challenge to the work environment which will in turn motivate others around them. 3) Intellectual stimulation- Transformational leaders encourage and promote creativity within the work environment, and 4) Individualized consideration-Transformational leaders act as a mentor to individuals by being supportive and recognizing individuality. Transformational leadership suggests that individuals can do more than what they intended or thought they could do.

There are various leadership models to choose from and a leader should focus on models that resonate with his/her personality and for the betterment of individuals.
Conclusion

Working with teachers is often a tough task. There are many things that a supervisor must take into account and determine how issues or factors may affect a teacher. As supervisors help prepare teachers, they need to guide and help them develop reflection techniques. Reflection techniques (Kruse, 1997) can help a teacher and supervisor analyze a difficult situation and develop alternatives for improvement.

Student teachers need guidance throughout their student teaching experience. They acquire direction that the supervisor or mentor may provide. The guidance is focused on teaching and student learning. An understanding of history, models of supervision, communication, teaching concerns and leadership theories may aide supervisors in better addressing the needs of teachers.
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CHAPTER III. ESCALATION MODEL FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISORS IN AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
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Abstract

The principal purpose of this study was to identify supervision models that are potentially useful to supervisors of agricultural instruction. Selected supervisory models served as the basis for creating the Escalation Model for instructional supervisors in agricultural education. The Escalation Model is divided into three levels of supervision. The supervisory models included in each level are placed along a continuum of structure and reward and risk. As the supervisor matures in the supervisory process, it is proposed that the model of supervision used should change. As their professional maturity increases and as the circumstances dictate, the supervisor will progress in an upward direction on the continuum and facilitate more teacher-directed models of supervision. With teacher-directed models of supervision, the teacher and supervisor may experience greater reward from the supervisory process.

Introduction

"Instructional supervision is the function in educational systems that draws together the discrete elements of instructional effectiveness into a whole educational action" (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon. 1995, p. 15). Supervision, teaching, and learning are major components of this educational system (Montgomery. 1999). Without these components the educational system may not be effective.
Each individual student who applies knowledge that is constructive, cumulative, self-organized, goal oriented, situated, and individually different (Montgomery, 1999) achieves effective learning. Effective learning should be the teacher's primary focus in education. Glickman, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2001) suggest that the blame for lack of student learning could be placed on the teachers and their teaching techniques. However, learning is the responsibility of the learner (student) because the teacher cannot learn for the student. Therefore, the teacher's role is to facilitate and promote learning.

Montgomery (1999) notes, "Effective teaching is occurring where the majority, preferably all the pupils, learn most of what the teacher intended. The pupils want to learn and do not have to be made to" (p. 126). This goal is a very difficult task to accomplish, and for some teachers it may take several years, if it happens at all. Montgomery's (1999) research has shown that teachers lack grounding in relevant relatively unstructured teaching theory and become susceptible to fashions and fads in teaching. Therefore, many teachers are unable to develop an effective system for teaching. Cogan (1973) concluded "the profound underestimation of the difficulties teachers face in learning how to teach and in improving their teaching on the job is at the root of the major problems in the preservice and inservice education of teachers" (p. 15).

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) affirmed that individual performance within an organization is often substantiated by effective supervisory leadership practices. Individual teachers may be more satisfied with their jobs if supervisors are providing effective leadership and support. Supervision could be very important to the teachers' overall satisfaction. Glickman et al. (2001) describe effective supervision as the glue that holds individual teachers' needs and school goals together. Glickman et al. (2001) also note, "glue.
if functioning properly, cannot be seen” (p. 9). Likewise, when supervision is functioning properly, it also goes unnoticed. But when the glue quits sticking, as in the case of inadequate supervision, the object (the school system) will collapse.

Supervision is an opportunity to promote teacher efficiency, abstract thought, and a reflection on the teacher's own instructional methods (Glickman et al., 1995). If the supervisor lacks adequate knowledge of supervision and does not know how to meet the needs of the teacher, then there may be an unproductive working relationship established (Acheson & Gall, 1980). The teacher could spend time being upset with the supervisor and might not devote sufficient effort toward teaching students. More importantly, the students' desire, ability, and levels of learning may be affected (Beach & Reinhartz, 2000). When the supervisor cannot meet the needs of the teacher, the entire teaching experience may not be as effective as it could have been (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1988).

Instructional supervision is an important function performed by teacher educators in agriculture (Hedges, 1989). Even so, there is a scarcity of scholarship related to supervision of instruction in agricultural education. Out of 803 articles published in the Journal of Agricultural Education between 1976 and 2001, only three directly focused on the supervision of teaching and only one on satisfaction with a supervisory process. Martin and Howell, in 1983, wrote about supervisory techniques used by principals and the related implications to the success of beginning teachers. Barrick, in 1985, addressed the current and expected roles of agriculture supervisors. In 1986, Martin and Yoder studied one supervision technique, clinical supervision, and how the technique should be practiced. The final article, written by Borne and Moss in 1990, focused on the satisfaction of student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors with agricultural education student teaching and the supervisory process.
Purpose and Objectives

The principal purpose of this article was to identify supervision models that are potentially useful to supervisors of agricultural instruction. The specific objectives were to:

1. Identify and explain models of instructional supervision that may be useful for supervision of agricultural instruction.
2. Present a model for supervisors of agricultural instruction to use in selecting a supervision model appropriate for a particular context.

Methods

A library search was performed to obtain information on a variety of models and techniques of supervision. Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Psychological Abstracts (PsychLit) were the databases used to identify articles focusing on instructional supervision. Articles were gathered from the following sources: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Yearbook, Journal of Agricultural Education, Educational Researcher, Educational Leadership, Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Journal of Teacher Education, The Journal of Higher Education, Journal of Staff Development, Viewpoints, and Principal. Additionally, the catalog of a Midwestern land grant university library was searched for all holdings related to instructional supervision. This search was used to locate books and other sources of information not indexed in ERIC and PsychLit.

The analysis of all this information progressed in two phases. The initial phase involved selecting models and techniques of supervision and then focusing on how they could be used by teacher educators in agriculture. Regarding selection criteria, models chosen were those that a) fit along a continuum of potential growth for the supervisor, b) provided specific explanations of how the models could be used, c) had a record of
Agricultural education is unique. Many subject areas have classroom and laboratory structures to supervise but most of the time not a third component. Agricultural education teachers typically integrate classroom instruction, SAE participation, and FFA activities into their curriculum. Therefore, agricultural education is unique and supervisory models that could assist in the agricultural education supervision process were selected.

The second phase of analysis focused on how the models or options could be used by teacher educators in agriculture. According to Newcomb, McCracken, and Warmbroad (1993), the objectives of instruction in agriculture are to 1) develop vocational and practical arts interests, knowledge, and skills; 2) provide exploration of and orientation to occupations requiring knowledge and skills in agriculture; 3) develop knowledge and skill for occupational competence; and 4) prepare for more advanced study of agriculture.

Furthermore, the extent of teaching skills and knowledge used by agricultural education teachers requires the supervisor to be flexible enough to accommodate such a variety. A supervisor in an individualized laboratory, classroom, or instructional setting can use supervision models that were selected.

**Findings**

*Objective 1. Identify and explain models of instructional supervision that may be useful for supervision of agricultural instruction.*

Although several models and techniques of instructional supervision are mentioned in the literature, this article is based on those that accommodate a relatively unstructured maturation process for the supervisor. Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) leadership model and the research of Glickman et al. (2001) were influential in the decision to use the
developmental approach. Glickman et al. (2001) emphasized that teachers are not all at the same level of professional maturity. Likewise, supervisors, as adult learners, also possess varying levels of professional maturity (Knowles, 1978).

The models were analyzed and placed into three growth levels for supervisors to use in deciding which model would be most appropriate for a given situation. These growth levels are structured, moderately structured, and relatively unstructured. The supervision models can be placed along a continuum representing the level of structure required by the model, the potential reward/risk for using the model, and the level of maturity required by the supervisor to use the model.

The level of structure refers to the specified steps that each type of supervisory model requires. The more specific procedures a model requires, the more structured it is. Potential reward is defined as "something given or offered for some service or attainment" (Mish et al., 1989, p. 628). Supervisors can be less directive with their supervisory practices and provide an opportunity for the teacher to gain more self-control which could help the teacher achieve job satisfaction (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972). But there are potential risks involved for the supervisor when supervision is teacher driven and the structure of supervision diminishes. Risk is defined by Mish et al. (1976) as "the exposure to possible loss or injury" (p. 632). Some examples of these risks for the supervisor could be: a) colleagues criticizing work ethic, b) losing identity of a job title, c) teachers' not fulfilling their responsibilities, and d) accountability for teaching performance.

Highly achievement-motivated individuals tend to take more risks that in turn can produce greater results (Hersey & Blanchard, 1972). A supervisor who is more conservative tends to feel secure with structure and feels that there is little danger of any mistake being
made. Therefore, if there are rewards to be gained in this model, there will be potential risks to achieving those rewards.

Supervisor maturity is also a feature in the model. The low, medium, and high maturity concepts are linked to Hersey and Blanchard's (1972) leadership theory. They define maturity as "achievement-motivation, the willingness and ability to take responsibility, and task relevant education and experience of an individual or a group" (p. 134). A supervisor with low maturity is one who is new to supervision or a model of supervision and needs more structure in his or her supervisory work. A supervisor with medium maturity is one who has had some experience with supervision and some workshops or training courses, etc. but still needs some structure in the supervisory process. High maturity is characterized by substantiate experience in supervision and supervisory education. Supervisors with high levels of maturity are comfortable with less structure and control over the teacher decision-making process.

*Structured Level*

The structured level introduces a starting point for supervisors. Supervisors at this level would be new to instructional supervision and would require more structure on how to conduct supervisory visits and the supervisory process. The clinical and collaborative supervision approaches are recommended for this level and were chosen due to their complete step-by-step processes.

*Structured-Clinical Supervision*

Clinical supervision, the first model of supervision recommended for the structured level, is a form of inquiry designed to encourage teachers to reflect on and analyze their own teaching methods and to develop and test hypotheses about what is effective and why (Cook,
Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) identified five major steps in clinical supervision: planning conference, classroom observation/data collection, analysis/strategy, supervision conference, and postconference analysis. There are several procedures to follow within the five major steps that can help direct the supervisor.

The planning conference is designed to inform the supervisor of the objectives for the lesson. The teacher should have prepared a detailed lesson plan for the supervisor to critique and on which to give suggestions (Acheson & Gall, 1980).

During the classroom observation/data collection step the supervisor observes the teacher teaching the lesson that was outlined in his/her lesson plan. The supervisor should use his/her observation instrument to collect data on the lesson being taught (Acheson & Gall, 1980). This procedure will provide written information to be given to the teacher in the postobservation conference.

The analysis and strategy stage is the core of clinical supervision because the supervisor conceptualizes what he/she observed in the classroom and converts the analysis into readable data for the teacher (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). The teacher then has a representation of how the supervisor perceived the lesson.

The supervision conference is designed for the supervisor to dialogue with the teacher on the lesson observed (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). This is a time for the teacher to give input on the lesson. In addition, the supervisor and teacher work together to establish goals to be met at the next observation date.

The postconference analysis is primarily for the supervisor. He or she must analyze if the best supervisory practices were used with the teacher. This analysis provides a reflection
exercise to help the supervisor on improving the next supervisory conference (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969).

**Structured-Conceptual Model**

The second model recommended for the structured level is the conceptual model. This model emphasizes the need for supervisors to familiarize themselves with influences that may affect the teaching process. The conceptual model is supported by the organizational theory emphasizing that individuals are unified by a common set of ethics and work together within a system of structure to accomplish specific goals and objectives (Beach & Reinhartz, 1989). The key for the supervisor using the conceptual model is the system of structure.

The conceptual model is based on clinical and collaborative supervision. In addition to the supervisory steps of clinical supervision and the collaboration established by the supervisor and teacher, the supervisor considers other factors that may affect teaching. Edmeier and Nicklaus’s (1999) conceptual model outlines organizational factors (e.g., work load, classroom climate, support of colleagues, decision making, role conflict, and support from supervisor via supervision) and personal factors (e.g., life stage, teaching assignment, interpersonal, intrapersonal, conceptual level, experience in education, and knowledge of subject) that influence teacher commitment and trust in the teaching system as well as how these factors directly reflect on the performance quality of the teacher. A supervisor should understand how factors that a teacher can and cannot control might affect their teaching effectiveness.

The supervisor and teacher set certain benchmarks based on personal and organizational factors that influence the teacher’s performance. Changes in organizational
and personal factors should be made, and the teacher’s improvements toward the benchmarks will be evaluated in each supervisory visit. For example, if the teacher is preoccupied with the notion that other teachers do not like him or her, the teacher’s teaching effectiveness may suffer. The supervisor should help the teacher with these feelings, whether they are warranted or not, because in the mind of the teacher they are reality. This type of supervision builds on a relationship and is initially used to develop trust between the supervisor and the teacher.

After conducting structured supervisory visits, developing a better understanding of supervision techniques in the structured level and assessing one’s maturity level, the supervisor may be ready to move to the moderately structured level.

**Moderately Structured Level**

The moderately structured level introduces models that are appropriate for an intermediate level of supervisor maturity. This level is made possible by previous experience and starts a self-discovery process related to different supervision styles. In the structured level, the supervisor was primarily focused on the process of supervision. However, the moderately structured level is focused on matching supervisory style with teaching ability.

The moderately structured level allows the supervisor more freedom in the style of supervision. The supervisor begins to reflect on more supervision practices and allows more teacher involvement. The supervisor develops a deeper understanding of supervision based on his/her experiences, advanced education, and reflection on his/her own supervisory practices. This level still requires some guidance from the models themselves, but the rigidity of the structure begins to diminish. Two models recommended for the moderately structured level are developmental and contextual supervision.
Moderately Structured-Developmental Supervision

Glickman et al. (2001) define developmental supervision as “the match of initial supervisory approach with the teacher or group’s developmental levels, expertise, and commitment” (p. 197). The supervisor in the developmental approach gives three types of assistance: directive, collaborative, and nondirective. Teachers who have low conceptual thinking, expertise and commitment to their teaching will be matched with directive supervision. Teachers at earlier stages of development have problems making decisions and defining problems, and they have few ways of responding to problems. Directive supervision places the supervisor as the expert and the one in charge of writing the goals for the teacher. Teachers at moderate levels of abstract thinking, expertise, and commitment are best matched with the collaborative supervisory approach (Glickman et al., 2001). In this approach, the supervisor and teacher establish goals to be achieved, identify how they will be achieved, and note when the achievement should be noticed as a team. The teachers who think abstractly, demonstrate high expertise and commitment to teaching are best matched with the nondirective approach (Glickman et al., 2001). The nondirective approach allows the teacher to be in control of how and when the goals will be achieved. The supervisor is still involved, but takes a more passive role in the supervisory process. Glickman et al. (2001) identify the behaviors of the supervisor in this role as listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem solving.

Moderately Structured-Contextual Supervision

The second model of supervision recommended for the moderately structured level is contextual supervision. In this approach, supervisory styles are matched to the teacher’s development or readiness level to perform a particular teaching task (Ralph, 1998). The
readiness levels are a function of the teacher’s confidence and competence. Competence is the extent of the teacher’s knowledge, skill, and ability to perform a certain task. Confidence is the degree of self-assurance, willingness, motivation, interest, or enthusiasm to become engaged in the task (Ralph, 1998). The contextual model of supervision requires that the supervisor have the ability to adjust and provide different leadership styles to match the teacher’s developmental level of teaching.

The contextual model provides four quadrants for the supervisor to use in determining the readiness level and confidence of the teacher (Ralph, 1998). The first quadrant is labeled high confidence and low competence. The teacher is energetic toward teaching but is not completely proficient with the material that he/she is teaching. The supervisor establishes low support and high task for the teacher. Ralph (1998) refers to support as the amount of encouragement/motivation given to the teacher. Task is referred to as the amount of guidance that is provided in subject matter areas. The second quadrant of the contextual model is labeled low confidence and low competence. The teacher is not energetic about teaching and not proficient in a particular subject area. The supervisor provides the teacher with high support and high task. The third quadrant of the contextual model is labeled low confidence and high competence. In this quadrant, the teacher is not confident in his/her teaching abilities but is knowledgeable about the subject he/she is teaching. The supervisor would provide high support and low task to the teacher. The final quadrant of the contextual model is labeled high confidence and high competence. The teacher is enthusiastic about teaching and is proficient in the subject area. The supervisor would then provide feedback to the teacher if he/she had any immediate concerns.
The moderately structured level is recommended for supervisors who have been supervising for at least three years, are receiving advanced education in supervision, and are feeling comfortable with their abilities as a supervisor. This level should be accompanied by more reflection on the part of the supervisor on identifying results that are meaningful to the teacher. The moderately structured level, as stated, is a growth process that the supervisor must go through to develop the supervisory skills necessary for the relatively unstructured level.

*Relatively Unstructured Level*

The relatively unstructured level offers the supervisor a more reflective role with the teacher. The relatively unstructured level assumes that, in addition to experience, the supervisor has acquired specialized knowledge of the model recommended for the relatively unstructured level, thorough academic preparation in supervision, and obtained a high level of maturity. The relatively unstructured level would best suit a teacher who is comfortable in the teaching process. This level is appropriate for a supervisor who is ready for a more flexible, supervising role.

*Relatively Unstructured-Differentiated Supervision*

The supervisory model recommended for relatively unstructured level, differentiated supervision, allows the teacher to choose one of four supervisory options. Differentiated supervision is particularly teacher driven and allows the supervisor to become more of a mentor to the teacher. Additionally, the supervisor can focus his/her efforts where they are needed most (Glatthorn, 1997).

Glatthorn (1997) suggests four options for differentiated supervision: intensive development (a special approach to clinical supervision), cooperative relatively unstructured
development, self-directed, and administrative monitoring. The teacher chooses one of the supervisory options, and then the supervisor and teacher focus on that area.

Glatthorn (1997) suggests that intensive development, the first option of the differentiated supervisory model, is a process requiring many observations conducted by the supervisor that focuses on learning outcomes instead of teaching methods. Intensive development should be used with a small number of teachers who are experiencing difficulty with the teaching process.

Intensive development, designed by Glatthorn (1997), includes eight components that involve five or more cycles and multiple observations. The first component is the taking stock conference. This conference is held anytime the supervisor and teacher want to discuss their professional relationship or to reflect on what has been accomplished. The second (preobservation), third (diagnostic observation), fourth (analysis of diagnostic observation), and fifth (diagnostic debriefing) components of the intensive development option are equivalent to the planning conference, classroom observation, analysis/strategy, and supervision conference of the clinical supervision model. The sixth component of the intensive development option, the coaching session, provides an opportunity for the supervisor and teacher to select one skill from the diagnostic process on which to focus. The seventh component, focused observation, focuses on one skill, using a form intended to assemble information about the teacher's use of that skill. The focused debriefing conference, the eighth component, allows the supervisor and teacher to review and analyze the results of the focused observation.

The second option, cooperative professional development, is a mutually respectful process in which a small group of teachers agree to work together to facilitate their own
professional growth (Glatthorn, 1997). The teacher would be part of a two-or-three teacher team that would undergo the mentoring process together. The teachers would observe each other's classes and give feedback on each other's teaching. This type of supervision is less time consuming for the supervisor because the teachers are conducting the supervisory process with the supervisor serving only as a resource. Cooperative professional development can be used with more experienced teachers and supervisors who are seeking collegiality (Showers & Joyce, 1996). This could provide a beneficial mentoring experience for teachers.

The third suggested option of the differentiated supervisory model is self-directed. Beach and Reinhartz's (2000) research states that self-directed supervision enables the individual teacher to work independently on professional growth and allows the supervisor to have a more relaxed supervisory role. In this case, the teacher would develop and carry out individualized plans for professional growth with the supervisor serving as a resource. This technique specifically is for the teacher who prefers to work alone, yet seeks the aid of the supervisor as a mentor (Glatthorn, 1997). Glatthorn (1997) and Beach and Reinhartz (2000) state the teacher would self-evaluate his/her teaching using videotape, inventories, reflective journals, or portfolios to critique the teaching procedure. The supervisor does not need to evaluate the lesson, but through individual conferences the supervisor could provide feedback on improving the instruction, if the teacher so desires.

The final option available to teachers in the differentiated supervisory model is administrative monitoring. Glatthorn (1997) defines administrative monitoring as a process by which the supervisor monitors the teacher's classroom with brief unannounced visits.
This option is used to monitor the activity in the classroom and enables the supervisor to be aware of any problems the teacher is having.

**Objective 2. Develop a model for supervisors of agricultural instruction to use in making decisions relative to the application of selected supervision models.**

![Figure 1. Escalation Model for Instructional Supervisors](image)

Based on the review and analysis of literature, a model for supervisors was conceptualized to aid in their growth process (see Figure 1). The supervision models can be placed along a continuum representing the level of structure required by the model, the potential reward/risk for using the model, and the level of maturity of the model required by the supervisor to use the model.

The Escalation Model is a unique representation of choices available to supervisors of agricultural instruction. The Escalation Model, represented by the reward/risk spectrum,
outlines the three levels. Once again, Mish et al. (1989) defines reward as “something given or offered for some service or attainment” (p. 628) and risk as “the exposure to possible loss or injury” (p. 632).

The left side of the spectrum begins with the structured level. The structured supervisor is more administrative, directive, and structured in the supervision process. The supervisor at this level may typically focus on completion and success of the supervision process. The models in this level are also used to familiarize the supervisor with basic supervisory practices. The structured level may not allow the teacher as much freedom as the moderately structured and relatively unstructured levels, but the structured level allows the supervisor to develop self-confidence in his/her supervisory role. The structured level should primarily be used for the supervisor who is new to supervision, needs structure on conducting a supervisory visit, and needs assistance on supervisory techniques.

As a supervisor continues to move to the right on the spectrum, from the structured to the moderately structured level, he/she should start to mature, gain more confidence, and develop more knowledge of supervision. The supervisor is growing professionally in the supervision process with teachers. With a combination of knowledge and supervisory skills gained in the structured level, the moderately structured supervisor could show a substantial amount of maturity and reflection. However, the supervisor should be reflecting and growing throughout each supervisory model that is used. With reflection being an ongoing process, the supervisor should start to witness more rewards or satisfaction with teachers and their progress with supervision. These two models are for supervisors who have experience conducting supervisory visits but still need some structure for supervising teachers. The models also provide implications for some advanced training on supervision.
The final level of the spectrum, the relatively unstructured level, should be the most rewarding to both the supervisor and teacher. The relatively unstructured level is considered the most powerful level in the model. The supervisor at this level must be at a high level of maturity and have extensive experience and knowledge about supervision. Since the relatively unstructured level includes a combination of models from the structured and moderately structured levels to enrich the supervisory process, a supervisor must be confident that he/she can guide the teacher accordingly. If reflection is ongoing, the relatively unstructured level should benefit both teacher and supervisor. It encourages the supervision process to be teacher driven.

A supervisor could use a supervisory model within the Escalation Model that is consistent with his/her level of maturity, teacher maturity, and is appropriate for a particular situation. As a result of knowledge and experience by the supervisor and the teacher, more teacher-directed models of supervision would be in order.

The foundation of structure is found predominantly in the structured level but diminishes as one moves up the spectrum. The structured level requires less risk for the supervisor but is potentially less rewarding when compared with less-structured models found in the moderately structured or relatively unstructured levels. Reward could be gained if supervisors can be open to more teacher-driven types of supervision. Since every supervisor is unique and defines reward differently, the supervisor could experience reward before he/she reaches the relatively unstructured level as projected in the Escalation Model.
Conclusions and Recommendations

Implications for Practice

This article represents an exercise in theory building that should prove useful for future research and practice related to the supervision of agricultural instruction. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1996) state that the ultimate goal of educational research is the formulation of scientific theory. In addition “theories summarize existing knowledge, make predictions, and explain relationships...theories represent our best efforts to explain the world we live in” (p. 17). According to Warmbrod (1986), studies involving teaching and learning should begin and end with a look at theory. Scholars in agricultural education are encouraged to conduct research to test the theoretical propositions presented here.

The Escalation Model can be a useful to teacher education programs. It provides several options to use plus opportunities to match many levels of supervisor maturity and relatively unstructured growth with various levels of teacher maturity and growth. This model could be a win/win situation for both the supervisor and teacher.

Future Research

Priority should be placed on researching several dimensions of the model. For example, whether the models may be used effectively for supervising agricultural instruction, confirming or disconfirming the hypothesized link between the supervisory model and the developmental level of the supervisor, and confirming or disconfirming the hypothesized reward/risk spectrum. Also, the model should be tested to see if in fact each level has included the appropriate supervisory models.

Regarding practice, supervisors of agricultural instruction can use this model to identify alternate approaches to use in different supervisory situations. Experimental
research needs to be conducted to determine which supervisory models are appropriate for
different supervisory situations.

This study demonstrates that there are many options available to supervisors of
agricultural instruction. Some other questions this might raise related to future research are:

1. To what extent do teacher educators in agriculture use the various supervisory
   models?

2. What is the relationship between selected university supervisor characteristics
   and the extent to which levels of the Escalation Model are used?

3. Does a supervisor use the appropriate model of supervision based on his/her
   maturity level?

4. Do supervisors benefit from using self-directed models of supervision with
   preservice teachers?

5. Do preservice teachers in agricultural education benefit from supervisors
   using self-directed models of supervision?

6. Do supervisors benefit from starting with the structured level and progressing
   through the relatively unstructured level of the Escalation Model?

7. How and over what period of time do supervisors progress through the levels
   outlined in the Escalation Model?
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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which teacher educators in agricultural education used selected models of supervision and the relationship between the level of supervision used and supervisor maturity. The supervisors (N=145) who participated in the study devoted considerable time to supervision. The majority of them had received formal training on supervision, had been a university supervisor for an average of 13 years, and had, on average, served as a cooperating teacher for two student teachers.

There were no statistically significant relationships between selected indicators of supervisor maturity and the type of supervisory model used. It was recommended that the agricultural education profession incorporate, into professional meetings, workshops on different supervisory practices by skilled educators to provide opportunities for teacher educators to increase awareness of a range of supervisory options.

Introduction/Theoretical Framework

Supervisors were once inspectors of teaching instead of partners in helping teachers to become better educators (Bolin & Panaritis, 1992). However, this situation appears to be changing. Sullivan and Glanz (2000) define supervision today as “a process of engaging teachers in instructional dialogue for the purpose of improving teaching and increasing student achievement” (p. 24). In addition, supervisors of the 21st century will be expected to collaborate more with teachers (Sullivan & Glanz, 2000). One of the most important
contributors to the success of teachers, supervision (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2001) needs to be done effectively so teachers can enhance student learning. Furthermore, supervisors should be improving their knowledge base of supervision to help teachers improve their teaching (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1998).

Since supervision plays a significant role in the teaching and learning process, one might expect to find a large number of discipline specific studies that address supervision. Out of 803 articles published in the Journal of Agricultural Education between 1976-2001, only three focused specifically on supervision. As a contribution to the literature on instructional supervision in agricultural education, Fritz and Miller (2001) developed the Escalation Model for instructional supervisors to use in their supervisory practice. This model provides a continuum of various supervisory models for the supervisor and teacher of agricultural instruction to select from.

*Escalation Model for Instructional Supervisors*

The Escalation Model (Figure 1) consists of three levels: structured, moderately structured, and relatively unstructured. Each level consists of models that could help the supervisor and teacher develop professionally over time.

There are three specific features of the model: risk, reward, and maturity. Risk is defined by Mish (1989) as “the exposure to possible loss or injury” (p. 632). Some possible risks to a supervisor could be loss of job title, colleagues criticizing work ethic, and accountability for teacher performance. Reward is defined as “something given or offered for some service or attainment” (Mish, 1989, p. 628).
Figure 1. Escalation Model for Instructional Supervisors

For example, the supervisor could experience satisfaction watching a teacher improve his/her teaching through self-reflection. In addition, a teacher could reference his/her reflection documentation to demonstrate growth. The maturity feature in the model is grounded in Hersey and Blanchard’s (1972) situational leadership theory. They define maturity as “achievement-motivation, the willingness and ability to take responsibility, and task relevant education and experience of an individual or a group” (p. 134).

In addition, the reward, risk, and maturity features coincide with each level of the Escalation Model. Thus, as the supervisor/teacher progress through each level, the models suggested would require an increasing level of risk by the supervisor and teacher but both could experience greater reward.

The structured level in the Escalation Model consists of the clinical and conceptual models of supervision. Goldhammer, (1969;1993), Anderson (1993), and Cogan (1973)
identified five major steps in clinical supervision: planning conference, classroom observation/data collection, analysis/strategy, supervision conference, and postconference analysis. The conceptual model developed by Edmeirer and Nicklaus (1999) outlined organizational factors (e.g., work load, classroom climate, support of colleagues, decision making, role conflict, and support from supervisor via supervision) and personal factors (e.g., life stage, teaching assignment, interpersonal, intrapersonal, conceptual level, experience in education, and knowledge of subject) that influence teacher commitment and trust in the teaching system as well as how these factors directly reflect on the performance quality of the teacher. According to the model, supervisors with little experience should be advised to consider selecting supervisory models from the structured level.

The moderately structured level in the Escalation Model consists of developmental and contextual models of supervision. Supervisors using the developmental model (Glickman et al., 2001) provide three types of assistance: directive, collaborative, and nondirective depending on the teacher’s conceptual level of thinking, expertise, and commitment to teaching. In the contextual model (Ralph, 1998), supervisory styles are matched to the teacher’s development or readiness level to perform a particular teaching task. The four supervisory styles are directing, coaching, supporting, and self-regulating. These models could be appropriate for an intermediate level of supervisor maturity. Supervisors who have gained a deeper understanding of supervision through experience, advanced education, and reflection should be advised to consider selecting models from the moderately structured level. The moderately structured level still requires some guidance from the models themselves, but the rigidity of the structure begins to diminish.
The relatively unstructured level of the Escalation Model assumes that, in addition to experience, the supervisor has acquired specialized knowledge and thorough academic preparation in supervision. This level would best suit a teacher who is comfortable in the teaching process and a supervisor who is ready for a more flexible supervising role.

The supervisory model recommended for the relatively unstructured level is differentiated supervision. Differentiated supervision is a unique approach to supervision because it allows the teacher to choose which type of supervisory technique he/she will receive (Glatthorn, 1997). The techniques that are embodied in differentiated supervision are the following: intensive development (special approach to clinical), cooperative professional development, self-directed, and administrative monitoring.

Student teachers often need direct guidance from a supervisor; however, some student teachers may be prepared for more self-direction. Even so, a supervisor must be able to analyze a teaching situation and select the appropriate supervisory approach for each individual teacher. Therefore, the Escalation Model suggests several supervisory models that could be used when supervising student teachers of agricultural education.

Prior to this study, no data existed on the status of student teacher supervision in agricultural education in the United States, the specific characteristics of supervisors in agricultural education or the extent to which supervisors were using a particular supervisory model. In addition, the validity of selected theoretical propositions derived from the Escalation Model had not been tested.

**Purpose and Objectives**

The purposes of this study were to determine the status of student teacher supervision in agricultural education, the extent to which teacher educators in agricultural education used
selected models of supervision, and the relationship between the level of supervision and supervisor maturity. Four objectives and two hypotheses guided the study.

**Objectives:**

1. Describe characteristics of teacher educators who supervised student teachers in agricultural education from September 2000-May 2001;

2. Determine the extent to which teacher educators in agricultural education used selected models of instructional supervision;

3. Describe the percentage of teacher educators who used Level I, II, and III supervisory approaches; and

4. Describe associations between selected teacher educator characteristics and the extent to which levels of the Escalation Model were used.

**Hypotheses:**

1. There will be a higher percentage of supervisors who most frequently used Level I models of supervision instead of Level II and III models of supervision.

2. There will be a statistically significant positive relationship between supervisor maturity and the level of supervision most frequently used.

**Methods and Procedures**

This census study was descriptive in nature. The population consisted of 167 teacher educators from 67 institutions who were responsible for supervising student teachers from September 2000-May 2001. These 67 institutions represented 76% of the 88 teacher education programs that were listed in the American Association of Agricultural Education (AAAE) directory (Dyer, 2000). The list of teacher educators was obtained by contacting the administrator of each agricultural education department or section in universities in the United States.

A questionnaire was developed by the researchers based upon a review of literature on supervision and from the proposed Escalation Model developed by Fritz and Miller.
This questionnaire was composed of three sections. However, only Sections I and III were used for this study.

In Section I, respondents were instructed to indicate on several questions to what extent they engaged in a specific behavior related to supervising student teachers. There was one behavior in each question, and this behavior was related to a specific type of supervisory model. Portions of the questionnaire that were relevant to this report included clinical supervision, contextual supervision, and differentiated supervision. The number of questions that represented each type of supervisory model were as follows: five for clinical supervision, five for contextual supervision, and one for differentiated supervision. Section I was quantified using a Likert-type scale consisting of the following choices: Never=1, Sometimes=2, Often=3, and Always=4. One model was selected to represent each level of the Escalation Model. Clinical supervision represented the structured level, contextual supervision represented the moderately structured level, and differentiated supervision represented the relatively unstructured level. These models capture the essence of their respective levels. Section III consisted of demographic questions.

A panel of experts on instructional supervision determined the content and face validity of the questionnaire. This panel consisted of Dr. Edwin Ralph, founder of contextual supervision, from the University of Saskatchewan; Dr. Allan Glatthorn, the founder of differentiated supervision, from East Carolina University; and Dr. Robert Martin, a teacher educator in agricultural education who has published research on instructional supervision, from Iowa State University. The questionnaire was tested for reliability with a group of nine secondary education supervisors from the College of Education at Iowa State University. Reliability was established by using the test-retest procedure. After the initial pilot test,
questions with reliability coefficients of less than .70 were revised. A participant from the pilot study group helped with revisions to these questions. A second pilot study group, consisting of five teacher educators in agricultural education at Iowa State University, participated in a test-retest of the revised questions. The reliability coefficients after the second pilot study were .86 for clinical supervision, .71 for contextual supervision, and .80 for differentiated supervision.

Data were collected by mailed questionnaire. In May 2001, the questionnaire, accompanied by a cover letter and a stamped return envelope, was sent to 167 teacher educators responsible for supervising student teachers in agricultural education. In June 2001, a second mailing consisting of a cover letter, questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope was sent to all nonrespondents stressing the importance of their participation.

In total, 145 out of 167 questionnaires were completed and returned for a response rate of 87%. Nonresponse error was handled by comparing early to late respondents (Miller & Smith, 1983). Deciding which respondents would be treated as early or late respondents was influenced by the work of Barrick, Na, and Catri (2000). Early respondents were classified as the first half of respondents to return the survey and late respondents were the second half of respondents to return the survey. No statistically significant differences were found between the early and late respondents on the supervisory behavior questions or the demographic variables.

The regional representation of participating agricultural teacher education programs was examined. The percentages of participating agricultural teacher education programs by region were 93% for the Western Region, 86% for the Central Region, 73% for the Eastern Region, and 68% for the Southern Region.
All data were analyzed using SPSS. The statistics that were deemed appropriate for the study included frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations and correlations. An *a priori* alpha level of .05 was used. Davis' (1971) descriptors were used to interpret the magnitude of all associations.

**Results/Findings**

**Demographic Characteristics**

Respondents participating in this study were Professors (36.8%, n=53), Associate Professors (20.8%, n=30), Assistant Professors (21.5%, n=31), Visiting Professors (.7%, n=1), Instructors (6.3%, n=9), Graduate Assistants (7.6%, n=11), and Other Professionals (6.3%, n=9). Most (89.6%, n=129) of the supervisors were male. A majority (60.7%, n=88) of the supervisors had received tenure and 74.3% had received formal training on supervision.

Table 1 summarizes respondents' demographic characteristics. On average, supervisors in agricultural education had 13 years of supervisory experience at the university level, six years of high school teaching experience, and had served as a cooperating teacher two times. Supervisors devoted 20% of their time during the 2000-2001 academic year to supervising student teachers. Supervisors made three on-site visits to each student teacher lasting approximately five hours per visit. For the 2000-2001 academic year, there was an average of 15 student teachers per department, with six student teachers assigned to each supervisor.
Table 1
Summary Characteristics of University Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of teaching high school agricultural education</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0-37</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Experience (Number of Student Teachers)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of time devoted to supervising student teachers from September 2000-May 2001</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years supervising student teachers at the university level</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1-42</td>
<td>13.39</td>
<td>10.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teachers from September 1, 2000-May 31, 2001 for the agricultural education program</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of student teachers supervised from September 1, 2000-May 31, 2001 by each supervisor</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent with each student teacher/visit</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.5-9</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site visits to each student teacher</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of Supervisory Models

Table 2 displays the extent to which teacher educators used a particular supervisory model and the overall mean at each level of the Escalation Model. Each level of the Escalation Model is represented by one supervisory model. Clinical supervision was chosen to represent the structured level, contextual supervision was chosen to represent the moderately structured level, and differentiated supervision was chosen to represent the relatively unstructured level.

The behaviors of the clinical supervision model were used to a greater extent than the behaviors of the contextual or differentiated models. The majority of supervisors used the
clinical model either often (40.1%) or always (58.5%). In addition, the contextual model was also used often (47.2%) or always (50.7%).

The differentiated model was the least used of the supervisory models. Differentiated supervision consists of four options. The extent to which the teacher is allowed to choose the option he/she will receive was the variable of interest. Teacher choice, not particular options, is the essence of this model. The majority of teacher educators in agricultural education either never (51.4%) or only sometimes (33.6%) used the differentiated model.

Table 2
*The Extent That Teacher Educators in Agricultural Education Use Different Supervisory Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Model</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structured Level (Clinical Supervision)</strong></td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderately Structured Level (Contextual Supervision)</strong></td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relatively Unstructured Level (Differentiated Supervision)</strong></td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Likert Scale: 1-1.5=Never, 1.51-2.5=Sometimes, 2.51-3.5=Often, 3.51-4=Always*

**Level of Supervision Used**

*Hypothesis 1. There will be a higher percentage of supervisors who most frequently used Level I models of supervision instead of Level II and III models of supervision.*
Table 3 displays the level of the Escalation Model that teacher educators in agricultural education tended to use most often. A mean was calculated for each respondent on the extent to which each of the supervisory levels was used. The level with the highest mean was coded as the most frequently used on a new variable "level." Almost half (47.79%, n=65) of teacher educators in agricultural education most frequently used the supervisory model from the moderately structured level. A slightly lower number of teacher educators (46.32%, n=63) most frequently used the structured level. Only 5.89% (n=8) of the teacher educators in agricultural education most frequently used the relatively unstructured level. Hypothesis 1 was not supported by the data.

Table 3
Agricultural Teacher Educators Most Frequently Used Level of the Escalation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Supervision</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Structured</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively Unstructured</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship Between Supervisor Maturity and Level of Supervision

Hypothesis 2. There will be a statistically significant positive relationship between supervisor maturity and the level of supervision most frequently used.

Tables 4 through 7 crosstabulate supervisors' most frequently used level of the Escalation Model with selected indicators of maturity. Table 4 shows the most frequently used level of the Escalation Model by years of supervisory experience at the university level. There was a large percentage of supervisors using the structured and moderately structured levels in the first five years. Additionally, supervisors with 6-10 years of experience most frequently used the moderately structured level instead of the structured level. However, as the years of experience increased, beyond 10, the number of supervisors most frequently
using the moderately structured level decreased. Moreover, as the experience of the
supervisor increased, more supervisors most frequently used the structured level. This
particularly occurred during 16-20 and 26-30 years of supervisory experience. In contrast,
supervisors who most frequently used the relatively unstructured level (50%, \(n=4\)) had 10
years or less of supervisory experience.

Table 4
Frequencies and Percentages for Years a Supervisor Has Supervised Student Teachers at the
University Level by the Most Frequently Used Level of the Escalation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Supervising Student Teachers (n=135)</th>
<th>Structured Level</th>
<th>Moderately Structured Level</th>
<th>Relatively Unstructured Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Cum. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 exhibits the frequencies and percentages of formal training experience by the
most frequently used level of the Escalation Model. Of the 63 supervisors who most
frequently used the structured level, 76.2% had received some formal training on
supervision. Of the supervisors who most frequently used the moderately structured level,
71.9% had received formal training on supervision. There were 75% of the supervisors in
the relatively unstructured level who had received formal training on supervision.
Table 5
Frequencies and Percentages for Formal Training Experience by the Most Frequently Used Level of the Escalation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Structured Level</th>
<th>Moderately Structured Level</th>
<th>Relatively Unstructured Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=135)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 focuses on the most frequently used level of the Escalation Model and the cooperating teacher experience obtained by the supervisor. The majority of the supervisors in the structured (72.1%) and moderately structured (80.9%) levels had served as cooperating teachers for 0-2 student teachers. The majority of supervisors who have served as a cooperating teacher for 3-8 student teachers most frequently used the structured level. However, supervisors who served as a cooperating teacher for 9-11 student teachers most frequently used the moderately structured or relatively unstructured level instead of the structured level.

Table 6
Frequencies and Percentages for Supervisors Obtaining Cooperating Teacher Experience (Number of Student Teachers) by the Most Frequently Used Level of the Escalation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperating Teacher Experience (n=132)</th>
<th>Structured Level</th>
<th>Moderately Structured Level</th>
<th>Relatively Unstructured Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Cum. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 displays frequencies and percentages of supervisor's academic position by the most frequently used level of the Escalation Model. Of the 49 Professors, 55.1% most frequently used the structured level, 42.9% most frequently used the moderately structured level, and 2% most frequently used the relatively unstructured level. There were 26 Associate Professors and 46.2% most frequently used the structured level, 42.3% most frequently used the moderately structured level, and 11.5% most frequently used the relatively unstructured level. Of the 30 Assistant Professors, 36.7% most frequently used the structured level, 53.3% most frequently used the moderately structured level, and 10% most frequently used the relatively unstructured level. The Visiting Professor most frequently used the moderately structured level and the nine Instructors most frequently used the structured level (44.4%) and moderately structured level (44.4%). The 11 Graduate Assistants most frequently used the structured level (63.6%) and the Other Professionals (n=9) most frequently used the moderately structured level (77.8%).

Table 7
**Frequencies and Percentages for Supervisor’s Academic Position by the Most Frequently Used Level of the Escalation Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Position</th>
<th>Structured</th>
<th>Moderately Structured</th>
<th>Relatively Unstructured</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                  | f           | %                     |
|                        |            |                       |
| Professor              | 49         | 100.0                 |
| Associate Professor    | 26         | 100.0                 |
| Assistant Professor    | 30         | 100.0                 |
| Visiting Professor     | 1          | 100.0                 |
| Instructor             | 9          | 100.0                 |
| Graduate Assistant     | 11         | 100.0                 |
| Other                  | 9          | 100.0                 |
Table 8 exhibits the relationship between selected supervisor characteristics and the level of the Escalation Model that was used. There was not a statistically significant relationship between the most frequently used level of the Escalation Model and the variables selected to represent supervisor maturity. Hypothesis two was not supported by the data.

Table 8
The Relationship Between Level of the Escalation Model and Supervisory Experience, Formal Training, Cooperating Teacher Experience, and Academic Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Experience</th>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher Experience</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of the Escalation Model</td>
<td>-.06&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.05&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>r<sub>s</sub>  
<sup>b</sup>Cramer's V  
<sup>*</sup>p<.05

Conclusions/Implications

The demographics of the study illustrated that a priority is placed on student teacher supervision in agricultural education. The majority of the supervisors (57.6%) were either Professors or Associate Professors. Supervisors were conducting three on-site visits per teacher that lasted approximately five hours and 20% of supervisor’s academic time was devoted to supervision. In addition, supervisors, on average, had 13 years of supervisory experience, six years of high school teaching experience, and had served as a cooperating teacher two times. Most supervisors (74.3%) had received formal training on supervision.

The behaviors related to the clinical supervision model were used to a greater extent than the behaviors related to the contextual or differentiated supervisory models. It appeared that faculty who had practiced in the profession for an extended period of time used more structured practices of supervision. One may conclude that faculty members with more
experience may have applied more structured models of supervision with student teachers due to the nature of the student teaching experience. Student teachers often need more structure and using structured models of supervision may be the most appropriate.

Teacher educators most frequently used the moderately structured level instead of the structured or relatively unstructured levels of the Escalation Model. However, the percentages of both the structured and moderately structured levels are close enough to conclude that teacher educators in agricultural education most frequently use both the structured and moderately structured models of supervision.

The variables that defined maturity were years of supervisory experience at the university level, formal training, cooperating teacher experience, and academic position. None of these variables had a statistically significant relationship with the most frequently used level of the Escalation Model. Therefore, these particular indicators of supervisory maturity do not determine a supervisor's selection of a particular model. In addition, this is not consistent with the Escalation Model (Fritz & Miller, 2001). The Escalation Model states that as a supervisor matures, he/she should use more teacher-driven models of supervision and as shown, this did not occur. Therefore, the Escalation Model must be altered to better represent supervisory practices within the agricultural education profession.

**Recommendations**

It is recommended that the agricultural education profession incorporate, into professional meetings, workshops on different supervisory practices by skilled educators to provide opportunities for teacher educators to increase awareness of a range of supervisory options. This training could be provided at regional or national conferences to advance professional development within the agricultural education profession. This training could
provide an opportunity to augment supervisor's knowledge and practice of supervision within their current programs.

Research is still needed to test the theoretical framework of the Escalation Model proposed by Fritz and Miller (2001). Research in this area should strive to answer the following questions:

1. What are the potential risks that are involved for a supervisor and teacher when using the differentiated supervisory model?
2. What are the potential rewards that may be gained by using the differentiated supervisory model?
3. Are there selected indicators of teacher maturity that determine which supervisory model is used? If so, what are the indicators of teacher maturity?
4. Can all levels of the Escalation Model be realistically applied to the agricultural education student teaching context?
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CHAPTER V. REFLECTION: AN EXERCISE USED TO ADDRESS STUDENT
TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS WHILE STUDENT TEACHING

A paper prepared for submission to the Journal of Agricultural Education

Carrie Fritz and Greg Miller

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore student teachers' professional concerns. Agricultural education student teachers at Iowa State University communicated about non-teaching concerns, teaching concerns, gave advice, responded to questions, and shared lesson plans or ideas using an Internet based communication tool. Student teachers were mostly concerned with self-adequacy. Self-adequacy is primarily concerns related to subject matter knowledge, discipline, and administrative rules. In addition, the teaching concerns expressed by student teachers majoring in agricultural education were not dependent upon students' gender. Findings of this study were consistent with previous studies (Adams & Martray, 1981; Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1974) on student teacher concerns.

Introduction/Theoretical Framework

Student teachers in agricultural education are geographically isolated from fellow colleagues during their student teaching experience. Often, student teachers experience teaching frustrations and need immediate feedback from other student teachers who may be experiencing similar concerns. This immediate communication increases the student teacher's reflection and dialoging opportunities and addresses their teaching concerns or frustrations.

Fuller began her research on teacher concerns in the 1960s. Some of Fuller's (1974) research focused on the stages of concern of preservice and beginning teachers. She
identified seven areas of teacher concerns: non-teaching concerns, role as a teacher, subject matter and discipline adequacy, personal/social/emotional relationships with pupils, teaching methods and evaluating pupil learning, pupils learning what they need to, and improving oneself as a teacher. Fuller et al. (1974) grouped specific categories of teaching concerns into three areas. The areas of concern are self-adequacy, teaching tasks, and teaching impact. Later, Adams and Martray (1981) verified Fuller’s stages of concern.

Self-adequacy concerns are described mostly as survival concerns. These survival concerns often experienced by preservice and beginning teachers include supervisor’s approval, administrative support, relationships with other teachers, subject matter adequacy, and discipline problems. These concerns have an influence on the student teachers’ ability to teach and their effectiveness in the classroom (Fuller et al., 1974).

Teaching tasks are concerns that are often felt by teachers who no longer worry about their survival in the classroom. Teachers are now concerned about teaching materials/methods and their specific workload. They worry about pupils feelings toward the teacher and about evaluating pupil learning (Fuller et al., 1974).

Teaching impact concerns are focused on the student as a whole. Teachers feel confident about their teaching abilities, classroom environment, and relationships with faculty and students. Teachers now are more focused on student needs and educational improvement (Fuller et al., 1974). Furthermore, teachers are concerned with personal/professional development and ethical issues within the educational system that could affect the student body.

Schmidt and Knowles (1994) suggested that one teaching concern might disrupt an entire teaching career. Trying to monitor students, develop curriculum, and pace activities are
some concerns that tend to overwhelm teachers (Stoller, 1996). Richardson-Koehler (1988) suggests that the supervisor needs to establish a trusting relationship with the student teacher to help reflect on the daily teaching concerns experienced by the student teacher.

One opportunity to develop trusting relationships among fellow colleagues is simply to communicate. Jewell (1998) defined communication as “the exchange of information, ideas, or feelings between two or more individuals or groups” (p. 448). In the 21st century, individuals are fortunate to have many ways to do this. They can communicate face-to-face, by telephone, letters, and through many modes of technology. Student teachers often find themselves needing to discuss teaching concerns or other problems. Communicating through technology could be a means that would provide immediate feedback to the student teacher.

In a recent study conducted by Chadwick (1999) on off-campus students, students found communicating through technology to be rewarding, effective, and satisfying.

One method of communication via technology that may be effective for individuals who are geographically isolated is dialoging. Dialoging, defined by Moore and Kearsley (1996), is “a term that helps us focus on the interplay of words, actions, and ideas and any other interactions between teacher and learner when one gives instruction and the other responds” (p. 201). Dialoging can be broadened to also include student-to-student interaction. This dialog would provide the student teacher an opportunity to reflect on teaching concerns and to gather input from other student teachers or supervisors.

For a teacher to learn and grow in his/her teaching profession, teachers need to reflect on their own activity (Brookfield, 1986). Dewey (1933) suggested that reflective thought is one component to success in an educational setting. When teachers' reflect on a teaching situation, an opportunity exists to impact their teaching experience in a positive manner.
Reaching the point in one’s career that reflection is done regularly, if even at all, is difficult and requires discipline and a high level of maturity. Supervisors need to challenge a teacher’s beliefs and values to push him/her to reflect and scrutinize one’s own work (Brookfield, 1986). Dewey (1933) explained that “the function of reflective thought is, therefore, to transform a situation in which there is experienced obscurity, doubt, conflict, disturbance of some sort, into a situation that is clear, coherent, settled, harmonious” (p. 101).

The concept of reflection is wonderful but if a person does not have an opportunity to share the reflection with others and obtain some feedback, the teacher may disregard the reflection process. Given the opportunity to dialogue using an Internet based communication tool, what will student teachers dialog about? Will the levels of concern expressed by agricultural education student teachers be consistent with the findings of previous studies on different student teacher populations?

**Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of this study was to explore student teachers’ professional concerns. The specific objectives of the study were to:

1. Describe student teachers in terms of their demographic characteristics;
2. Identify the areas of professional concern that student teachers dialogued about using WebCT;
3. Determine if professional concerns were gender specific; and
4. Account for communication activity that supplemented the student teaching experience.
Methods and Procedures

This study was descriptive in nature. The population consisted of (N=41) student teachers that were completing their student teaching experience during the spring semesters of 2000 and 2001. There were 10 females and 10 males who completed their student teaching experience during the spring semester of 2000 and 8 females and 13 males who completed their student teaching experience during the spring semester of 2001.

Student teachers used WebCT (Web Course Tools) to communicate with university professors and fellow student teachers while student teaching. WebCT is “an educational tool for facilitating learning, communicating and collaborating through the use of the Internet and computers” (Peters, 2000). During the spring semester of 2001 and 2002, student teachers were given instructions to make at least three postings on the WebCT about professional concerns or ideas that were related to teaching.

The data from the WebCT postings were collected at the end of the spring 2000 and spring 2001 semesters. The statements were coded using Fuller and Case (1972) manual for scoring teaching concern statements. The manual consists of six categories of concern about teaching (Code 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6) and one category (Code 0) that is considered non-teaching concerns. Code 1 contained statements about one’s role as a teacher; Code 2 contained statements about one’s adequacy as a person and as a teacher; Code 3 contained statements about a student teacher’s personal, social, and emotional relationships with pupils; Code 4 contained statements about whether pupils were learning what the teacher was teaching; Code 5 contained statements about whether pupils are learning what they need as persons; and Code 6 contained statements about personal and professional development, ethics, educational issues and anything else that could have influenced pupils. The six codes were
collapsed into three categories; teacher’s concern about self as a teacher (Codes 1 and 2),
teacher’s concern about the tasks in teaching (Codes 3 and 4), and teacher’s concern with the
impact of teaching on pupils (Codes 5 and 6).

To account for other communication activity that had taken place, the researcher
added two other codes 7 and 8. Code 7 represents any student responding to a question or
giving advice and Code 8 represents a student sharing lesson plans or lesson ideas.

Intrarater reliability for the coding of data was established. To ensure that the data
collector coded postings in a manner that was consistent with Fuller’s theory, Fuller and Case
(1972) teacher concern manual was studied. Intrarater reliability was established by coding
the postings and two weeks later coding the postings again. Intrarater reliability was .95.

Fuller and Case (1972) established content validity of the teaching concern codes by
conducting interviews and group counseling sessions with teachers. Based on these
interviews and sessions, Fuller and Case developed the topics and groupings of different
categories of the concern codes and substantiated the interviews and sessions with many
sources (Combs, 1965; Erickson, 1956; Gabriel, 1957; Jackson, 1968; Maslow, 1954).

All data were analyzed using SPSS. The statistics that were deemed appropriate for
the study included frequencies, percentages, and correlations. Davis’ (1971) descriptors were
used to interpret the magnitude of all associations.

Results/Findings

Table 1 presents the overall frequency of postings related to teaching concerns and
non-teaching concerns by gender. Non-teaching concerns included such topics as seeking
employment, interviewing, and several other professional issues related to the teaching
environment. Teaching concerns are specifically related to teaching and student
achievement. Some examples of teaching concerns are: being supervised by the cooperating teacher or university supervisor, discipline problems, subject matter knowledge, and the learning process of students. Non-teaching concerns were widely expressed by both males and females. However, males posted a higher percentage (55.9%) of non-teaching concerns than females (44.1%). Furthermore, females posted a higher percentage (62.7%) of teaching concerns than their male counterparts (37.3%).

Table 1
Frequency of Overall Non-Teaching and Teaching Concerns by Gender (2000 and 2001 Combined).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Female (N=17)</th>
<th>Male (N=17)</th>
<th>Overall(N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of student teachers who made a posting related to the concern

Table 2 presents teaching concerns by category of teaching concern by gender. The majority of the postings made by females and males were self-adequacy concerns. Based on the number of postings by gender, teaching tasks were slightly higher for males but the impact concerns were slightly higher for females. The magnitude of the association between gender and teaching concerns was negligible.

Table 3 presents other communication that took place during the student teaching experience. The communication consisted of responding to concerns or giving advice and sharing lesson plans or ideas. There were a total of 95 other communication postings. Approximately 62% of the student teachers gave advice or responded to concerns, whereas 38% shared lesson plans or ideas.
Table 2
Teaching Concerns by Gender (2000 and 2001 Combined).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Concern</th>
<th>Female (N=17)</th>
<th>Male (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Adequacy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Tasks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Impact</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cramer’s V was used to quantify the association between gender and teaching concerns. Cramer’s V = .07

*Total number of student teachers who made a posting related to the concern

Table 3
Other Communication Activity on WebCT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responding/Giving Advice</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Lesson Plans or Ideas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of student teachers who made a posting related to the communication area

Table 4 exhibits all student teacher postings on the discussion board that took place via WebCT during the spring 2000 and the spring 2001 student teaching experience. The communication consisted of non-teaching concerns, teaching concerns and other communication including: responding to concerns or giving advice and sharing lesson plans or ideas. The total number of postings during the spring of 2000 was 90 and increased to 132 during the spring of 2001. In addition, the number of postings per person increased from approximately 5 during the spring of 2000 to approximately 7 during the spring of 2001.
Table 4
Communication Activity on WebCT during 2000 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Number of Postings</th>
<th>Postings/Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions/Implications/Recommendations

The maturity of apprehensive educators could be accomplished through reflection on current “theories in action” (Argyris & Schon, 1974) and generating “knowledge-in-action” (Schon, 1983). Furthermore, Kruse (1997) suggested that reflection may be the most powerful when teachers have the opportunity to express congruent problems of classroom and school wide concerns. Based on the concept of reflection during the student teachers’ experience, three conclusions can be drawn.

Student teachers, during the spring of 2000 and 2001, were more focused on dealing with self-adequacy concerns (subject matter material and discipline problems) than any other concern area. Studies conducted by Adams and Martray (1981) and Fuller et al. (1974) discovered student teachers of various academic disciplines (elementary through secondary) also focused on self-adequacy concerns instead of teaching task or impact concerns. It was concluded that student teachers in this agricultural education program were not developmentally different than other student teachers from various academic disciplines. Consistent with previous studies on student teaching concerns, student teaching concerns in this agricultural education program were not gender specific.
In addition to communicating about teaching concerns, student teachers communicated about other areas of their professional responsibilities. They gave advice or responded to questions plus they shared lesson plans or ideas. In addition, communication activity on the discussion board via WebCT increased from the spring of 2000 to the spring of 2001. This increase may be due to the greater acceptance of the Internet as a communication tool. In addition, student teachers valued the Internet as a tool for communication for a range of purposes.

Mundt (1991) recommended that teacher educators in agriculture help prospective teachers recognize and deal with problems that they will face. This study has shown that WebCT is an effective tool for teachers to recognize and address some of those concerns through reflection. However, questions emerged from this study, which could lead to further research:

1. What impact does reflecting during student teaching on teacher concerns have on student teachers when they enter their beginning year of teaching?

2. Do student teachers continue to address teaching concerns with fellow colleagues or supervisors during their first and second years of teaching? If so, by what means do they communicate?
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CHAPTER VI. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

General Discussion and Recommendations

This dissertation contained three papers that explored supervisory practice in agricultural education. Three overall conclusions can be drawn.

The Escalation Model can be useful to teacher education programs. It provides many options plus opportunities to match supervisor's professional growth with teacher maturity and growth. The Escalation Model consisted of different supervisory models that were placed on a continuum of growth. This growth continuum started with the structured models of supervision and progressed to more teacher driven models. The supervisory models recommended at each level of the Escalation Model were based on the maturity of both the supervisor and teacher, the risk of using the model, and the potential reward received by the supervisor and teacher for using that particular model.

Data suggest that the practice of instructional supervision in agricultural education is deemed important by the profession. The majority of individuals conducting student teacher supervisory visits are either Professors or Associate Professors. These supervisors had an average of 13 years of university supervisory experience, had served as a cooperating teacher twice, and had six years of high school teaching experience. However, the selected variables of maturity: university supervisory experience, cooperating teacher experience, formal training, and academic rank were not significantly related to the supervisory approaches selected by teacher educators in agricultural education. Therefore, it is recommended to identify factors that influence university supervisor's selection of particular supervisory approaches.
The Internet based communication tool provided student teachers an opportunity to communicate during their student teaching experience. The most frequently posted concerns were related to subject matter adequacy and discipline problems. It was concluded that student teachers in this agricultural education program were not developmentally different than other student teachers from various academic disciplines (Adams and Martray, 1981; Fuller, 1974). Student teachers also communicated about other areas of their professional responsibilities. They gave advice or responded to questions plus they shared lesson plans or ideas. In addition, the posting of professional concerns permitted student teachers to reflect on their student teaching experience. This reflection could provide for an opportunity for future growth.

This study has raised several questions about instructional supervision in agricultural education. Questions for further research may include:

1. What types of supervisory models do cooperating teachers use?

2. What impact does supervision have on student teachers?

3. Do supervisory approaches coincide with a student teacher's conceptual, ego, and moral development?
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APPENDIX B. SUPERVISION SURVEY
SUPERVISION SURVEY

Department of Agricultural Education and Studies
Iowa State University
Spring 2001

Code: _________
Part I. Please indicate the extent to which you do the following things when supervising student teachers.

**KEY**

N = NEVER  
S = SOMETIMES  
O = OFTEN  
A = ALWAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>(Circle One)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct a meeting (either in person, by telephone, or email) with the student teacher to discuss the lesson that you will observe.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have other teachers in the school supervise the student teacher at least twice during the student teaching experience.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ask the student teacher about his/her relationship with other teachers in the school.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Meet with the student teacher (either in person, by telephone, or email) to discuss the lesson that you observed.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establish benchmarks with the student teacher to be achieved at each supervisory visit based on his/her personal or workload problems.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adjust your leadership style to accommodate the student teacher you are working with.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ask the student teacher to choose the type of supervision he/she will receive.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hold conferences with the student teacher to monitor his/her progress toward achieving his/her goals.</td>
<td>N S O A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Continue
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Display the data from your observation in readable form and give to the student teacher to analyze.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ask the student teacher how he/she feels about the classroom environment.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ask the student teacher to give you an overview of his/her teaching workload.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Have the student teacher visit other classrooms in the school at least twice.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Have the student teacher provide feedback to other teachers about their teaching.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**  
N = Never  
S = Sometimes  
O = Often  
A = Always
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Ask the student teacher about the level of support that you provide.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Adjust your supervision approach as the student teacher progresses in his/her student teaching experience.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ask the student teacher about his/her prior teaching experience.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have the student teacher evaluate his/her teaching either by videotape, journaling, inventories, or portfolio.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ask the student teacher to provide feedback about your critique of his/her lesson.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Continue
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Observe the student teacher’s decision-making process.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Serve as a resource to the student teacher.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Assess the student teacher’s confidence level.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Eliminate yourself from the supervision of the student teacher.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Have the student teacher be supervised by other teachers in the school.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Have the student teacher develop a list of goals.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key: N=Never  S=Sometimes  O=Often  A=Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Have the student teacher commit to a set of dates for goals to be achieved.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Adjust the type of encouragement that you give each student teacher.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Arrange for the student teacher to be part of a two or three teacher team that observes each other's classroom.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Adjust the amount of structure you give to the student teacher.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Dialogue with the student teacher about his/her knowledge of the subject matter he/she will be teaching.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Document observation of the student teacher teaching a lesson.</td>
<td>N  S  O  A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Continue
Part II. Please circle the letter that represents what you would do in each scenario.

1. You go to supervise the student teacher (Mark) and he is not satisfied with the quality of discussions in one of his classes. You ask Mark to describe the type of class discussions he wants to take place. Mark replied that he wants to foster students' "higher level" thinking and have open dialogue concerning some important issues related to the class. You ask Mark what is preventing such discussion. He replies that he probably hindered class discussions himself by asking too many simple recall questions rather than questions that would spark student interest and discussion. Mark explains that typically only a few students participate in class discussions, and he did little to encourage those who did not participate to join in. How would you help the teacher?

   a. You should present your solutions to Mark and direct him to carry out the solutions that you present.

   b. You should collaborate with Mark to develop a plan to solve the problem, and mutually agree on a plan of action that will be taken.

   c. You should allow Mark to develop his own solutions to the problem and then have him submit a formal commitment (in writing) of a plan of action to solve the problem.
2. There have been several complaints made by teachers, students, and parents about the student teacher (Missy) using inappropriate teaching methods, so you visit her to discuss the complaints on three occasions. During each visit, you try and find out more about Missy’s attitude toward teaching agricultural education. Also, you have provided several suggestions and alternatives to help Missy improve her teaching. Regardless of your input, lesson content or student population, all of the observed lessons still follow the same pattern. First, seat-by-seat and row-by-row, students would take turns reading paragraphs from the textbook. Next, Missy passes out a worksheet for students before the end of class, they are told to begin their homework assignment, which always consisted of written exercises from the textbook. During independent seatwork, Missy sits at her desk reading Glamour magazine, looking up only to give an “evil-eye” to students who are talking to each other or out of their seats. After three conferences with the student teacher, how would you help her?

   a. You should identify the problem for Missy, present the solutions to her, and direct Missy to carry out the solutions.

   b. You should allow Missy to identify the problem she is having, and then collaborate with her to develop a plan to solve the problem, and mutually agree on a plan of action.

   c. You should allow Missy the opportunity to identify her own problems, develop her own solutions to the problems, and have her submit a formal commitment (in writing) of a plan of action to solve the problem.

   Please Continue
3. A student teacher (Camie) approaches you about a staff development option for teachers wishing to participate in an individualized professional development program. She has some tentative ideas for a program that would provide development opportunities for her and others. A number of teachers have decided that they want to try cooperative learning strategies in their classroom but few have received in-depth training. Since Camie has received several hours of training in cooperative learning at college, she thought that she could provide some training to other teachers. She has requested a meeting with you and the other teachers to discuss the plan. You attend the meeting with Camie and other teachers in the school district. There are some concerns about the program and how it will work. As a supervisor, what do you do?

a. You should identify the problems that the professional development program could have, present solutions to those problems, and direct Camie to carry out the solutions that could improve the professional development program.

b. You and Camie should identify the problems that the professional development program could have, develop solutions to those problems, and mutually agree on a plan of action to solve the problems.

c. You should allow Camie to identify the problems that the professional development program will have, allow her to develop solutions to those problems, and then have her submit a formal commitment (in writing) of the plan of action that she wishes to follow to reach her solutions.
Part III. Information About You

1. How many years have you supervised student teachers?
   __________ YEARS

2. Have you received formal training in instructional supervision?
   (Please place a check next to your response)
   __________ YES
   __________ NO

3. Briefly describe the formal supervision training that you have received.

Please Continue
4. From September 1, 2000 to May 31, 2001, how many student teachers from the agricultural education program went out to student teach?

__________STUDENT TEACHERS

5. How many student teachers did you supervise in the period beginning September 1, 2000 and ending May 31, 2001?

__________STUDENT TEACHERS

6. On average, how many on-site visits did you make to each student teacher during his/her student teaching experience?

__________ON-SITE VISITS

7. On average, how many hours do you spend with the student teacher during each visit?

__________HOURS

8. How many years did you teach agricultural education at the high school level?

__________YEARS

9. How many student teachers did you serve as a cooperating teacher for when you were teaching high school agricultural education?

__________STUDENT TEACHERS
10. What is your gender? (Please place a check next to your response)
   
   [ ] FEMALE
   [ ] MALE

11. What is your age?
   
   [ ] YEARS

12. What is your academic position? (Please place a check next to your response)
   
   [ ] PROFESSOR
   [ ] ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
   [ ] ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
   [ ] VISITING PROFESSOR
   [ ] INSTRUCTOR
   [ ] GRADUATE ASSISTANT
   [ ] OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)

13. Do you have tenure? (Please place a check next to your response)
   
   [ ] YES
   [ ] NO

14. What portion of your time is devoted to student teacher supervision?
   
   [ ] PERCENT

Please Continue
15. Please describe how you conduct a supervisory visit with a student teacher.