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To Marnie

When two people love each other, nothing is more imperative and delightful to them than GIVING: to give always and everything, one's thoughts, one's life, one's body and all that one has and to feel the gift and to risk everything in order to be able to give more, still more.

Thank-you for Giving--for Risking--for Feeling--for Always Loving--and like the boy and the Velveteen Rabbit, for finally making me REAL.
There is nothing I can give you which you have not,  
But there is much, very much,  
That while I cannot give it,  
You can take.

No heaven can come to us  
Unless our hearts find rest in today.  
Take heaven.  
No peace lies in the future  
Which is not hidden in this present instant.  
Take peace.  
The gloom of the world is but a shadow.  
Behind it, yet within reach, is joy.  
There is a radiance and glory in the darkness,  
Could we but see, and to see, we have only to look.  
I beseech you to look.

Life is so generous a giver, but we,  
Judging its gifts by their covering,  
Cast them away as ugly, or heavy, or hard.  
Remove the covering, and you will find beneath it,  
A living splendor, woven of love, by wisdom, with power.  
Welcome it, grasp it, and you touch  
The angel's hand that brings it to you.  
Everything we call a trial, a sorrow, or a duty,  
Believe me, that angel's hand is there;  
And the wonder of an overshadowing presence.  
Our joys too; Be not content with them as joys.  
They too, conceal diviner gifts.

And so, at this time, I greet you.  
Not quite as the world sends greetings,  
But with profound esteem  
And with the prayer that for you, now and forever,  
The day breaks, and the shadows flee away.

Fra Giovanni, 1513, A.D.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In order to complete this dissertation, the patience, endurance, and interest of many persons was necessary to make the possibility of this study into a reality.

To the chairperson of my Committee, Dr. Mary Quilling, who spent many irreplaceable hours reading and rereading, editing and counseling me toward this study's completion and who became a guiding force in my endeavor, I am deeply indebted.

I would like to express especially warm thanks to the members of my dissertation committee: Dr. Mason Bunker, whose friendship and assistance from the beginning made my program a memorable one; and Dr. Anthony Butterfield, who provided me with continuous support and guidance.

A special thanks to Dr. Kenneth Blanchard, who encouraged and assisted me throughout my entire period of study. To Dr. David Flight, whose confidence in my ability started me on this venture, goes my deepest heartfelt gratitude.

Further, recognition is given Dr. Sheila Inderlied, whose professional advice and support encouraged me towards completion of my doctoral work.
The author wishes to thank the staff and administration at Wildwood School for contributing many hours of their time to help this model succeed. I am also particularly indebted to all "my" student teachers for the extra energy they put forth and satisfaction I derived working with them.

To Nancy Kaminski, whose efficient and professional assistance went into the typing of this dissertation, I owe a special thanks.

To all my good friends who have given so much to me—thank-you for understanding.

To my parents, Ada and Herbert Miller, my first teachers, for their immeasurable love and devotion.

To my in-laws, Barbara and Edward McCarthy, and Family, who provided encouragement, faith, prayers, and a love that always made me feel special; and to whom I will be eternally grateful for my wife, Susan.

And of course, Gretchen, without her there would have been many an unhappy and dull day.
Beyond Management by Objectives as a Supervision Technique:  
An Investigation of the Effects of Applying Jointly a  
Situational Leadership Model and Management by  
Objectives in the Supervision of Student Teachers  
(April 1976)  
Geoffrey Clark Miller, B.S., West Chester State College  
M.Ed., University of Massachusetts  
C.A.G.S., University of Massachusetts  
Directed by: Dr. Mary R. Quilling  

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of the present study was to develop and test a scheme for supervision in the triad involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor, integrating four conceptual bases: (1) management by objectives (MBO); (2) supervision in a triadic relationship; (3) research on student teacher concerns; and (4) the Hersey-Blanchard model for situational leadership. A secondary purpose was to examine the fit of the situational leadership model to the requirements of the student teaching situation.  

A review of literature pertaining to the preceding four conceptual bases indicates that none of these techniques may be encompassing enough to cope with the requirements of the unusual situation found
in student teaching, where two leaders' and one follower's activities need coordination. An MBO/Leadership supervisory model with four phases (Planning: What; Planning: How; Implementing; and Appraising) was formulated, described and diagrammed in a flow chart from the literature analysis. The model provided direction regarding how and on what the program supervisor and cooperating teacher work cooperatively and how they coordinate the separate actions taken by each with the student teacher.

Using an MBO system initially to help organize the efforts of all participants, each triad mutually agreed on objectives for the student teacher and established an MBO contract. The shared responsibility of the supervisor and cooperating teacher in planning how to best assist the student teacher in completing his/her MBO contract was considered next. To achieve maximum effort from both leaders, to clearly define role responsibility and to refine the cooperating teacher's and/or supervisor's behavior in adapting to a particular student teacher's needs or objectives, a situational leadership model developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard was incorporated into the supervisory process. An addendum to the MBO contract specified the leadership style each leader was to utilize for each objective for which the student teacher had contracted.

During the Implementation phase, each leader attempted to utilize the contracted leadership style. Additionally, a clinical supervision model was employed by the program supervisor, while more informal
methods were used by the cooperating teacher. Each provided direct feedback to the student teacher on aspects concerning his/her teaching. During Implementation and Appraisal phases, evaluation was utilized primarily as an input to further planning.

The evaluation was guided by four overarching questions: 
(1) What changes are needed in the process?; (2) Does the supervisory process result in the accomplishment of significant objectives?; (3) How well did the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership apply to the supervision of student teachers?; (4) Is the process practical and effective in the judgment of the participants—student teachers, cooperating teachers, the supervisor, and administrative personnel? The participants in the field test included nine student teachers and nine cooperating teachers in one elementary school. The duration of the field test was four months. Synthesis of the evidence indicates that the process worked satisfactorily and that the changes recommended were minor; that the outcomes reached by members of the triad were both significant and similar to the goals which had been set: that in the judgment of the participants and others, the MBO/Leadership approach to the supervisory process was perceived as useful and as an improvement over supervision of student teachers in the school prior to the semester in which the present study was conducted; and that both cooperating and student teachers preferred leadership styles that varied on the amount of direction given by a leader but maintained a high degree of socio-emotional support for the follower.
Continued research should be directed toward the applicability of the Hersey and Blanchard model in education and other helping professions, particularly when the supervisee is an adult in a learning role.
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CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

"Two is company, three is a crowd."
Thomas Fuller, Gnomologia, 1732

Background and Problem Statement

The student teaching experience is undoubtedly the most important aspect of any teacher education program. The literature abounds in testimonials from students, professional educators, and critics of teacher education programs as to the value and importance of the student teaching experience (Andrews, 1964; Bennie, 1972; Conant, 1963; Leslie, 1969; Silberman, 1970; Yee, 1967). Close association with teachers and teaching can cause a student teacher to raise important questions, to sense disequilibrium, to obtain specific knowledge and skills, and to feel a growing commitment to excellence in his/her chosen profession.

Compared with the kind of clinical training student teachers should and could receive, however, practice teaching often falls short of the mark. Dissatisfaction in the professional community with the effectiveness of the experience is widespread, as Andrews (1964) suggests:
Nowhere are the vast extremes between excellence and inadequacy in student teaching more striking and more shocking than in the dimension of quality. Some student teachers have a skillfully guided growth experience which leads them to an artistic and professionally effective performance in directing learning, while others have a continuously frustrating, emotionally disturbing experience during which they receive little positive direction or assistance, and may in fact learn unwise and professionally unsound procedures. . . . Unless all signs fail, the fears of many directors and coordinators seem well founded--that the quality of student teaching will not improve generally, actually will decline in various places, unless and until the profession as a whole recognizes the dimensions of the problem and takes effective action. (pp. 7-8)

Both teacher educators and public school personnel have to address the problem of quality and provide leadership to ensure that high standards will be set for and met by prospective teachers. Direct responsibility for the quality of a particular student teaching experience, however, rests with two persons in a supervisory relationship to the student--the cooperating teacher and supervisor from the program.

Guiding young people to develop a deep, meaningful concept of teaching, helping them analyze the many facets of teaching, and providing them with pertinent resources, are activities that demand professional expertise, including supervisory skill. The present study focuses on the supervisory process, which has been specifically identified as one facet of the problem in providing a high quality student teaching experience. Silberman (1970), for instance, has observed, "... students receive incredibly little feedback on their performance, for supervision tends to be sporadic and perfunctory" (p. 451).

In addition to unsystematic application of supervisory processes,
the roles and responsibilities of the supervisor and cooperating teacher vis-a-vis the student teacher are often not clearly defined and sometimes bear little relation to role capacity. Cooperating teachers and supervisors frequently lack training in supervisory skills that they could use. Finally the field of education has not borrowed as widely as it might in identifying and adopting leadership theory relevant to the problem.

Currently available supervisory techniques that specifically apply to student teaching include the Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) models for clinical supervision. More general approaches to supervision that have developed outside the field of education may also be applicable, however. Management by Objectives (MBO), a process that originated in the business world, has already found some use in education and in student teaching. MBO, however, has had a mixed reception and its potential limitations in instructional applications need to be squarely addressed if it is to be successfully utilized. Not yet tested in education is a supervisor strategy based on situational leadership theory, also borrowed from the field of business.

None of the preceding techniques may be encompassing enough to cope singularly with the requirements of the unusual supervisory situation found in student teaching, where two leaders' and one follower's activities need coordination. There does not seem to have been a conscious application of more than one of the techniques available to supervision in student teaching. One reason it might be desirable to
approach the development of a more effective supervisory process by eclectic use of several techniques is that each addresses particular aspects of the supervisory situation. MBO may give overall direction to the student teacher's learning, whereas a clinical supervision model outlines the specific processes for observation, including preparatory and follow-up conferences. Situational leadership techniques would further refine the cooperating teacher's or supervisor's behavior in adapting to a particular student teacher's needs and objectives.

Whether each of these specific processes can be incorporated into a richer, coordinated process for supervising student teachers is the first problem of the study. Given a potentially feasible model for such a process, the second question is whether or not it works and is effective as each member of the student teaching triad carries out his/her roles throughout the student teaching experience.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the present study was to develop and test a scheme for supervision in the triad involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor, integrating four conceptual bases: (1) management by objectives; (2) supervision in a triadic relationship; (3) research on student teacher concerns; and (4) a model for situational leadership developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. A secondary purpose was to examine the fit of the situational leadership
model to the requirements of the student teaching situation.

The study has a dual emphasis on design and field testing. One intent was to develop a conceptually-based model that could guide supervision in designing future student teaching experiences. Field testing of the innovation alone, rather than evaluative research comparing the innovation to other methods of supervision, was the appropriate evaluation strategy to first apply to a new development.

Methodology

The supervision procedure was formulated from an analysis of the literature, which is presented in Chapter II. In the following section, four specific phases (Planning: What; Planning: How; Implementing; and Appraising) are outlined and operationalized. These phases and the evaluation methodology are described briefly; a more detailed discussion of the supervision process and methodology may be found in Chapter III.

Supervisory Procedure

Phase I (Planning: What). Simultaneous with the beginning of student teaching, Phase I began. In informal introductory meetings, the supervisor became acquainted with both cooperating and student teachers, identified roles of each member of the student teaching triad including the supervisor, summarized procedures for the semester, and administered Fuller's Concerns Checklist to each student teacher. A
formal group meeting to brainstorm objectives was held with all cooperating and student teachers participating. A master list of potential objectives for the student teacher was compiled to assist the cooperating teacher in setting objectives for the student teacher, and the student teacher in establishing objectives for him/herself. At a subsequent meeting with each triad, MBO contracts were formulated. Significant objectives were selected, mutually agreed upon and listed on the MBO contract along with activities and projected time lines.

**Phase II (Planning: How).** Upon completion of all contracting sessions, another formal group workshop was held to discuss the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Another set of triad meetings followed to contract appropriate leadership styles for the cooperating teacher and supervisor to follow in assisting the student teacher achieve his/her objectives. The resulting MBO/Leadership contract was made final by the mutual agreement of all triad members.

**Phase III (Implementing).** With the establishment of this contract, the formal implementation phase began. Supervision of the student teacher by the supervisor was carried out using a clinical supervision model. Support seminars were developed in response to the needs of the individual student teacher identified in the contracting process. A mid-semester triad meeting was held to assess overall progress, redefine objectives, consider new or delayed objectives, renegotiate leadership styles and review projected time lines for each objective.
Phase IV (Appraising). Finally, upon completion of the objectives and course requirements, an appraisal of the student teacher's performance was made in a session with the student teacher, cooperating teacher and the supervisor.

Nature of Evaluation

The participants in the study included nine senior elementary majors from a university teacher education program, nine classroom teachers from one public elementary school, and the author, who assumed the role of supervisor and cooperatively worked with each student teacher and cooperating teacher. The supervisory process was utilized over the period of one semester.

The evaluation was motivated by the need to determine whether the process described above and its outcomes were satisfactory. The study was guided by four overarching questions. These questions are listed below with specific details on the content of each.

Question A: What changes are needed in the process? Each activity in the four phases of the supervisory process (Planning: What; Planning: How; Implementing; and Appraising) was analyzed to determine whether implementation resulted in the accomplishment of the goals stated for the activity. Additionally, the flexibility of the contracting/supervisory process was also examined.

Question B: Does the supervisory process result in the accomplishment of significant objectives? This question was answered by determining how significant the contracted objectives were in the opinion of
triad members and whether the original objectives were met.

Question C: How well did the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership apply to the supervision of student teachers? The distribution of leadership styles selected for a set of situations by cooperating teachers and student teachers was examined and compared with the distribution of styles found in other helping professions. The dominant styles, range of styles and effectiveness of the choices made by participants were described next. The distribution of contracted styles was tabulated and related to the previous data. Finally, the question was raised as to whether the cooperating teacher and supervisor used the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher.

Question D: Is the process practical and effective in the judgment of the participants—student teachers, cooperating teachers, the supervisor, and administrative personnel? Ratings on the effectiveness of the supervisory process were obtained through a questionnaire administered to the student teachers and cooperating teachers. From the supervisor's log and feedback from the student teacher and cooperating teacher, the amount of time spent by the participants in large group meetings, in planning meetings, in formal conferences, and all other supervisory events, was recorded. Through a questionnaire given to student and cooperating teachers who did and did not carry out the supervisory process developed in the present study, an attempt was made to study any difference in their ratings of the
supervisor. A final question was posed as to whether or not the participants, their colleagues or the university program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process.

Significance of the Study

The researcher developed and tested procedures for the supervision of student teaching by proposing a new model combining management (MBO) and leadership (Life Cycle) theory in the student teaching triad. With the development of management and leadership skills, the cooperating teacher, supervisor and student teacher were able to contract tasks, objectives, and evaluative criteria and negotiate specific leadership styles. This process enabled the leaders (cooperating teacher and college supervisor) to know what assistance and resources the followers (student teacher) needed to accomplish each stated objective.

Through application and field testing of procedures related to Management By Objectives and the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership, the present study also attempted to bridge the gap between theory and practice. In the study, a relatively new theory (Life Cycle), for which only a small amount of empirical data have yet been gathered, was tested in an educational environment. Not only could this research result in a broadening of the concept of supervision beyond what is presently known as clinical supervision, it could stimulate the application of leadership theory in other areas of school
administration; e.g., principal-department chairperson-teacher evaluations or teacher-student-parent contracting.

Limitations of the Study

Generalization of the results of the study is limited by a number of factors. First, the number of participants was small and the sample of student teachers and cooperating teachers participating in the study were from only one elementary school and attached to one teacher education program. Further field tests with larger, more varied audiences would be required to validate the model.

The group meetings and certain other features of the implementation capitalized upon the proximity of the cooperating teacher and student teacher involved in the study. Different procedures would be required, were teacher and student teacher spread out over a large region.

The author assumed the role of supervisor and was also the major facilitator in the implementation of this theory into the school setting. The investigator was a participant/observer and recorder throughout the study; thus experimenter bias was uncontrolled for in the data collection.

Finally, the present study was an exploratory, first stage, field test due to the lack of previous implementation of situational leadership theory to supervision in educational settings.
Organization of the Dissertation

The present study is reported in five chapters. In Chapter I, the background and statement of the problem were presented, the purpose of the study is defined, the methodology described, and the study's significance and limitations explored. In Chapter II, the theoretical background of the study is presented, consisting of a selected review of research dealing with management by objectives, supervision in the triadic relationship, student teacher concerns, and leadership theory, particularly the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership. In Chapter III, the supervisory process and field test procedures are explained; the field test setting, the specific field test questions, the instruments, the data collection plan, and the process used in data analysis are described. The findings of the study are presented and interpreted in Chapter IV; the overarching questions posed in Chapter I are answered there. In Chapter V, the conclusions and recommendations of the study are discussed with implications presented for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

The literature pertaining to student teaching denotes the variety existing in the conception, organization, and operation of student teaching programs. These teacher education programs extend into hundreds of public schools across the country placing teachers and administrators in active, participatory, and supervisory roles where they have limited preparation and little assistance in effectively assuming their responsibilities. The methods of student teaching and systems of supervision vary greatly, depending on the college from which the programs are offered. This variety in supervision of student teachers exists as a result of confusion, uncertainty, and lack of knowledge concerning student teacher training. The present study investigates this problem through a review of pertinent literature and proposes a conceptual teacher training model to guide educators in designing future teacher education programs.

The literature review presented in this chapter is organized into four sections. Literature pertaining to a system of management by objectives will be summarized in the opening section, with applications to the field of education indicated. In Section Two, supervision in the student teaching triad is discussed with special focus on the problems inherent in three member groups. Roles of supervisors are defined
and contributions to supervision suggested by humanistic psychologists are also included.

Frances Fuller's work at the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at the University of Texas is examined in Section Three. Her hierarchical code of teacher concerns is discussed as it applies to student teachers.

Section Four will examine several theories of leadership with a detailed section on the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership as developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1972).

Chapter II concludes with a synthesis of the research incorporated into a four-phase model for student teaching supervision.

Management By Objectives

As school officials became increasingly concerned with the quality of services their systems provided, they began to look beyond education for examples of viable methods for establishing and attaining objectives (Hacker, 1971). Kaplan (1973) recommended the following "guiding process" in developing a management by objectives system in education. "Decide where, in general, you want to go (your 'goal'), define, within that general ideal, a specific destination (the 'objective') and map out how, given the resources available, the objective is to be achieved (the 'strategy')" (p. 4). However, the objective-setting process has seen only limited use in educational management. Articles adapting MBO to education began to appear in the early 1970's, but they
have been relatively few and far between (Schwartz, 1975). Recently, several large school systems have given their attention to the MBO technology currently popular in business (Hacker, 1971; Schwartz, 1975).

This interest in the management by objectives approach has grown steadily in business since it was popularized in the fifties by Peter Drucker and Douglas McGregor. Drucker (1954) concluded that managers should be responsible for setting both their own objectives and those of their subordinates in conjunction with organizational goals. McGregor's (1960) modified version of management by objectives included both the negotiation of goals by subordinate and superior and the identification of objectives for the individual. In McGregor's version, most of the objective-setting was done by the subordinate; the superior acted as facilitator, assisting in the formation of those objectives.

A popular definition of MBO, conceptualized in 1965 by George Odiorne, suggests that a superior manager and his/her subordinates work as a team to jointly identify objectives for the subordinates' functions. Odiorne states:

The system of management by objectives can be described as a process whereby the superior and subordinate jointly identify goals, define individual major areas of responsibility in terms of results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. (pp. 55-56)

Odiorne suggested that MBO has four basic phases when "installed" in an organization:

1. Familiarization of the top man and his key executives (those who report directly to him) with the system and how it operates.
2. Following the decision to install the system, the top man and his subordinates program measures of organizational performance.

3. Goal-setting methods are then extended down through the organization to the first-line supervisory level through a successive series of meetings between the various organizational units and their superiors.

4. The necessary changes are made in such areas as the appraisal system, the salary and the bonus procedures and the delegation of responsibility. Ambiguous policies are clarified and procedures that may be blocking effective operation of the system are amended. (p. 69)

Research has indicated the value of establishing individual objectives for each manager and supervisor congruent with departmental and organizational objectives and the value of periodic and final review of performance in relation to these objectives. Raia (1965) and Meyer, et al. (1965), have noted that management by objectives does indeed:

1. Improve communications;
2. Increase mutual understanding;
3. Enlarge opportunities for utilization of ability;
4. Improve planning;
5. Create more positive attitudes toward the evaluation system;
6. Promote innovation.

Research has also demonstrated, however, that the way organizations and individual managers set up and apply a system of management by objectives may impair their effectiveness (Raia, 1966; Tosi and Carroll, 1968). Managers with different needs and personalities might
be expected to react in dissimilar ways to various job situations. Vroom (1964) and Korman (1970) cited evidence for the theory that an individual's work performance is a function of how he perceives himself in relation to his work assignment. A system such as management by objectives must be adapted to fit the particular circumstances under which it is applied.

Because of the limited amount of empirical research on the effects of installing a system of management by objectives into various settings, the researcher will investigate goal-setting and participation in the goal-setting process conducted in settings without established MBO systems. Although this research was not conducted in educational situations, it suggests some facilitative conditions under which objective setting might be carried out. Furthermore, group objective-setting is described, and the team processes utilized in planning effectively in an MBO system are explicated.

**Setting of goals.** Fryer (1963) reported that when subjects were obligated to set goals, their levels of performance increased most on difficult tasks; while Stedry and Kay (1966) stated that the setting of difficult goals increased overall performance. Locke (1966) and Locke and Bryan (1967) concluded through their studies on relationships between goal and performance levels that:

1. The higher the goal, the higher the level of performance.
2. Specific goals resulted in higher levels of performance than when subjects were told to do their best.

3. An initially low-motivated group equalled the performance of an initially high-motivated group when given specific goals.

4. Setting goals for boring tasks increased interest.

5. If too many goals were identified, they became difficult to accomplish and there was less clarity on the goals as a set.

**Participation in the goal-setting process.** Different degrees of participation in goal-setting may also influence the results obtained. Vroom (1964) cited evidence that satisfaction increases with increased participation. Maier (1963) found that subordinates showed greater acceptance of decisions when they participated in the decision-making process; with proper leadership, these decisions were also found to be of superior quality (Maier and Hoffman, 1960). Vroom (1965) also found that job satisfaction in managers was related to the extent to which they could influence their superiors in decision making.

Although the preceding research on goal-setting and participation was not actually carried out using MBO, the results suggest that the manner in which goals or objectives are established has a direct bearing on the success of an MBO approach. It would also appear that the results obtained in the goal-setting process would vary with the situation and characteristics of the manager.
Group objective-setting. One manner in which objectives are being established in management by objective systems is through group objective-setting. This process is seen by Beck (1975) as one of the most important methods of using the MBO concept effectively. Beck sees the team process as being useful in several situations:

1. A team that works together on a permanent or semi-permanent basis.
2. Individuals brought together for a special task or project and disbanded after its completion.
3. Individuals from different functional areas in the organization who need each other to accomplish their objectives. (p. 6)

In discussing group objective setting, Beck considered it necessary to study both task (content) and process (how individuals work together) issues. Certain items such as clarifying role functions, interpersonal relationships between members, handling of conflict and confrontation and accountability measures were considered especially important, by Beck, for group consideration.

To achieve a high level of effectiveness in this area of group objective setting requires commitment on the part of the leader and members of the team, according to Beck. He perceives the outcomes as high commitment to objectives and decisions, high motivation, maximum utilization of human resources, high satisfaction for both individuals and organization.
In their article, Beyond Management By Objectives, Gill and Molander's (1970) view coincides with Beck's theory on the importance of group objective-setting. "It is clear from an examination of the work of motivational theorists that objectives which are worked out on a group basis, rather than given to individuals by an authority, are those to which people will be most committed" (p. 20). They feel that group objective-setting procedures will have two main effects:

1. Targets set on the basis of group activity will be those to which individuals feel genuinely committed.
2. The resulting targets will be those which lessen the degree of interdepartmental friction which often arises when targets are set without reference to others who of necessity will be directly or indirectly affected.

Lyons, Reynolds and Allen (1974, p. 33), in explaining the management by objectives system which was introduced in the Amherst/Pelham Regional School District, see MBO as being much more than a performance based personnel evaluation system. They state that an MBO program using group objective-setting may be used by educators in a number of ways:

1. As a means of coordinating the efforts of many people to encourage progress toward objectives;
2. As a means of encouraging participatory management in which all staff take part in defining common
goals, individual objectives, expected results, and a means of evaluation.

3. As a means of coordinating a staff development or professional improvement program such that personal growth becomes shared responsibility.

If the effectiveness of an objective-oriented system is to be maximized, the individual participation of each member is important. Attention to process, as well as task issues, could ensure a model emphasizing both task and process issues through group objective setting; however, failure by any leader to involve his/her members in the process of objective-setting could lead to individual or group failure to achieve its objectives and an unwarranted increase in tension, stress, and anxiety.

Educators enjoy certain advantages in turning to an established set of practices. As borrowers, they are able to benefit from previous efforts at working the problems out of MBO. On the other hand, they risk assuming that this technology comes to them trouble free. To the contrary, MBO contains inherent tendencies which create pitfalls for the unwary and which confront the administrator with a number of difficult choices.

Hacker (1971) points to a number of problems in using MBO in education. He explains that MBO programs typically measure performance exclusively in terms of goal attainment. The employee (teacher, administrator) is considered to have performed well to the extent that
he/she fulfills the objectives targeted for him/her. This emphasis upon hitting the target often results in the setting of trivial goals. With a program calling for goals to be negotiated by the employee and his/her superior, the subordinate may not want to maximize his/her risks by accepting challenging goals. This vested interest may suggest instead a strategy of negotiating for easily attained and therefore, in all probability, insignificant objectives. Incentive to set challenging goals is lacking, for such objectives increase chances of failure when performance is judged solely by goal attainment. In view of what has been reported in the literature on difficult goal setting, if properly implemented in a group objective-setting process, overall performance will increase with the setting of difficult objectives.

Payment by results is a less effective method which reinforces the tendency of MBO programs to produce trivial goals. "Target hitting is an unequivocal criterion to judge what constitutes rewardable performance: the target objective has either been reached or it has not (Hacker, 1971)." Broader criteria of praiseworthy performance, Hacker points out, lack this mechanical precision. "The desire for complaint-free programs accounts for the frequency with which MBO plans incorporate target hitting criteria and quantitative goals." He concludes that reduced reliance upon easily quantified goals and reduced emphasis upon goal attainment would open the way to serious consideration of worthwhile objectives; that is, objectives which are
both significant and appropriate. Hacker recommends that planning rather than evaluation techniques be emphasized, and suggests that the following steps be taken to reduce emphasis on goal attainment:

1. Base performance appraisal on a variety of criteria rather than solely hitting the target, thereby freeing the employee to experiment with more meaningful objectives.

2. Allow the employee to formulate goals which are both realistic and significant.

3. Take into account the relative difficulties presented by various goals, thus providing incentive to set challenging goals.

4. Employ resources effectively in moving toward a goal, regardless of whether it is attained. (p. 2)

In its booklet, MBO and Results, the American Association of School Administrators (1973) also stresses the improved planning which occurs when an organization uses an MBO approach.

MBO is a system of operation that enables the organization and its personnel to identify, move toward and lock into objectives as well as to manage more effectively for desired results. . . . Many writers stress the importance of objectives in education. It is the quality of the objectives, the manner in which objectives are set, and the management of the organization to achieve them that are somewhat new. (p. 5)

With a primary focus in the present study on the planning phase of MBO within the framework of supervision in student teaching, the preceding section investigated research relevant to this process. The
value of establishing individual objectives for participants with periodic and final review of performance in relation to these objectives was reported to improve communication, increase mutual understanding, enlarge opportunities for utilization of ability, and improve planning. The research reported on goal-setting and participation indicates that it is the manner in which goals or objectives are established that will have a direct bearing on the success of an MBO approach. Finally, group objective-setting, seen as a team process, was identified as an important method used to increase communication among participants.

The next section investigates supervision in the student teaching triad of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor. The literature reviewed will focus on the problems caused by these relationships. Roles assumed by both the cooperating teacher and the supervisor are defined and a "helping" relationship atmosphere between cooperating teacher, supervisor and student teacher is proposed as an important characteristic of a facilitative environment.

Supervision in a Triadic Relationship

While it is important to examine literature pertaining to planning, organizational settings, and accomplishing objectives, the information gleaned from such a review is relevant only to the extent it can be applied to a triadic relationship. In the following section, the triad and the problems inherent to this relationship are investigated.
It is frequently stated in the literature (Andrews, 1964; Bennie, 1972; Johnson, 1968; Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching, 1967) that supervision of a student teacher is the "joint" or "shared" responsibility of a cooperating teacher and college supervisor. But little attention has been given to their roles. Ward and Suttle's (1966) comment is timely: "It is not uncommon for one supervisor to observe and decide upon an approach to helping the student while the other supervisor is pursuing a different one. Both may have good approaches—they may be different routes toward the same goal. But when this occurs, it may result in confusion to the one being helped; the student wonders whose suggestions he should follow" (p. 448).

How and on what do the two supervisors work cooperatively with one another, and how do the two coordinate their separate efforts with the student teacher? The problems are documented by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

College supervision of student teaching has been a link between the school and the college since the beginning of off-campus student teaching, but it has been a very weak link at best. The college supervisor and the student teacher are usually guests in the classroom. Everyone, including the cooperating teacher, treads easily so as not to upset anybody or anything. The student often feels torn between the positions of the cooperating teacher and those of the college supervisor. The college supervisor has little influence over the classroom program, and the practicing classroom teachers have almost no influence over the college program. But groups tend to go their own ways and no bridges are crossed, no barrier broken, although everyone is usually polite, at least when the other one is around. (AACTE, 1965, p. 102)
From limited to highly flexible and individualized, there exists a difference of opinion on how much the college supervisor should enter into the direct supervision of the student teacher. One survey (Neal, et al., 1967) that included public school administrators and teachers as well as student teachers and college supervisors reported that all four groups felt that the liaison function was the process with the only substance in the college supervisor's role. A somewhat distant second function was that of providing help to the student teacher. The survey revealed that the direction and critical evaluation of student teachers should not be the role of the college supervisor but should be reserved for the cooperating teacher. The same study indicated, however, that administrators did not want the student teacher program in their schools without adequate supervision from the university. The results indicated quite a limited role ascribed to the supervisor.

The anxieties and concerns of the student teacher, the discomforts of the cooperating teacher working with the student teacher and supervisor, plus the frustration of the college supervisor are well documented (Bennie, 1972; Elliott, 1974; Fuhrmann, 1972; Fuller, 1969; Silberman, 1970). In commenting on the shift of student teaching triads toward negative relationships, Yee states:

The reason that the student teaching triad shifts toward negative relationships and resembles competitive rather than cooperative situations may very well be that typical student teacher programs provide little opportunity and purpose for meaningful triad interaction. The primary
objective of student teaching would seem to require meaningful and sustained cooperation among triad members. (Yee, 1968, pp. 106-107)

In a review of studies which indicated how groups developed lowered cohesiveness, Cartwright and Zander (1960) listed these reasons, which could apply to the situation in student teaching:

1. Possible reduction of needs that the group has been satisfying.
2. Disagreement over the way to solve a group problem.
3. Unpleasant experiences of a member of the group, such as assumption of responsibilities that may provide stress, opportunity for failure, and demand for greater ability than he/she feels capable of.
4. Dominating or unpleasant characteristics of other members.
5. Limitation of satisfaction and other activities.
6. Failure or lack of communication.
7. Negative status ascribed by others to group members.
8. Competition between different groups for members.

As a solution, they recommend:

... the attractiveness of a group may be increased by making it better serve the needs of people. A group will be more attractive the more it provides status and recognition, the more cooperative the relations, the freer the interaction, and the greater security it provides for members. (p. 86)

Thus the student teacher is placed in what is potentially a conflict situation that was invariably created by role ambiguity, thereby
lowering the attractiveness of the group to each other. Role responsibility—whether to teach, to learn, or to advise—is not clearly defined and sometimes bears little relation to the role capacity. If the triad is to remain viable and productive, a careful differentiation must be made between the duties of a cooperating teacher and college supervisor and an understanding and acceptance of these respective roles by all triad members.

There are also considerable variations in approaches and techniques used by college supervisors in their supervisory task. Student teachers feel strongly that the classroom visit, followed by a constructive conference, is the most helpful technique that is used (Commission on Standards for Supervisory Teachers and College Supervisors, 1968; Edwards, 1961; Haines, 1966). More recent studies indicate those two activities far outnumber any other approaches with respect to the value of student teaching (Bennie, 1972).

Morris Cogan and a group of colleagues working in the Harvard M.A.T. program more than a decade ago developed a procedure for observation in the classroom called clinical supervision (Cogan, 1973; Goldhammer, 1969). This process rests on the conviction that instruction can only be improved by direct feedback to a teacher on aspects of his or her teaching that are of concern to that teacher—rather than items on an evaluation form or items that are pet concerns of the supervisor only (Reavis, 1976). The cycle consists of the following eight phases:
Phase 1: Establishing the Teacher-Supervisor Relationship

The first phase of clinical supervision is the period in which the supervisor—

a. establishes the clinical relationship between himself/herself and the teacher;

b. helps the teacher to achieve some general understandings about clinical supervision and a perspective on its sequences; and

c. begins to induct the teacher into his/her new role and functions in supervision.

These first-phase operations are generally well advanced before the supervisor enters the teacher's classroom to observe his teaching.

Phase 2: Planning With the Teacher (Pre-Observation Conference)

The teacher and supervisor together plan a lesson, a series of lessons, or a unit. Lesson generally is taken to mean an instructional process oriented by objectives of fairly limited scope and designed to be accomplished in a span of time varying from part of a class to a school day or two. Plans encompassing more complex objectives and more extended periods of time are referred to as units. Whatever the scope of the
planning, the entire design and each of its constituted lessons are planned in terms of the objectives for the students and the teacher. Plans commonly include specification of outcomes, anticipated problems of instruction, materials and strategies of teaching, processes of learning and provisions for feedback and evaluation.

Phase 3: Planning the Strategy of Observation (Pre-Observation Conference)

The supervisor plans the objective, the processes, and the physical and technical arrangements for the observation and the collection of data. His/her functions in the observation are clearly specified, as are those of other observers if they are to participate. The teacher joins in the planning of the observation and takes a role in it as he/she becomes more familiar with the processes of clinical supervision. The contract which is developed must be specific and becomes the basis of the remainder of the clinical supervision pattern.

Phase 4: Observing Instruction

The supervisor observes the instruction in person and/or by way of other observers and other
techniques for recording classroom events. These notes become the basis of the analysis.

Phase 5: Analyzing the Teaching-Learning Process

The supervisor analyzes the data collected, looking for recurring patterns in the exchanges. While Cogan would use standard category systems such as Flanders' Interaction Analysis (1970), Goldhammer specifically rejects these, preferring to let the data interpret for itself what has occurred. Both agree that the supervisor must clear his or her mind of all pet theories foremost in mind. Upon completing the analysis, the supervisor must decide on a strategy, a method of presenting the result of the analysis in a manner most likely to result in improved teacher performance.

Phase 6: Planning the Strategy of the Conference

In the early stages of working with a teacher, the supervisor alone generally develops the plans, alternatives, and strategies for conducting the conference with the teacher. Later on, if it is advisable, the planning for the conference may be carried out by teacher and supervisor together.
If this occurs, the planning for the conference may be incorporated into the conference itself.

**Phase 7: The Conference**

The conference participants are generally the supervisor and teacher. As need and appropriate circumstances arise, other participants may join them. The conference may, on occasion, be conducted by the teacher and others, sometimes without the supervisor.

**Phase 8: Renewed Planning**

At an appropriate stage in the conference, the teacher and supervisor decide on the kinds of change to be sought in the teacher's classroom behavior. At this point, the cyclical nature of the supervisory process asserts itself, and the teacher and supervisor stop the analysis and discussion of the previous lesson to begin planning the next lesson and the changes the teacher will attempt to make in his/her instruction. The resumption of planning also marks the resumption of the sequence of the cycle. (pp. 10-12)

Cogan notes that certain phases of the cycle may be altered or omitted, or new procedures instituted, depending upon the successful
development of working relationships between the supervisor and the teacher.

Fuhrmann (1972) points out, however, that supervisors traditionally have seen themselves as responsible for getting someone else, the teacher or student teacher, to do something differently. "Thus their function becomes evaluative, and an atmosphere of threat is created" (p. 10). Corey (1963) and McDonald (1966) concur in this analysis. Other commentators note the stress supervisors place on techniques, methods, and mechanics (Guss, 1961; Silberman, 1970; Stewig, 1970; Sybouts, 1967).

A study by Blumberg (1970) analyzing the verbal interactions of the supervisor and teacher during conferences revealed that:

1. Supervisors give their own opinions and ideas four times as often as they ask for the teacher's;
2. Supervisors tend to dodge legitimate teacher complaints and concerns;
3. Teachers tend to passively accept supervisor opinions and advice;
4. The majority of conference time is concerned with procedural matters rather than instructional concerns;
5. Finally, past statements and answers give the impression that both teachers and supervisors are playing roles, going through the motions that each expects of the other.
In his book, *Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War*, Blumberg (1974) revealed the following teacher criticisms of supervisors:

1. Supervisors seem to be out of touch with the classroom.
2. Much of what is communicated involves trivia.
3. Supervisors avoid them, which makes teachers think the supervisors do not seem to like people.
4. Supervisors play a democratic game, but do not really mean it. (pp. 15-16)

The basic responsibilities in supervision are in assuming roles of evaluator and helper. If juxtaposed, the helping role becomes threatening to the individual receiving the help. A possible remedy focuses on the influence of the cooperating teacher and college supervisor working towards a "helping" relationship with the student teacher. There is an increasing amount of evidence to support the humanistic belief that the interpersonal relationship between facilitator and learner is a most important characteristic of truly facilitative environments (Combs, et al., 1963; Combs, et al., 1971; Fiedler, 1950; Maslow, 1968; Rogers, 1969). Fuhrmann (1972) identifies the qualities of effective helpers as Rogers, and Combs and Soper have perceived them (Figure 2.1) and proposes that persons who supervise should be perceived by the individual being helped as possessing these qualities.

Elliott (1974), in his study, made the assumption that educators perceive good cooperating teacher/student teacher working
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REALNESS:</th>
<th>ACCURATE PERCEPTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congruent in relationship; open; willing to risk sharing of self</td>
<td>About subject field, about human learning, about other individual's private perceptions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIZING, ACCEPTANCE, TRUST:</th>
<th>INTERNAL FRAME OF REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional positive regard; warm, non-possessive caring; trust in human organism; willingness to act on tentative hypotheses</td>
<td>CONCERN FOR PEOPLE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly, helpful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING:</th>
<th>TRUST:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to sense the client's private perceptual world &quot;as if&quot; it were his own, but without losing the &quot;as if&quot; quality</td>
<td>In humans as capable, worthy, internally motivated, and dependable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERN FOR PRESENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeks causes in current thinking rather than historical events (cp. Gestalt &quot;here and now&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1. Qualities of effective helpers (Rogers, 1969; Combs, et al., 1963).
relationships as characteristically parallel to any good interpersonal relationship. His results support this belief: "... an ideal cooperating teacher/student teacher working relationship is simply a variation of good interpersonal relations generally. People need to reach a certain level of functioning, need gratification, or adequacy to be considered operant in an efficient, mature and productive way" (p. 36).

This level of functioning is what Combs depicted as a feeling of adequacy; a personal belief the individual holds that he/she is able, wanted, and a person of dignity and integrity. "People who feel inadequate cannot afford the time and effort required to assist others as long as they feel deprived themselves" (Combs, et al., 1971, p. 13).

There is the best chance for success in the student teaching experience when each participant is open, honest, and possesses a mutual respect and understanding for the interpersonal relationships which exist. The college supervisor can promote a good "helping relations" atmosphere by including all parties in the student teaching triad in the planning and evaluative aspects of the experience. Three-way conferences in which each participant is encouraged to: (a) contribute his/her suggestions, (b) assume a major responsibility in decision making, and (c) operate with clearly defined roles, should, as research indicates:

1. Develop positive interpersonal relationships.
2. Increase the group's attractiveness to all members.

Applied in the context of the MBO approach to supervision, these humanistic criteria could be combined with MBO to form a viable model for supervision.

In this section, literature has been examined which focuses attention to inherent problems found in the supervision of student teachers. Problems relating to interpersonal relationships among triad members and roles assumed by the cooperating teacher and supervisor were identified and discussed. The process of clinical supervision was presented as a format to use by supervisors in observing student teachers. Finally, the qualities of effective helpers were identified and applied to a "helping relations" atmosphere in a triad where each member contributes suggestions, assumes responsibilities, and operates with clearly defined roles and objectives.

Teacher Concerns Theory

The student teacher's concerns as he/she progresses through student teaching have, to this point, been only briefly discussed. In this section, these concerns will be investigated through an examination of a developmental concerns model designed by Francis Fuller (1969). The humanistic literature discussed previously also lends support to the work done by Fuller. The concerns model posited
by Fuller and the instrumentation subsequently developed to measure these student teacher concerns will also be investigated.

As the student teacher progresses through the teaching experience, he/she passes through developmental stages of teaching effectiveness. From early concerns involving him/herself, the student teacher eventually reaches the point where the primary concern is with the growth of the pupils and the effectiveness of his/her teaching (Fuller, 1969).

The developing concerns of small groups of prospective teachers as examined by Fuller (1969) grew out of the analysis of recorded typescripts of student teaching seminars and interviews with student teachers. These records were used in the identification and classification of problems which student teachers experienced over an extended period of time and the concerns they expressed about these problems. These expressed concerns, when grouped into definable, sequential, and developmental stages, showed that the early concerns of student teachers were characterized by a concern for self and self-protection, while the later concerns of student teachers and in-service teachers satisfied with their teaching were characterized by a concern for others, for relationships with others, and for pupil learning.

Fuller hypothesized that teachers progress through these developmental stages as they become part of the profession. The concerns theory is a conceptualization of the flow in the learning process for a prospective teacher from concerns for Self (trainee) to Task
A further hypothesis was then drawn that persons with concerns about self are less mature than persons with concerns about pupils' needs, and through teacher training, this concern about self was gradually replaced by a concern for pupils.

An effective supervisory model requires the identifying and meeting of need satisfaction. This concerns model becomes even more significant in its compatibility with the Basic Need Construct developed by Abraham Maslow, and depicted graphically in his hierarchy of needs (Figure 2.2). Both these models place strong emphasis on the momentum of the individual toward growth, maturation, and health. Elliott (1974), in drawing a comparison to the two schemes, points out that:

1. In Maslow's schema, people functioning at higher need levels display a whole host of positive, personal characteristics and potentialities, while in Fuller's model, teachers who express impact concerns are found to focus more on student growth and self-evaluation.

2. People functioning at lower levels in either scheme tend to be more egocentric.

3. Both schema place strong emphasis, if individual growth is to occur, on the necessity for positive outside conditions or support. (pp. 36-38)

Initially utilizing open-ended responses through the use of an instrument titled Teacher Concerns Statement (TCS), the question was asked: "When you think about your teaching, what are you concerned about?" The student teacher was given ten minutes to fill an 8 X 10 unlined sheet of paper. The scoring system consisted of the six
Growth Needs: (Being values) (Metaneeds) not hierarchical; all of equal importance and all interrelated, although any one individual may express his growth needs through only one or a few most favored values.

The External Environment: Preconditions for need satisfaction: Freedom, Justice, Orderliness, Challenge (Stimulation)

Figure 2.2. The deprivation and growth needs as defined by Abraham Maslow (1968).
teaching concerns categories, plus one non-teaching category (Figure 2.3).

Research using the TCS led to the reconceptualization of the model in 1973 and again in 1975. The revised instrument, called the Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC), is easily administrable, quickly scored and taps the major areas of teacher concerns. The instrument itself consists of fifty Likert-scaled items, each of which describes a teaching concern that was considered to be representative of one of five categories used in the TCS scoring procedures. Briefly, these concerns deal with role, adequacy, liking or being liked, teaching, and pupil needs. The response categories, developed in order to tap the highest levels of concern, range from (1) "Not Concerned" through (5) "Totally Preoccupied". It is the revised model of the TCC that is used in this study (Appendix A).

The initial concern of each student teacher as he/she is confronted by a new learning experience will be for the self. This subjective assessment of the learning experience yields concerns which can give the cooperating teacher and college supervisor access to the motivations and perceptions of the student teacher. This knowledge can also be gained through the assessment and analysis of data obtained from self-reports, reports by peers and supervisors, and behavioral observations made in a systematic fashion. By measuring the concerns of the student teacher, it is possible to help him/her become aware of self-concerns, clarify motivations, identify
I. Concerns About Self

Code 0. Non-Teaching Concerns

Statement contains information or concerns which are unrelated to teaching. Codes 1 through 6 are always concerns with teaching. All other statements are Coded 0.

II. Concerns About Self As Teacher

Code 1. Where Do I Stand?

Concerns with orienting oneself to a teaching situation; i.e., psychological, social, and physical environment of the classroom, school and/or community. Concerns about supervisors, cooperating teachers, principal, parents. Concerns about evaluation, rules, or administrative policy; i.e., concern about authority figures and/or acceptance by them.

Code 2. How Adequate Am I?

Concern about one's adequacy as a person and as a teacher. Concern about discipline and subject matter adequacy.

Code 3. How Do Pupils Feel About Me? What Are Pupils Like?

Concern about personal, social, and emotional relationships with pupils. Concern about one's own feelings toward people and about pupils' feelings toward the teacher.

III. Concern About Pupils

Code 4. Are Pupils Learning What I'm Teaching?

Concern about whether pupils are learning material selected by the teacher. Concern about teaching methods which help pupils learn what is planned for them. Concern about evaluating pupil learning.

Code 5. Are Pupils Learning What They Need?

Concern about pupils' learning what they need as persons. Concern about teaching methods (and other factors) which influence that kind of learning.

Code 6. How Can I Improve Myself As A Teacher? (And Improve All That Influences Pupils?)

Concern with anything and everything which can contribute to the development not only of the pupils in the class, but of children generally. Concern with personal and professional development, ethics, educational issues, resources, community problems, and other events in or outside the classroom which influence pupil gain.

Figure 2.3. Overview of concerns codes (Fuller and Case, 1972).
personal objectives, resolve anxiety, and reduce defensiveness.

In this section, research, as developed by Frances Fuller in the area of student teaching concerns, has been discussed. The theory's importance to the supervisory process was established and a recommendation made for supervisory awareness to these developmental concerns.

Leadership and The Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership

Since learning, according to the Concern Theory sequence, proceeds from the self, the prospective teacher should be the starting point for planning and structuring a learning experience. A system such as MBO, where the student teacher could develop his/her own objectives for the semester, would appear to be an appropriate vehicle. However, it is important for the college supervisor and cooperating teacher, as the MBO contract is formulated, to be fully aware of and sensitive to these developmental stages. To effectively utilize the talents of the college supervisor and cooperating teacher in assisting the student teacher and to insure that a relevant learning experience occurs, the leadership style of the two supervisors (leaders) as they work with the student teacher (follower) should be identified. It should be the student teacher who decides what style of leadership will be necessary from both his/her college supervisor and cooperating teacher if he/she is to successfully accomplish this learning experience.
In the following section, relevant literature pertaining to leadership theory is investigated with a detailed section presented on situational leadership as developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard.

The results of a study by Della Piana and Gage (1955) supported the theory that leadership involves an interaction between the characteristics of the leader and the values of the followers. Stogdill and Coons (1957) made a factorial study to determine the factors most important in leader-follower relationships. **Consideration** and **Initiating Structure** accounted for eighty-three percent of the total factor variance. Friendliness, mutual trust, respect, and warmth characterized the leader high in the dimension of consideration. Getting the job done, effectiveness in organizing and directing the work, and helping his/her followers to understand their duties characterize the leader high in initiating structure.

Yee (1968), reacting to a statement by Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962, p. 4), that stated: "The actions of each are at once a result of and a cause of the actions of the other," comments that influence, therefore, can flow in both directions as cooperating teachers and student teachers mutually determine the nature and outcome of the interpersonal behavior event in student teaching.

Current theories concerning leader-follower relations appear to be quite pertinent to student-teaching relationships. From the literature previously reviewed, the factors of Consideration and Initiating
Structure found by Stogdill and Coons to be salient characteristics of effective leaders appear to be comparable to the affective and cognitive value orientations investigated by Della Piana and Gage. Yee, in drawing upon the latter's work for some of his study procedures, summarizes:

There has been suspicion that the subjective biases of the cooperating teacher and/or supervisor influence the interaction between student teacher and the leaders' ultimate evaluation of the student teacher. The nature of such bias may be centered in the affective need-disposition of the students and the willingness and ability of the supervisor and cooperating teacher to perceive and satisfy the student's needs. Rapport between the student and his mentors, therefore, can be viewed as a function of the extent to which a supervisor and cooperating teacher are perceived by the student as effective in doing those things about which the student is most concerned. (Yee, 1967, p. 22)

From these early models of leader behavior was developed the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Hersey and Blanchard suggest that by adding an effectiveness dimension to the task (Initiating Structure) and relationship (Consideration) of earlier leadership models, they are attempting to integrate the concepts of leader style with situational demands of a specific environment. They suggest that when the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation, it is termed effective; when his/her style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective and that no single style is more effective than any other.

A situational leadership theory, according to Hersey and Blanchard, portrays the behavior of a leader in relationship to his/her
followers. This theory is an outgrowth of earlier leadership models that were based on two types of behavior central to the concept of leadership style—Initiating Structure and Consideration. Hersey and Blanchard have used the term \textit{Task Behavior} to replace Initiating Structure and the term \textit{Relationship Behavior} to replace Consideration. They define these concepts as:

\textbf{Task Behavior} [is] the extent to which a leader organizes and defines the roles of individuals and group members by explaining what activities each is to do as well as when, where and how tasks are to be accomplished. It is further characterized by the extent to which a leader defines patterns of organization, formalizes channels of communication, and specifies ways of getting jobs accomplished.

\textbf{Relationship Behavior} [is] the extent to which a leader engages in personal relationships with individuals or group members; the amount of socio-emotional support and psychological strokes provided by the leader as well as the extent to which the leader engages in interpersonal communications and facilitating behaviors. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972)

The dimensions of leader behavior have been plotted on two separate and distinct axes as shown in Figure 2.4.

Research has shown that there is no right style of leadership. In this model, any one of the four styles may be effective or ineffective, depending on the situation.

With the situation aspect of leadership as a given, Life Cycle Theory of Leadership is based on a relationship between (1) the amount of direction (task behavior) a leader gives, (2) the amount of socio-emotional support (relationship behavior) a leader provides, and (3) the "maturity" of his or her followers or group. Followers in any situation are vital not only because individually they accept or reject the leader, but also because they,
Figure 2.4. The basic leader behavior styles in Life Cycle Theory (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).
as a group, actually determine whatever personal power he or she may have. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1974, p. 27).

Maturity is defined in Life Cycle Theory by the **level of achievement**, **motivation**, **willingness** and **ability** to take **responsibility** and **task relevant education and experience** of an individual or a group (Blanchard and Hersey, 1974, p. 27). Blanchard and Hersey point out that these variables of maturity (willingness, ability and educational experience) should be considered in relation to a specific task to be performed. It should be noted that as the level of one's followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to **reduce** their task behavior and **increase** relationship behavior until the individual or group is sufficiently performing for the leaders to decrease their relationship behavior (socio-emotional support) as well (Hersey and Blanchard, 1974).

"... this theory focuses on the appropriateness of effectiveness of leadership styles according to the level of performance of the follower" (p. 28).

The cycle is illustrated by the bell-shaped curve going through the **four leadership quadrants** (Figure 2.5).

When working with student teachers who are below average or inexperienced in a learning situation, a high task style (Quadrant 1) has the highest possibility of success; whereas in dealing with a student teacher who has had average experience in a particular learning experience, **moderate** structure and **moderate to high socio-emotional style** (Quadrants 2 and 3) appear to be most appropriate; and a low
Figure 2.5. Life Cycle Leadership Theory (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).
task and low relationship style (Quadrant 4) has the highest probability of success working with student teachers with above average experience in a particular learning experience.

Life Cycle Theory is situational in that the leader uses a specific leadership style for each specific task. MBO is also situational because it, too, specifies tasks and objectives.

Hersey and Blanchard feel that the "missing link" in MBO, however, is a system for assisting the follower in accomplishing tasks.

It seems appropriate to suggest that superior and subordinate should negotiate and contract not only goals and objectives but also the leadership style appropriate for accomplishing each of those objectives. Attempting to apply a situational leadership theory as a diagnostic tool may facilitate this second kind of negotiation for leadership style. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1974, p. 30)

... MBO must include a means by which the leader assists the follower in accomplishing tasks. Contracting for specific leadership style between leader and follower will enable the leader to know what the follower needs in order to accomplish his or her tasks. (Inderlied, 1975)

Implementation of an MBO system in the student teaching triad will be facilitated if the appropriate leadership behavior to accomplish the objectives negotiated for is used. Problems may occur when a superior uses too much of any one style.

In terms of leadership theory, once a superior and subordinate have agreed upon and contracted certain goals and objectives for the subordinate, the next logical step would be a negotiation and agreement about the appropriate leadership style that the superior should use in helping the subordinate accomplish each one of the objectives. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1974, p. 30)

It is important for leadership style to be clarified for each objective. The role of cooperating teacher and college supervisor can
be seen as that of a resource facilitator, to assist and be sure
resources are available for goal accomplishment; or the student
teacher may negotiate for sufficient structure and direction from both
cooperating teacher and college supervisor until he/she is familiar
with the task.

Hersey and Blanchard (1974, p. 28) point out that:

To accomplish all the goals, the subordinate may require
the supervisor to use a variety of leadership styles at
any given time, depending upon the subordinate's maturity
in relation to the specific tasks involved.

In student teaching, the negotiation of leadership style should
remain as an open contract. Any member of the student teaching triad
can renegotiate for a different style if the one contracted is ineffec-
tive in accomplishing the stated task. Even more important in this
negotiation process is the implication of shared responsibility if the
objective is not met.

The Life Cycle Theory has been established as situational leader-
ship in that the leader uses a specific leadership style for each
specific task. MBO is also situational because it, too, specifies
tasks and objectives. The crucial point is made that in this system
combining management (MBO) and leadership (Life Cycle) theory, the
"missing link" is in the contracting for specific leadership style
between the leader (cooperating teacher and college supervisor) and
the follower (student teacher), enabling the cooperating teacher and
college supervisor to know what the student teacher needs to accomplish
in the task.
Application of Research to Present Study

The focus of the review of the literature has been to develop support for operationalizing a process for supervision in the student teaching triad. The following portrayal of the process identifies the source in the literature of the various ideas incorporated into the process.

**PHASE I** Planning begins with the establishment of the teacher-supervisor relationship (Cogan, 1973) followed by the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor independently proposing objectives for the student teacher's job (Fryer, 1963; Hacker, 1971). At a group meeting, MBO contracts are formulated and mutual agreement on significant objectives and goals reached (Beck, 1975; Cogan, 1973; Gill and Molander, 1970; Hacker, 1971; Vroom, 1964) through the rating of objectives and a consideration to the student teacher's readiness to complete specific objectives on scores analyzed from the TCC (Fuller, 1969; Locke and Bryan, 1967). Differences between members are negotiated, and both supervisors and student teacher seek to develop a contract which will base evaluation of performance on a variety of

PHASE II

A formal group workshop on leadership is held (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972) followed by group negotiation of appropriate leadership styles for the cooperating teacher and supervisor to follow in assisting the student teacher achieve the objectives in his/her MBO contract (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).

PHASE III

Through pre- and post-observation critiques and support seminars, the needs and concerns of the student teacher are met (Cogan, 1973; Combs, et al., 1971; Fuller, 1969; Goldhammer, 1969; Hacker, 1971; Maslow, 1968; Yee, 1968). Mid-term assessment occurs where contracts are reviewed, objectives redefined, and leadership style renegotiated, through contract modification (Cogan, 1973; Combs, et al., 1971; Commission on Standards for Supervisory Teachers and College Supervisors, 1968; Goldhammer, 1969; Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Upon completion of each objective and subsequent completion of the
activity, new objectives are developed by the triad members, when appropriate. Upon completion of the contract and course requirements, Phase III is completed.

**PHASE IV**

This phase includes an appraisal of the terminal performance of the student teacher and readiness to assume a professional career.
CHAPTER III

FIELD TEST PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of the present study was to develop and test a scheme for supervision in the triad involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor. This chapter provides an in-depth look at the four phases of supervision, using an MBO/Leadership approach within the student teaching triad. A description of the field test situation, including facts about participants, setting and the investigator's role in the program, is also included. The field test questions are stated exploring the many inquiries concerning the practicality and effectiveness of the process, changes implied, and the applicability of Hersey and Blanchard's situational leadership model to the process. The methodology of the field test section includes a description of the data-gathering instruments used in the study, a data collection plan, and concludes with a description of the evidence used to answer each of the field test questions.

The Supervisory Process

Through the review of literature, support has been established for operationalizing a four-phase process of supervision using an MBO/Leadership approach within the student teaching triad. The events in
each phase are described in detail in this section and diagramed in a corresponding flow chart (Figure 3.1). In the discussion that follows, the numbers associated with each geometric symbol on the chart are referenced.

**Phase I (Planning: What)** began with orientation meetings (1.0) with cooperating teachers and a group seminar for student teachers. The individual meetings between supervisor and cooperating teacher (1.1) were held for two principal purposes: (1) to identify the cooperating teacher's and supervisor's roles as they pertain to supervision of a particular student teacher, and (2) to agree upon procedures to be followed during the semester. The starting point for each meeting was provided by discussing three sets of program-prepared guidelines: roles and expectations of cooperating teachers; the supervisor's roles and functions; and the technical skills of teaching (Appendix B). Additionally, dates for small and large group meetings were established.

The supervisor then conducted a seminar during the first week of the semester with all the student teachers (1.2). Its purposes were:

1. to establish an atmosphere of warmth, friendliness and trust between student teachers and supervisor;
2. to allow time for all the student teachers to become better acquainted with each other;
3. to describe the role of the supervisor;
4. to administer the Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC) and to discuss concerns;
5. to discuss the steps for contracting in Phase I (Planning: What) and Phase II (Planning: How);  
6. to prepare for the first large group meeting with the cooperating teachers by discussing the agenda (Appendix C) for the meeting;  
7. to set dates for future meetings, especially seminars.

The large group meeting (2.0) attended by all student and cooperating teachers was held primarily to formulate a master list of objectives to assist individual and cooperating teachers select potential objectives for a particular student teacher. After a brief introduction of all participants, the supervisor summarized his role for the coming semester. Although there was to be some variation from dyad to dyad, the supervisor's principal activities were to include:

1. coordinating the efforts of each triad in contracting;  
2. observing and critiquing the student teachers;  
3. facilitating—being sure resources are available for accomplishment of objectives;  
4. providing socio-emotional support to participants;  
5. providing professional counseling;  
6. promoting good relationships between the public school and University;  
7. developing seminars to meet the student teachers' needs.
The basic concepts of brainstorming (Timmerman and Ballard, 1975) were reviewed so this process could be followed by the group in developing the list of objectives that student teachers might use. Important points stressed were:

1. that all ideas should be recorded and accepted;
2. that the list should be as long as possible;
3. that ideas should be "piggybacked" (one idea might grow out of another);
4. that there are no right or wrong ideas nor should contributions be evaluated by others;
5. that there is no need to defend an idea to anyone in the group.

Groups of five persons with two or three student and cooperating teachers each were established, and materials were provided to tabulate ideas. To allow for unrestricted and freer dialogue, it was further stipulated that a student teacher and his/her cooperating teacher must join different groups. One person from each group was appointed by the supervisor to record all the suggestions.

Twenty minutes was allowed for development of the lists, after which the large group was reconvened. A master list was compiled from small group reports presented to the entire group. This master list was subsequently distributed to all participants (Appendix D).

The hypothetical relationship between concerns of individual student teachers and the selection of their objectives was briefly
discussed. Each student teacher and each cooperating teacher was assigned to develop, without collaboration, a list of student teacher objectives and to formulate activities that would assist in completion of the objectives. Times were then set by the supervisor with each dyad for a meeting the following week to develop an MBO contract which would be agreeable to all parties.

The student teacher then spent the following week developing a set of objectives and activities for him/herself for the semester (3.0). The cooperating teacher also formulated a list of objectives and activities for the student teacher that he/she felt were important and possible within the setting and allocated time frame (3.0). The supervisor met informally with all participants during this week to answer questions, to suggest possible alternative objectives, to supply cooperating teachers with additional information about their student teachers (e.g., TCC data and prior history in the Amherst–Pelham Elementary Program—APEP—as a pre-intern), and to ensure timely completion of the task.

At the first triad meeting (4.0), MBO contracts were formulated between the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor. The goal of the supervisor was to develop a contract between triad members that contained realistic and significant objectives upon which mutual agreement was reached. The supervisor recorded the various objectives proposed by the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor on the Objective-Setting Conference Form (Appendix K). The objectives were clarified, interpreted or combined when necessary and
written by the supervisor in an agreed final version (5.0).

The appropriateness of each objective and the estimated time for objective completion were next discussed. The present concerns of the student teacher as indicated by the TCC were also discussed. For instance, if a student teacher expressed high self-concerns on her TCC, a delay was recommended by the supervisor on objectives major in scope, such as planning a unit of study, until these self-concerns were identified and dealt with by the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor. Each triad member made final recommendations to either delay or proceed with each objective (6.0).

At the same meeting, the objectives agreed upon were transferred to an MBO Focussing/Contract Form (Appendix K) on which necessary related activities were listed. This completed contract listed objectives, objective priority weight, activities, and evaluative criteria (7.0). Copies were distributed to the student teacher and cooperating teacher in preparation for the leadership workshop, marking completion of Phase I (Planning: What) of the process. It should be noted that during the three-week process just described, the student teacher was in the classroom. This initial portion of the student teacher's practicum assisted all three parties in becoming more aware of strengths and weaknesses on which to base the planning activities described in Phase I and in the following events of Phase II (Planning: How).

Phase II began with a leadership workshop for all student and cooperating teachers (8.0). The goals of this session were:
1. to increase theoretical understanding of situational leadership;
2. to create a positive attitude toward application of theory in relation to supervision of student teachers (and others);
3. to provide teachers with an opportunity to think how they might function as leaders.

Dr. Kenneth Blanchard, Professor at the University of Massachusetts, and the supervisor conducted the two-hour meeting. The agenda included the following activities:

1. The consultant explained the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).
2. Cooperating teachers took the LEAD-Self to arrive at a measure of the teacher's perception of his/her leadership style, and student teachers took the LEAD-Other to measure the student teacher's perceptions of his/her cooperating teacher's leadership style, and another LEAD-Other (student teacher) to measure perceptions of an ideal leadership style in a cooperating teacher.
3. Cooperating teachers and student teachers learned to use the Task Relevant Maturity Form (TRM) on which the student's perceived ability, willingness and experience to perform each objective are
evaluated on a scale of 1 to 8 by the student
teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor
(Appendix K).

4. The leaders of the workshop role played a con-
tracting session.

A more complete description of each activity is found in Appendix E.

At the meeting, each participant was given a TRM form and assigned
the task of individually completing it in one week (9.0), as it would
apply to the student teacher's objectives that had been agreed upon in
the earlier three-way meeting (4.0 to 7.0).

The contracting session (10.0) was held for the purpose of negoti-
tiating appropriate leadership styles for the cooperating teacher and
supervisor to follow in assisting the student teacher achieve each
objective in his/her MBO contract. Through the use of the TRM form
(10.1), the student teacher was able to identify his/her maturity
(ability, willingness, and experience; for the definition of maturity
used here, see Chapter II), in relation to each of the agreed upon
objectives and corresponding activities. The contracted leadership
style and its objectives were normally agreed to by consideration and
discussion of the student's TCC scores (10.2), his/her file folder
containing notations and samples of previous experiences in the APEP
program (10.3), and his/her classroom performance to date. Through
the use of this information, the cooperating teacher and supervisor,
referring to their TRM forms, either concurred with the student
teacher's evaluation or one or both suggested an alternative leadership style (11.0). If there were differences of opinion concerning a specific objective, then further negotiation between members occurred, usually at a later meeting (11.1). In this extension of the meeting, student history and TCC were looked at more explicitly. A possible delay in proceeding with the objective (11.2) would imply the need for a change in the original contract.

A continuous dialogue occurred during this session as individual strengths and weaknesses were discussed and ideas and recommendations made. The supervisor, who chaired the meeting, also clarified leadership terminology, participated in the discussion of the student teacher's maturity relative to each objective, and served as a resource person in dealing with the contracting process. In Appendix F, abbreviated transcripts from selected contracting sessions are provided to show how various segments of the triad meeting were conducted. These segments include the beginning of a session (10.0), an example of the negotiation of leadership styles that were readily agreed upon (11.0), and one in which either it was more difficult to reach consensus (11.1) or a delay was recommended (11.2), and an example of closure of a session (12.0). Also, in certain cases it was desirable for the cooperating teacher and supervisor to assume different leadership styles in working with the student teacher on a particular objective. An example of this style of contracting is also included in the set of transcripts.
When mutual agreement had been reached among all members, a supplementary MBO/Leadership contract (Appendix K) was written (12.0) by the supervisor with the original given to the student teacher and a copy given to the cooperating teacher. In this contract, the objectives were listed, the contracted leadership style specified, and specific details such as responsibilities and concerns to be considered noted. The MBO/Leadership contract was conceived as a supplement to the original MBO Focussing/Contract form (7.0). A partially complete MBO/Leadership contract, with its attached MBO/Focussing contract, for the transcripts described just previously, may be found in Appendix F.

The student teacher had been in the classroom for approximately six weeks at this point and had begun within the last week to work toward the completion of objectives. However, with establishment of the supplementary contract, Phase III Implementing began (13.0). The student teacher planned and developed his/her teaching within the guidelines of his/her contract (13.1), and the cooperating teacher and supervisor supplied the needed assistance through the contracted leadership style (13.2). The observations (13.3) by the supervisor were carried out using the clinical supervision model discussed in Chapter II and were based on the needs and objectives of individual student teachers as expressed through the contracting process.

Specific monthly dates were set during the semester for the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor to meet, assess and renegotiate the contract (14.0). The objectives of these periodic sessions were:
1. to provide the student teacher with feedback from the cooperating teacher and supervisor on his/her performance to date (14.1);
2. to provide feedback to the cooperating teacher and supervisor from the student teacher on the appropriateness of contracted leadership styles and renegotiate this style if necessary (14.1, 14.3);
3. to redefine objectives and/or consider new or delayed objectives (14.2);
4. to review the timetable and overall progress of events toward completion of the contract (14.4).

In most student teacher contracts, one or more modifications of contract, as suggested above, were required. In some cases, a longer period of time was contracted for completion of an objective or of the contract itself, while in other cases, new objectives were identified and written. Objectives previously delayed because of their major scope and dependence upon completion of minor objectives were now discussed and contracted (15.1). Again copies of the renegotiated contract (16.0) were given to the student teacher and cooperating teacher and the remainder of the semester was spent either completing the original contract or working on additional or modified objectives.

When the student teacher was considered by his/her cooperating teacher and supervisor to have completed all of his/her objectives, his/her course requirements were completed (17.0) and a date was set
to review his/her performance. This decision did not occur in most cases until the last week of the semester because additional objectives had been written for the student teacher to complete. Phase IV Appraising began with the triad meeting to review performance (18.0). The objectives of this summarizing session were:

1. to evaluate the performance of the student teacher in terms of the contract;

2. to consider importance of possibly contracting for more experience if more time to complete objectives was needed (19.0);

3. to discuss the effectiveness of the MBO contracting process and identification of leadership styles for each objective, and administer a final LEAD instrument to each student and cooperating teacher;

4. to administer a questionnaire to each participant to assist the supervisor in evaluating the supervisory process.

In actuality, the meeting served to summarize formally recommendations augured in prior meetings. Except for those student teachers requiring more work (19.0), upon completion of this meeting the student teacher received his/her grade, was given a recommendation for certification (20.0), and officially completed his/her internship.
Field Test Situation

Setting

The Amherst/Pelham Elementary Teacher Education Program (APEP), jointly sponsored by the School of Education at the University of Massachusetts and the Amherst, Massachusetts Public Schools, embraces three basic and sequential components (pre-internship I, pre-internship II, and internship), each of which combines field experiences with academic work over the course of a semester. The practicum experiences take place in three Amherst public elementary schools. For logistic reasons, this study was limited to one of the open space schools in the district where the majority of student teachers was located. The school contains six quads, which are rooms the size of four classrooms. Within each quad are three teachers, seventy-five to one hundred students, three instructional aides, and two or three student teachers.

Both cooperating teachers and student teachers had considerable program experience prior to the conduct of the study and, in addition, cooperating teachers worked continuously with students from all phases of the program. The internship (student teaching) is a full-time experience extending through a full semester (fourteen weeks for fifteen University credits). Students are admitted to the student teaching experience only after they have achieved satisfactory performance levels in the pre-internship phases of the program. A complete folder is also accumulated by each student on his/her experiences
as he/she progresses through the program and serves as a portfolio for future use.

The APEP program has strong district support and combines the resources of the University community with those of the local Amherst Public Schools. The schools' instructional, administrative, and specialist personnel are actively involved in the guidance of these field experiences. One of the primary roles of the assistant principal, agreed upon by the central administration of the school district, is to play an active role in the selection, placement, and monitoring of University of Massachusetts student teachers in the classroom.

The program provided teacher resources to the school through the participation of many students at all stages of their training. In turn, the school supplied an office for the supervisor allowing for easy access with all school personnel.

Participants

The participants in this study initially included ten undergraduate senior elementary education majors at the University of Massachusetts who were student teaching full time for fifteen weeks as part of the APEP program; and nine classroom teachers at levels ranging from kindergarten through sixth grade who were acting as cooperating teachers with the APEP program during the 1975 Fall semester. One cooperating teacher worked with two student teachers simultaneously; however, one of these student teachers was unable to adapt to the program requirements and dropped out midway through the
second month. Data for this individual were incomplete; therefore, results are reported for nine student and cooperating teachers.

Near the end of the 1975 Spring semester, cooperating teachers and prospective student teachers (pre-intern II's) undertook interviews to select partners for the Fall semester. The pre-intern prepared a folder including:

1. a resume, biographical data sheet, or other statement indicating who he/she is and what he/she has done;
2. a short personal statement of educational philosophy and professional aspirations in education;
3. a brief report and commentary about the pre-intern experience prepared jointly by the cooperating teacher and supervisor in consultation with the pre-intern;
4. a brief report and commentary about the pre-intern seminar participation prepared by the instructor in consultation with the pre-intern;
5. a statement of desired experience or needs to be met during the internship by the prospective intern. (APEP Handbook, 1975)

The cooperating teacher was expected to have the following materials ready to show to the prospective student teacher:

1. a statement conveying the general philosophy and approach to teaching and learning pursued by the teacher and by other professionals in the quad;
2. a weekly schedule of classroom activities with an indication of how student behavior is managed/monitored and how the intern fits into the classroom social system;
3. an introduction to the learning materials and experiences generally used, the nature of the
planning and evaluation procedures generally followed; and the intern's expected role in these;

4. specific expectations of the intern: initially upon entering the quad/classroom and later; regular and occasional assignments; regular and occasional opportunities for cooperating teacher/intern interchange for planning; and feedback on performance, for instance;

5. particular opportunities available to the intern and/or encouraged by the cooperating teacher; e.g., working with school specialists, visiting other quads/classrooms and/or schools, participating with parents, sharing professional readings together. (APEP Handbook, 1975)

Each student teacher and each cooperating teacher mutually selected their partner at the close of the Spring semester, 1975.

**Investigator's Role in Program**

In the present study, the researcher assumed the role of supervisor and cooperatively worked with each student teacher and cooperating teacher. The supervisor was previously trained in situational leadership theory and was therefore in a position to carry out the model as intended by its developers.

**Field Test Questions**

As previously stated in Chapter I, the purpose of the study was to develop and test a scheme for supervision in the triad involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor, integrating four conceptual bases: (1) management by objectives; (2) supervision
in a triadic relationship; (3) research on student teacher concerns; and (4) a model for situational leadership developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. A secondary purpose was to examine the fit of the situational leadership model to the requirements of the student teaching situation. The evaluation was formative in nature; formative in its use in smoothing out the process and in answering questions about the overall efficiency and usability of the model.

Four overarching questions were stated: What changes are needed in the process? (Question A); Does the supervisory process result in the accomplishment of significant objectives? (Question B); How well did the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership apply to the supervision of student teachers? (Question C); Is the process practical and effective in the judgment of the participants—student teachers, cooperating teachers, the supervisor, and administrative personnel? (Question D). In this section, the specific subquestions related to each overarching question will be listed.

Question A: What changes are needed in the process?

A1: How successful were each of the group meetings: seminar (1.2); objective setting (2.0) and subsequent task (3.0); leadership workshop (8.0) and subsequent task (9.0)?

i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?

ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?

iii. What changes should be considered?
A2: How successful were each of the dyad and triad meetings: individual cooperating teacher/supervisor (1.1); MBO contracting (4.0 to 7.0); MBO/Leadership contracting (10.0 to 12.0); observing/critiquing (13.0); assessing and renegotiating contract (14.0 to 17.0); reviewing performance (18.0 to 20.0)?

i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?
ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?
iii. What changes should be considered?

A3: Was the process flexible enough that members of the triad were able to alter or modify objectives and/or recontract leadership style as the need arose?

Question B: Does the supervision process result in the accomplishment of significant objectives?

B1: How significant were the contracted objectives in the opinion of triad members?

B2: Were the original objectives met?

Question C: How well did the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership apply to the supervision of student teachers?

C1: What is the distribution of leadership styles selected on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers?

i. Pre- and post-means on each quadrant
ii. Match in dominance

C2: Is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers similar to that observed in other helping professions?
C3: What happens over the course of the study to participants’ responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range, and Effectiveness?

C4: Is there a distribution of responses on the part of all respondents on the Task Relevant Maturity form?

i. What styles are selected on the TRM?

ii. What is the percent of agreed styles on the TRM and final MBO/Leadership contract?

C5: Did the cooperating teacher and supervisor use the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher?

C6: How effective was utilizing the Teacher Concerns Checklist in the process of supervising student teachers?

i. When high self-concerns are considered, is a High Relationship style agreed upon more frequently than a Low Relationship style?

ii. Is there a more varied distribution in suggested and contracted leadership styles for student teachers who are more mature and who have lower self-concerns?

Question D: Is the process practical and effective in the judgment of the participants—student teachers, cooperating teachers, supervisor, and administrative personnel?

D1: How much time was required of each participant involved in the contracting/supervisory process?

D2: What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administration regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?
D₃: Did the contracting/supervisory process allow for more contact and positive feeling between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and supervisor than recorded in the program last year when the process was not used?

D₄: Is there any evidence in the semester following the study that the participants, their colleagues, or the APEP program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process?

Methodology of the Field Test

Data utilized to answer the preceding questions were gathered either as a natural part of the orientation and contracting processes, or were collected specifically for research purposes. In this section, each source of data will be described or an appropriate cross reference to other chapters and/or appendix will be provided. In this section, the instrumentation used to collect the data is described. A data collection plan is then presented relating the field test process to specific data collected and the field test questions. The methods used to analyze the data presented in Chapter IV are described in the final portion of this section.

Instrumentation

LEAD. The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Questionnaire (LEAD) is an instrument developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1973). There are two forms of the LEAD—Self and Other. The LEAD-Self is completed by the leader himself/herself, while the LEAD-Other
is completed by a leader's supervisor(s), associates (peers), or followers. The instrument asks for self- or other-perception of what a leader would do in twelve situations.

The LEAD measures three aspects of leader behavior: (1) dominant and supporting leadership style; (2) style range; and (3) style adaptability (Hersey and Blanchard, 1973, p. 3). From the LEAD, a leader's dominant style and supporting styles are determined by the frequency of choices of a particular style for the twelve situations as perceived by the leader himself/herself (LEAD-Self) and Others (LEAD-Other). A leader's dominant style is the style he/she or others indicate the leader uses most often. Supporting styles are styles that the LEAD suggests a leader can use on occasion (his/her flexibility).

The LEAD also measures style range.

A leader's dominant style plus supporting styles determines style range. In essence, this is the extent to which one can vary or is perceived to vary one's leadership style. Some leaders are able to modify their behavior considerably. Other leaders seem to be limited to one dominant style. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1973, p. 4)

Range is determined by the frequency of choices of each of the four styles of the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).

The LEAD also measures style adaptability.

Style adaptability is the degree to which leader behavior is appropriate to the demands of a given situation. Thus, a person with a narrow style range can be effective over a long period of time if the leader has a high probability of success. Conversely, a person with a wide range of
styles may be ineffective if these behaviors are not consistent with the demands of the situation. (Hersey and Blanchard, 1973, p. 4)

Scores for measuring style adaptability are weighted, with the behavior with the highest theoretical probability of success weighted +2 and the lowest theoretical probability of success a -2.

The LEAD provides an individual with feedback on self-perception and the perception of others on his/her leadership style in terms of task and relationship behavior. It also gives the leader information about the flexibility of his/her style. In addition, it indicates whether the style he/she has selected is appropriate to a given situation according to the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership.

In the present study, the LEAD was used as a diagnostic instrument in the contracting process (8.0, 10.0 to 12.0), and provided the cooperating teacher and supervisor with perceptions of their leadership style. Also, the student teacher expressed his/her perceptions of the cooperating teacher's leadership style and his/her own ideal style through two administrations of LEAD-Others. The LEAD was also administered at the final review of performance (18.0) and indicated what the cooperating teacher perceived as his/her style toward the student teacher during the semester, and what the student teacher perceived as the cooperating teacher's style toward him/her. A copy of the LEAD instruments may be found in Appendix G.

Teacher Concerns Checklist. The TCC developed by Fuller and Borich (1974) is described in Chapter II. This checklist was
administered at the beginning of the semester (1.2) to the nine student teachers who participated in the study. The TCC results were used as part of the process, to assist the author in better identifying and acting upon student teacher concerns, prior to completion of the MBO contract. The full use of this instrument in this study is described in the Supervisory Process section of this chapter.

Questionnaires. Two questionnaires were administered at the end of the study. One questionnaire was administered to each cooperating teacher and each student teacher at the final review of performance meeting (18.0). The questionnaire (Appendix H) was developed by the supervisor and consisted of both open-ended questions and ratings. Its primary focus was on evaluating the contracting/supervisory process; it was used also to fill in voids in the data collection scheme. The second questionnaire was the Supervisor Appraisal Form (Appendix I) developed by the APEP program. The questionnaire was initially administered to all cooperating teachers and their student teachers, who were participating in the APEP program during the Spring semester. These student and cooperating teachers were asked to appraise the performance of the supervisor working with them. The identical Supervisor Appraisal Form was administered again at the close of the Fall semester to the eighteen student and cooperating teachers participating in the developer's study. In both instances, the assistant principal administered the testing.

Taped Interviews. At the final review of performance meeting
(18.0), the author conducted exit interviews with the student teacher and cooperating teacher from each triad. The interview protocol (Appendix J) consisted of open-ended questions focussing on the student teachers' and cooperating teachers' overall reactions and evaluations of the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process.

**Supervisor's Log.** The supervisor documented all activities and events during the semester in a log of events. Included in the log were critical notes suggesting possible changes on each workshop, large and small group meeting, individual conferences and seminars.

**Products of the Process.** Included in the contracting/supervisory process were four forms (Appendix K) used by the supervisor to assist the student teachers and cooperating teachers in clarifying procedures. These forms included: the Objective-Setting Conference Form (4.0); the MBO Focussing/Contract Form (7.0); the Task Relevant Maturity Form (9.0 to 12.0); and the MBO/Leadership Contract (12.0). Inspection of these forms indicates data elements including spaces to list objectives, priority weights, related activities, leadership styles, specific details such as individual responsibilities and time for completion of an objective, and finally a space to record accomplishments.

**Data Collection Plan**

The instruments previously described in many cases serve multiple purposes in that they contribute information to more than one of the field test questions. For instance, the MBO/Leadership contract gives
information which relates to questions $A_2$, $A_3$, $C_4$, $C_5$, and $C_6$. In Table 3.1 is clarified where the data to answer each question comes from and how the data collection is related to the supervisory process. In this table, the participants who respond in each data collection event are also identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart No./ Event</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
<th>Who Responds(^a)</th>
<th>Field Test Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Individual Meetings with Cooperating Teachers</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(A_2): How successful were the individual cooperating teacher/supervisor meetings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(D_1): How much time was required of each participant involved in the individual meetings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews with all participants</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Student Teacher Seminar</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(A_1): How successful was the student teacher seminar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(D_1): How much time was required of each participant involved in the seminar?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Abbreviation ST denotes Student Teacher, CT—Cooperating Teacher, and S—Supervisor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart No./Event</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
<th>Who Responds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Field Test Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Objective Setting Workshop (Large Group Meeting)</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Individual Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Set Objectives</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Chart No./Event</td>
<td>Data Collection Process</td>
<td>Who Responds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Field Test Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 MBO Contracting to Process</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td><strong>A&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;:</strong> How successful was the MBO contracting session?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of group meeting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ii. Was the meeting perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBO Focussing/Contract Form</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>iii. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td><strong>B&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;:</strong> How significant were the contracted objectives in the opinion of triad members?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td><strong>D&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;:</strong> How much time was required of each participant involved in the MBO contracting process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td><strong>D&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;:</strong> What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administration regarding the effectiveness of the contracting-supervisory process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews (also with assistant principal)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Chart No./Event</td>
<td>Data Collection Process</td>
<td>Who Responds</td>
<td>Field Test Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Leadership Workshop</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>A₁: How successful was the leadership workshop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of group meeting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11. Was the meeting perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>111. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C₁: What is the distribution of leadership styles selected on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Self</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C₂: Is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers similar to that observed in other helping professions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEAD-Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C₃: What happens over the course of the study to participants' responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range and Effectiveness?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₁: How much time was required of each participant involved in the leadership workshop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₂: What is the appraisal of the student teachers and cooperating teachers regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Chart No./Event</td>
<td>Data Collection Process</td>
<td>Who Responds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Field Test Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST CT S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0 Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, and Supervisor</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>( A_1 ): How successful was each member in filling out TRM form?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Supervisor's log of event</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRM form</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>2. Was the process perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocated to each event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher, and Supervisor</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>( A_2 ): How successful was MBO/Leadership contracting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 to 12.0</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>Supervisor's log of group meeting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRM form</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>3. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBO/Leadership Contract</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> ST = Student, CT = Cooperating Teacher, S = Supervisor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart No./Event</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
<th>Who Responds</th>
<th>Field Test Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST CT S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 (Continued) to</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>C₆: How effective was utilizing the Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>MBO/Leadership Contract</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>Concerns Checklist in the process of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time</td>
<td></td>
<td>supervising teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>i. When high self-concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>are considered, is a High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship style agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>upon more frequently than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a Low Relationship style?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>ii. Is there a more varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>distribution in suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>and contracted leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>styles for student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>who are more mature and who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>allocated to each event</td>
<td></td>
<td>have lower self-concerns?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 Implementing</td>
<td>Student Teacher and</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₁: How much time was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Process</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>required of each participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td>involved in establishing an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>MBO/Leadership workshop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D₂: What is the appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and cooperating teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regarding the effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the contracting/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervisory process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A₂: How successful was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process of observing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and critiquing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Were stated goals and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Were the meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. What changes should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Chart No./Event</td>
<td>Data Collection Process</td>
<td>Who Responds</td>
<td>Field Test Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0 (Continued) to 13.3</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₂: Did the cooperating teacher and supervisor use the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D₁: How much time was required of each participant involved in the observing and critiquing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interview</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₂: What is the appraisal of the student teachers and cooperating teachers regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 Assess MBO/ to Leadership Contract</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>A₂: How successful were renegotiating meetings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0 Contract</td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of group meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>iii. What changes should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBO/Leadership Contract</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>D₃: Was the process flexible enough that members of the triad were able to alter or modify objectives and/or recontract leadership style as the need arose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>D₁: How much time was required of each participant involved in renegotiating contracts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Chart No./ Event</td>
<td>Data Collection Process</td>
<td>Who Responds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Field Test Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18.0 Review Performance 20.0 | Supervisor's log of group meetings | X | A<sub>2</sub>: How successful was final group meeting?  
1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?  
11. Was the meeting perceived as worthwhile?  
111. What changes should be considered? |
| | Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires | X X | |
| | MBO/Leadership contract with record of completion | X X X | |
| | Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires | X X | |
| | LEAD-Self | X | B<sub>2</sub>: Were the original objectives met? |
| | LEAD-Other | X | |
| | Final taped interview | X X | |
| | Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event | X | |
| | Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires | X X | C<sub>3</sub>: What happens over the course of the study to participants' responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range, and Effectiveness?  
C<sub>5</sub>: Did the cooperating teacher and supervisor use the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher? |
| | Final taped interviews | X X | |
| | Supervisor Appraisal Form Spring and Fall Semesters | X X | D<sub>1</sub>: How much time was required of each participant involved in the contracting/supervisory process?  
D<sub>2</sub>: What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administration regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?  
D<sub>3</sub>: Did the contracting/supervisory process allow for more contact and positive feeling between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and supervisor than recorded in the program last year when the process was not used? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart No./Event</th>
<th>Data Collection Process</th>
<th>Who Responds&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Field Test Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.0 (Continued) to 20.0</td>
<td>Final taped interviews Supervisor's log of teacher, student or program initiated contacts or requests for continuation of process following semester</td>
<td>ST CT S</td>
<td>D&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;: Is there any evidence in the semester following the study that the participants, their colleagues, or the APEP program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

In the previous section, the instrumentation used in the study has been identified. The specific nature of the measurement or observation and the method by which they will be analyzed or aggregated, however, was not made explicit. In general, descriptive statistics served to summarize the data. In Table 3.2, the evidence used to answer each of the field test questions is described explicitly.
Table 3.2  
Relationship Between Specific Field Test Questions, Source of Evidence and Evaluation of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching Question A: What Changes Are Needed in the Process:</th>
<th>Specific Question</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $A_1$: How successful were each of the group meetings: seminar (1.2); objective setting workshop (2.0) and subsequent task (3.0); leadership workshop (8.0) and subsequent task (9.0)? |  | Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires  
Final taped interviews with all participants  
Supervisor's log of group meetings | Categorization and count of comments |
| 1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?  
ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?  
iii. What changes should be considered? |  |  |  |
| $A_2$: How successful were each of the dyad and triad meetings: individual cooperating teacher/supervisor meetings (1.1); MBO contracting (4.0 to 7.0); MBO/Leadership contracting (10.0 to 12.0); observing/criticizing (13.0); assessing and renegotiating contract (14.0 to 17.0); reviewing performance (13.0 to 20.0)? |  | Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires  
Final taped interviews with all participants  
Supervisor's log of group meetings | Categorization and count of comments |
| 1. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?  
ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?  
iii. What changes should be considered? |  |  |  |
| $A_3$: Was the process flexible enough that members of the triad were able to alter or modify objectives and/or recontract leadership style as the need arose? |  | Final taped interviews with all participants  
MBO/Leadership contracts | Number of modified MBO/Leadership contracts |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Question</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1: How significant were the contracted objectives in the opinion of triad members?</td>
<td>MBO Focussing/Contract Form</td>
<td>Count and percent on ratings given objectives by each student teaching triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Were the original objectives met?</td>
<td>MBO/Leadership contract with record of completion Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>Number and percent of objectives accomplished overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Question</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₁</strong>: What is the distribution of leadership styles selected on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers?</td>
<td>LEAD-Self, LEAD-Other</td>
<td>Actual percent and mean score of responses in each quadrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Pre- and post-mean and percent on each quadrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Match on dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₂</strong>: Is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers similar to that observed in other helping professions?</td>
<td>LEAD-Self, LEAD-Other</td>
<td>Results of distribution and comparison of student teaching dyad with other helping professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₃</strong>: What happens over the course of the study to participants' responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range, and Effectiveness?</td>
<td>LEAD-Self, LEAD-Other</td>
<td>Count of responses to pre- and post-administration of questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C₄</strong>: Is there a distribution of responses on the part of all respondents on the Task Relevant Maturity Form?</td>
<td>TRM form brought to contracting session</td>
<td>Number and percent of individual styles chosen for various objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What styles are selected on the TRM?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent agreement between cooperating teacher, student teacher and supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the percent of agreed styles on the TRM and final MBO/Leadership contract?</td>
<td>Final taped interview with all participants</td>
<td>Number and percent of cooperating teachers who distinguished between leadership styles as they worked with student teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Question</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆: How effective was utilizing the Teacher Concerns Checklist in the process of supervising student teachers?</td>
<td>TCC</td>
<td>Number and percent of objectives for which High Relationship styles used with high self-concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. When high self-concerns are considered, is a High Relationship style agreed upon more frequently than a Low Relationship style?</td>
<td>MBO/Leadership contract</td>
<td>Compare percent of styles negotiated by each group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Is there a more varied distribution in suggested and contracted leadership styles for student teachers who are more mature and who have lower self-concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overarching Question D: Is the Process Practical and Effective in the Judgment of the Participants—Student Teachers, Cooperating Teachers, the Supervisor, and Administrative Personnel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Question</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D₁</strong>: How much time was required of each participant involved in the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
<td>Supervisor's log of time allocated to each event</td>
<td>Amount of time spent in contracting/supervisory process by participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews with all participants</td>
<td>Amount of time allocated to each event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of cooperating teachers and student teachers indicating major allotment of time spent by supervisor to various functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D₂</strong>: What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administration regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
<td>Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires</td>
<td>Categorization and count of comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews with all triad members and the assistant principal</td>
<td>Modal ratings of cooperating teacher and student teacher regarding effectiveness of supervisor roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D₃</strong>: Did the contracting/supervisory process allow for more contact and positive feeling between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and supervisor than recorded in the program last year when the process was not used?</td>
<td>Supervisor Appraisal Form Spring and Fall Semesters</td>
<td>Percent of categorical responses by cooperating teachers and student teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final taped interviews with all participants</td>
<td>Comparison of ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D₄</strong>: Is there any evidence in the semester following the study that the participants, their colleagues, or the AEP program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process?</td>
<td>Supervisor's log of teacher, student or program initiated contacts or requests for continuation of process following semester</td>
<td>Record of answers to this question from taped interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Record of number of requests for continuation or adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter has described the field test procedures and methodology involved in the implementation of the study. It provided an in-depth look at a four-phase model developed for use in the student teaching triad, a description of the field test situation, the stating of field test questions, a description of the data-gathering instruments used in the study, and details of the data collection plan. The chapter concluded with a description of the evidence used to answer each of the field test questions.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purposes of this chapter are to report and discuss the findings of the study following the sequence of analysis given at the end of Chapter III. The chapter is divided into four sections addressing four overarching questions: (1) A: What changes are needed in the process?; (2) B: Does the supervisory process result in the accomplishment of significant objectives?; (3) C: How well did the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership apply to the supervision of student teachers?; and (4) D: Is the process practical and effective in the judgment of the participants—student teachers, cooperating teachers, the supervisor, and administrative personnel? Within each section, specific sub-questions are stated and data related to them is given, followed by a discussion of the several pieces of data applying to the overarching question.

Changes Needed in the Supervisory Process

Question A: What Changes Are Needed in the Process?

In analyzing what changes should be considered in the present contracting/supervisory process, three specific questions were answered--one which dealt with the large group meetings, another
investigating each of the dyad and triad meetings, and a final question pertaining to the flexibility of the process. Specific data regarding their attainment and the perceptions of participants were collected from a number of sources. Data from the supervisor's log, final interviews with all the participants, student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaires, and forms used in the contracting process, together suggested what changes should be considered. The goals for each step in the process were originally stated in Chapter III. The data reported from these questions is discussed in a section at the end.

A1: How successful were each of the group meetings: seminar (1.2); objective setting workshop (2.0) and subsequent task (3.0); leadership workshop (8.0) and subsequent task (9.0)?

i. Were the stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?

ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?

iii. What changes should be considered?

Seminar (1.2). The supervisor conducted a seminar the first week of the semester with all of the student teachers. Seven goals were set by the supervisor for the meeting. Two were procedural and involved administering the Fuller Concerns Checklist and setting dates for future meetings. In the final interviews, the student teachers were queried about the overall success of the meeting and accomplishment of
the five non-procedural objectives, paraphrased and underlined in the following paragraph.

All nine student teachers indicated satisfaction with the agenda. Besides establishing a warm and friendly relationship between them and the supervisor, the nine also commented positively on the supervisor's effectiveness in outlining his role and the contracting procedures to be followed in the next six weeks. One student teacher stated, "I left the meeting with a strong feeling that the supervisor was committed." Four of the nine indicated that they felt encouraged by the implied structure of the process. All nine felt that they became better acquainted with each other and that it helped knowing some "friendly faces," especially for the first few weeks. After discussing the agenda for the subsequent meeting with cooperating teachers, the majority of the student teachers felt prepared for the following week. Three expressed apprehension, however, about accomplishing the task of setting objectives at a large group meeting with so many teachers involved.

In summary, information received from the student teachers pertaining to this seminar indicates that all its goals were accomplished, and the meeting was apparently perceived as worthwhile. In addition, the positive nature of most comments and the lack of suggestions for changes in the seminar itself, suggested that the agenda not be modified.

Objective-setting workshop (2.0) and subsequent task (3.0).
purpose of the large group meeting was to formulate a master list of objectives to assist individual student teachers and cooperating teachers select potential objectives for a particular student teacher. The meeting was attended by all student and cooperating teachers during the second week of the semester. The student and cooperating teacher working individually then spent the four days following the meeting developing a set of objectives and activities for the student teacher. In final interviews with both groups, and through the student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaire administered at the last triad meeting, the participants were asked to comment on the value of the meeting and their readiness for the next task and recommend any changes.

The goal of this meeting was accomplished through the development of a master list of objectives. Although the meeting was judged to be informative by all participants, responses varied as to the future usefulness of such a meeting. As one student teacher commented, "I had already formulated my set of objectives prior to this meeting and felt this step could have been accomplished in a group seminar with the student teachers." One-third of the teachers indicated the meeting should be dropped from the process since they now felt informed as to important objectives for student teachers. There was no consensus on the necessity of having formal meetings for all student teachers and cooperating teachers, with a structured agenda either.

Fifty-six percent of the student teachers felt it should be kept
as a formal step in the process, while the remaining forty-four percent indicated that informal meetings would be sufficient. In addition to the teachers who favored dropping the meeting, forty-five percent of the teachers were in favor of formally retaining this event, while twenty-two percent said it could be done informally.

The participants also agreed that the amount of time allowed for the subsequent development of individual sets of objectives and the assistance given by the supervisor were appropriate. "It gave me an opportunity to spend some time reexamining my needs as a student teacher," commented one student teacher, while two others expressed the opinion that by developing the objectives individually, they were able to list what they felt was important to them. Two other student teachers felt that the supervisor was able to help them develop additional objectives through unscheduled conferences. Four of the cooperating teachers reported that they received assistance from the supervisor in gaining additional information about their student teacher, which then helped in planning objectives for their student teacher.

The preceding data suggest that changes be made in future objective-setting meetings. The meeting should be developed as a required seminar for the student teacher, with optional attendance of cooperating teachers. Also, informal discussion of possible objectives, rather than the several brainstorming processes, might serve the meeting's purpose. The majority of participants recommended no
changes in the process of objective-setting that followed the meeting.

**Leadership workshop (8.0) and subsequent task (9.0).** The leadership workshop was the starting point of Phase II and was held in the fourth week of the semester for all student and cooperating teachers. Three goals were established with four related activities included on the agenda. At the meeting, the task of individually completing the TRM form as it would apply to the student teacher's objectives was assigned to each student and cooperating teacher, as well as the supervisor. In final interviews and individual questionnaires, participants were questioned as to the general success of the meeting, the attainment of the goals, the usefulness of the meeting's activities, and their readiness for the subsequent activity.

Workshop objectives were met by most, but not all cooperating and student teachers. Seven of the nine cooperating teachers, however, felt a positive attitude toward applying the theory to the process they would be following. One student teacher said, "I felt unsure of the theory at the close of the workshop but considered the role playing by [the workshop leaders] helpful in knowing how my cooperating teacher and supervisor were going to assume appropriate leadership styles to help me complete my objectives." The majority of student teachers and cooperating teachers who participated in the meeting indicated a general understanding of situational leadership after the meeting and were sufficiently informed to fill out the Task Relevant
Maturity form (TRM), as all were prepared for the contracting meeting (10.0). Triad members were uniformly satisfied with the length of time to fill out the TRM and also felt knowledgeable about the student teacher's strengths and weaknesses at that point in the semester.

There was somewhat more criticism of this meeting than the other two large group meetings, although it was perceived by the majority of participants as worthwhile. Three of the cooperating teachers said the meeting was informative but should be offered only to new student teachers and cooperating teachers in the future. Another cooperating teacher suggested training student teachers in the leadership processes during the semester prior to student teaching. One of the nine cooperating teachers felt that, although informative, the workshop should have dealt with leadership techniques "minus the jargon" and that there was too much time spent in lecturing. All participants also questioned the relevance to education and their own classroom settings of the situations described on the LEAD instrument that was administered to them.

In responding to the question of whether or not the meetings be formal or informal or, perhaps, even dropped from the contracting/supervisory process, both student teachers and cooperating teachers responded similarly. Fifty-six percent were in favor of formally retaining this step, thirty-three percent felt it could be continued informally, and eleven percent thought it should be dropped.
Recommendations growing out of the data are two-fold: first, the LEAD needs to be adapted to the educational setting if the actuality of the situational leadership model is to be clear; second, the leadership meeting might become optional, with those participants who do not attend supplied with a booklet on situational leadership and a follow-up conference to highlight important steps. Such a procedure was followed in the present study when two individuals were absent for the workshop. Both responded positively to following this procedure and had no problem in contracting leadership style.

A2: How successful were each of the dyad and triad meetings; individual cooperating teacher/supervisor meetings (1.1); MBO contracting (4.0 to 7.0); MBO/Leadership contracting (10.0 to 12.0); observing/critiquing (13.0); assessing and renegotiating contract (14.0 to 17.0); reviewing performance (18.0 to 20.0)?

i. Were stated goals and/or purposes accomplished?

ii. Were the meetings perceived as worthwhile?

iii. What changes should be considered?

Individual cooperating teacher/supervisor meetings (1.1). The supervisor met individually during the first three days with each cooperating teacher for two reasons—to identify respective roles and to discuss procedures to be followed during the semester. Perceptions of the cooperating teachers' value of these individual meetings were
recorded in the supervisor's log and probed at the final interviews.

All nine cooperating teachers indicated feeling self-assured about the roles they and the supervisor would be assuming in the coming semester. One teacher commented, "This is the first time I have seen a supervisor before a week or two of the semester has gone by." The majority of teachers also commented on the value of knowing what would be transpiring in the coming months. Although most of the cooperating teachers expressed prior knowledge of the technical skills sheets which the supervisor handed out, they also felt this use of "common terminology" in critiquing a student teacher's lesson would be helpful for everyone. The model of clinical supervision to be used by the supervisor in working with each student teacher was also familiar and acceptable to all the cooperating teachers, though not a technique that each of them used. Information compiled by the supervisor suggested the individual meetings were successful. All purposes were accomplished and no changes were recommended.

MBO contracting (4.0 to 7.0). During the third or fourth week of the semester, a series of triad meetings were held for two hours for the purpose of completing each student teacher's MBO contract. In reaching mutual agreement on a set of objectives, the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor considered a number of sources of information. In the final interview, the participants were queried about the overall success of the meeting, while the individual questionnaires administered elicited responses as to whether or not this
event should be formally retained in the contracting/supervisory process.

All nine student teachers expressed a personal commitment to the completion of the agreed upon objectives because of their participation in proposing and clarifying their objectives. Sixty-seven percent of the student and cooperating teachers felt that discussion of the Teacher Concerns Checklist, which had been administered to the student teacher at a prior meeting, was particularly helpful and timely in selecting which objectives should be realistically considered then and which could be deferred until a later date. One cooperating teacher commented, "I learned more about what my student teacher would initially need from me before I assigned her any major responsibilities."

All eighteen participants indicated that the process of listing related activities was constructive and necessary for completion of the objectives by the student teacher. Three of the cooperating teachers also felt that the contracting helped to clarify the responsibilities of the student teacher.

Responding to the question, should this process be formal, informal or dropped, all nine of the student teachers and eight of the nine cooperating teachers indicated the need for its formal retention in the contracting/supervisory process.

Thus, the MBO contract-setting meeting accomplished the goals set for it, taking into consideration the necessary items in assisting the
triads to arrive at mutually agreed upon objectives. The meetings were successful in that all the triads established MBO contracts. No changes were recommended.

**MBO/Leadership contracting (10.0 to 12.0).** This meeting was held during the sixth or seventh week of the semester for each triad and lasted approximately two and one-half hours. The major purpose of the meeting was for the triad to negotiate appropriate leadership styles for the cooperating teacher and supervisor to follow in assisting the student teacher achieve each objective in his/her contract. In final interviews and on the Student and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires, participants were asked to comment on the success of this process, as well as the value of using the TRM form.

Ninety-four percent of the participants indicated that this meeting was worthwhile. These seventeen student and cooperating teachers also expressed the need for this meeting to be retained as a formal process of the model. One cooperating teacher suggested that this step be dropped from the process but the MBO contracting session retained. In responding to the question of how helpful the process of identifying objectives and contracting leadership style was in helping them complete the objectives, seventy-eight percent of the student teachers rated (on a 9-point scale) this segment of the process as "8" or better in helping them. The question rated a "7" or above by two-thirds of the teachers. All eighteen participants indicated their approval of the manner in which the Task Relevant Maturity form was
used. One teacher commented, "I found using this form extremely helpful in evaluating my student teacher's ability to perform various tasks . . . by her honest sharing of her strengths and weakness, I began to understand what her needs were." Two other cooperating teachers felt that by using this form their student teachers got a clearer picture of how the supervisor and cooperating teacher perceived them. The majority of participants mentioned the effective way negotiating styles through this form helped to pinpoint specific needs, and everyone commented on the form's usefulness in opening communication between members of the triad. One teacher stated that the form's value was in focusing a discussion of the past history of the student teacher, the student teacher's file folder, and TCC scores in relating to the semester's objectives.

All the participants perceived this meeting as successful and in all nine cases of contracting between student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor, mutual agreement was reached and an MBO/Leadership contract written. The participants felt the meeting to be worthwhile and extremely informative because a much clearer picture had been drawn of their student teacher's needs. The approximate six-week time span from the beginning of the semester until the establishment of an MBO/Leadership contract was also indicated as appropriate since it allowed all participants time to identify better student teacher and cooperating teacher styles. No major changes were recommended for this meeting.
Observing/Critiquing (13.0). In Phase III, the student teacher planned and carried out her teaching within the guidelines of her contract. The main function of the supervisor during this phase was to observe and critique each student teacher using a clinical model of supervision. In final interviews with both student and cooperating teachers, the question was posed as to the supervisor's success in following this model.

Every student teacher indicated their preference for pre-observation conferences prior to an observation. "I had the opportunity to identify what I thought was important for the supervisor to observe and in which areas I needed help," commented one student teacher. Seven of the nine indicated that time was ultimately saved in these pre-observation meetings because they were operating from an established contract to which reference could be made.

Six of the nine also found using the technical skills of teaching quite helpful, since their teacher and supervisor referred to it quite often. Two of the nine expressed the need to be observed in settings other than the classroom, such as on class field trips or other activities where large groups were operating. One other student teacher felt she needed more observation when she worked with small groups and individual children. The majority, however, were satisfied with the amount of observation they received. They all also found the post-observation conference with the supervisor valuable for discussing the observation, in planning future activities, and in supplying support.
The cooperating teachers expressed satisfaction with the amount of time the supervisor spent with their student teachers. One commented, "Because of the supervisor's guidance in assisting my student teacher, and because of his consistency of being there when he said he would, I was able to rely on him and could therefore spend more time with my own children."

Five of the nine cooperating teachers suggested that in the future they participate in some of the post-observation conference meetings. These five wanted to share their perceptions of their student teacher's progress in the classroom with the supervisor. This was the only change suggested. There was general agreement, then, that clinical supervision be kept as an integral part of the contracting/supervisory process.

Assessing and renegotiation sessions (14.0 to 17.0). Periodic sessions were set during mid-semester to assess the overall progress of the student teachers. Four objectives were set by the supervisor for this triad meeting. In final interviews and through the Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires, participants were asked to evaluate the success of this meeting.

All nine triads expressed positive comments towards this meeting. A majority of the student teachers indicated receiving helpful suggestions from the cooperating teacher and supervisor on their work to date in the classroom. A majority of the participants said the meeting helped both to assess progress and to begin planning for the
time when the student teacher would assume full classroom responsibility.

Although the use of leadership styles by the cooperating teacher and the supervisor was discussed in each triad meeting, seventy-eight percent of the triads did not formally renegotiate new styles, having done so informally prior to this date whenever the need arose. Two contracts were significantly modified in these sessions, while on the other seven MBO/Leadership contracts, the changes which had been made were noted by each individual and new timelines were set for objective completion.

In summary, although the supervisor was successful in discussing and acting on all the objectives set for the session, a majority of the triads had completed some of the tasks prior to the meeting. Responses from various triad members regarding the value of this step in the contracting/supervisory process was varied. The majority of the members of each group perceived the meetings as worthwhile, primarily because they were able to discuss and evaluate the student teacher's readiness to assume full responsibility in managing the classroom. Fifty-six percent of the student teachers and forty-four percent of the cooperating teachers recommended that these meetings should be retained but scheduled on an ad hoc basis. Two teachers, for instance, suggested that informal conversation about the student's progress precede the setting of a date to discuss and review performance. Another felt that in her case, since the student
teacher was progressing satisfactorily, there was no need for a mid-
semester triad meeting to be held. The remaining cooperating teachers
wanted this step kept as a formal process, and all these respondents
expressed the desire for additional meetings between supervisor,
teacher, and student teacher to keep all participants up-to-date and
in communication.

Reviewing performance (18.0 to 20.0). The culminating meeting
of the student teaching experience occurred during the last week of
the semester. The meeting served two purposes: first, to evaluate
the performance of the student teacher in terms of his/her contract;
and second, to evaluate the effectiveness of the MBO/Leadership
approach used during the semester in supervising each student teacher.
In actuality, this meeting also served to summarize formally recom-
mendations augured in prior meetings. Except for those student
teachers requiring additional student teaching time to complete objec-
tives, upon final review of the contract the student teacher was
recommended for certification and completed his/her internship.

A2: Was the process flexible enough that members of the triad
were able to alter or modify objectives and/or recontract leadership
style as the need arose? Data from members of the triad were elicited
from final interviews regarding the overall flexibility of the process.

Seven of the nine triads had altered their contracts without
waiting for a scheduled mid-semester meeting. Both of the dyads who
perceived the need for this meeting required major revision in their
MBO/Leadership contracts. One of the student teachers had eight objectives on her contract, five of which required modification in content. A leadership style change from High Relationship-Low Task to High Relationship-High Task was also recommended for one of these objectives. The other student teacher whose contract needed major revisions had seven objectives, three of which required content revisions. In each case, a leadership style change was recommended for one objective; in each case two more evaluation meetings were required to complete planning regarding a final set of objectives.

The seven triads who altered their contracts whenever the need arose commented that the renegotiation session was most effective in considering any objectives which were still deferred from previous meetings, such as assuming full responsibility for all classroom activities. These triads had contracted a total of fifty-three objectives, seven of which had been deferred at the start of the semester. These seven student teachers and seven cooperating teachers also indicated completing, prior to the renegotiating session, five objectives; writing three new objectives into their contracts; and modifying fifteen of their original objectives. Twelve leadership styles were also changed that did not require a meeting to discuss.

The data suggest that the majority of individuals initiated changes in their contracts without scheduling a meeting, that the contracting/supervisory process was flexible enough to allow for
changes in the contract, and, finally, that only in extreme cases was it necessary for the supervisor to intervene.

Discussion

Analysis of data about each group and triad meeting suggests for the most part that goals were accomplished. The small number of changes suggested by participants grew principally from cooperating teachers' anticipation that similar meetings with each semester's student teachers would become repetitious, and thus were not truly criticisms of initial supervision leadership workshops.

The specific changes recommended by cooperating teachers and student teachers dealing with participation in meetings were, first, that cooperating teachers attend some of the post-observation conferences with the student teacher and supervisor and, second, that informal discussions with all triads be held to discuss objectives in lieu of an objective-setting workshop or that the objective-setting conference be held as a regular seminar for student teachers and new cooperating teachers with attendance optional for the remainder of the cooperating teachers, and, finally, that leadership workshops be optional for all participants with a booklet and subsequent conference provided for those electing not to attend.

The primary change recommended in the scheduling of the meetings concerned the renegotiation session (14.0), where it was recommended by the cooperating teachers that since most changes were made in the contract by cooperating and student teachers without a scheduled
meeting, the supervisor only needed to schedule renegotiation meetings in extreme cases.

The only meeting that needs major design revisions is the leadership workshop (8.0). Both the "jargon" and LEAD instrument were criticized. It would appear that there is a need to redesign this questionnaire if it is to be appropriately administered in the educational setting.

In summary, then, it was recommended that all steps in the process are necessary, although optional attendance for cooperating teachers at certain meetings and ad hoc triad renegotiation sessions were suggested. The formal agenda of each session, with the exception of objective-setting, should remain in the original form.

The Significance and Attainment of Objectives

Question B: Does the Supervisory Process Result in the Accomplishment of Significant Objectives?

It is fitting that the evaluation study consider the value of the substance of the student teachers' learning programs as expressed in the objectives developed cooperatively by the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor.

Two questions are suggested by the original question:

(1) B₁: How significant were the contracted objectives in the opinion of triad members?; and (2) B₂: Were original objectives met?
B1. How significant were the contracted objectives in the opinion of the triad members? The contracted objectives in Phase I resulted from the Planning (What) process (4.0 to 7.0) wherein each triad rated its objectives on a 3-point scale. Of the seventy objectives set collectively by the nine triads, fifty-four percent were rated of high priority (3), forty percent of moderate priority (2), and only six percent low priority. Not only, overall, were fifty-four percent of the objectives rated as high priority, but the proportion of high priority objectives in individual student's programs ranged from thirty-three percent to eighty percent, indicating that each student teacher set a substantial number of significant objectives.

While the system of rating the significance of objectives may be criticized because of the rater's involvement in the objective-setting activity, some examples will suggest that the objectives set were indeed significant. Those objectives rated as high priority are typical of major activities in most student teacher programs. For example, developing a unit of study that uses a variety of instructional approaches and materials was an important objective for most student teachers, as was assuming full responsibility for a classes instruction for three to five days.

Most of the remaining objectives in each student teacher's program were rated moderate in priority. One example objective in this category would be to understand and use basic principles of classroom
management, demonstrating an ability to work with both large and small groups of children in a variety of activities, using a firm, but supportive, and positive manner. Even the low priority objectives were non-trivial, if somewhat more narrow or peripheral. Developing skills and demonstrating an ability to operate a full range of audio-visual and school equipment and integrating the use of this equipment into classroom planning serves as an example of the lowest priority category.

\[ B_2: \text{Were original objectives met?} \] The previous information has suggested that the objectives that were contracted by the triad were, in fact, significant. The evidence associated with the first overarching question suggests that the process used to assist the student teacher accomplish each objective worked reasonably well. Next, the outcome of the process merits description.

Of the seventy objectives originally contracted by all the student teachers, cooperating teachers and supervisor, eighty-six percent were completed. Of the ten objectives not completed, seven were rated high in priority and three moderate in priority. Four of the nine student teachers did not complete objectives. Three of these student teachers continued their programs during the January intersession in order to finish. For example, all three planned to assume full responsibility during that month for planning all classroom activities for a week. The other student teacher continued working toward completion of the objectives the following semester as her cooperating teacher's aide.
Discussion

In criticizing objective-based programs for objectives that are insignificant and for an exclusive reliance on goal attainment, Hacker (1971) commented, "Reduced reliance on easily quantified goals and reduced emphasis upon goal attainment would open the way to serious consideration of objectives which are worthwhile and significant" (p. 2). Goal-setting research has also indicated that when subjects were obligated to set goals, their levels of performance increased most on difficult tasks (Fryer, 1963), and that the higher the goal, the higher the level of performance (Locke and Bryan, 1967).

Presumably a rating of objectives set in this program by independent judges would similarly identify a substantial number of the actual objectives as highly worthwhile. Incentive to set challenging and significant objectives was apparent, as seen by the examples of student teachers developing their own units of study and assuming total responsibility for the classroom for a period of time.

In the present study, relatively more emphasis was placed on goal-setting and related planning in Phases I and II than on evaluation of performance in Phases III and IV. Evaluation was utilized primarily as input to further planning.

The student teachers challenged themselves with difficult and time-consuming objectives; nonetheless, seven-eighths of the objectives were completed, despite the deemphasis on appraisal. It is apparent that the student teachers felt, to some degree, a personal
commitment to the completion of the objectives. Hacker's prediction about the relationship between worthwhile goals and deemphasis of goal attainment thus seems to have been borne out by the results of the present study.

The Application of Hersey and Blanchard
Situational Leadership Model to Supervision of Student Teachers

Question C: How Well Did the Hersey and Blanchard Model of Situational Leadership Apply to the Supervision of Student Teachers?

In analyzing how well the Hersey and Blanchard model of situational leadership applied to the supervision of student teachers, six specific questions were answered:

(1) C₁: What is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers?
   i. Pre- and post-means on each quadrant
   ii. Match in dominance

(2) C₂: Is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers similar to that observed in other helping professions?
(3) C₃: What happens over the course of the study to participants' responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range, and Effectiveness?

(4) C₄: Is there a distribution of responses on the part of all respondents in the Task Relevant Maturity form?
   i. What styles are selected on the TRM?
   ii. What is the percent of agreed upon styles on the TRM and final MBO/Leadership contract?

(5) C₅: Did the cooperating teacher and supervisor use the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher?

(6) C₆: How effective was utilizing the Teacher Concerns Checklist in the process of supervising student teachers?
   i. When high self-concerns are considered, is a high relationship style agreed upon more frequently than a low relationship style?
ii. Is there a more varied distribution in suggested and contracted leadership styles for student teachers who are more mature and who have lower self-concerns?

The LEAD instrument, Task Relevant Maturity form, MBO/Contract, the Teacher Concerns Checklist, and final interviews all served as data collection sources in answering the preceding questions.

C. What is the distribution of leadership styles selected on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers?

i. Pre- and post-means on each quadrant

ii. Match in dominance

As described in Chapter III, there are two forms of the LEAD—the LEAD-Self and the LEAD-Other. The cooperating teachers completed a pre- and post-test administration of the LEAD-Self, while each student teacher completed pre- and post-test administrations of the LEAD-Other. In completing the LEAD-Other, each student teacher was asked to select for each twelve situations one of four possible actions that they believed was an appropriate behavior for the leader being described. Each of the four alternative actions is consistent with one of the four leadership styles represented by the quadrants of the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership—High Task/Low Relationship (HT/LR) in
Quadrant 1; High Task/High Relationship (HT/HR) in Quadrant 2; High Relationship/Low Task (HR/LT) in Quadrant 3; or Low Relationship/Low Task (LR/LT) in Quadrant 4. A respondent may choose behaviors that are representative of all four leadership styles or of fewer style responses.

The mean number and percent of responses on the pre- and post-test are presented in Table 4.1. As indicated in the table, the cooperating teachers' dominant style or the quadrant in which the most responses fell was High Task/High Relationship on both administrations of the LEAD-Self. The student teachers also perceived the cooperating teacher's dominant style as High Task/High Relationship or both occasions.

The data also show a distribution of styles on the part of both the cooperating teacher and student teacher on both occasions. The cooperating teacher had two supporting styles, styles chosen at least seventeen percent of the time (Inderlied, 1975). These styles were High Relationship/Low Task and High Task/Low Relationship. Data from the student teachers, however, suggested that the cooperating teacher had one supporting style—High Relationship/Low Task. Neither identified Low Task/Low Relationship as a style the cooperating teacher would use with much frequency. According to the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership, the perceived dominant style of High Task/High Relationship is appropriate for working with low to moderately mature people.
Table 4.1

Perceptions Expressed by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers
About Cooperating Teachers' Leadership Style in Various
Situations on the LEAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant/Leadership Style</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Mean Number (Percent) of Responses&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 HT/LR</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HT/HR</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HR/LT</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LR/LT</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Pre and post measurements were only available on 8 cooperating teachers and 8 student teachers.
The student teachers' post-test scores indicate an additional supporting style for the cooperating teacher (Quadrant 4). While High Task/High Relationship is still the perceived dominant style, there is a notable shift in the student teacher data away from High Task/High Relationship toward Low Relationship/Low Task.

In summary, both groups' perceptions of their cooperating teachers' dominant leadership style remained the same at the completion of the study as at the outset. The cooperating teachers' responses on the post-test showed almost as great a preference for High Relationship/Low Task, however, suggesting a shift to a higher quadrant as the student teachers' maturity increased. The student teachers also perceived the cooperating teachers as retaining a pre-dominant style of High Relationship/High Task, but indicated that the teacher moved in the direction of Style 4—Low Relationship/Low Task. The data indicates a match in dominance with some similarity in supporting styles.

$C_2$: Is the distribution of leadership styles on the LEAD by cooperating teachers and student teachers similar to that observed in other helping professions? Data similar to some of that gathered in the present study were available for two groups in the helping professions. A study conducted by Johnson (1976) on Nursing leadership compared self-concepts, leadership style and leadership effectiveness of Head Nurses and their nursing staff. LEAD scores were also analyzed from a study conducted by Inderlied (1975) that documented
the application of both MBO and situational leadership contracting system between a lab director and graduate students in a cell biology research/laboratory. In each study, data were collected from both leaders and followers using the appropriate LEAD questionnaire.

For comparison purposes, post-test data were used in the student teaching and University laboratory situation, because interpersonal leader-follower relationships had not been definitely established at the outset of the studies. In these two studies, the participants had training in working with the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership; the post-test results reflect this training as well as familiarity by followers with the leaders' styles. In the case of the hospital nurses, no training was provided, and the LEAD instruments were administered once.

Comparisons between the LEAD instrument scores for these three groups may be made by inspecting Table 4.2. As previously indicated, the cooperating teachers viewed themselves as having a dominant leadership style of High Task/High Relationship and the student teachers concurred. The cooperating teachers' range of leadership styles includes High Task/High Relationship; High Relationship/Low Task; and High Task/Low Relationship. They tend to see themselves rarely using a Low Task/Low Relationship leadership style.

The student teachers saw the cooperating teachers having a distribution of styles across all four leadership styles. In addition to viewing the cooperating teachers as having a High Task/High
Table 4.2

Mean Number of Quadrant Choices and Overall Effectiveness Ratings for Leaders and Followers in Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant/Leadership Style</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>Student Teaching Dyads Cooperating Teachers (n=8)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Student Teachers (n=8)</th>
<th>Diff. Score</th>
<th>Hospital Nurses Head Nurses (n=22)</th>
<th>Nursing Staff (n=158)</th>
<th>Diff. Score</th>
<th>Univ. Research Lab. Laboratory Director (n=1)</th>
<th>Graduate Assistants (n=7)</th>
<th>Diff. Score</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HT/LR</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HT/HR</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HR/LT</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LR/LT</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effectiveness Rating</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Pre and post measurements were only available on 8 cooperating teachers and 8 student teachers.
Relationship style, the student teachers tend to view the cooperating teachers as using a Low Task/Low Relationship style more frequently than the cooperating teachers do themselves. In the effectiveness rating, the cooperating teachers had a somewhat higher overall effectiveness rating in selecting appropriate leadership styles for various situations than did student teachers. Many similarities may be observed in the data from the three leader-follower dyads. All three groups of "leaders" view themselves as having a dominant leadership style of High Task/High Relationship as do their "followers." In addition, the range of styles for all the leaders was quite similar and included High Task/High Relationship; High Relationship/Low Task; and, for two of the groups, High Task/Low Relationship. None of the groups perceived themselves to make much use of the low Relationship/Low Task style. A High Task/High Relationship style was the dominant style indicated by the student teachers, nursing staff and graduate assistants. Each group of followers chose the High Relationship/Low Task style as the next most used by their leaders; they also tended to view the "leaders" as adopting a style of Low Relationship/Low Task more frequently. Overall effectiveness ratings indicate that the leaders adapted their styles better to various situations than did their subordinates.

There is a substantial similarity, then, in the data from the three groups. Leaders and followers in these "helping profession" groups predominantly utilize leadership styles 2--High Task/High
Relationship—and 3—High Relationship/Low Task—in working with subordinates.

C.3: What happens over the course of the study to participants' responses to the LEAD in terms of Dominance, Range, and Effectiveness? The preceding data from the LEAD have summarized particular groups' responses. In Table 4.3, the individual responses of cooperating teachers and student teachers on the pre- and post-test administrations of the LEAD are identified with respect to dominance and range of styles.

Initially, all student teachers, and all but one cooperating teacher, perceived the leaders' dominant styles as High Task/High Relationship or as that style in addition to another—a style that is appropriate for working with low to moderately mature people, according to the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership. Six individual student teachers saw the cooperating teacher as still using Style 2, which is theoretically appropriate for working with low to moderately mature people; however, two student teachers now believed that their cooperating teachers were using Style 4, Low Relationship/Low Task, an appropriate style for highly mature student teachers.

The cooperating teachers also perceived their range of styles to be more limited by the end of the semester. Seven had initially utilized a full range of styles in response to the LEAD questions, compared to only four in the post-administration of the LEAD. The student teachers, however, indicated that they perceived the cooperating
Table 4.3

Characteristics of Responses of Cooperating and Student Teachers on Two Administrations of the LEAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Selected Leadership Styles</th>
<th>No. of Cooperating Teachers (n=8)</th>
<th>No. of Student Teachers (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 2 (shared)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style 4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Styles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Styles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Styles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aPre and post measurements were only available on 8 cooperating teachers and 8 student teachers.*
teachers' range of styles as increasing over the course of the semester and seven of the eight student teachers perceived their cooperating teachers as having a range of three or four styles.

A full range of styles is not always necessary, as Hersey and Blanchard (1972) point out; there is no all-purpose template for ideal styles. "Successful leaders are those who can adapt their behavior to meet the demands of their own unique environment" (Hersey and Blanchard, 1974, p. 6). Thus, style range is not as relevant to effectiveness as style adaptability. In the present study, no attempt was made to rate the effectiveness of the adaptations that apparently were made to particular student teaching situations. Overall effectiveness scores on the LEAD, however, diminished for both groups from the pre- to post-test administration: for the cooperating teachers—9.3 and 7.9—and for the student teacher—6.7 and 6.6.

The preceding results indicate that possibly in a student teaching situation the use of four styles is unnecessary. Not only were the predominate styles found in Quadrants 2 and 3, but there was also a limited range of styles utilized. Accompanied by the diminution also in effectiveness scores over the semester, the data tend to support the conclusion that cooperating teachers' style preference became focussed on the two High Relationship styles.

C. Is there a distribution of responses on the part of all respondents on the Task Relevant Maturity form?

i. What styles are selected on the TRM?
ii. What is the percent of agreed upon
styles on the TRM and final MBO/
Leadership contract?

In the process of developing an MBO/Leadership contract, each
student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor completed a
Task Relevant Maturity form. Along with listing each objective, the
cooperating teacher and supervisor rated the student teacher on what
they perceived to be his/her ability, willingness, and prior experi-
ence to perform each contracted objective, while the student teacher
rated himself/herself on the same areas. The rating process by each
member of the triad resulted in identification of a leadership style
that, according to the situational leadership model, was appropriate
to assume for the particular objectives. Through discussion of the
reasons for selection of various styles, one, or, if necessary, two
styles were contracted.

Table 4.4 indicates the number and percent of individual styles
chosen on the TRM by the cooperating teachers, student teachers, and
supervisors for the sixty-one separate objectives.

According to the Life Cycle Theory, then, participants perceived
the student teachers as having low to average maturity on all the
contracted objectives. Members of the triads almost exclusively chose
Quadrant 2—High Task/High Relationship (89 choices)—and Quadrant 3—
High Relationship/Low Task (82 choices)—as appropriate styles. This
uneven distribution of leadership styles on the part of the respondents
Table 4.4

Number and Percent of Individual Styles Chosen for Various Objectives on Task Relevant Maturity Form by Cooperating Teacher, Student Teacher and Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant/Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Cooperating Teachers (n=9)</th>
<th>Student Teachers (n=9)</th>
<th>Supervisor (n=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 HT/LR</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 HT/HR</td>
<td>28 (46)</td>
<td>26 (43)</td>
<td>35 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 HR/LT</td>
<td>28 (46)</td>
<td>31 (50)</td>
<td>23 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 LR/LT</td>
<td>4 (6)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Cooperating teachers, student teachers, and supervisor each selected styles for 61 separate objectives.
clearly indicates the desire for High Relationships. The pattern of participant responses is similar to that on the LEAD instrument but stronger in the emphasis of Quadrants 2 and 3.

In Table 4.5 is summarized the agreement among triad members on various appropriate leadership styles for particular objectives. The vast majority of dyads expressed more agreement than disagreement on style, while all three persons agreed forty-four percent of the time. These figures suggest that the TRM quickly identified areas of agreement, so that time at the MBO leadership contracting session could be devoted to reaching consensus in remaining areas.

The styles finally selected were principally the High Relationship styles. However, for a number of objectives, more than one style was contracted. For instance, if an objective included a variety of activities, styles could be established appropriate to each.

Two contracted initially for one style—coupled with five triads who contracted for Styles 2 and 3 exclusively, with a combination of styles for three separate objectives. Only two triads contracted for three styles—S2, 3 and 4. In only two instances out of the total sixty-one objectives was Style 1—High Task/Low Relationship—considered appropriate. In both of these cases, the TRM scores had indicated a low maturity and a lack of knowledge about particular subject matter. A style of High Task behavior on the part of the cooperating teacher was agreed to, with the supervisor supplying a
Table 4.5

Percent Agreement Between Cooperating Teacher, Student Teacher and Supervisor

on Task Relevant Maturity Form and Contracted Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triad</th>
<th>Number of Objectives</th>
<th>Percent Agreement Among Dyad or Triad</th>
<th>Quadrant/Leadership Styles</th>
<th>Finally Contracted for Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S-CT</td>
<td>S-ST</td>
<td>ST-CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High Relationship style with the two student teachers. Such a division of supervisory leadership, it should be noted, provides the equivalent overall leadership of Style 2. Also, in all contracting sessions, there existed an understanding that as the student teachers' maturity (performance) improved, the cooperating teacher and supervisor would begin to reduce their task behavior.

C5: Did the cooperating teacher and supervisor use the contracted leadership style in working with the student teacher? At the final interview, the preceding question was discussed by all members of the triad. Two of the nine cooperating teachers believed they consciously operated with the contracted styles and indicated changing styles to meet the students' particular needs. For instance, when their student teachers worked in new subject matter, they did consciously change their style to one that matched the students' needs, even though it was not always preferred by the cooperating teacher.

Seven cooperating teachers suggested that to varying degrees they did not consciously follow a particular leadership style. All seven said they operated from Styles 2 and 3 naturally—High Task/High Relationship and High Relationship/Low Task—and that this proved sufficient in working with their student teachers. One teacher commented, "I initially worked with a High Task/High Relationship style and only consciously changed my style to fit the student teacher's objectives after our group meetings. I then identified what style I had to use, although in most cases I was using it." Another
cooperating teacher commented that only when the supervisor put "labels" on the style did she then consciously change her behavior. Five of the teachers attributed the lack of range in their styles to a good "match" with their student teacher. All seven, therefore, seemed to perceive their style as appropriate for the student teacher, although knowing about the various styles did raise their "consciousness levels" and make them more aware of their behaviors.

The seven student teachers who worked with these cooperating teachers were satisfied with the styles of their teacher and supervisor but emphasized that the flexibility of the model was an advantage. One commented, "Since I had two people working to help in completing my objectives, I could get a lot of support from my supervisor and task direction from my teacher."

All nine student teachers indicated that their cooperating teachers did not really "talk the jargon" to them but felt that their knowing what was expected may have been helpful in leading to appropriate behavior.

The supervisor found it easier to attend to particular styles which had been contracted since he was not always in the classroom. Being able to "come and go" allowed him the privilege of adjusting styles to meet the needs of various student teachers. The supervisor perceived this as a time-saving method to his supervision because of the pre-arranged leadership style. For example, when the supervisor worked with a particular student teacher, he knew what his/her needs
were, what leadership was needed from him and just what his/her expectations were of him.

Although the majority of cooperating teachers perceived themselves as not consciously using the contracted leadership style, the style they did use was apparently effective, as indicated in an eighty-six percent completion rate of all objectives. Perhaps the fact that in just contracting for the style, everyone was aware of what needed to be done. The student teachers were, for the most part, satisfied with their cooperating teachers' style and felt that they were given more responsibility as they gained classroom experience.

The supervisor perceived a benefit to contracting leadership style in the time which he saved in directly working with each student teacher.

C6: How effective was utilizing the Teacher Concerns Checklist in the process of supervising student teachers?

i. When high self-concerns are considered, is a High Relationship style agreed upon more frequently than a Low Relationship style?

ii. Is there a more varied distribution in suggested and contracted leadership styles for student teachers who are more mature and who have lower self-concerns?
The Teacher Concerns Checklist (TCC) was administered to all the student teachers at the beginning seminar (1.2) and was utilized in the contracting session as an indicator of student teacher readiness to assume responsibility for particular objectives and to guide the choices of leadership style. The concern of the supervisor was that if the TCC indicated a student teacher has high self-concerns, then in contracting for leadership style a high relationship style must be provided.

Results from the TCC identified three student teachers with relatively high self-concerns. Of the twenty-two objectives that they contracted, twenty-one leadership styles contracted called for high relationship on the part of either the cooperating teacher or supervisor. For the majority of these objectives, however, ratings on the TRM suggested a low relationship style, and the TCC data were utilized to "override" the TRM data.

It would also stand to reason that a student teacher who was perceived as more mature on his/her TRM would have a more varied distribution of leadership styles. The data collected bears this out. The only two student teachers who contracted for three styles of leadership had high scores on the same scales of the TCC and the TRM form, and were therefore two of the more mature student teachers of the study. For the remaining students, the TCC verified what had already been established through the use of the TRM form.
Discussion

The results gathered from the data instruments suggest a common thread--all participants in all situations primarily focused on two leadership styles--Style 2 (High Task/High Relationship) and Style 3 (High Relationship/Low Task). Through pre- and post-test administration of the LEAD to cooperating teachers and student teachers, and a comparison between the LEAD instrument scores for three groups involved in the helping profession, in addition to all the styles contracted by triad members on leadership contracts, the majority of the participants indicated a preference to these two styles.

With the majority of leadership styles, both perceived and contracted centering around Quadrants 2 and 3, it is possible that Quadrants 1 and 4 are not necessary in student teaching situations. Also, the LEAD instrument deliberately sets up Styles 1 and 4 for right answers. In an educational setting, it is more difficult to find situations where Styles 1 and 4 are appropriate. The Hersey and Blanchard situational leadership model is applicable to student teaching, as the data indicate. However, modifications are necessary to better adapt this theory into supervision in student teaching.
The Judgment of the Participants Regarding the Supervisory Process

Question D: Is the Process Practical and Effective in the Judgment of the Participants--Student Teachers, Cooperating Teachers, the Supervisor, and Administrative Personnel?

Given the information that the objectives were significant and that eighty-six percent of these objectives were completed, the preceding overarching question concerns itself with the participants' perceptions of the feasibility and of the contracting/supervisory process. Data were obtained through final interviews, student teacher and cooperating teacher questionnaires, ratings on a supervisor appraisal form, and the developer's log of events throughout the process. Specific questions posed include: (1) \( D_1 \): How much time was required of each participant involved in the contracting/supervisory process?; (2) \( D_2 \): What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and an administrator regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process?; (3) \( D_3 \): Did the contracting/supervisory process allow for more contact and positive feeling between the cooperating teacher, student teacher, and supervisor, than recorded in the program last year when the process was not used?; and (4) \( D_4 \): Is there any evidence in the semester following the study that the participants, their colleagues, or the APEP program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process?
D1: How much time was required of each participant involved in this contracting/supervisory process? Table 4.6 indicates the time allocated for each supervisory event in which various participants were involved. In the table, the "Flow Chart Number" is referenced to Figure 3.1 in which "Event" in the MBO/Leadership approach is diagramed. The "Participants" in each event are then identified. "Time Spent" refers to the time spent directly by a participant in an event. For example, in event 1.2, the time spent by all the student teachers and the supervisor was three hours. "Time (Allowed)" refers to the time period allowed participants to complete an event. For example, in event 3.0, the individual student or cooperating teacher worked alone on setting objectives and was allowed four days in which to formulate this list. "Timeline" refers to the particular week or weeks in which each event occurred.

Although Table 4.6 supplies a detailed account of time spent or allowed participants in this contracting/supervisory process, the additional organizational time required by the supervisor is not listed. The time logged by the supervisor in organizing, planning, and implementing the MBO/Leadership approach during the first six weeks was thirty hours. With the establishment of the MBO/Leadership contract, twenty hours per week was sufficient time for the supervisor to accomplish the contracted tasks for the remaining ten weeks. Therefore, a total of approximately three hundred and eighty semester hours was spent in direct and indirect supervision of nine student teachers,
### Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart No.</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Who Participates&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Tire Spent (Allowed) for Event</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Individual Meetings (Orientation)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>(3 days)</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Seminar (Orientation)</td>
<td>Xall X</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Large Group Meeting (Brainstorm Objectives)</td>
<td>Xall Xall X</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Individual Alone (Set Objectives)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>(4 days)</td>
<td>Week 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 to 7.0</td>
<td>Triad Meeting (Complete MBO Contract)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Week 3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Large Group Meeting (Leadership Workshop)</td>
<td>Xall Xall X</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>Individual Alone (Develop TRM)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>(4 days)</td>
<td>Week 4 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0 to 12.0</td>
<td>Triad Meeting (Establish MBO/Leadership Contract)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>2 1/2 hours</td>
<td>Week 6 or 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>Implementing Contract&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (Planning, Teaching, Observing, Critiquing)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>(4 to 5 weeks)</td>
<td>Weeks 6 to 10, 11, or 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 to 16.0</td>
<td>Triad Meeting (Assessment of Progress)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>Week 10, 11, or 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0 to 20.0</td>
<td>Triad Meeting (Review Performance)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>Week 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>An "X" denotes that participation was on an individual basis for each person in the category. Joint participation of all members of the category is indicated with "Xall".

<sup>b</sup>An "X" denotes in this event that dyad meetings were held between Supervisor and Student Teacher, Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher, and Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher, as well as all three together.

---

**Table 4.6**

**Time Allocated to Various Events in Contracting Process Using MBO/Leadership Approach**

*Flow Chart No.*

- 1.1: Individual Meetings (Orientation)
- 1.2: Seminar (Orientation)
- 2.0: Large Group Meeting (Brainstorm Objectives)
- 3.0: Individual Alone (Set Objectives)
- 4.0 to 7.0: Triad Meeting (Complete MBO Contract)
- 8.0: Large Group Meeting (Leadership Workshop)
- 9.0: Individual Alone (Develop TRM)
- 10.0 to 12.0: Triad Meeting (Establish MBO/Leadership Contract)
- 13.0: Implementing Contract<sup>b</sup> (Planning, Teaching, Observing, Critiquing)
- 14.0 to 16.0: Triad Meeting (Assessment of Progress)
- 18.0 to 20.0: Triad Meeting (Review Performance)

*Who Participates<sup>a</sup>*

- ST: Supervisor
- CT: Cooperating Teacher
- S: Student Teacher

*Timeline*

- Week 1
- Week 2
- Week 3 or 4
- Week 4 or 5
- Week 6 or 7
- Weeks 6 to 10, 11, or 12
- Week 10, 11, or 12
- Week 16
for an average time of forty-two hours for each student teacher. It should be noted that the proximity of the University to the public school where the student teachers worked did not make travel time a factor, and it was, therefore, insignificant to the study.

Through the Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaires, additional information was gathered about the distribution of the supervisor's time among various roles. In the specific question, each student teacher and each cooperating teacher was asked to identify three out of nine aspects of direct supervision on which they perceived the supervisor directly spending the most time. Perceptions of the two groups were quite different, as Table 4.7 indicates. Perhaps the cooperating teachers indicated "Coordinating," "Observing/Critiquing," and to a less extent "Interpersonal Facilitating," as the areas where the supervisor spent most of the time, because these are aspects of the supervisor's role which they could observe. Most student teachers, on the other hand, perceived the supervisor providing time with "Socio-Emotional Support," "Observing/Critiquing" and to a lesser degree "Personal Counseling." The greater variability among student responses suggest perhaps that particular time spent with various student teachers was adapted to meet individual needs. Also noteworthy is the fact that none of the participants in either group perceived the supervisor spending a major amount of time functioning as a "Resource Broker," and there was only one person in either group who saw the supervisor committing time to "Job Counseling."
Table 4.7

Percentage of Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers

Indicating Major Allotment of Time by Supervisor to Various Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Roles</th>
<th>% of Cooperating Teachers (n = 9)</th>
<th>% of Student Teachers (n = 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing/Critiquing</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Facilitating</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Emotional Support</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Broker</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Job Counseling</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting School/Community Relations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Each participant was requested to select the three direct supervisory functions in which the supervisor spent the most time. Percentages do not add up to 300% because several participants did not check three items.
At the outset of the study, four conceptual bases were stated for the study: (1) Management by Objectives; (2) Supervision in a triadic relationship; (3) Research on student teacher concerns; and (4) A Model for situational leadership developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. The responses to the survey suggested that indeed the developer implemented his interest to incorporate the Cogan/Goldhammer model of clinical supervision into the process, address the socio-emotional needs of the student teachers through Fuller's concerns checklist, identify and act upon common problems in a triadic relationship, and coordinate the efforts of all the participants through a management and leadership approach to supervision. On the other hand, other traditional roles of a supervisor, such as a "Resource Broker," were not represented in participant perceptions of the way the supervisor allocated his time.

D2: What is the appraisal of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, and administration regarding the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process? Data from each of the three groups were elicited from interviews regarding the overall effectiveness of the process as well as on the effectiveness of the supervisor in filling various roles.

The majority of teachers' comments regarding the contracting/supervisory process was positive. All nine of the cooperating teachers responded that the process's most important function was to allow for open communication between all participants. Four of the
nine cooperating teachers stated that the process helped them to stay focused on the specific needs of their student teachers, while six of the nine teachers felt the contracting process useful in delineating responsibilities between the supervisor, student teacher and themselves. One teacher suggested that the contract was helpful to her in reminding the student teacher of her commitments, while still another teacher saw the "beauty" of the process in its situational approach to each objective. A cooperating teacher summarized her opinions of the process saying, "In my five years of working with student teachers, this was the best form of supervision used with a student teacher with whom I have been involved." One of the nine cooperating teachers, however, reserved final judgment on the total process until she had the opportunity to work with another student teacher. Still another teacher felt that the contract placed too much pressure on her to make the student teacher complete each task.

The nine student teachers agreed that the process was effective in guiding them towards completion of their objectives. They felt that the time lapse between setting objectives and contracting for leadership styles allowed them the opportunity to become familiar with their new roles in the classroom. Seven of the nine student teachers indicated an advantage in knowing the style of leadership contracted by their cooperating teacher and supervisor. They felt it gave them better insights into their leaders' behavior while working with them on particular objectives. The remaining two student
teachers were already familiar with their cooperating teachers' style, as they had worked together prior to the intern stage.

The assistant principal, who has major responsibility to coordinate student teacher programs in the school, felt that the process allowed him more time to concentrate on other aspects of his job, such as program planning and teacher evaluation. He perceived the process as helpful in identifying specific needs of student teachers and in concentrating the efforts of all participants on particular objectives.

Through a Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher Questionnaire, each participant was asked to rate on a 5-point scale the supervisor's effectiveness in nine traditional supervisory roles. Table 4.8 displays the modal ratings of the two groups on each question. The student teachers tended to perceive the supervisor's effectiveness as high in most categories. The cooperating teachers perceived the supervisor's effectiveness as high in coordinating activities and ranked as fairly high roles of "Facilitating, Supporting and Promoting School/Community Relationships." These activities had also been perceived by teachers as ones to which the supervisor allocated a major portion of his time. No complaints were forthcoming from either group regarding a lack of effort or effectiveness on the part of the supervisor regarding any function.

D3: Did the contracting/supervisory process allow for more contact and positive feeling between the cooperating teacher, student
Table 4.8

Modal Ratings on a 5-Point Scale by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers Regarding Effectiveness of Supervisor Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Roles</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher (n = 9)</th>
<th>Student Teacher (n = 9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing/Critiquing</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Facilitating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Emotional Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Broker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Job Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting School/Community Relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teacher, and supervisor than recorded in the program last year when
the process was not used? The data gathered to answer this question
were obtained from a Supervisor Appraisal Form developed by the APEP
program and initially administered to all cooperating teachers and
their student teachers during the preceding spring semester. The
student and cooperating teachers, working with a variety of super-
visors, were asked to appraise the performance of the supervisor who
had been working with them that semester. The same Supervisor
Appraisal Form was administered again at the close of the fall semes-
ter to some of the same, as well as other, cooperating teachers and a
different group of student teachers. The eighteen student and coop-
erating teachers contributing data in the fall had all participated
in the MBO/Leadership approach to supervision.

The appraisal form used by the program was not developed to make
actual quantification of the responses possible. However, the
existence of the slash in the center of each continuum makes it possi-
ble to categorize each response as strong, neutral or weak. In
Appendix I, responses to the Supervisor Appraisal Form for both spring
and fall semesters are tallied in the positions marked by student and
cooperating teachers. In Table 4.9, these data are summarized in
dichotomous form for each supervisory characteristic.

There is a considerable difference in the responses of the spring
and fall groups to this appraisal form. In the fall semester, all but
one cooperating teacher rated the supervisor's performance as strong
Table 4.9

Percent of Categorical Responses by Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers to Supervisor Appraisal Form in Spring and Fall Semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Characteristics</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Spring (No Program)</th>
<th>Spring (MBO/Leadership Approach)</th>
<th>Fall (MBO/Leadership Approach)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT (n=13)</td>
<td>ST (n=6)</td>
<td>CT (n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Feedback</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral/Weak</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/Problem</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral/Weak</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshalling Resources</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral/Weak</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching/Educational Scene</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral/Weak</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on each supervisory characteristic. In the spring semester, approximately two-thirds of the student teachers rated their supervisors as strong, while the majority of the cooperating teachers rated their supervisors as neutral or weak in providing these supervisory services.

Although many variables must be accounted for in interpreting data such as these, including the personalities of each supervisor and the sample of individuals responding to the two forms, the data, when used in conjunction with other data, provided additional support for the MBO/Leadership approach in the supervision of student teachers.

$D_4$: Is there any evidence in the semester following the study that the participants, their colleagues, or the APEP program wished to continue or adopt the contracting/supervisory process? Data to answer this question came from two sources—final interviews of all participants and the supervisor's log reporting teacher, administration or program-initiated contacts.

All of the nine cooperating teachers who took part in the study said they would continue to use this process of supervision in the following semester if they were assigned a student teacher. The nine also commented that even if assigned to another school they would try to continue with the contracting process. Seven of the nine cooperating teachers stated, though, that they would need assistance and support from a supervisor. One of the seven remarked, "I will continue with this process because it blends naturally with my own style and it
is an added benefit to have in working with a student teacher."

Of the nine student teachers, the six who were graduating that semester indicated their intention of utilizing the process with future pupils in the classroom through initially analyzing the child's social, emotional, or academic needs and then developing individual contracts with appropriate styles of leadership for each child. Four of the six also expressed a desire to "indoctrinate" their future administrators in this contracting/supervisory process as a way to assist them in the classroom.

The supervisor was also approached at the close of the semester by two classroom teachers who had not worked with the contracting/supervisory process but who had heard about the approach and wanted to utilize it with student teachers the following semester.

In addition, the administration in the public school, where this contracting/supervisory approach was utilized, had, in previous years, operated under an MBO contracting system with all its personnel. The process of contracting leadership styles, patterned after the supervisory model, was adopted by them in late November, as the present study neared completion. The contracting/supervisory process was also described in an updated APEP Handbook as a suggested model for future supervisors in the program to follow.

Discussion

The data gathered from several sources has indicated acceptance of this contracting/supervisory approach. Although the supervisor's
total time during the semester averaged forty-two hours per student, this amount of time is not excessive in terms of an expanded clinical supervision model. Some of the organizational time required of the supervisor during the first six weeks, as well as the time spent in initial training activities, would likely decrease during following semesters as cooperating teachers developed skills and adjustments were made in meeting attendance. There were no complaints by the cooperating teachers or student teachers as to the time required of them in the contracting/supervisory process. A concern was expressed, however, about the excessive number of forms which had to be completed and kept track of.

The student and cooperating teachers perceived the allocation of time by the supervisor to various roles quite differently. The cooperating teachers perceived the supervisor as having a quite visible role in the classroom, while the student teachers who varied more in their perceptions suggested that time was devoted to meeting their individual needs.

All the student teachers and most cooperating teachers saw the process as effective. Both groups rated the supervisor's effectiveness as fairly high to high in most categories, and no complaints about the supervisor's effort or effectiveness were registered regarding any function.

Also, in all but one case, the participants rated the supervisor's performance as strong during the fall semester. Compared with ratings
of other supervisors given by cooperating teachers and student teachers in the spring semester, those gathered during the semester in which the present study was conducted are higher.

When asked whether they would continue with this process in the future, the majority of participants responded positively. In combining all data that have been accumulated, there exists strong support for the MBO/Leadership approach on the supervision of student teachers.

This chapter has reported and discussed the findings of the study. It was divided into four sections, addressing four overarching questions. Specific sub-questions were stated and answered. Each section concluded with a discussion of the data applying to each overarching question.

Chapter V will provide conclusions and recommendations for further studies.
Conclusions

The primary purpose of the present study was to develop and test a scheme for supervision in the triad involving the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor, integrating four conceptual bases: (1) management by objectives; (2) supervision in a triadic relationship; (3) research on student teacher concerns; and (4) Life Cycle Theory, a model for situational leadership developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard. A secondary purpose was to examine the fit of the situational leadership model to the requirements of the student teaching situation. The multi-faceted approach to supervision developed and tested in the present study emphasized triad interaction in the planning phase.

The four-phase process of supervision was formulated from an analysis of relevant literature. The innovation did incorporate the study's conceptual bases into the planning, implementing, and appraising phases of the model. The Planning Phases (How and What) blended an MBO and situational leadership approach, relying on prior training of cooperating teachers and student teachers in the former process and providing new training for the two groups in the latter technique.
Student teacher concerns were also identified and dealt with in these two phases. Clinical supervision techniques were utilized during the implementation phase.

The evaluation and general impression of all participants indicated that this contracting/supervisory process did, indeed, work. Synthesis of the data reported in Chapter IV indicates that the process worked satisfactorily, with few changes recommended; that the outcomes reached by members of the triad were both significant and similar to the goals which had been set; and finally, in the judgment of participants and others, the supervisory process was useful and satisfactory, and an improvement over supervision of student teachers in the school prior to the semester in which the present study was conducted.

The key findings of the study, each of which will be elaborated on, relate to the importance of planning in the supervisory process, the essential nature of good communication between the cooperating teacher and college supervisor, the success of the idea of training teachers in situational leadership techniques, and the limited range of leadership styles apparently needed in a student teaching environment.

The literature suggested that planning was a key aspect of the student teaching supervisory process. The logic of the reasoning for allocating a large portion of time to planning is emphasized by Hacker (1971), who recommends that planning rather than evaluation
strategies be emphasized. He suggests that by so doing, participants tend to experiment with more meaningful and significant objectives. The study's data verify this fact.

Literature related to problems inherent in teacher education programs also indicated that college/school communication, particularly at the cooperating teacher/student level, needed careful attention. A main strategy utilized in this model was to spend a substantial amount of time in triad interaction at various scheduled meetings. This strategy was employed with the assumption that if good communications and trust among members could be established, if status and recognition could be provided for each person, and if all needs could be served as a three member group, then success would follow during the implementation phase when dyad interaction predominated. The data collected suggest that the careful analysis of student competencies and needs in the planning phases that occurred during the first six weeks of the term helped ensure the student teachers' growth and development and realization of their objectives. Because of the time spent in the planning phases, appraisal during the remainder of the semester became almost perfunctory, and was utilized primarily as an input to further planning.

Another successful feature of the study was in the area of training. One problem that initially confronted the author was the cooperating teachers' lack of prior supervisory training in any technique other than management by objectives. Their ability to
perform the particular role required by the situational leadership technique called for staff development activities. Also, although the sample of cooperating teachers was operating within a school with a performance objectives program, and was also periodically developing MBO contracts with the administration, they were inexperienced in developing appropriate objectives for student teachers. The significance of Phase II of the process was the choice of training teachers in situational leadership techniques, rather than providing training in other supervisory techniques. The situational leadership model gave them a chance to think of how their behavior was appropriate or inappropriate in relation to their student teachers. The self-focussing effect of the Hersey and Blanchard technique perhaps makes a person introspective and thus more humanistic and less mechanical in their application of the supervisory techniques.

The striking fact regarding the leadership data is the seeming inappropriateness of both styles calling for low relationships, a finding similar to that of Blumberg (1974), whose four-fold categorization of styles is not unlike that of the Life Cycle Theory (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Although the leadership model in use provided four styles for cooperating teachers and supervisor to choose and implement in supervision of the student teacher, only two styles were used with much frequency. In striving to develop a productive helping relationship between the cooperating teacher, supervisor, and student teacher, the inclination of both leaders in working with the student teacher
was not to use a low relationship style, nor did the student teachers request that such styles be used. Blumberg (1974) also reported that perceived productivity was greater for supervisory styles that provided communicative supportiveness and an empathetic relationship. This need for a style of consistent high relationships is perhaps an occupational trait of teachers and/or supervisors working in what is perceived as a helping profession. Studies utilizing Life Cycle Theory in other helping relationship areas (Inderlied, 1975; Johnson, 1976) likewise showed overwhelming choice and use of high relationship styles. In contracting sessions, the concerns raised by members were towards the degrees of "taskiness," not "relationships," needed to accomplish the objectives. Perhaps the assumption should be made that in a learning situation, as is the student teaching semester, low relationship styles are not appropriate; focus in supervision of student teaching should be on utilization of the two task styles, with high relationships considered a "given."

Recommendations for Future Studies

The present study was conducted in the context of one teacher education program and in one elementary school setting. Future studies must be conducted using a wider sampling of students, teachers, supervisors and teacher education programs. Such studies should be conducted using a somewhat revised supervisory process. Specific
recommendations gathered from participants suggest the following changes:

1. The Objective-Setting Conference form should be eliminated from the contracting process. It did not particularly benefit the supervisor in clarifying the objectives and only added to the number of forms already used in the contracting process. The combining of the MBO Focussing form and the MBO/Leadership Contract would also save time.

2. The Teacher Concerns Checklist should become an optional feature of the model, depending upon the availability of time and the perceived need for its incorporation into the process. If a decision were made to use the checklist, it could be better utilized in the supervisory process through administration of the form to both student and cooperating teachers at the beginning and middle of the semester. The supervisor would then receive a clearer picture of the concerns of each triad member and then better adjust his/her style and subsequent seminars and meetings to meet their needs. In-service workshops could also be established to assist the cooperating teachers. It is also important that perceived
concerns be shared and discussed among the triad members.

3. Additional time should be spent in training cooperating teachers and supervisors in clinical supervision techniques. If all triad members are familiar with this method, clinical supervision could become a "three-way venture." The MBO/Leadership Contract could be used as a format for all pre-observation and strategy planning sessions by the cooperating teacher, student teacher and supervisor. Following observation of the student teacher in the classroom, the triad would convene for a post-conference with renewed planning.

4. Optional attendance could be allowed for the leadership workshop. However, an appropriate booklet should be developed outlining leadership theory and its use in the contracting process with special attention being given to the use of the TRM form.

5. If the LEAD instrument is to be used in future teacher education studies, it must be rewritten to better describe supervisory relationships among individuals in educational settings.
In addition to these recommendations for future development and field testing of the supervisory process for student teaching, it would also be interesting to discover whether administrators in various educational settings will be able to utilize these contracting techniques, as cooperating teachers did in the classroom, for example, with a board of education, or with an administrative team of assistants. Interesting, too, would be the possible use of this contracting technique by cooperating teachers with their children and parents.

Continued research should also be directed towards the usefulness of the Hersey and Blanchard model as a leadership technique in the context of helping relationships in the educational field. Such research might determine whether variation on the relationship dimension has more utility in other supervisory situations than it did in the student teaching triad. In addition, the possibility of other situational leadership models working equally as well needs to be explored.

The present study was an exploratory, first stage, field test, successfully utilizing situational leadership in a supervisory process. Future research to discern why this process was effective and whether the success can be attributed to the MBO/Leadership model itself, or to particular components of the model, is needed.
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APPENDIX A

TEACHER CONCERNS CHECKLIST
Teacher Concerns Checklist

Frances F. Fuller
Gary D. Borich
Research and Development
Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas
at Austin

DIRECTIONS: This checklist is designed to explore what teachers are concerned about at different points in their careers. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his or her own concerns.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think they should be concerned about or expect to be concerned about in the future. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know only what you are actually concerned about NOW.

On the following pages you will find statements about some concerns you might have now. Read each statement. Then ask yourself: WHEN I THINK ABOUT TEACHING, AM I CONCERNED ABOUT THIS?

If you are not concerned about that now, or the statement does not apply, write the number “1” in the box.

If you are a little concerned, write the number “2” in the box.

If you are moderately concerned, write the number “3” in the box.

If you are very concerned, write the number “4” in the box.

And if you are totally preoccupied with the concern, write the number “5” in the box.

Be sure to answer every item. Begin by completing the following:

1. Name _______________________________ Male ______ Female ______ Age ______

2. Circle the one that best describes your teaching experience:

   1. No education courses and no formal classroom observation or teaching experience
   2. Education courses but no formal observation or teaching experience.
   3. Education courses and observation experience but no teaching
   4. Presently student teaching
   5. Completed student teaching
   6. Presently an inservice teacher

3. If you are a student: Freshman ______ Sophomore ______ Junior ______ Senior ______ Graduate ______

4. The grade level you plan to teach (if student) or are now teaching (if inservice):

   Preschool ______ Elementary ______ Junior High ______ Senior High ______
   College ______ Other ______

5. If currently teaching: Average number of students you teach per class: ______

copyright 1974 by F. F. Fuller and G. D. Borich
For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you now. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as accurate as you can.


☐ 1. Selecting and teaching content well
☐ 2. Whether the students really like me or not
☐ 3. Increasing students' feelings of accomplishment
☐ 4. Lack of freedom to initiate innovative instructional programs
☐ 5. The nature and quality of instructional materials
☐ 6. Too many students in each class
☐ 7. Motivating students to study
☐ 8. Lack of instructional materials
☐ 9. Rapid rate of curriculum and instructional change
☐ 10. Feeling under pressure too much of the time
☐ 11. Maintaining the appropriate degree of class control
☐ 12. Frustrated by the routine and inflexibility of the situation
☐ 13. The wide range of student achievement
☐ 14. Being in constant demand by students
☐ 15. Doing well when a supervisor is present
☐ 16. Meeting the needs of different kinds of students
☐ 17. Insufficient time to think
☐ 18. Being fair and impartial
☐ 19. Getting a favorable evaluation of my teaching
☐ 20. Diagnosing student learning problems
☐ 21. Lack of opportunity for professional growth
☐ 22. Too many noninstructional duties
☐ 23. Insuring that students grasp subject matter fundamentals
☐ 24. Working with too many students each day
☐ 25. Challenging unmotivated students
☐ 26. Adapting myself to the needs of different students
☐ 27. Ineffective faculty meetings
☐ 28. Whether students can apply what they learn
☐ 29. Students who disrupt class
☐ 30. Inadequate fringe benefits for teachers
☐ 31. Student health and nutrition problems that affect learning
☐ 32. Insufficient class time for rest and class preparation
☐ 33. The psychological climate of the school
☐ 34. Clarifying the limits of my authority and responsibility
☐ 35. Inadequate assistance from specialized teachers
☐ 36. Lack of public support for schools
☐ 37. Chronic absence and dropping out of students
☐ 38. Feeling more adequate as a teacher

☐ 39. Guiding students toward intellectual and emotional growth
☐ 40. Too many standards and regulations set for teachers
☐ 41. Being accepted and respected by professional persons
☐ 42. Adequately presenting all of the required material
☐ 43. Slow progress of certain students
☐ 44. Insufficient clerical help for teachers
☐ 45. Helping students to value learning
☐ 46. Whether each student is getting what he needs
☐ 47. Inadequate teacher salaries
☐ 48. Increasing my proficiency in content
☐ 49. Recognizing the social and emotional needs of students
☐ 50. The wide diversity of student ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds

Please use the back of this page for any comments. These may be about the questionnaire in general, about specific items or about any additional concerns you may have.
APPENDIX B

COOPERATING TEACHERS: ROLE AND EXPECTATIONS
SUPERVISORS: ROLES/FUNCTIONS
TECHNICAL SKILLS OF TEACHING
Cooperating Teachers: Role and Expectations
(Spring, 1975)

The relationship between cooperating teacher and student teacher has got to be the most influential in any teacher education program. Not only does research support the powerful impact of modeling behavior; but, in APEP the more sustaining, often two-semester, interactions between the two groups undoubtedly enhance the influence of the one upon the other.

As APEP structures have been developed since the Fall of 1972, as the relationship between Amherst Schools and School of Education folks has matured, a fair degree of clarity in role concept and expectation has emerged, at least on paper. Increasingly, these ideas are taking on operation significance as Inservice Teachers and University Supervisors continue to refine and implement them. The following paragraphs set forth "Expectations for Cooperating Teachers" in draft form. We invite full discussion within the APEP community at this stage of our conceptualization to the end that increasingly effective service may be rendered our University students and our Amherst youngsters.

1. Feedback. Through observation of teaching performance, preceded and followed by discussion, cooperating teachers participate in the essential supervisory process with their student teachers. The provision of non-judgmental feedback to full-time students as well as Pre-ones and Pre-twos begins within the context of the "Technical Skills of Teaching" which is the starting point of the APEP system. Such supervision takes place both formally at scheduled and planned times, and informally "around the edges" of normal classroom interactions. Feedback expectations of cooperating teachers and program supervisors must be coordinated as to timing and approach.

2. Technical Expertise. The role of providing technical or substantive assistance to students
involves cooperating teachers' supplying help in operationalizing knowledge and skills which students have learned but not applied, and providing learning opportunities which students may not yet have experienced. Thus, the range of such help may extend from assisting students in formulating lesson plans for particular groups using a planning format they have already learned, to providing initial instruction in leading a discussion, if such skill has not yet been acquired. Cooperating teachers may also serve as "brokers" of expertise, helping students find resources outside a particular quad or classroom as needs are identified, often consulting with supervisors in the process.

3. Interpersonal Facilitation, Socio-Emotional Support. As the professional advisor and mentor who spends the most time in the same room with students during their three semesters of APEP prescribed activity, cooperating teachers have a crucial responsibility for taking account of students as "whole persons" in addition to professional neophytes. This role embraces work with students in enhancing interpersonal effectiveness within the teaching team and responding to student needs for personal, socio-emotional support, among other things.

4. Professional Induction. Intertwining and overlapping with the above, cooperating teachers are in a unique position to take conscious and systematic note of the professional role they model for their students. The development and maintenance of "Professional" behavior and standards takes place within students in response to example as well as prescription and, in the long run, may be the most significant learning students can derive from their cooperating teachers.

5. Inservice Growth. Working with preservice teachers is a potentially growth-producing enterprise. To the extent that this becomes an explicit objective of cooperating teachers, the full range of program resources can enhance the effectiveness of all APEP participants. The Inservice Teacher component of the program and the fact that cooperating teachers
volunteer to work with students should facilitate achieving this expectation.

One example of the way in which collaboration is being fostered within APEP procedure may be seen in the preparation we ask cooperating teachers and prospective student teachers to undertake before student teaching assignments are confirmed. At the same time that students present their cumulative files to teachers during the interview process, teachers should be prepared to share:

1. A statement conveying the general philosophy and approach to teaching and learning pursued by the teacher and by those in the quad/classroom generally.

2. A weekly schedule of classroom activities with an indication of how student behavior is managed/monitored and how the student teacher fits into the classroom social system.

3. An introduction to the learning materials and experiences generally used, the nature of the planning and evaluation procedures generally used, and the student teacher's role in these.

4. Specific expectations of the student teacher: initially upon entering the quad/classroom and later; regular or repeated, plus occasional, assignments; regular and occasional opportunities for cooperating teacher/student teacher interchange for planning, feedback on performance, etc.

5. Particular opportunities available to the student teacher and/or encouraged by the cooperating teacher; e.g., working with school specialists, visiting other quads/classrooms and/or schools, participating with parents, sharing professional readings together.

List of Expectations of Teachers With Student Teachers:

1. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the intern before assigning tasks.

2. Assure successful experiences by starting with small tasks and gradually leading to complete responsibility.
3. Start responsibility with one child, then to small group and eventually to large groups. Include all subject areas.

4. Supervision: normally the intern should not be left alone with youngsters for the first month or two until group control is acquired.

5. Critiquing: regular specific feedback cannot be done adequately if you are also teaching a group at the same time.

6. Provide time for informal discussions so that closeness or trust level emerges.

7. Encourage open communication--most interns will not express their true feelings until they are certain you want to listen and understand.

8. Contact the intern's supervisor if unresolved difficulties arise.

9. Regularly communicate with your building administrators on the progress of the intern.

10. Facilitate the intern emerging as a "teacher peer" on the team.

11. As the intern takes more responsibility, provide opportunity for planning and "breathing" time.

12. Provide opportunities to visit other quads, specialists, IPC, IMC, etc.

13. Help interns fill in gaps in their college training--an understanding of diagnosing student needs, lesson planning, evaluating, use of behavioral objectives, means of individualizing instruction, etc.

14. Encourage and provide opportunity to attend some district meetings.

15. Recommend professional readings.

16. Be very explicit about your personal expectations.
17. Interns should arrive no later than 8:15 a.m. or leave earlier than 3:30 p.m. However, you may have them come earlier and stay later, depending on your personal work schedule.

Be constantly aware of the children's needs as your first priority. While interns may take on a wide range of tasks, the ultimate responsibility rests with you.

Supervisors: Roles/Functions
(Spring, 1975)

Except for the relationships between cooperating teacher and full-time student, those between supervisors and all APEP preservice teachers are generally most significant for success in the undergraduate teacher preparation process. As conceived and implemented in Amherst, the supervisory role or function is essentially five-fold.

1. Feedback. Through observation of teaching performance, preceded and followed by discussion, supervisors provide crucial, non-judgmental feedback to student teachers and pre-ones and twos, on the basis of which these preservice learners can build skill and mesh theory and practice. Feedback is frequently part of the agenda during the weekly seminars supervisors conduct with the student teachers for whom they have direct responsibility. As the supervisors' "job description" indicates, supervisory contact in a teaching area is expected forty to sixty minutes per week for full-time teachers; bi-weekly visits in classrooms are expected for pre-ones and twos.

2. Technical Expertise. Supervisors have abundant opportunities to share technical or substantive expertise with APEP students and staff members. They are asked to acquire functional mastery of a basic framework within which their work with students takes place—a combination of the feedback system referred to above and a set of "technical skills of teaching" (list appended). In addition, each supervisor is encouraged to develop/ refine skills and content which he/she is concerned about and can share with others, formally and informally.
3. **Resource Broker.** As needs arise and are expressed by individual students, seminar groups, and/or cooperating teachers, supervisors play a key role in helping to locate resources to satisfy. This may involve referral to appropriate readings, identification of School of Education or Amherst Schools personnel who can help, or sharing the need with APEP staff members to check out its pervasiveness and to marshal cooperative resources.

4. **Interpersonal Facilitator.** As a member of the basic teacher preparation team of student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervisor, supervisors carry particular responsibilities for facilitating constructive working relationships among all parties. As for all these functions, this one must be adapted to the requirements of each situation, including the particular interpersonal style of the supervisor, the needs of cooperating teachers and students, etc. Particularly important for the supervisor is arranging meetings with the other two members of the team and serving as a communications link among all interacting personnel, School of Education and Amherst Schools staff members.

5. **Socio-Emotional Support.** The particular relationship between supervisor and student teacher as it develops in classroom and seminar must be open and supportive, providing "hoists over the humps" during the sometimes-challenging stages of professional growth. Of course, cooperating teachers and program advisors share in this function, but the particular feedback responsibilities and seminar contacts with students expected of supervisors render them especially important providers of support.

**Procedures**

The supervisors' "job description" provides a bare-bones overview of the time demands on these twenty-hours-per-week graduate assistants: an hour or so per week per full-time student teacher, bi-weekly contacts with pre-ones and twos, two to three hours per week of seminar activity divided between "support group" and substantive agendas, "on
call" status with TEC for presentation of methods modules and the like, and supervisor staff meetings, registration advising, and special event participation (program development, combatting racism/sexism workshops, etc.). Several of these expectations cited above appear to warrant elaboration.

1. **The "Supervisory Process."** The basic approach to supervision in its observation and discussion phases includes pre-observation conferencing, observation and post-observation discussion of feedback in relation to performance goals. This clinical supervision procedure is organized around a set of "technical skills of teaching," the first six of which are establishing set, securing and maintaining attending behavior, providing feedback, achieving closure, using reinforcement, controlling participation. It must be emphasized that this process is a common starting point to facilitate communication and understanding among members of the basic classroom team. Other supervisory systems and components should be introduced and used as needs arise for which alternative or supplementary strategies are indicated.

2. **Seminars/Presentations.** The weekly seminars led by supervisors for the full-time student teachers for whom they are responsible should take account for the skill/content needs of the students and the support-group function as well. In the first instance, agendas may be developed according to the expressed needs of each small group and may be pursued in those groups. When supervisors identify needs in common to most student teachers, large-group sessions will be arranged. In both cases, supervisors' expertise will be tapped as appropriate.

Support group agendas derive from problem-sharing within the small groups and range from sharing individual, personal and professional concerns to exchanging curriculum ideas and techniques. Establishing trust and openness in these groups is essential.

3. **Completing the Record.** The following student teacher monitoring form should be filed for each student teacher each week and for Pre-ones and
twos on alternate weeks. The purposes of these very brief reports are to maintain a current status record for each student so that a performance profile can be ascertained readily; to provide at check points in the middle and at the end of semesters a cumulative picture of each student's student teaching experience so that mid-course corrections and final assessments can rest on as full information as possible; and to provide comprehensive data for phase-by-phase placement decisions within APEP and for final recommendation preparation upon program completion.
# Student Teaching Monitoring Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NAME</th>
<th>S.T.</th>
<th>TWO</th>
<th>ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Initials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Date</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Contact</td>
<td>OBSV.</td>
<td>CONF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated By</td>
<td>SUPVS.</td>
<td>COOP. TCHR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Outcome:**

**Future Indications:**
TECHNICAL SKILLS OF TEACHING

1. Establishing Set or Set Induction

   The term "Set" refers to the establishment of cognitive and affective rapport between students and teacher in a way that obtains immediate student involvement and interest in the learning experience. Experience indicates a direct relationship between the effectiveness in establishing set and the effectiveness of the total learning experience. If a teacher succeeds in creating a positive set, the likelihood of student involvement in the experience will be enhanced. The most effective "sets" are those that catch the student's attention and interest early. Establishing set is usually the first instructional move of the teacher. It may also, and often does, occur during a class when a change in student focus or thought is desired. Some common places where establishing set is especially useful:

   a) At the start of a unit;
   b) When assigning outside work;
   c) Before a speaker or media presentation;
   d) When beginning a discussion;
   e) Starting any activity.

2. Achieving Closure

   Closure is complementary to establishing set. Closure is attained when the major purposes and content of the learning experience or portion of the experience are judged to have been accomplished so the students can relate new knowledge or skills to prior ones. It is more than a quick summary of the ground covered in the class. It is a pulling together of the major ideas or skills and provides the students with a needed feeling of achievement. Closure is not limited to the completion of a learning experience. It is often needed at specific points within the experience so that students may know where they are and where they are going. The teacher should, at least at the end of each experience, plan a way to achieve closure. Examples of this could be getting students to generalize about the content, plan for students to practice skills, or define what will occur next. When achieving closure, the teacher should include evaluation that tells how well students have attained the goals set for the learning experience.
3. Asking Questions

A. Memory/Recall. Questions of this order are the simplest of the three levels of questions discussed here. Memory/Recall questions are the kind that begin: list, name, give, locate, who, what, when, where, define, etc. Any question that expects the student has already been exposed to the answer and should be able to repeat that answer from memory fits this level of questioning. Most review questions, current events questions, questions about yesterday's work or homework, true/false, fill-in, and multiple-choice questions are of the Memory/Recall level.

B. Convergent. "Tending to come to one point" is the definition the dictionary offers for convergent. This best summarizes this level of questioning. Convergent questions are those where the questioner has in mind a single or closed answer he/she expects to hear. (In a sense, only with much less freedom, Memory/Recall questions are convergent.) If there is room in an answer for only "correct" or "right" responses, then the question is classified as Convergent. Some examples of key words found in Convergent questions are: summarize; outline; what's the main idea of the story; give examples; compare; from this information, what do you conclude; solve; write a report; put rules, principles, or skills into practice.

C. Divergent. To extend in different directions. To differ from a normal form. Responding to Divergent questions represents the highest level of mental activity for students. These questions not only permit, but openly encourage diversity of response. There are many answers to Divergent questions and using this form of question promotes independence of thought. Divergent questions are seldom heard in classrooms and are often side-stepped by students because the answers are often personal or private for the student. Often students will not open up to these questions until they are confident that the listener can be trusted. Some examples of key words in "less personal" Divergent questions are: propose a plan; draw a generalization; hypothesize; design; speculate; judge. Examples of key words in "more personal" Divergent questions are: create; what do you think; in your opinion; rate these; whom do you favor; should; would you.

The quality of any question is not determined by the level it falls into, but rather, what is the objective for asking the question. If a class is reviewing work or skills, Memory/Recall questions are most appropriate. On the other hand, if the objective is for students to relate personal opinions, judgments, or ideas for solving complex problems, then Memory/Recall or Convergent questions are very inappropriate.
4. Using Examples/Illustrations

The use of examples is basic to good sound, clear teaching. Examples are necessary to clarify, verify, or substantiate ideas, concepts, and skills. Both inductive and deductive use of examples can be used effectively during a learning experience. Effective use of examples and illustrations include:

a) Starting with simple examples and progressing to more complex ones;
b) Starting with examples relevant to student's experience, interest, and knowledge;
c) Relating examples to the ideas, concepts, or skills being taught;
d) Checking to see if the objectives of the class have been achieved by asking students to give or create examples/illustrations which demonstrate the material.

5. Positive Reinforcement

Encouraging desired student behavior and class participation through the use of positive verbal and non-verbal reinforcement techniques is an integral part of the teacher's role as a facilitator of the learning experience. Substantial psychological evidence confirms the value of reinforcement in the learning process. The acquisition of knowledge of specific reinforcement techniques and the development of skill in using these appropriately in classroom situations is an important step for a beginning teacher.

Positive reinforcement of students often increases their participation in the learning experience. This, in turn, usually increases learning. Using positive reinforcement must remain a flexible skill at all times. Students respond differently even to similar reinforcers. A skillful teacher will adapt reinforcement techniques as he/she gets in touch with the uniqueness of each student.

a) Positive Verbal Reinforcers. Besides the usual "Good," "Correct," and "Right," the teacher can encourage participation by asking questions that a student can have success answering. Over time, the reinforcement that comes with successful participation should increase a student's involvement.

b) Positive Non-Verbal Reinforcers. Techniques include smiling, moving toward the student, eye contact, and writing the student's ideas on the board or experience chart.
6. Planned Repetition

The purpose of this skill is to clarify and reinforce major ideas, key words, concepts, and skills. The use of repetition is a powerful technique for focusing and highlighting important points, and describing them from a different point of view. Repetition, while often seen as something the teacher does in lecturing or in teacher-led discussions, should also include students in a variety of active situations. In math, students often solve several similar problems. In science, students find several mammals. In social studies, students construct a collage with several pictures illustrating "interdependence." There are two main varieties of Repetition:

1) Literal -- To repeat in essentially the same words
   a) Simple -- Occurring immediately after presentation
   b) Spaced -- At intervals in the lesson or across lessons
   c) Cumulative -- Repeating all previous points or concepts before going on

2) Figures of Speech -- Using metaphors, analogies, gestures, and alternative communication forms

7. Teacher Silence and Non-Verbal Cues

Many teachers seem frightened by silence or pauses in classroom discussion. They usually hasten to fill these gaps with their own talking. What these teachers do not realize is that silence is a powerful tool in a learning experience. Silence or pausing can be used:

   a) After introductory statements to provide students time to digest or consider the idea or thought presented;
   b) After questions to give students time to think about and prepare an answer;
   c) After a question from a student to indicate the teacher is considering the question or, momentarily, before redirecting the question to another student;
   d) After a student response to encourage the student to continue.

Usually, non-verbal cues are employed by the teacher to indicate what happens next. Facial expressions are cues that can encourage a
student to continue or stop. Head movement can direct the same behavior as facial cues. Body movement or leaning is help to telegraph interest and thoughtful consideration. Finally, the innumerable hand gestures of our culture can suggest and direct all kinds of student behavior.

8. Cueing

Cueing is an effort on the teacher's part to prepare a student in advance to answer a question or make a contribution to a learning experience. Cueing has two dimensions: time and content. A teacher, by providing a student with content hints and/or extra time to organize his/her thoughts, can, in effect, offer considerable help to one or more students and greatly improve the quality of student contributions to the group. Cueing can be done with individuals or groups, in class or privately outside of class. It pays the best dividends when your plans include posing complex, lengthy, or controversial problems for student's consideration. By alerting a student or group five or ten minutes or even a day ahead, the teacher helps students to have a successful part in the class experience. And, after all, planning for and promoting student success in the learning experience is what teaching is all about, isn't it?

9. Completeness of Communication

Building a sensitivity to the importance and difficulty of being understood is the focus of this skill. The skill requires that the teacher insure clarity in giving directions, sharing objectives with students, and setting group responsibilities. The skill involves three phases:

1) Understanding student feedback by attending to student responses, verbal and non-verbal, looking for evidence of misunderstanding/confusion.

2) Taking steps to identify the nature of the confusion.

3) Taking additional steps to correct the confusion of the learner.

An example:

The teacher looks for puzzled faces while giving directions. A remedy for this confusion could be to ask the student to explain what he/she just heard. When the
teacher identifies the nature of the confusion, he/she can adjust the verbage.

Another example:

The teacher looks for students who do not understand, but think they do. A technique here is to check individual progress to see if the product of the student's work shows his/her understanding.

10. Establishing Appropriate Frames of Reference

A student's understanding of ideas or concepts can be enhanced if the material is organized and presented from several points of view. A single frame of reference provides one structure through which students can gain a grasp of materials. The use of several frames of reference deepens and broadens the opportunity for students to understand material more thoroughly. For example, The Emancipation Proclamation becomes more meaningful when it is seen through the frame of reference of the Northern white abolitionist, the Southern white, the Black slave in the seceded South, and the English clothing manufacturer. A deeper grasp of the energy crisis can be attained by seeing it from the frames of an Arab Sheik, a Japanese manufacturer, a retired couple on a fixed income, an American oil driller, an independent trucker, a Jordanian refugee, and an Israeli farmer near the Golan Heights.

Integrative Skills

The following technical skills of teaching are classified as integrative skills because they consist of combinations of other skills. Mastery of the separate skills is not enough to produce the overall teacher competency desired. The inclusion of these integrative skills should help teachers begin to see how teaching skills can be successfully molded together to compliment and strengthen each other.

11. Control of Participation

Control of student's participation during a learning experience is an important skill in the craft of teaching. When establishing set, questioning, reinforcing, using verbal and non-verbal cues, and varying stimuli, the teacher is creating the dynamics of student participation in the discussion/activities of the learning experience. Everything a
teacher brings to the learning experience affects how, when and if students will participate. Small groups in circles will enhance student verbal participation. A movie or TV program reduces student verbals. Some teachers want students to raise their hands as a way of regulating participation. Other teachers discourage hand-raising by giving their attention to students who just begin contributing. The complexity of the content, the relevance of the topic, the arrangement of students, the rules for discussions, the objectives for the lesson, and the awareness the teacher has of all students in the group will each have an impact on the quantity and quality of student participation in the learning experience.

12. Varying the Stimulus

Psychological experiments have shown that deviations from standard, habitual teacher behavior results in higher student attention levels. Teachers should be sensitive to their habit patterns and become aware of the student attending behaviors that these habits and patterns evoke. Stimulus behaviors include: teacher movement; hand, head, and body gestures; focusing student attention; varying interaction patterns (teacher to student, teacher to group, student to student); silence; shifting sensory channels; and varying student involvement.

13. Recognizing and Obtaining Student Attending Behavior

Recognizing attending behavior of students involves the use of visual cues fed back to the teacher by students involved in a learning experience. Reactions to the learning experience are often seen in the facial expressions, direction of the eyes, tilt of the head, and body posture of the students in the group. Skillful teachers, through these visual cues, can note indications of interest or boredom, comprehension or bewilderment. Obtaining student attending behavior at the beginning of a learning experience or when the teacher senses that students may be moving mentally away from a learning experience in progress is the other part of this teaching skill. At the beginning of a learning experience, obtaining student attending behavior is much the same as establishing set. Holding or regaining attending behavior during a learning experience usually involve personalizing communications to students, moving toward students, offering help, varying the "pace," altering the instructional media, or redeploying students into different groups. Actually, one of the strongest techniques of obtaining attending behavior is to positively reinforce attending behavior when students are doing it.
14. Obtaining Student Feedback

The feedback process in the training of teachers may be simply stated as "gathering knowledge of results" or "collecting data about outcomes." Teachers often ignore the availability of information accessible during the lesson. Student questions, examination of student work, and informal discussions are immediate sources of feedback. Teachers unconsciously tap a variety of feedback sources but should be sensitive to all data lest they tend to rely unevenly on a limited number of students and a restricted range of cues. A common insensitivity often shows when a teacher hears only the student who volunteered an answer and does not bother to check out the students who remain quiet.

15. Lecturing

Effective lecturing is actually the result of combining several teaching skills in an integrative way. Lecturing deals with establishing set, obtaining attending behavior, repetition, using examples, varying stimuli, planning complete communications, and achieving closure. While our experience is that "everybody lectures," we realize that very few teachers make the effort to integrate the many skills that make for effective lecturing. Lecturing seems to come in two styles:

1) Formal -- One-way, speaker to listener, communication

2) Informal -- Two-way communication that permits listener questions and contributions. Key points are illustrated by incorporating audio-visual materials.

Appropriate uses of Lecturing technique:

a) Convey information unavailable to students;

b) Summarizing key points as reinforcement;

c) Change of pace from other learning experiences;

d) Synthesize information from several sources;

e) Build enthusiasm while also demonstrating teacher interest.

"Tell 'em what yer goin' tell 'em. Tell 'em. Then tell 'em what ya told 'em."
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MEMORANDUM: AGENDA FOR OBJECTIVE SETTING MEETING
MEMORANDUM

FROM: Geoff

DATE: September 8, 1975

TO: Carol K., Loraine T., Ronnie M., Marilyn H., Dale N., Monica K., Kathy F., Nancy D., John C.

SUBJECT: Agenda for Meeting of Wednesday, September 10 (2:00 P.M.)

I want to begin by saying how happy I am to be working with all of you this semester. My job as a supervisor will be made a lot easier and certainly be more enjoyable because of your invaluable experience.

I believe that this present group of student teachers are certainly more than qualified to assume the responsibilities which will be placed upon them. They are the first group to have experienced two full semesters of the APEP program, and are well prepared for this—the most important part of their university education.

I plan to work very closely with everyone and hopefully assist in making this a most successful and productive four months for everyone.

In order to initially get us all off on the "right track," I have scheduled a meeting of the entire group (ten cooperating teachers and ten student teachers) for this Wednesday, September 10, in Cafeteria 3. The major purposes of this meeting will be:

1. An opportunity for all participants to become better acquainted with our program objectives for the semester;
2. A better identification of all roles;
3. Sharing of objectives for student teachers;
4. Sharing of concerns about this experience;
5. Establishment of specific meeting times for individual student teacher-cooperating teacher and supervisor.
MEMORANDUM
Page 2
September 8, 1975

I would anticipate this meeting to run a maximum of one hour. If we can start promptly at 2:00 P.M., I will be sure that we stop by 3:00 P.M.

I look forward to this meeting and the opportunity this semester to grow both personally and professionally through the development of our relationship.

If you have any questions about this meeting or concerns with other aspects of the student teaching program, please contact me at any time here at Wildwood or at my home (549-4500).

Thank you for your continued support.
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MEMORANDUM: LIST OF OBJECTIVES DERIVED FROM OBJECTIVE SETTING MEETING
MEMORANDUM

FROM: Geoff                                      DATE: September 11, 1975
TO: Teachers and Student Teachers Working With Geoff
SUBJECT: Objectives Brainstormed During September 10 Session

Again thank you all for your inputs yesterday. I hope that between the "handouts" and the following list of shared objectives you can develop your own student teaching objectives for this semester. Our individual meetings next week should then provide everyone with an opportunity to better organize and accomplish some very specific tasks.

The primary objective of next week's meeting then is to come together (Student Teacher, Cooperating Teacher and Supervisor) and develop a contract of specifically agreed-upon objectives for the student teacher from your individually developed lists.

Thanks.
The following list has objectives and suggestions for goals for Student Teaching developed at yesterday's meeting:

1. Developing positive methods of classroom control (Classroom Management);

2. Developing skills to: Write Objectives, Lesson Plans, Units of Study, Do Basic Math Computation;

3. Develop awareness of responsibilities to total classroom (Boundaries and Limit's);

4. To be better informed on total school responsibilities;

5. To be aware of teacher's responsibilities (aside from Student Teacher);

6. Develop skills of planning for week's activities;

7. An opportunity for Student Teacher to incorporate "skills learned" into their classroom teaching;

8. Develop skills at counseling for special needs children;

9. Developing skills to: Handle Large Groups of Children; Work with Learning Disability Children; Be More Perceptive to Children's Needs; Administer Reading Aptitude Tests, etc.; Handle Parent-Teacher Conferences; Motivate Children;

10. Develop an ability to be critiqued without fear of all negative repercussions;

11. Working on skills to give and take criticism (Constructive);

12. Opportunities to set own teaching style.

The following list are suggestions for Student Teachers, Supervisor, and Cooperating Teachers:

1. Develop background in reading methods, phonetics and grammar skills;
2. Be comfortable with approaching Cooperating Teacher with concerns;

3. Supervisor assist Cooperating Teacher with "support" in classroom;

4. Awareness by Student Teacher of full-time commitment to student teaching;

5. Starting Student Teacher with work in area of Student Teacher's strengths--eventually branching out to all areas.
APPENDIX E

MEMORANDUM: AGENDA AND LIST OF ACTIVITIES FOR LEADERSHIP WORKSHOP
MEMORANDUM

FROM: Geoff
TO: All Student and Cooperating Teachers
SUBJECT: Agenda and List of Activities for Leadership Workshop

Just a reminder that this Thursday we will be holding our Leadership Workshop at 3:00 p.m. in Cafeteria 3. The following agenda has been developed:

1. Dr. Ken Blanchard from the School of Education here at the University will spend the first hour explaining the Life Cycle Theory of Situational Leadership.
2. We will all be administered an instrument to measure perceptions of our leadership style.
3. A form will be explained which we will use in our subsequent contracting sessions.
4. Ken and I will role play a contracting session to familiarize you with what should transpire.
5. Time will be planned for feedback and questions from you.

I hope you are as excited about this meeting as I am. I am sure it will prove to be a most informative session. See you there.

Thanks for your time.

Note. If participants missed this meeting, a booklet on situational leadership was supplied (copy attached). A follow-up conference was also held to highlight important steps.
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PAUL HERSEY
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A DIVISION OF AMERICAN MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATIONS
Management by objectives could be a more powerful tool for productivity improvement if managers negotiated with their subordinates not just goals, but also the leadership styles they would use to help the subordinates meet their objectives.

What’s Missing in MBO?

PAUL HERSEY
KENNETH H. BLANCHARD

Of all the management concepts and techniques that have been developed over the past decades, few have received such widespread attention as management by objectives (MBO). Managers in all kinds of organizational settings are attempting to run their organizations with MBO as a basic underlying management concept. Unfortunately, however, MBO success stories do not occur as often as anticipated by theorists who have written about MBO or practitioners who have applied it.

It is our contention that there has been a major missing link to more successful implementation of MBO: contracting for leadership style. In most MBO programs, an effort is made only to reach agreement on performance goals; there is little thought given to develop-
ing a psychological contract between the leader and the subordinates regarding the role of the leader in helping these subordinates accomplish their objectives.

Management by objectives, as it is practiced in most organizations, begins with agreement by superiors and subordinates of an enterprise on the common goals of the entire organization. At this time, any changes needed in the organization’s structure—for example, changes in title, duties, or span of control—are made. Next, superior and subordinate independently propose time-oriented goals for the subordinate’s job and the methods to be used to evaluate on-the-job performance. These are discussed and jointly agreed on by the superior and the subordinate. Checkpoints also are established: times when superior and subordinate together will compare the performance goals with what has actually been accomplished. If there is a discrepancy between the goals and the accomplishments, they discuss and determine the cause of the problem, then take steps to overcome it.

The missing link

The unique aspect of MBO is that superior and subordinate participate both in the establishment of performance goals and in the review or evaluation that takes place in relation to the agreed-upon goals. It has been found that participation in the formulation of objectives tends to make subordinates feel more personal responsibility for goal attainment and is thus more effective than having objectives imposed by an authority figure in the organization. The problem with MBO—and the reason why few effective implementations occur—is that the role of the leader in helping subordinates accomplish objectives is not clearly defined.

MBO could be a powerful tool for productivity improvement if superiors negotiated with their subordinates not only the goals toward which the subordinates would work but also the leadership style they would use to help their subordinates meet their objectives. Just as golfers, with the aid of their caddies, select a club depending on their lie on the course, so managers, with the help of their subordinates, should select the leadership style to be used according to the objectives and the needs of the subordinate in achieving the agreed-upon objectives. The Life Cycle Theory of Leadership—a situational leadership theory developed at Ohio University’s Center for Leadership Studies—should help in this selection.

This theory grew out of earlier leadership models that were based on two kinds of behavior central to the concept of leadership style: task behavior and relationship behavior. Task behavior is the extent to which a leader explains what each subordinate is to do as
well as when, where, and how tasks are to be accomplished. Relationship behavior is the extent to which a leader engages in behaviors such as emotional support, communication, facilitation, and interpersonal relations. The two dimensions of leader behavior, plotted on two separate axes, are shown in Figure 1.

Research in the last several decades has clearly indicated that there is no “best” style of leadership that can be universally applied. Thus, any of the four basic styles shown in Figure 1 may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation. The situational aspect of leadership is taken into consideration in the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership—which is based on the relationship among (1) task behavior—or the amount of direction a leader gives, (2) relationship behavior—or the amount of socio-emotional support a leader provides, and (3) the “maturity” of the leader’s followers or group.

Maturity is defined in Life Cycle Theory as the capacity to set high but attainable goals, the willingness and the ability to take responsibility, and the education and/or experience of an individual or a group. These variables of maturity should be considered in relation to a specific task to be performed. A salesperson may be very responsible in closing sales but very irresponsible when it comes to completing the paperwork that has to be filed on every sale.

According to Life Cycle Theory, as the level of maturity of one’s followers increases in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task behavior and increase their relationship behavior until the individual or the group is sufficiently mature for the leaders to reduce their relationship behavior as well. This cycle is illustrated in Figure 2 by the bell-shaped curve going through the four leadership quadrants.
Benchmarks of maturity are provided for determining appropriate leadership style by dividing the maturity continuum into three categories—below average, average, and above average. When working with people of below average maturity in terms of accomplishing a specific task, a high-task style (quadrant 1) has the best possibility of success. Moderate-task and moderate-to high-socio-emotional styles (quadrants 2 and 3) appear to be most appropriate in dealing with people who are of average maturity in terms of accomplishing a specific task, while low-task and low-relationship styles (quadrant 4) have the best possibility of success in working with people of above average maturity.

Modifying levels of maturity

In attempting to help an individual or a group mature—that is, to take on more and more responsibility for a specific task—a leader should be careful not to delegate responsibility and/or increase socio-emotional support too rapidly. If the leader does either of these things, the individual or the group can take advantage and view him as a "soft touch." The leader should slowly develop the capability of subordinates on each task, using less task behavior and more relationship behavior as they mature and become more willing and able to assume responsibility.
"Of course, when people begin to behave less maturely for whatever reason—say, a crisis at home or a change in work technology—the leader should adjust behavior backward through the curve to meet the present maturity."

Also, to obtain the desired behavior, a leader should reward as soon as possible behaviors exhibited by the individual in the desired direction and continue this process as the individual's behavior comes closer and closer to the leader's expectations of good performance. For example, suppose a sales manager wants to move a salesperson through the cycle so that he or she assumes significantly more responsibility. If the salesperson is normally very dependent on the manager to close a sale, the sales manager's best bet initially is to reduce some of the structure or close supervision by giving the salesperson the opportunity to assume some responsibility for, say, setting up the closing meeting. If this is done well, he should reinforce the behavior with increases in socio-emotional support or relationship behavior.

This process should continue until the salesperson is assuming significant responsibility and performing as a mature individual in closing sales. This does not mean that the salesperson's work will have less structure, but rather that the structure will now be internally imposed by the individual instead of being externally imposed by the sales manager. The cycle would be depicted in Figure 2 as a backward-bending curve moving into quadrant 4 (low-task behavior and low-relationship behavior). The salesperson is able not only to structure many of the activities in which he is engaged, but also to provide his own satisfaction for interpersonal and emotional needs. At this stage of maturity, individuals are positively reinforced for their accomplishments by the leader's not looking over their shoulder on a specific task and leaving them more and more on their own.

Of course, when people begin to behave less maturely for whatever reason—say, a crisis at home or a change in work technology—the leader should adjust behavior backward through the curve to meet the present maturity of his or her group. Suppose, for example, that a salesperson who is presently working well alone faces a family crisis that begins to affect performance on the job. In this situation, it may be necessary for the manager to increase structure and socio-emotional support until the individual regains composure.
Negotiating for leadership style

In the case of MBO, once a superior and a subordinate have agreed upon certain goals for the subordinate, the next logical step (but not often used) is for both parties involved—the superior and subordinate—to negotiate the appropriate leadership style that the superior will use in helping the subordinate accomplish each objective. The subordinate should participate in this selection not only because it will increase his feeling of personal responsibility for goal attainment but also because he can bring input to the decision making that will help in the selection of the appropriate leadership style.

Failure to select the right leadership style can lead to problems. For example, if the superior uses a low-task, low-relationship leadership style and leaves the subordinate completely alone in an area where the subordinate lacks sufficient technical skill and knowhow, the result may be failure—and the superior may not know about it until the next interim check period. Conversely, if a leader continually hovers over and directs the activities of subordinates working in areas where they are competent and capable of working alone, that leader may alienate them.

In areas where a subordinate is experienced and has been successful in accomplishing similar objectives over a period of time, superior and subordinate should negotiate a contract calling for the boss to leave the subordinate on his or her own. Rather than direct and closely supervise the subordinate, the boss should make sure that the resources necessary for accomplishing the goal are available and should coordinate the results of the project with other projects under his or her supervision. In those instances where the subordinate is working on a project with which he or she has very little experience and the boss does have some expertise, the subordinate and the superior should negotiate significant structure, direction, and supervision from the boss until the subordinate is familiar with the task. For a subordinate to accomplish every agreed-upon goal, a boss may have to use a variety of leadership styles depending on the subordinate’s maturity in relation to the specific tasks involved.

Two things should be remembered in negotiating leadership style. First, the contract should always be open for renegotiation by either party. A subordinate may find that working without supervision on a particular task is not realistic or a superior may find that the style being used with an individual on a particular task is not producing results—and the two should be able to renegotiate for more supervision.

Second, it is important to remember that boss-subordinate negotiation over leadership style implies a shared responsibility if goals are not met. This means that a boss, if he or she has contracted for
close supervision, cannot withhold help from a subordinate (even though work may pile up on another project) without sharing some of the responsibility for lack of accomplishment of that goal.

An example of contracting

Integrating the negotiation of leadership styles with management by objectives is a new concept but one that is already meeting with some initial success in industrial and educational settings. Take the case of an elementary school we studied in eastern Massachusetts. In many school systems, the principal of a school is required by school policy to visit each of his or her classrooms a certain number of times each year. This visitation policy is dysfunctional for principals who recognize that their teachers vary in their experience and competence and therefore have varying needs for supervision. If a principal decides to schedule visitations according to his or her perception of the competence of the teachers, problems can occur with teachers at either end of the extreme. Left alone, a highly experienced teacher may be confused by the lack of contact with the principal and may even interpret it as a lack of interest. By the same token, an inexperienced teacher may interpret frequent visits of the principal as a sign of lack of trust and confidence.

These potential problems were eliminated in this particular elementary school when the principal shared Life Cycle Theory of Leadership with the staff, then proceeded to negotiate what his leadership style should be with each of the teachers. It was found that when low-task, low-relationship, "hands-off" leadership style was negotiated between the principal and a teacher because both agreed that the teacher was capable of working on his or her own, infrequent visits from the principal were perceived by the teacher as a positive rather than a negative reinforcer.

The same thing held true at the other end of the continuum. It was found that when negotiation for leadership style took place with an inexperienced teacher who realized that the system was designed to help teachers learn to work on their own, the teacher was less reluctant to share anxieties about certain aspects of his or her teaching. If the negotiation resulted in initial close supervision, the teacher was able to view this interaction as positive—not punitive—because it was a temporary situation and demonstrated the principal’s interest in helping the teacher to operate without much supervision.

Establishing objectives and reaching consensus over performance criteria for subordinates in a traditional management-by-objectives program are often the first steps toward providing the structure for individual and organizational accomplishment. Recent experiences indicate that if this initial negotiation procedure is combined
with a similar process for negotiating the appropriate leadership style a superior should use to facilitate goal accomplishment, the whole MBO process may become more effective. Contracting for leadership styles can also help establish the interpersonal relations necessary for accomplishment of meaningful long-term objectives.

PAUL HERSEY is director of the Center for Leadership Studies and professor of management and organizational behavior at Ohio University. As a consultant, he also has helped train more than 100,000 supervisors and managers from some 500 business and industrial organizations. KENNETH H. BLANCHARD is professor of leadership and administration at the University of Massachusetts School of Education and codirector of the Center for Curricular and Organizational Studies. As a consultant, he is training school administrators and teachers throughout the country in the use of the applied behavioral sciences. Hersey and Blanchard have written a number of books, articles, and papers on motivation, leadership, and change, and are coauthors of the Prentice-Hall text Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources.
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ABBREVIATED TRANSCRIPTS FROM SELECTED CONTRACTING SESSIONS
PARTIALLY COMPLETED MBO/LEADERSHIP AND FOCUSING CONTRACTS
ABBREVIATED TRANSCRIPTS FROM SELECTED
CONTRACTING SESSIONS

The following segments of various contracting sessions, included in this section of the Appendix, occurred in the first week of October, 1975, in meetings between a student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor. The transcripts were recorded by the author (supervisor) and they assisted the supervisor in transferring, at a later date, important details of the meetings onto a written MBO/Leadership contract. The transcripts have been edited slightly to make them more "readable" but the interviews have not been changed in substance.

To best illustrate how various segments of the triad meeting were conducted, the transcripts are divided into three abbreviated sessions. The first session (1) includes the beginning of a session, and an example of the negotiation of a leadership style that was readily agreed upon by the student teacher, cooperating teacher and supervisor. The next session (2) includes the negotiation of leadership style in which it was more difficult to reach consensus, thereby making it more desirable for the cooperating teacher and supervisor to assume different leadership styles in working with the student teacher on this objective. The final segment (3) will illustrate a situation where a delay in contracting leadership style was recommended and an example
of closure of a session. Individuals in all segments are referred to as supervisor, cooperating teacher and student teacher.

This section of the Appendix ends with an example of a partially completed MBO/Leadership contract, with its attached MBO/Focussing contract for the transcript described here.

1. The following segment includes the beginning of a session and an example of a leadership style readily agreed upon. The cooperating teacher has been in this school five years and has worked with four student teachers prior to this experience. The student teacher is a twenty-two-year-old senior at the University working in her third semester in the APEP program and completing her final semester.

SUPervisor: In this meeting today, we'll be taking a look at the TRM forms which Ken and I used in role playing a contracting session at last week's workshop. I've asked you to rate your ability, willingness and educational experience for each objective and both the cooperating teacher and I have rated you (student teacher) on those items as well. Hopefully, the month's experience in the classroom helped to make the ratings in the TRM a little easier to answer.

Student Teacher: Yes, it did. I'm anxious to discuss the ratings and learn from the cooperating teacher and you what both of your ratings are and where you perceive my needs.

Supervisor: Hopefully, by the end of this meeting we will reach consensus on the ratings and we will have contracted for an appropriate leadership style that will assist you in completing your objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT TEACHER:</td>
<td>Ability—&quot;4&quot;; Willingness—&quot;7&quot;; Educational Experience—&quot;4&quot;; for a mean score of &quot;5&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR:</td>
<td>Can you explain why you rated &quot;4&quot; for Ability; plus your reasons for the others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT TEACHER:</td>
<td>Well, I rated a &quot;4&quot; for Ability because I have had some experience in the classroom so I chose low-moderate for Ability. I put &quot;7&quot; for Willingness since I have the desire to learn. That's what I'm here for. With regard to Educational Experience, I've had three semesters in the classroom, plus some experience with CCD in high school, so I have some background. So for this objective, I would like to contract for High Relationship-Low Task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR:</td>
<td>You have several activities listed under this objective. Would you like to contract for different styles for the activities, or do you feel that the one leadership style is appropriate for the objective and activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT TEACHER:</td>
<td>I think that the High Relationship-Low Task is suitable for all parts of this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISOR:</td>
<td>Let's make sure that we keep referring back to the MBO/Focussing Contract Form where your activities and expected results are listed, to make sure that the leadership style is consistently appropriate. O.K. (cooperating teacher), how have you rated the student teacher for this objective dealing with classroom management?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATING TEACHER:</td>
<td>I've rated her Ability, Willingness, and Educational Experience with &quot;6's&quot;. I arrived there by comparing the student teacher to other student teachers that I've had. The way I've seen her work with children in the quad is acceptable to me, and therefore rated her moderately high. I've seen her with large and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
small groups and feel, like the student teacher, that High Relationship-Low Task is the appropriate leadership style for this objective.

SUPERVISOR: My scores were "3" for Ability; "6" for Willingness; and "3" for Experience. I had chosen High Task-High Relationship because I haven't had as much of a chance that you, the cooperating teacher, has had, to observe her working on this objective in the classroom. However, I'm willing to agree to that style if you both feel that it's most appropriate. In summary, then, we've contracted for High Relationship-Low Task for the objective dealing with developing skills in classroom management. Are you both comfortable with that?

STUDENT TEACHER: Yes.

COOPERATING TEACHER: Yes, and remember (student teacher) that there's always the option to modify the style should the need arise.

SUPERVISOR: The second objective to be considered is . . .

2. The following transcript is a segment of a contracting session where reaching a consensus on the proper leadership style was more difficult due to the complexity of the objective, thereby calling for different leadership styles to be contracted by the cooperating teacher and supervisor. The cooperating teacher is a tenured teacher who has had previous experience with APEP Program students. The student teacher is married and a mother of two. She has been in the APEP Program for two semesters as a pre-intern.

SUPERVISOR: . . . This next objective deals with classroom management. How have you rated yourself (student teacher) and why?
STUDENT TEACHER: I rated myself as "5" for Ability; "7" for Willingness; and "4" for Educational Experience, giving me a mean score of "5.3". The style called for then is High Relationship-Low Task. I've been in the classroom for two semesters, so I rated myself as moderate for the experience. Because of this experience, which I feel pretty good about, I rated myself above average in my Ability. And I give myself a "7" or high for Willingness.

SUPERVISOR: You and I have the same scores for Ability and Willingness, though we differ in the Educational Experience ratings. My style called for S2 -- High Task-High Relationship.

COOPERATING TEACHER: I gave you an "8" in Willingness--even higher than your own rating!

STUDENT TEACHER: Some days my Willingness could be rated at "2"!

COOPERATING TEACHER: I think that I was combining Ability with capability, and since I see you as being capable, I gave you a "7". But maybe those abilities will be achieved because of your capabilities. Anyway, I gave you a "7" and, as I said, an "8" in Willingness. Because of our experience, when you worked with me last year, I gave you a "6" in Educational Experience. My mean score was "7" which is S4 Style -- Low Task-Low Relationship. Maybe I've made too much of an assumption.

STUDENT TEACHER: I would not feel comfortable contracting for Low Task-Low Relationship. I think there are some things in here that I need help in.

SUPERVISOR: Since this appears to be a more complex objective, why don't we break it up into the various activities and contract for leadership style individually? Perhaps we could even split some of the styles between the cooperating teacher and me to help you complete the objective? To start with: How do you feel about the technical skills of teaching in activities (c), (d), and (e)?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>STUDENT TEACHER:</strong></th>
<th>I feel that I need both High Task and High Relationship in those activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOPERATING TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>Since you're skilled in those areas (supervisor), why don't you supply the High Task and I will supply the High Relationship? (Student Teacher) Are you comfortable with that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>I would feel real comfortable with that. It's fine. Now, for activity (a), which deals with large and small group instruction skills, I would like to contract for a High Relationship-Low Task style because of my prior experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISOR:</strong></td>
<td>That's fine, and perhaps we could use that same style for classroom visitation in activity (b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>That sounds good to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOPERATING TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>I agree with both of those styles and feel capable with assuming them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISOR:</strong></td>
<td>Let's review all of this and see if we're comfortable with the contracted styles. For activities (c), (d), and (e), we've contracted for a split leadership style. I will supply the High Task and (cooperating teacher) will supply the High Relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOPERATING TEACHER/STUDENT TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>Right. That's fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPERVISOR:</strong></td>
<td>Now, for activities (a) and (f), a High Relationship-Low Task style has been contracted. Our goal, of course, (student teacher) is that these contracted leadership styles will assist you in effectively completing this objective. But, if necessary, we can renegotiate for a change in leadership styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>I feel very comfortable with these styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COOPERATING TEACHER:</strong></td>
<td>So do I. Let's go on to the next objective . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The next transcript includes a negotiation session where a delay in contracting leadership style was recommended for an objective which was inappropriate at the time. The cooperating teacher is a tenured teacher who had worked previously with this same student teacher as a pre-intern in the APEP Program. The student teacher is a twenty-one-year-old senior at the University working in her third semester in the APEP Program.

SUPERVISOR: ... Since we've agreed on the leadership style for objective number seven, let's move on to number eight, which deals with the student teacher taking full responsibility for planning and teaching the class for one week. I've marked that as a delay and I believe we talked earlier about setting another date for later in the semester after (student teacher) has completed some of these other objectives. Then we can assess the student teacher's performance and needs in order that she might successfully assume this responsibility.

COOPERATING TEACHER: Sure, that sounds like setting a later date to discuss this objective would be appropriate.

STUDENT TEACHER: That sounds fine to me.

SUPERVISOR: Let's tentatively set November 12th for further discussion on this objective, with hopes of your assuming responsibility for the classroom the second week in December.

STUDENT TEACHER: I'm sure that will work out.

SUPERVISOR: Since we've finished with our last objective and the contract is completed, let's schedule our next meeting tentatively for October 31st at 8:30 a.m. Then we can assess (student teacher) progress and the appropriateness of our leadership styles.
STUDENT TEACHER/COOPERATING TEACHER: That sounds fine.

SUPERVISOR: (Student Teacher) Could you stay a minute so you and I can establish some times for observation? Thank you both for your time and energy. I will get this contract to you in the next two days after I listen to this tape of our session and copy down all the salient points. I really appreciate your effort in this project.
MBO/LEADERSHIP CONTRACT

(MBO/Leadership Contract was conceived as a supplement to the original MBO/Focussing Contract form. The following is a partially complete MBO/Leadership Contract, with its attached MBO/Focussing for the transcript just described.)

STUDENT TEACHER: ____________________________

COOPERATING TEACHER: ____________________________

SUPERVISOR: ____________________________

DATE: ____________________________

CONTRACTING SESSION #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>CONTRACTED LEADERSHIP STYLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DETAILS: RESPONSIBILITIES, CONCERNS, DEADLINES (Refer to MBO/Focussing Contract for details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Develop Skills in Classroom Management:  
  a) Large and Small Groups  
  b) Special Needs  
  c) Identify Strengths and Weaknesses  
  d) Student Motivation  
  (Refer to attached MBO form for details) | S3: High Relationship and Low Task | Student Teacher: Work with small group in Reading and Math  
Work with large group in Social Studies and Science  
Through experience in these areas, gain insights into children's strengths and weaknesses plus methods of motivation (experiment)  
Visit other Quads and Schools  
Cooperating Teacher: Especially work with Student Teacher on special needs skills  
Supervisor: Meet with Student Teacher in Social Studies planning session -- Identify areas to critique and set up dates -- By October 22, assist Student Teacher in developing questions on classroom management |
**M30 FOCUSING/CONTRACT FORM**

(These objectives were formulated from the OBJECTIVE SETTING CONFERENCE with Student Teachers, Cooperating Teacher and Supervisor.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>PRIORITY WEIGHT (3-HIGH)</th>
<th>EXPECTED RESULTS IN MEASURABLE TERMS -- ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESULTS AT FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCE -- EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Will Develop Skills in Classroom Management:  
  a) Large and small groups  
  b) Work with special needs children in effective manner  
  c) Identify strengths and weaknesses  
  d) Student motivation | 3 | a. Small Group -- Assigned Reading and Math groups  
  Large Group -- Science and Social Studies coordinated into total Quad  
  b. Develop experiences working with special needs children  
  c. Talk to counselor -- learn more about core evaluation  
  d. Develop skills by trying various methods  
  Observe teacher -- visit other schools | |

COOPERATING TEACHER: ___________________________  DATE: ___________________________
STUDENT TEACHER: ___________________________
SUPERVISOR: ___________________________
MBO/LEADERSHIP CONTRACT

(MBO/Leadership Contract was conceived as a supplement to the original MBO/Focussing Contract form. The following is a partially complete MBO/Leadership Contract, with its attached MBO/Focussing for the transcript just described.)

STUDENT TEACHER: ____________________________
COOPERATING TEACHER: ____________________________
SUPERVISOR: ____________________________
DATE: ____________________________

CONTRACTING SESSION #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>CONTRACTED LEADERSHIP STYLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DETAILS: RESPONSIBILITIES, CONCERNS, DEADLINES (Refer to MBO/Focussing Contract for details)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Develop Skills of Classroom Management (Small and Large Group) (See lettered activities on attached MBO sheet for specific details) | **SPLIT:** S2 _ S3 High Task/High Relationship (For Skill Work) c-d-e High Relationship/Low Task: Activities a-b | Immediate need for feedback from Cooperating Teacher focussing on Student Teacher (positive and constructive feedback)
Need to Critique: Supervisor set dates to observe (October 9; October 15) -- Share feedback with Cooperating Teacher Cooperating Teacher critique each month (formal)
Follow (Goldhammer; Cogan) -- Focus on technical skills
Student Teacher arrange to visit other classrooms
Tuesday afternoon (make list of areas to observe -- feedback to Cooperating Teacher) |
MBO/LEADERSHIP CONTRACT

(MBO/Leadership Contract was conceived as a supplement to the original MBO/Focussing Contract form. The following is a partially complete MBO/Leadership Contract, with its attached MBO/Focussing for the transcript just described.)

STUDENT TEACHER: ___________________________

COOPERATING TEACHER: ___________________________

SUPERVISOR: ___________________________

DATE: ___________________________

CONTRACTING SESSION #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>CONTRACTED LEADERSHIP STYLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC DETAILS: RESPONSIBILITIES, CONCERNS, DEADLINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Take Full Responsibility for Planning, Coordinating and Teaching Class for a Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay discussion until November 12 at 1:30 p.m. -- Review progress on other objectives (Tentative date to assume responsibility is week of December 9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram of effective styles and relationship between task behavior and style of cooperating teacher/supervisor]
MBC FOCUSING/CONTRACT FORM

(These objectives were formulated from the OBJECTIVE SETTING CONFERENCE with Student Teachers, Cooperating Teacher and Supervisor.)

COOPERATING TEACHER: _______________________________ DATE: _______________________________

STUDENT TEACHER: _______________________________

SUPERVISOR: _______________________________

CONTRACTING SESSION #2/CONTRACTING SESSION #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>PRIORITY WEIGHT (3-HIGH)</th>
<th>EXPECTED RESULTS IN MEASURABLE TERMS -- ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESULTS AT FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCE -- EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Develop Skills of Classroom Management (Small and Large Group) | 3 | a. Identify skills necessary for small and large group functions (through weekly feedback sheet, identify management that helped)  
Plus through readings, handouts and observation  
b. Visitation of other rooms (especially Kindergarten)  
i. Base feedback on observation and insights  
ii. Provide for "out-of-Amherst" visits  
c. Be critiqued (Goldhammer) on this objective during semester  
d. Familiarization with technical skills  
e. Videotape | | |
| 3. Take Full Responsibility for Planning, Coordinating and Teaching Class for a Week | 3 | Delay Discussion and Planning | |
APPENDIX G

INSTRUMENTS: LEAD-SELF; LEAD-OTHER
Directions:
Assume you are involved in each of the following twelve situations. Each situation has four alternative actions you might initiate. READ each item carefully.
THINK about what you would do in each circumstance. Then CIRCLE the letter of the alternative action choice which you think would most closely describe your behavior in the situation presented.
Circle only one choice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1** Your subordinates are not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Their performance is in a tailspin. | A. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.  
B. Make yourself available for discussion but don’t push.  
C. Talk with subordinates and then set goals  
D. Intentionally do not intervene. |
| **2** The observable performance of your group is increasing. You have been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards. | A. Engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure that all members are aware of their roles and standards.  
B. Take no definite action.  
C. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.  
D. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks. |
| **3** Members of your group are unable to solve a problem themselves. You have normally left them alone. Group performance and interpersonal relations have been good. | A. Involve the group and together engage in problem-solving.  
B. Let the group work it out.  
C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.  
D. Encourage group to work on problem and be available for discussion. |
| **4** You are considering a major change. Your subordinates have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change. | A. Allow group involvement in developing the change, but don’t push.  
B. Announce changes and then implement with close supervision.  
C. Allow group to formulate its own direction.  
D. Incorporate group recommendations, but you direct the change. |
| **5** The performance of your group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time. | A. Allow group to formulate its own direction  
B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.  
C. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.  
D. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don’t push. |
| **6** You stepped into an efficiently run situation. The previous administrator ran a tight ship. You want to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment. | A. Do what you can to make group feel important and involved.  
B. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.  
C. Intentionally do not intervene.  
D. Get group involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met. |
**SITUATION**

You are considering major changes in your organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in its day-to-day operations.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Define the change and supervise carefully.
B. Acquire group's approval on the change and allow members to organize the implementation.
C. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain control of implementation.
D. Avoid confrontation; leave things alone.

**SITUATION**

Group performance and interpersonal relations are good. You feel somewhat unsure about your lack of direction of the group.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Leave the group alone.
B. Discuss the situation with the group and then initiate necessary changes.
C. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
D. Be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by being too directive.

**SITUATION**

Your superior has appointed you to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gathering. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Let the group work it out.
B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.
C. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.
D. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don't push.

**SITUATION**

Your subordinates, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to your recent redefining of standards.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Allow group involvement in redefining standards but don't push.
B. Redefine standards and supervise carefully.
C. Avoid confrontation by not applying pressure.
D. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that new standards are met.

**SITUATION**

You have been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled its tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
B. Involve subordinates in decision-making and then force good contributions.
C. Discuss past performance with group and then you examine the need for new practices.
D. Continue to leave group alone.

**SITUATION**

Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among subordinates. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. Members have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task.

**ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

A. Try out your solution with subordinates and examine the need for new practices.
B. Allow group members to work it out themselves.
C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
D. Make yourself available for discussion but be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations.
Directions:
Assume ____________________________ (name of leader)
is involved in each of the following twelve situations. Each situation has four alternative actions this leader might initiate. READ each item carefully. THINK about what this person would do in each circumstance. Then CIRCLE the letter of the alternative action choice which you would most closely describe the behavior of this leader in the situation presented. Circle only one choice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITUATION</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates are not responding lately to this leader’s friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Their performance is in a tailspin.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. be available for discussion but would not push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. talk with subordinates and then set goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. intentionally not intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The observable performance of this leader’s group is increasing. The leader has been making sure that all members were aware of their roles and standards.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure that all members are aware of their roles and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. take no definite action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. do what could be done to make the group feel important and involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This leader’s group is unable to solve a problem. The leader has normally left the group alone. Group performance and interpersonal relations have been good.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. involve the group and together engage in problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. let the group work it out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. encourage group to work on problem and be available for discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This leader is considering a major change. The leader’s subordinates have a fine record of accomplishments. They respect the need for change.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. allow group involvement in developing the change, but would not push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. announce changes and then implement with close-supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. allow group to formulate its own direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. incorporate group recommendations but direct the change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance of this leader’s group has been dropping during the last few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. allow group to formulate its own direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. redefine goals and supervise carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. allow group involvement in setting goals, but would not push</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This leader stepped into an efficiently run situation. The previous administrator ran a tight ship. The leader wants to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.</td>
<td>This leader would...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. do what could be done to make group feel important and involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. intentionally not intervene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. get group involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITUATION</td>
<td>ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| This leader is considering making major changes in organizational structure. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has demonstrated flexibility in day-to-day operations. | **This leader would**...  
A. define the change and supervise carefully.  
B. acquire group's approval on the change and allow members to organize its implementation.  
C. be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain control of implementation.  
D. avoid confrontation; leave things alone. |
| Group performance and interpersonal relations are good. This leader feels somewhat unsure about the lack of direction given to the group. | **This leader would**...  
A. leave the group alone.  
B. discuss the situation with the group and then initiate necessary changes.  
C. take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.  
D. be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations by being too directive. |
| This leader has been appointed by a superior to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help. | **This leader would**...  
A. let the group work it out.  
B. incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.  
C. redefine goals and supervise carefully.  
D. allow group involvement in setting goals, but would not push. |
| Subordinates, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to the leader's recent redefining of standards. | **This leader would**...  
A. allow group involvement in redefining standards, but would not push.  
B. redefine standards and supervise carefully.  
C. avoid confrontation by not applying pressure.  
D. incorporate group recommendations, but see that new standards are met. |
| This leader has been promoted to a new position. The previous manager was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled its tasks and direction. Group interrelations are good. | **This leader would**...  
A. take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.  
B. involve subordinates in decision-making and reinforced good contributions.  
C. discuss past performance with group and then examine the need for new practices.  
D. continue to leave the group alone. |
| Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among subordinates. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. Members have effectively maintained long range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task. | **This leader would**...  
A. try out solution with subordinates and examine the need for new practices.  
B. allow group members to work it out themselves.  
C. act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.  
D. be available for discussion, but be careful of hurting boss-subordinate relations. |
APPENDIX H

COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
COOPERATING TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How well did the student teaching experience meet your expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Fairly Well</td>
<td>Perfectly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you enjoy working with this particular student teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Relative to other experiences with student teachers, how did this semester compare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worst</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what degree has your student teacher's performance improved since the beginning of the semester?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Dramatically Improved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If any change, how much of it do you attribute to you and your suggestions? (Please be frank.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What alterations, if any, would you have made in the student teacher's attitude or behavior?

7. Would you want to work with a similar student teacher again?

   With what reservation?
8. Rate your student teacher in comparison to others you may have had and to others you have known about.

         1               5               9
The Very Worst Average The Very Best

9. Assess the student teacher's desire to teach.

         1               5               9
Very Poorly Motivated The Most Highly Motivated

10. Assess the student teacher's desire to teach at the beginning of the semester.

         1               5               9
Very Poorly Motivated The Most Highly Motivated

11. How many objectives was your student teacher able to complete during the semester?

   No. Contracted _______  No. Completed _______

12. How helpful do you feel the process of identifying objectives and contracting leadership style was in helping to complete these objectives.

         1               5               9
Not At All Fairly Helpful Ideally So

13. Following are possible characteristics of supervisors' roles. Indicate on a 5 point scale (1 low to 5 high) the effectiveness of your supervisor in carrying out each role.

   _____ Coordinating
   _____ Observing/Critiquing
   _____ Interpersonal Facilitating
   _____ Provider of Socio-Emotional Support
   _____ Resource Broker
   _____ Personal Counseling
   _____ Professional/Job Counseling
   _____ Promoting Good Relationships Between School and University
   _____ Consulting
   _____ Other --

Now star the 3 roles you observed your supervisor devoting the largest portion of his/her time.
14. The supervisor's style that was used this semester comprised the following characteristics:

1) An initial session to brainstorm objectives with all teachers and student teachers

2) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to develop and agree upon an MBO contract for the semester

3) A group workshop that dealt with leadership theory

4) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to identify appropriate leadership style and agree upon a final contract

5) Observations and Critiques

6) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to renegotiate and evaluate the contract

7) Final "wrap-up" sessions

On the line after each stated characteristic, mark F if you feel it is desirable to formally retain this as an explicit step in the supervisory process—(Put F on the appropriate line).

Mark I if you feel it would be desirable to informally retain this characteristic in the supervisory process—(Put I on the appropriate line).

Mark D if you feel the characteristic should be dropped from the supervisory process—(Put D on the appropriate line).

EACH STEP (#1 to #5) SHOULD BE MARKED F, I, OR D.

15. In what ways did the supervisor complement your style (e.g., Do something lack of time, knowledge, etc., prevented you from doing with the student teacher)?

If appropriate, give an example:
STUDENT TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How well did the student teaching experience meet your expectations?
   Not At All | Fairly Well | Perfectly
   1 5 9

2. How helpful was your cooperating teacher?
   Not At All | Fairly Helpful | Ideally So
   1 5 9

3. Evaluate your student teaching experience.
   A Failure | Fair | Ideal
   1 5 9

4. To what degree has your teaching performance improved since the beginning of this semester?
   Unchanged | Moderately Improved | Dramatically Improved
   1 5 9

5. If any change, how much of this change do you attribute to your cooperating teacher?
   None | 50% | All
   1 5 9

6. What alterations, if any, would you have preferred in the cooperating teacher's attitude or behavior?

7. Would you recommend using this cooperating teacher again?
   With what reservations?
8. Rate your cooperating teacher as a model to follow.

[5-point scale from The Very Worst to The Very Best]

9. How well did the student teaching experience meet your needs?

[5-point scale from Not At All to Perfectly]

10. Assess your desire to teach.

[5-point scale from Poorly Motivated to Most Highly Motivated]

11. Assess your desire to teach at the beginning of the semester.

[5-point scale from Poorly Motivated to Most Highly Motivated]

12. How many objectives identified through your contract were you able to complete during the semester?

No. Contracted ______  No. Completed ______

13. How helpful do you feel the process of identifying objectives and contracting leadership style with your cooperating teacher and supervisor was in helping to complete these objectives?

[5-point scale from Not At All Helpful to Ideally Helpful]

14. Following are possible characteristics of supervisors' roles. Indicate on a 5 point scale (1 low to 5 high) the effectiveness of your supervisor in carrying out each role.

- Coordinating
- Observing/Critiquing
- Interpersonal Facilitating
- Provider of Socio-Emotional Support
- Resource Broker
- Personal Counseling
15. The supervisor's style that was used this semester comprised the following characteristics:

1) An initial session to brainstorm objectives with all teachers and student teachers

2) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to develop and agree upon an MBO contract for the semester

3) A group workshop that dealt with leadership theory

4) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to identify appropriate leadership styles and agree upon a final contract

5) Observations and Critiques

6) Individual meetings with the supervisor and student teacher to renegotiate and evaluate the contract

7) Final "wrap-up" sessions

On the line after each stated characteristic, mark F if you feel it is desirable to formally retain this as an explicit step in the supervisory process—(Put F on the appropriate line).

Mark I if you feel it would be desirable to informally retain this characteristic in the supervisory process—(Put I on the appropriate line).

Mark D if you feel the characteristic should be dropped from the supervisory process—(Put D on the appropriate line).

EACH STEP (#1 to #5) SHOULD BE MARKED F, I, OR D.
APPENDIX I

SUPERVISOR APPRAISAL FORM
APEP supervisors have again requested appraisal by you, cooperating teachers and student teachers, of the services they have been providing this semester. We very much want your comments; but, if you prefer to use check marks on the scales provided, please do so.

Please return the completed forms to the Assistant Principal.

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: ________________________________

ARE YOU A COOPERATING TEACHER: _________

OR STUDENT TEACHER: _________

1. Providing feedback on teaching performance of student teacher. (Effectiveness and frequency of observations, pre- and post-observation conferencing, use of technical skills of teaching, etc.)

   WEAK ___________________________ / ___________________________ STRONG

   Comments:

2. Giving general support and responding to problems raised. (Availability in times of need, providing support individually, in seminars, in three-way conferences.)

   WEAK ___________________________ / ___________________________ STRONG

   Comments:
3. **Marshalling resources for substantive needs.** (Giving specific help in ideas, materials, techniques, and skills related to student teaching, and/or finding where these can be found.)

**WEAK** / **STRONG**

Comments:

4. **Relating student teaching to the broader educational scene.** (Highlighting ways of working and organizing alternative to those used in quads/classrooms, encouraging visits and readings.)

**WEAK** / **STRONG**

Comments:
APPENDIX J

PROTOCOL FOR FINAL INTERVIEW WITH COOPERATING AND STUDENT TEACHERS
PROTOCOL FOR FINAL INTERVIEW
WITH COOPERATING AND STUDENT TEACHERS

During the Review of Performance Meeting (18.0), the author interviewed each of the student teaching triads with the expressed purpose of eliciting from each participant responses as to the effectiveness of the contracting/supervisory process. The interviews lasted approximately one and one-half hours and centered around the following questions:

1. What was your (CT/ST) overall reaction to the contracting/supervisory process (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, necessity of meetings, helpfulness of process, how would you change, time spent, success of each meeting)?

2. Did you (CT) find yourself consciously thinking of leadership style as you worked with the student teacher?

3. After now going through this process once, could you carry on this approach without structure, or is there a need for organized structure?

4. Would your style (CT) of supervision be different if working with other personnel next semester or if in another school district?
5. Did you find the contract flexible enough so you both could make any changes when they were needed? Did you find yourself waiting until a meeting was called to make these changes?

6. How did you feel about the value of the large group meetings?

7. How successful was the clinical supervision model in helping you during the semester?
APPENDIX K

FORMS UTILIZED IN MBO/LEADERSHIP PROCESS OF SUPERVISION
OBJECTIVE SETTING CONFERENCE (TRIAD MEETING)

(Initial form to list objectives formulated by Student and Cooperating Teacher and to develop mutual contract.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOPERATING TEACHER:</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT TEACHER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPERVISOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT TEACHER OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>CONTRACT</th>
<th>COOPERATING TEACHER OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COOPERATING TEACHER:</th>
<th>STUDENT TEACHER:</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MCO FOCUSING/CONTRACT FORM**

(These objectives were formulated from the OBJECTIVE SETTING CONFERENCE with Student Teachers.)

**DATE:**

**RESULTS AT FOLLOW-UP CONFERENCE:**

**EVALUATION**

**EXPECTED RESULTS IN MEASURABLE TERMS — ACTIVITIES**

**PRIORITY WEIGHT (1-HIGH)**

**OBJECTIVES**
## Task Relevant Maturity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>Willingness</th>
<th>Education/Experience</th>
<th>Task Relevant Maturity (Mean Score)</th>
<th>Maturity Level (M1 - M4)</th>
<th>Leadership Style Needed (S1 - S4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicators:**
- Student Teacher Folders
- Classroom Experience to Date
- TCC: Self
- Task
- Impact

(c) Copyright 1975
Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard (Revised by Geoffrey C. Miller)
SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY
## Negotiating Supervisory Style for Agreed Upon Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Style Student Teacher Thinks Needs</th>
<th>Style Cooperating Teacher Thinks Student Teacher Needs</th>
<th>Style Supervisor Thinks Student Teacher Needs</th>
<th>Agreed Upon Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Copyright 1975
Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard
# MBO/Leadership Contract

**Student Teacher:** 

**Cooperating Teacher:** 

**Supervisor:** 

**Date:** 

## Objective | Contracted Leadership Style | Specific Details: Responsibilities, Concerns, Deadlines

(Refer to MBO/Focussing Contract for details)
APPENDIX L

STUDENT TEACHER RESPONSES TO SUPERVISOR APPRAISAL FORM
FOR SPRING AND FALL SEMESTERS

COOPERATING TEACHER RESPONSES TO SUPERVISOR APPRAISAL FORM
FOR SPRING AND FALL SEMESTERS
APPEP Supervisor Appraisal Form

APPEP supervisors have again requested appraisal by you, cooperating teachers and student teachers, of the services they have been providing this semester. We very much want your comments, but would also appreciate your using check marks on the scales provided.

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: ________________________________________

ARE YOU A COOPERATING TEACHER: __________
OR STUDENT TEACHER: _______________

1. Providing feedback on teaching performance of student teacher. (Effectiveness and frequency of observations, pre- and post-observation conferencing, use of technical skills of teaching, etc.)

   WEAK \ 1  /  2  3  4  5  STRONG
   Comments:

2. Giving general support and responding to problems raised. (Availability in times of need, providing support individually, in seminars, in three-way conferences.)

   WEAK \ 1  /  1  2  3  4  5  STRONG
   Comments:

3. Marshalling resources for substantive needs. (Giving specific help in ideas, materials, techniques, and skills related to student teaching, and/or finding where these can be found.)

   WEAK \ 1  /  1  2  3  4  5  STRONG
   Comments:

4. Relating student teaching to the broader educational scene. (Highlighting ways of working and organizing alternative to those used in quads/classrooms, encouraging visits and readings.)

   WEAK \ 1  /  1  2  3  4  5  STRONG
   Comments:
APEP Supervisor Appraisal Form

APEP supervisors have again requested appraisal by you, cooperating teachers and student teachers, of the services they have been providing this semester. We very much want your comments, but would also appreciate your using check marks on the scales provided.

NAME OF SUPERVISOR: __________________________

ARE YOU A COOPERATING TEACHER: __________

OR STUDENT TEACHER: ________________

1. Providing feedback on teaching performance of student teacher. (Effectiveness and frequency of observations, pre- and post-observation conferencing, use of technical skills of teaching, etc.)

   WEAK 3 3 3 1 1 1 4 Strong

   Comments: __________________________

2. Giving general support and responding to problems raised. (Availability in times of need, providing support individually, in seminars, in three-way conferences.)

   WEAK 4 4 4 3 1 Strong

   Comments: __________________________

3. Marshalling resources for substantive needs. (Giving specific help in ideas, materials, techniques, and skills related to student teaching, and/or finding where these can be found.)

   WEAK 4 3 2 2 2 Strong

   Comments: __________________________

4. Relating student teaching to the broader educational scene. (Highlighting ways of working and organizing, alternative to those used in quads/classrooms, encouraging visits and readings.)

   WEAK 2 6 4 1 Strong

   Comments: __________________________

(Note: Each circle represents the position in which the specific number of check marks was recorded by respondents. Responses for Spring, 1975 (n = 13) are shown above the line representing the continuum for the dimension of supervisory strength; the responses for Fall, 1975 (n = 8), when the contracting process using an MBO/Leadership approach was applied, are shown below the line.)