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CHAPTER I

AN OVERVIEW FOR THE STUDY OF SUPERVISORY CONFERENCES

The field of educational supervision has undergone, and is undergoing, definite shifts in emphasis. Changing views of man, of the management of human organizations, and of the learning process have led the emphasis of supervision away from functions of monitoring and inspection to functions of assisting people and organizations in developing their potential and achieving their purposes. The basic rationale for this shift in emphasis is found in Harris's premise that instructional change in the school setting is inevitably a change in people.

Another important shift in emphasis is evident when the most recent writings and proposals in the field of supervision are compared with their antecedents. The trend is toward operational descriptions of supervisory purposes and practices, toward the development of researchable models and theories of supervisor behavior, and toward the investigation of variables hypothesized as being related to effective supervisory behavior. The more specific attempts at defining supervision and supervisory behavior have the advantage of providing researchable hypotheses which, if investigated, can provide

---

additional information for predicting the consequences of supervision. Acknowledging this trend in thinking about supervision should not be construed as evidence that there is, at this time, a well-defined body of knowledge which provides a basis for predicting the outcomes of supervision.

Over the years much has been written about supervision, however, Macdonald\(^1\) stated that most supervisory practices are derived from folklore, personal experiences, and philosophical or psychological background. He further stated that planners for the ASCD's\(^2\) 1965 Research Institute on Research and Development in Supervision were hard pressed to find research in the field of supervision that would provide the basic content for the institute. Even though supervision has a long history in America's schools, its state of development is characterized by the title of the ASCD publication \textit{Supervision: Emerging Profession}.\(^3\)

Research and theory from the social sciences have provided the content from which it is possible to theorize about the kind of supervisory organizations, processes, and behaviors needed by educational institutions in a dynamic, democratic society. Such research

---


\(^2\)The abbreviation ASCD stands for the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

\(^3\)loc. cit.
and theory also provide the basis for investigating, with the intent of improving their effectiveness, processes which have been and will continue to be common to most schemes of supervision. Teacher-supervisor conference interaction is one of these processes.

Statement of the Problem

Although the conference as a supervisory activity has been treated in the literature on educational supervision, these references to the conference have generally consisted of statements about the unique potential of the conference and a series of maxims about how to arrange and conduct a conference consistent with the style of supervision advocated by the author. The supervisor is advised that he will usually determine the way conferences are conducted and that his behavior will have much to do with the outcome of the conferences. In recent years however, there has been an attempt to provide operational definitions, based on models derived from theory and research in other fields, which deal with the relationship of conference interaction to the desired outcomes held for the conference. The dynamics of interaction between the supervisor and teacher is the vehicle through which the purposes of the conference must be achieved. It is necessary that more knowledge about the dynamics of such interaction becomes available before conferences can be used to achieve, in a predictable manner, the general purposes assigned to them. It was the intent of this study to add to the knowledge available on conference interaction.

Specifically, the purposes of this study were to:
1. investigate the relationship of perceived direct and indirect supervisory behavior to teacher perception of (a) productivity of the teacher-supervisor conference interaction, (b) interpersonal satisfaction, (c) learning, and (d) communicative climate.

2. investigate the congruence of (a) the perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the teacher-supervisor interaction, and (b) teacher and supervisor statements of ideal supervisory behavior described on the dimensions of directness and indirectness.

3. investigate the relationship of supervisor flexibility to (a) perceived direct and indirect supervisory behavior, (b) teacher perceptions of productivity, interpersonal satisfaction, and learning, and (c) to congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions.

The specific purposes of this study consisted, in part, of a re-investigation of previous work done by Blumberg, Amidon and Weber.¹ Their investigations of teacher perceptions of supervisory conference interaction were based on Flanders'² initial work with

¹The reports around which this study was designed are: Arthur Blumberg and Edmund Amidon, "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Interaction," Administrator's Notebook, XIV (September, 1965); Arthur Blumberg, Wilford Weber, and Edmund Amidon, "Supervisor Interaction as Seen by Supervisors and Teachers" (paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, February, 1968, New York); Arthur Blumberg, "Supervisory Behavior and Interpersonal Relations," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Spring, 1968), 34-45.

direct and indirect influence. Due to the limited circumstances in which the investigations of Blumberg and associates took place, continued study of conferences using the basic study design reported was seen as needed.¹

Definition of Terms

The use of these terms in this study is intended to convey the following meanings:

1. Direct supervisory behavior—behavior typified by giving information or opinions, giving directions or commands, or giving criticism.

2. Indirect supervisory behavior—behavior typified by accepting feelings, praising or encouraging, accepting ideas, and asking questions.

3. Flexibility—freedom from psychological rigidity, the evaluation of ideas apart from their source, seeing issues as many sided, and tolerance for tentativeness and suspended judgement.

4. Interpersonal satisfaction—the level of regard, empathy, unconditional acceptance, and consistency a person feels in his relationships with another person.

5. Supervisor—one who is employed by the school system and has the responsibility assigned to him to work with teachers for

¹For a more complete rationale of the re-investigation of Blumberg, Amidon, and Weber's work, see Chapter II, Rationale for Re-Investigating the Blumberg Studies, pp. 58-61.
the purpose of improving instruction.

6. Supervisory conference—a conference taking place at a designated time between a teacher and supervisor.

7. Non-evaluative basis—not being involved in the formal evaluation procedures used to determine the retention, promotion, or tenure status of a teacher.

8. Functional group—a supervisor and the teachers with whom he is involved in supervision and who have taken part in this study.

9. Teacher-supervisor interaction—the pattern and content of actions and reactions, primarily verbal, between a supervisor and teacher in a dyadic relationship.

Why Study Teacher-Supervisor Conferences?

It is difficult to imagine any supervisory program which does not make use of the supervisory conference as one method in working toward the improvement of instruction. Howey stated that, "... more time and effort is given to supervision in the field of education than in any other profession." In keeping with the traditional concept of teaching as an individual act, much of this supervision does occur in conferences between a teacher and any one of a number of supervisors who may be working with that teacher. While it is not


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
valid to assume that every meeting between a teacher and supervisor or administrator has as its purpose the personal and professional growth of the teacher, it is safe to assume that this is the purpose for many conferences.

Guss, reporting on a study conducted by the Indiana Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, concluded that holding individual conferences was a common expectation for the supervisor and was seen as one of the most important of the supervisory activities. McInnes alluded to the widely based acceptance of the value of conferences, and at the same time sounded a warning about their misuse when he stated, "Although the supervisory conference is obviously a valuable activity, it is also one that is very expensive and easily misused." Because of the potential value seen for the supervisory conference, its comparative ease of use in the typical school structure, and its potential for providing the kind of supervision which is consistent with current views of teacher assistance, it is likely that extensive use of the supervisory conference will continue.

**Teachers' need for outside help**

In order for supervision to help teachers improve their instruc-

---


tional practices, according to Macdonald,¹ it must be recognized that learning is an individual matter. How something is learned depends on the internal structure of needs, perceptions, readiness, and motivation of the individual teacher. It is the function of supervision to affect this internal structure in a way that promotes personal and professional growth. Bartky² contended that supervision "tacitly assumes the existence" of someone other than the teacher who will set in motion, through his action, movement toward improved instructional practices. There are both personal and organizational factors which make it necessary to provide "outside" assistance to teachers in order to promote their personal growth.

Organizations, in their efforts to achieve and maintain stability, often create conditions which tend to dampen the search for alternative forms of individual and organizational behavior. March³ postulated that classical notions of supervision, often focused on achieving consistency and coordination within an organization, do not promote the generation of alternatives; yet one of the primary ways of influencing someone is by generating, or helping him generate, new alternatives which he may find attractive as a means for improving his performance. Organizations tend to encourage systemized,


ritualized, conforming performances. While a sufficient amount of such standardized behavior is necessary to maintain an organization, any efforts at change must take into account, and perhaps counteract, the presence of factors encouraging such behavior.

In schools, where instructional improvement is inevitably a change in people, there are organizational features which do not encourage or support change. Possibly the most important of these features is the organizational design of the school; namely, individual teachers spending the vast majority of their time in individual classrooms with their students. In such a setting, the kinds of interaction processes which often precede and accompany personal change are minimal. Anderson\(^1\) indicated, "By insulating its members from each other in separate, private teaching spaces, the profession has (perhaps unintentionally) made it difficult for a meaningful professional dialogue to take place within each school."

It is fair to assume that during each day the greatest portion of a teacher's energy is used interacting with students while managing the instructional setting and activities of that day. Because so much of the teacher's energy is used in meeting the day to day demands of teaching, it is unlikely that there will be much emphasis on the energy consuming process of investigating alternative ways of thinking, organizing, or teaching. Alternative ways of teaching can

also be circumscribed by class loads, class schedules, type and amount of teaching materials provided, values built into procedures used to evaluate teachers, and by group norms established by work groups.

Wilson¹ and March² suggested that in order to overcome organizational factors which stifle change, it will be necessary to shift the focus of supervision from individual supervision to organizational supervision. Their position seems well founded; however, it is unlikely that an increase in organizational supervision will decrease the importance of individual supervision. Quality of teaching, whether performed in relative isolation by one individual or in teaching teams, depends essentially on the cumulative effects of many individual teaching acts which are performed as the result of decisions by individual teachers. Factors in organizations which may deter efforts for instructional improvement have been identified. It would be fallacious thinking to assume, however, that difficulties in promoting instructional improvement reside entirely within the characteristics inherent in the organizations called schools.

There is a consistent reference in the literature on supervision to teachers' needs for outside help in achieving personal and professional growth. While examining the six bases for supervision,  

¹L. Craig Wilson and others, Sociology of Supervision (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969).

²James March, "Organizational Factors in Supervision," The Supervisor; Agent for Change, op. cit., p. 124.
Swearingen\(^1\) noted a psychological base for extending experiences through interaction. The teacher-supervisor interaction can be a source of support for learning, can expand the perceptions of teachers, and can help in clarifying goals. Corey\(^2\) expressed a similar position as he noted that often our experiences are not open to us because we have not been given help in utilizing them. In considering conditions that are desirable for the stimulation and guidance of change in teacher behavior, Macdonald\(^3\) assigned supervision the responsibility for providing (1) an interpersonal climate which gives the teacher support during risk taking, (2) reality testing which can give the teachers a more realistic view of their behavior, and (3) clarification processes which help teachers develop their values and their skills for rational thinking. If these kinds of experiences are to be made available to teachers, it will mean extensive use of the supervisory conference, either with individuals or with small learning groups.

The supervisory conference is different from other supervisory activities because of its special potential in the interpersonal interaction it makes possible. Conferences can, and should, according to Howey,\(^4\) involve both parties in the supervisory processes of


\(^3\)Macdonald, "Helping Teachers Change," pp. 4-5.

\(^4\)Howey, p. 8.
(1) providing direction, (2) evaluating, (3) critically analyzing, (4) reflecting, and (5) projecting. Where processes requiring a high degree of interpersonal interaction are needed in working toward instructional improvement, the conference will be much in use because of its unique ability to provide this interaction. Study needs to be done to increase the ability of supervisors to utilize the potential of this interaction.

**A need for research on the conference**

Corey\(^1\) lamented that much of what is written about change is directed toward others. Supervisory literature talks about changing teachers. Literature on teaching talks about changing students. Research in the field of supervision is needed to provide a basis for promoting change of behavior within its own ranks. An oft-repeated theme is that there is a critical need for research in supervision. Most of the research that has been done in supervision has been focused on the duties and roles of supervisors. Faulsi\(^2\), after examining the literature in supervision for empirical studies, commented:

> Instead of a large body of empirical knowledge about supervision we found many studies of the non-behavior of supervisors. We had hopes in the beginning of attempting a theoretical integration but found there wasn't much to integrate.

---

\(^{1}\)Corey, p. 2.

If studies of supervisory behavior are to be made, they will have to be made of those processes, tasks, or methods which have been well enough defined and delineated to be researched. The supervisory conference is one supervisory activity which meets these criteria. Those who have chosen to investigate the conference have also noted the lack of previous research on conferences. Blumberg in 1965, wrote:

In view of the obvious importance of the supervisor in supervisor-teacher interaction, the paucity of research on the supervisory conference is surprising.

But nowhere does one find a clinical study of the supervisory confrontation. Neither are there systematic attempts to study the manner in which teachers perceive the conference itself, the supervisor's behavior, and the apparent consequences. McInnes, who in his dissertation did study teacher-supervisor conference interaction patterns, cited a lack of attention to conferences in the literature and saw a need for study to promote its best use. In recent years, studies of the various aspects of conference behavior have become more evident.

As Harrison stated, "The responsibility for making the individual conference a more profitable growth opportunity rests largely with the supervisor." Research which provides knowledge for supervisors to use in improving their use of the conference is needed


2McInnes, p. 18.
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if supervisors are to fulfill this responsibility.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was designed to investigate the relationship of (1) a measure of supervisor flexibility and (2) teacher perceptions of the directness and indirectness of supervisors' conference behavior to a number of teacher reactions to the conference interaction. Because of this focus, the population obtained for the study and the data collected did not make it possible to generalize to a larger population the perceived behavior patterns of supervisors, nor was it possible to interpret data as an actual description of supervisory behavior or conference interaction. The usefulness of the study is limited to providing data which either support or do not support the contention that these variables are related, in a predictable manner, to teacher reactions to conferences.

Because this kind of study could be made only by using in-service supervisors who would volunteer to assist, subjects were widely distributed throughout the state of Michigan. This meant that procedures for determining teacher participants, distribution and return of materials, and providing instructions for participants had to be designed to use the supervisors who had agreed to help. Although these procedures made the study possible, it should be noted that such procedures forced the use of research methods which tend to decrease control over nuisance variables. Two such methods were:

1. having to rely on written communication to find a population for the study and to provide instructions to both the supervisor
and teacher participants. There was little opportunity to alleviate or correct misinterpretations of instructions.

2. having to secure a number of reactions and opinions at one time. Not being able to get measurements at separate times made it possible for the reactions to one instrument or task to influence or modify the reactions to another.

Organization of the Dissertation

The purpose of Chapter I has been to give an overview of the basic purposes of the study; to present a statement of the problem, a rationale for studying conferences, a definition of terms, and to present the limitations of the study. Chapter II, Rationale and Related Literature, contains the rationale and supporting literature for the assumptions this study has made about the purposes for supervision and supervisory conferences, for investigating supervisory conferences on the basis of perceived directness and indirectness of supervisory behavior, for investigating the relationship of flexibility to the perceived indirectness of supervisor behavior, and for having done a basic re-investigation of Blumberg's work.

Chapter III contains the description of the population and methods used for obtaining participants, the data-gathering instruments and methods, the methods of data analysis, and the hypotheses which were tested by the study. Chapter IV contains the report of the findings, and Chapter V a summary of the study, discussion of the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, and a statement of implications.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE AND RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is: (1) to make explicit, and present the rationale for, the assumptions which are inherent in this study of supervisory conference interaction, (2) to present the rationale and supporting evidence for investigating supervisory conference behavior on the basis of perceived directness and indirectness, and (3) for investigating the relationship of supervisor flexibility to the perceived indirectness of supervisor conference behavior and to teacher reactions to conferences. Since a significant portion of this study was based on Blumberg's previous work, a rationale will also be presented for this re-investigation.

Assumptions

Three basic assumptions underlie the manner in which this study investigated teacher-supervisor conference interaction. They are:

Assumption I—Supervision is a process intended to improve instruction and teacher performance through the use of a helping, supportive relationship in working with teachers. Its basic intent is change.

Assumption II—There are many similarities between teaching and the supervisory act of conferring.

Assumption III—Models used for investigating teaching as dynamic
verbal interaction are appropriate for investigating teacher-supervisor conferences.

Assumption I

Supervision is a process intended to improve instruction and teacher performance through the use of a helping, supportive relationship in working with teachers. Its basic intent is change.

Harris, in his efforts to define the purposes and processes of supervision, used the classification of tractive and dynamic supervision to differentiate between supervision which is intended to produce continuity and supervision which is intended to produce change. Supervision for change, dynamic supervision, has its emphasis on innovating, restructuring, and upgrading rather than on resisting, enforcing, and codifying which are characteristics of supervision for continuity, tractive supervision. The great bulk of literature in educational supervision, while recognizing the need for some continuity, emphasizes that instructional improvement requires dynamic supervision since change is an inherent ingredient of instructional improvement. Not only does the intent of dynamic supervision determine the nature of the supervisor-teacher relationship, but the nature of this relationship is also influenced by current views of the nature of man, the values held in the social system, the nature and purposes of the organization in which the supervision takes place, and by the demands of the times.

The manner in which those who are to be supervised are viewed is a major determinant of the manner in which supervision takes place. Knowles and Saxberg\(^1\) contended:

Knowingly or otherwise, one's assumptions about human nature will influence his relationship with others and his beliefs about social control. Perhaps no other factor has greater influence upon the form and nature of organizational and interpersonal relations.

An optimistic view of man's potential for productive performance in an organization has been posited by McGregor\(^2\) and Likert\(^3\) in their writings pertaining to the management of human organizations. McGregor theorized that the productiveness of both the organization and of the individuals in it can be increased if man is viewed as a resource which does not have to be "controlled" in the classical sense, who will exercise self-direction and seek responsibility given proper conditions, and who has the capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of problems. Likert proposed that influence based primarily on extrinsic motivation and vested authority fails to utilize the full potential in a work group. He suggests that a supportive, facilitative management style where members of an


organization are treated as more than a means to an end is likely to be more productive. Both McGregor and Likert postulated that the supervision of individuals in an organization does not have to be based on the premise than man will avoid work if he can, that the average human being likes to be directed and wishes to avoid responsibility, and that organizational objectives can be reached only if he is coerced, controlled, directed or threatened with sanctions.

Knowles and Saxberg\(^1\) summarized this position succinctly:

> Behavioral Science Man, whether the setting has been in the laboratory or in the field—in business, education, or government organizations—is a "good" man whose potential for productive growth and self-actualization has too often been stunted by his "superiors" outdated assumptions that he is "bad." Therefore for their purposes, he must be manipulated like a puppet on a string.

This more optimistic view of man, with its implications for methods of supervision, is consistent with those beliefs which epitomize the way of life in a democratic society.

Hopkins\(^2\) cited six beliefs which epitomize democracy, five of which expressed a framework of values underlying supervision based on helping, supportive relationships. These beliefs are:

1. faith in the potentialities of the individual man.
2. belief that every person has the capacity to act on thinking.
3. belief that every person who must abide by decisions

\(^{1}\)Knowles and Saxberg, p. 119.

should have a voice in making them.

4. belief that the control and direction of democratic action lies within the situation and not outside of it.

5. belief in the interactive process as basic to the democratic way of life.

Such beliefs do not support schemes of supervision which rely on imposed control and which fail to recognize the individual's potential for growth. The literature in educational supervision gives consistent indications that supervisory emphasis should be on assisting rather than controlling so that the potential of instructional staffs can be developed.

The ASCD position is that supervision is a service rather than an administrative function. Wiles\(^1\) contended that supervisors must see their role as assistance, not direction. Goldhammer,\(^2\) in stating a framework of values for supervision, recognized that individual human autonomy is decreased by controlling functions that are based outside of activities which focus on the processes and structures of teaching. He further recognized the possibility for increasing both an individual's autonomy and skills in teaching by developing the teacher's incentives and skills for self-supervision. Williamson\(^3\) saw supervision as a process by which workers are helped to learn

---


according to their needs, to make the best use of their knowledge and skills, and to improve their abilities to do their job more effectively and increase satisfaction to themselves and to the agency. Berman and Usery\(^1\) referred to the relationship of supervision to democratic values by stating, "Ultimately the goal of supervision within a democratic society should be to build, within teachers, skills of self-analysis and self-direction." Not only is this view of supervision fostered by democratic values, but also by the setting in which educational supervision takes place.

A supervisor in education works with people who are considered professionals, whose training and experience may equal or exceed his own, especially in specialized areas; and whose professional associations are demanding and getting increased influence in all matters which affect them. In addition, the teaching process requires of the teacher a multitude of decisions which are made on the basis of the teacher's assessment of teaching-learning situations. Under such conditions it is unlikely that a highly directive form of supervision will be acceptable to teachers, nor can it be expected to have long range effectiveness. Expertise in planning for and reacting to a broad range of teaching conditions is based on the personal competence a teacher has developed and not on adherence to prescriptive notions of teaching advanced by supervision. It is suggested

by Lovell\(^1\) that if teachers are viewed as competent and professional, and if there is an interest in further development of their competence, the overseeing, hierarchical, monitoring notions of supervision would appear inappropriate. This kind of behavior can be considered inappropriate also if, as Bartky\(^2\) suggested, supervisory style must be consistent with the kind of learning desired for children in the schools. Much of the current emphasis in the improvement of teaching is focused on having teachers spend less time in controlling behavior and more time in acts which promote learner independence and growth.

Rogers\(^3\) believes that the only man who is educated is the man who has learned to learn. Supervision which emphasizes learning and development on the part of teachers is seen as more appropriate in these times than are supervisory activities that are more appropriate to non-changing environments or short term goals. Supervision which develops in teachers skills of self-analysis and self-direction is supervision which amplifies its efforts and is appropriate to a changing environment. Supervision which expends the bulk of its energies inspecting and controlling teacher behavior will leave the teacher with few skills to use in meeting changed conditions.


frequently a desire for such relationships was expressed by the supervisors. Those organizational factors which do not enable the supervisor to assist the teacher with problem identification, determination of alternative courses of action, implementation of action, evaluation of goal attainment, and the evaluation of the goals themselves, are factors which place limitations on having supervisors function in a helping, supportive relationship. They make supportive supervision a precarious value in that organization.

As the vehicle by which any supervisory process becomes manifest, the behavior of supervisors can be a limitation in providing supportive supervision, even in a system which places such supervision high on its hierarchy of values. Regardless of how egalitarian an image a school system may desire to create in its supervisory program, the supervisor-teacher relationship is essentially a superior-subordinate relationship. The supervisor is an agent of the administration and board of education. Usually, he has organization backing, if not expectations, for establishing some kind of relationship with teachers, and he operates under the expectation that he will somehow influence teachers. If, as Macdonald\(^1\) holds, helping teachers depends on the dynamic components of communication and interaction, the superior-subordinate dimensions of the supervisor-teacher relationship need to be considered.
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According to Hughes,¹ any interaction in which there is a superior-subordinate relationship includes a power component held by the superior. As the superior in the relationship, the supervisor has the power to: (1) arrange the learning environment, (2) decide on content, (3) decide on standards, (4) decide who is to do what, and (5) distribute punishment and rewards. A supervisor needs to be aware of the existence of this power component and its possible effect on the kind of relationship the supervisor desires to establish with teachers. Not recognizing its existence is to be ignorant of a powerful factor influencing the outcomes of the teacher-supervisor interaction. McInnes,² in his study of teacher-supervisor interaction, found superior-subordinate interaction patterns typical of the relationship found between teacher and pupils in the classroom. Supervisors exhibited structuring, controlling behavior while teachers were typically confined to the passive role of responding. Teachers made very few attempts to structure the relationship and were usually unsuccessful when they did.

If a supervisory program based on the helping, supportive relationship is desired, McInnes³ suggests training teachers to make


³McInnes, p. 192.
better use of the interaction they have with supervisors. They also need to become aware of the role-set typically assumed by participants in a superior-subordinate interaction and to change their role-set so that they can secure more help from supervisors. McInnes\(^1\) found that not only do supervisors follow the same basic pattern of dominative behavior exhibited by teachers in their superior-subordinate relationships with students, but that teachers' reactions as subordinates were very similar to those of students. Regardless of the intent of supervisory programs, if the supervisors and teachers fall into role-sets typically found in superior-subordinate interactions because they are unaware of the probable causes of such role-sets, the helping relationship is unlikely to become a reality.

**The relationship of teacher perception to supervisor behavior**

The phenomenological premise that behavior is based on what is perceived has great significance for considering the effects of supervisory behavior. Regardless of supervisory intent, the effectiveness of supervision (or in the case of this study, supervisory conferences) will be controlled to a large extent by the way it is perceived by teachers. Teachers' perceptions of supervision will communicate to them supervisory expectations for their role in this process—active or passive, dependent or collaborative, free or restricted, open or ritualized, expansive or conforming. These perceptions will define their role basically either as a participant or a

\(^{1}\)McInnes, pp. 170-73.
recipient. If supervision is to be, in fact, a helping relationship, it is essential that teachers view their role as participants who directly influence this teacher-supervisor relationship.

It is a common phenomenon for the superior in a superior-subordinate relationship to view his behavior and the results of his behavior as being more productive than do the subordinates. Numerous studies have documented this phenomenon in a variety of situations. Marquist\textsuperscript{1} found that principals saw themselves providing more supervisory stimulus for instructional improvement than did their teachers. Towers\textsuperscript{2} reported administrators rating the usefulness of in-service activities more favorably than did teachers. Frisbie\textsuperscript{3} concluded that principals saw supervision functioning more effectively in secondary schools than their teachers did. The presence of this phenomenon makes it important to gather data which gives dimensions to any discrepancies between supervisor and teacher views about what is actually occurring in the supervisory process. Blumberg\textsuperscript{4} hypothesized that "in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{3}Kenneth Glen Frisbie, "A Study of the Functions of Supervision as Perceived by Principals and Teachers in Class AAA Missouri High Schools and the Effect of These Perceptions on Teacher Morale," (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Kansas, 1969).
\end{itemize}
order to create a productive . . . climate, supervisors and teachers ought to have common perceptions of their relationship," and that barriers to effective interaction are created by discrepancies in viewpoint.

Although teacher satisfaction is not the ultimate criterion for determining the success of supervisory behavior, it is an important factor in determining how teachers will involve themselves in the supervision process. Blumberg\(^1\) stated that "in order for supervisors to perform their supervisory roles in a productive manner, it is important to establish the kind of interpersonal relationship in which the teacher will see the supervisor as a source of help."

There is, therefore, a need to study the relationship between perceived supervisory behavior and teachers' feelings about the kind and amount of help they get from teacher-supervisor interaction. Such information can be helpful in two ways.

First, this kind of information can be used to investigate the relationship between teacher satisfaction and theoretically-based models of supervisory behavior. Second, the information can be used to describe teacher expectations associated with those supervisory roles seen as helpful. Meeting these expectations does affect the supervisory relationship with teachers. Lucio and McNeil\(^2\) commented, "When working with others, it sometimes seems to matter little what

\(^1\)Blumberg, loc. cit., p. 1.

a supervisor actually does. It matters more that what he does is what they think he should do."

Assumption II

There are many similarities between teaching and the supervisory act of conferring.

The recognition that the more personal acts of supervision are similar to teaching is not new. Bartky¹ wrote, in 1953, that supervision and teaching were similar terms. Berman and Usery² acknowledged that both supervision and teaching involve mediation and intervention. Ammons³ viewed supervision as a teaching function which is conducted in a one-to-one or small group situation. Comparisons between supervision and the more recent definitions of teaching—teaching as dynamics of verbal interaction—show that supervision, especially in the act of conferring, can be viewed as a teaching function. McInnes,⁴ Howey,⁵ and Weller⁶ have all made the assumption

¹Bartky, p. 2.
²Berman and Usery, p. 2.
⁴McInnes
that the conferring behavior of supervisors was basically a teaching process. Howey's\(^1\) position was that one way to delimit the various aspects of supervision for more systematic analysis was to view it basically as a teaching function.

McInnes\(^2\) offered a thorough rationale for viewing teaching and the supervisory act of conferring as similar. He advanced the following similarities:

1. **Similarity of intent.**
   
   Conferences are a system of action intended to induce learning and to bring about change in teacher behavior. The conference resembles Gage's\(^3\) definition of teaching. "Teaching is an interpersonal influence aimed at changing the ways in which other persons can or will behave."

2. **Teaching and conferring as verbal activities.**
   
   Flanders' stated that most of the functions associated with teaching are implemented verbally. Any analysis of what happens in teacher-supervisor conferences shows that Flanders' statement also holds true for conferring.

3. **Superior-subordinate relationships are common to both teaching and conferring.**

---

\(^1\)Howey, p. 10.  
\(^2\)McInnes, pp. 19-22.  

Bellack's studies offered evidence that teacher verbal style is quite consistent, varying little from time to time or from situation to situation. McInnes found that the verbal patterns of the supervisors he investigated also exhibited verbal stability.

5. Principles of learning are applicable to both conference and classroom learning situations.

As research in teaching, based on the definition of teaching as interaction, has become more prevalent, it has provided a basis for defining supervisory conference behavior as teaching and for investigating the interaction of the conference.

Assumption III

Models used for investigating teaching as dynamic verbal interaction are appropriate for investigating teacher-supervisor conferences.

The support given for assuming that teaching and conferring are similar provides the logical basis for also assuming that models used for the investigation of teaching are applicable to the investigation of teacher-supervisor conferences.


2McInnes, pp. 172-73.
Directness and Indirectness as Dimensions
for Investigating Supervisor Behavior
in Teacher-Supervisor Conferences

Earlier in this chapter support was given for the helping, supportive relationship being appropriate for meeting current needs for instructional improvement and for being consistent with the democratic ethic. Support was also given for viewing the relationship in teacher-supervisor conferences as a superior-subordinate relationship and for viewing the supervisory act of conferring as teaching. Also justified was the investigation of the teacher-supervisor conference through the use of models formulated to investigate teaching when it is defined as dynamic verbal interaction.

In this section, the rationale is given for investigating supervisory conference interaction with a teaching-research model based on the dimensions of directness and indirectness. This rationale is based on (1) the theoretical foundation for investigating teacher-supervisor conference interaction on the dimensions of directness and indirectness and (2) studies of conferences which have used these dimensions in their investigations.

Theoretical base for investigating teacher-supervisor interaction on the dimensions of directness and indirectness

Flanders's design for investigating teaching interaction on the dimensions of directness and indirectness was formulated on a

---

^1Flanders

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
psychology of superior-subordinate relationships. This psychology recognizes that in a superior-subordinate relationship the power to influence is unevenly distributed because of the status conferred to the superior by his supporting institution. As a result, the superior can and does control interaction to a much greater extent than the subordinate. Flanders' model of direct and indirect behavior, recognizing the power of the superior to control interaction, is used to determine the manner in which the superior decides to exert influence during interaction. These decisions have the effect of communicating to subordinates the role they are expected to play in the interaction and in determining the nature of their experience. Learning climate is an outgrowth of this interaction pattern.

The premise that the superior's verbal behavior controls interaction and sets the pattern for that interaction is supported by Bellack and Davitz. They suggest that in teaching situations the student plays a role in relation to the behavior of the teacher and that these roles are exhibited in verbal patterns. Their studies have shown that verbal interaction between teacher and student has in it aspects of gaming; where roles are taken, rules of interaction are followed, and the patterning of interaction takes place along predictable lines. The power of the superior in an interaction situation manifests itself in his control of the interaction pattern. Typically, this pattern does not call for the subordinate to structure, initiate, solicit, evaluate, or challenge through his verbal

---

1 Bellack and Davitz
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behavior. Interaction patterns, and consequently, teaching-learning patterns, are defined by Flanders' categorizations of direct and indirect influence.

Flanders noted that most research on classroom climate, which is related to classroom interaction, makes distinctions in terms of the integrative and dominative contact pattern identified in the research of Anderson and Brewer. Integrative behavior is flexible, adaptive, objective, scientific, and cooperative and is seen as producing more spontaneity, more initiative, more voluntary contributions and more acts of problem solving on the part of the learner than does dominative behavior. Dominative behavior focuses on attempts to control the behavior of others according to an external set of standards. It is seen as decreasing the learner's freedom of action, as encouraging excessive conformity, and as creating dependence on the part of the learner. Flanders' direct patterns of influence describe essentially dominative behavior while the indirect patterns of influence describe essentially integrative behavior.

On the basis of the concepts of direct and indirect influence, there are two generic patterns of behavior with which to describe the influence exerted by the superior in a superior-subordinate relationship. Flanders described them as indirect, integrative behavior

1 Flanders, p. 3.
3 Flanders, p. 6.
investigated.

2. there exists a power component in this superior-subordinate relationship which enables the superior to determine the essential nature of the interaction and learning environment.

3. interaction which promotes independent, problem-focused behavior on the part of the subordinate is not promoted by controlling behavior on the part of the superior.

It would appear that the desired outcomes of supervision, as defined for this study, are most likely to be achieved through learner behavior encouraged by integrative acts of the supervisor in the teacher-supervisor conference interaction. Because, in effect, the direct-indirect dimensions of supervisory behavior represent two styles of influence, one which encourages the kind of outcomes desired from supervision and the other which discourages desired outcomes, the use of these dimensions for investigative purposes is well founded.

Studies of supervisory conference interaction which have used the dimensions of directness and indirectness as variables in their investigation

The usefulness of investigating teacher-supervisor interaction using direct and indirect supervisor behavior as a variable is evidenced by the fact that a number of studies have either built these dimensions into systems for investigating supervisory conference behavior or, with slight modification, have used the basic Flanders model. Six of the studies and their findings are reviewed here with major emphasis placed on the work of Blumberg.

Using a modification of the Flanders System of Interaction
Analysis, Hupper\textsuperscript{1} classified the verbal behavior of twenty-four administrators who were observed during an administrative conference. Teacher participants in these conferences described each administrator by responding to a questionnaire and, on the basis of these questionnaires, administrators who were perceived as exhibiting the most effective and least effective conference behavior were identified and re-visited for conference observation. Data gathered from both conferences were used to compare the performance characteristics of the two groups. Hupper's findings indicated that administrators who are viewed as most successful by teachers:

1. accept ideas more often than they use directions or commands.
2. permit teachers more time to talk over an extended period of time.
3. use more praise and acceptance of ideas, questions, and directions.

Administrators who are viewed as least successful by teachers:

1. accept teachers' ideas about as often as they give directions or commands.
2. use directions or commands on a recurring basis when this category of behavior has once begun.
3. respond to teachers most frequently by lecturing.

The conference behaviors exhibited more frequently by administrators

perceived as most successful by teachers are behaviors which Flanders' system classifies as indirect, integrative influences.

Another study using a modification of the Flanders Interaction Analysis System, conducted by McInnes,$^1$ analyzed the supervisory conference behavior of three supervisors who were working with secondary in-service teachers on the implementation of a program of reading improvement. Each supervisor held six conferences with three different teachers. The fifty-four conferences were taped for analysis on the revised Flanders system. Data were analyzed to describe (1) relative amounts of supervisor and teacher talk, (2) perception of role, and (3) stability of styles.

The data showed that among the three supervisors, amounts—time occupied—of supervisor and teacher talk varied from a low of fifty percent to a high of eighty-four percent for supervisors and from a low of sixteen percent to a high of fifty percent for teachers. This variation existed primarily in the performance of different supervisors, not in the performance of the same supervisor in different conferences. Supervisors used forty-five to fifty percent of the time lecturing and giving information, their greatest use of time; fifteen to eighteen percent of the time giving commands, their second greatest use of time; and gave a negligible amount of criticism. The amount of talk by each participant in the conference was very similar to the stereotyped patterns of teacher behavior in classrooms where teachers are found to talk about three times as

$^1$McInnes
much as students. Commenting on the interaction patterns which were observed, McInnes concluded that the "intent of the supervisor to play either a dominating or helping role appears to be reflected in the amount and kind of talking he does." The great amount of talking done by supervisors appears to be connected with the dominative effects of most conferences. As a rule, the supervisor did not use acts which would solicit knowledge about the concerns, needs, or views of the teacher.

Data analysis showed that the supervisors adopted a stereotyped teaching role which was inflexible and that teachers' reactions were patterned much like that of students. Their role was relatively passive. It appeared to McInnes that both the teachers and supervisors lacked flexibility in altering their roles and thus the nature of their interaction.

A comparison of the supervisors' behavior in a series of conferences with the same teacher and a comparison of their behavior with different teachers revealed that these supervisors had characteristic ways of behaving that did not vary much over a number of interactions. A stability of style which was primarily dominant created interaction patterns which called for passivity and compliance on the part of teachers. Noting a lack of flexibility of response on the part of supervisors, McInnes stated, "The inability to make conferences integrative seemed to result more from inadvertent moves than

---

1 McInnes, p. 127
2 McInnes, p. 173.
from deep-rooted intention to be directive."

In reflecting on the behavior patterns identified by his study, McInnes concluded that:

1. insufficient attention had been given to the use of conferences by supervisors as a means of promoting better teaching.
2. supervisors need to learn to use fewer of the dominative acts of telling, directing, and disagreeing and more of the integrative acts of accepting, building, and developing.
3. supervisors should be exposed to in-service activities which help them become and remain aware of their verbal behavior.
4. supervisors should be selected from teachers who have exhibited flexibility.
5. teachers should be trained to get help from supervisors by changing their concept of the role they should play in a conference.

Blumberg, in conjunction with Amidon and Weber, has in the literature a series of four reports on his investigations of teacher-supervisor conference interaction. Since the four reports do not actually represent four different studies but rather are separate reports of the different variables investigated in two studies, it is useful to provide some general background information which relates to all of the reports, and to then review the four reports and describe the relationships found between the variables investigated.

Data used to describe variables which were investigated were collected through the use of the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor
Behavior instrument devised by Blumberg and Amidon.\(^1\) The first part of this instrument is an adaptation of Flanders\(^2\) model for investigating teacher-pupil interaction in the classroom. The items in this part of the instrument provide a non-evaluative description of the supervisors' behavior as seen by teachers. Each respondent was asked to indicate, by placing a mark on a continuum, the amount of emphasis he saw his supervisor placing on (1) giving information or opinion, (2) giving directions or commands, (3) giving criticism, (4) accepting feelings, (5) praising or encouraging, (6) asking questions, (7) accepting ideas, (8) giving objective information, and (9) discussion of affective content in the conference. The second part of the instrument secured teacher evaluations of (1) communicative freedom and supportiveness, (2) learning outcomes, and (3) general productivity of the conference. To get these evaluations, teachers were asked to respond to straightforward, direct questions about these matters. For example, teacher perception of productivity was obtained by asking a single question, "In general, do you feel your supervisory conferences are: (1) a very productive use of time and energy, or (2) useless - a waste of time and energy." Attitudes 1 and 2 represent the polar positions of a continuum on which the teacher can indicate his assessment of the value of the conference.

The first part of the instrument described direct and indirect

\(^1\)Instrument can be seen on page 182 in Appendix C.

\(^2\)Flanders
influences which could be exhibited by the supervisors. Consistent with Flanders' description of direct and indirect influence, direct behavior was operationally defined by the instrument as giving information or opinion, giving directions or commands, and giving criticism. Indirect behavior was defined as accepting feelings, praising and encouraging, accepting ideas, and asking questions. Teacher responses to this portion of the instrument showed that perceived supervisor behavior did fall into different patterns of direct and indirect influence.

Direct and indirect behavior are independent behaviors; the presence of direct behavior does not in itself create an absence of indirect behavior and vice versa. As such, it was conceivable that teachers would, and they did, describe behavior patterns which contained a variety of combinations of direct and indirect supervisory behavior. Blumberg identified four groupings which were then used to describe direct-indirect behavior patterns that could be treated as either dependent or independent variables. These groups were:

1. High-direct, High-indirect
2. High-direct, Low-indirect
3. Low-direct, High-indirect
4. Low-direct, Low-indirect

Placement in one of these four groups was determined by computing a cumulative score for directness and indirectness from the teacher ratings on the Teacher Perception of Supervisor Behavior instrument. It was then determined if these cumulative scores fell within the
range of scores used to define operationally the four groupings of
directness and indirectness. For example, if a teacher's rating of
perceived supervisor behavior produced cumulative scores of 14 for
directness and 20 for indirectness, this supervisor's behavior did
not fall into one of the four behavior groups. As a result, this
teacher's ratings on other variables would not be analyzed to deter-
mine relationships between these variables and supervisor directness
and indirectness. Dealing with these "pure types" only increased
the likelihood that differences between different behavior patterns
and their relationship to the other variables mentioned would become
evident.

Blumberg and Amidon's study, "Teacher Perceptions of
Supervisor-Teacher Interaction" investigated the relationship of
variables found in the Blumberg-Amidon instrument just described;
perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior and the
evaluation of the conference and conference interaction. Comparisons
were made with data collected from those teachers whose rating of
their supervisor's directness and indirectness placed them in one of
the four groups described by Blumberg. Compared were perceived
conference productivity, perceived amounts of learning, and perceived
communicative climate. The population for this study consisted of
166 in-service teachers who were enrolled for graduate work at Temple
University during the spring and summer of 1964. Teachers who

\[1\] Arthur Blumberg and Edmund Amidon, "Teacher Perceptions of
Supervisor-Teacher Interaction," Administrator's Notebook, XIV
(September, 1965), 1-4.
reported they had been involved in a conference with their principal during the year were those included in the study. From this population of 166 teachers, the evaluations of 64 teachers were used; 16 in each of the 4 groups described operationally by Blumberg on the dimensions of directness and indirectness.

Group mean scores were analyzed by a one-way analysis of variance and Tukey's significant gap and straggler tests. On all items compared, differences at the .01 level of significance were obtained. The findings led Blumberg and Amidon to conclude that:

1. the productivity of the conference is evaluated most negatively when the supervisor is perceived as emphasizing direct influence and de-emphasizing indirect influence.

2. teachers who perceived their supervisors' behavior as High-indirect, in combination with High-direct or Low-direct, felt they learned more about their teaching behavior and about themselves than those teachers who perceived Low-indirect behavior.

3. freedom of communication appears to be curtailed only when the supervisor combines High-direct behavior with Low-indirect behavior.

4. groups who perceived their supervisors de-emphasizing indirect behavior showed a greater discrepancy between perceived supervisor behavior and desired supervisory behavior than did the groups who perceived their supervisors emphasizing indirect behavior.

In a paper presented to the American Educational Research...
Association in 1967, Blumberg, Weber, and Amidon\(^1\) reported comparisons made between the data gathered in the study just reviewed and data gathered from forty-five public school supervisors who had direct responsibility for the improvement of instruction. These supervisors were also enrolled in graduate classes at Temple University during the summer. The teachers and supervisors from whom responses were gathered had no functional relationship.

The function of the study was to make comparisons between:

1. the supervisors' perceptions of their own behavior and teachers' perceptions of the supervisors' behavior.

2. supervisors' perceptions of teachers' attitude toward the interaction that takes place in supervisory conferences and the actual attitudes reported by teachers.

3. the kind and amount of learning supervisors think teachers get from the supervisory conference and the kind and amount of learning teachers say they get.

4. the degree of overall productivity as seen by supervisors and teachers.

To gather data that were comparable, the supervisors were asked to describe their supervisory conference behavior on the first part of the Blumberg-Amidon instrument and to rate, on the second part of the instrument, the scales concerning productivity, learning, and communicative atmosphere as they thought teachers would rate them.

\(^1\)Blumberg, Weber, and Amidon, "Supervisor Interaction as Seen by Supervisors and Teachers."
For data analysis, the means for each group were calculated for all scales on the instrument and for the grouped scale scores needed to determine mean scores for a measure of directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior. Data were analyzed to test the significance of the differences between teacher and supervisor mean ratings.

The findings were that:

1. supervisors saw themselves as being less direct than did the teachers.

2. supervisors saw themselves as being more indirect than did the teachers.

3. supervisors felt that teachers learned more about themselves and their teaching as a result of the conferences than did the teachers.

4. teachers felt that a superior-subordinate relationship was conveyed to a greater extent than did supervisors.

5. supervisors saw themselves being more empathetic than did teachers.

6. supervisors rated the productivity of the conferences higher than did the teachers.

A third report by Blumberg, "Supervisory Behavior and Interpersonal Relations," dealt with the relationship of perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior to reported teacher satisfaction with teacher-supervisor interpersonal relations. Instruments

used for this investigation were the Blumberg-Amidon instrument and
the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Both instruments were
administered to 210 in-service teachers registered in graduate
courses at Temple University during the 1965-66 academic year. Out
of the 210 teacher responses, Blumberg identified 60 teachers, 15 in
each of 4 groups, who perceived their supervisors' behavior as High-
direct, High-indirect; High-direct, Low-indirect; Low-direct, High-
indirect; and Low-direct, Low-indirect. The responses of these
teachers on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory, a measure of
interpersonal satisfaction, were then compared using the 4 groupings
of perceived supervisor behavior as independent variables.

On the basis of previous findings which had shown perceived
indirect supervisory behavior associated with more favorable reac­
tions to teacher-supervisor conferences than were found for perceived
direct supervisory behavior, Blumberg hypothesized that:

1. more positive interpersonal relations would be perceived
   by teachers who describe their supervisors' behavior as
   High-direct, High-indirect than would those who perceived
   supervisor behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect or Low-
   direct, Low-indirect.

2. more positive interpersonal relations would be perceived by
   teachers who describe their supervisors' behavior as Low-
   direct, High-indirect than would those who describe super­
   visor behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect or Low-direct,

1Instrument can be seen on page 185 in Appendix C.
Low-indirect.

3. using the first and fourth quartile scores of interpersonal satisfaction as independent variables and perceived supervisory behavior style as dependent variables would show that perceived indirectness and positive ratings of interpersonal satisfaction were systematically related.

Analysis of the data revealed that:

1. those behavioral styles that were seen as having a relatively heavy emphasis on indirect behavior seemed to be more related to interpersonal relations that were more positive than behavioral styles which did not emphasize indirectness.

2. generally speaking, High-direct emphasis, when in the presence of High-indirect emphasis, did not reduce interpersonal satisfaction. Any behavior style with a Low-indirect emphasis was associated with less positive feelings of interpersonal satisfaction.

3. use of interpersonal satisfaction as an independent variable indicated that more positive relationships are associated with a lower emphasis on direct behavior and higher emphasis on indirect behavior.

The final report of Blumberg\(^1\) to be reviewed is, "Teacher Morale as a Function of Perceived Behavioral Style." Blumberg

stated that "on a hunch" an instrument to measure teacher morale was administered to the same 210 teachers, reported in the previous study, who responded to the Blumberg-Amidon instrument and the Barrett-Lennard Inventory. The morale instrument used an incomplete sentence completion process to identify the positiveness of teachers' reactions to their dealings with children, administration, community, school board, and the like.

As in the previous studies reported, data for analysis were taken only from those teachers who rated their supervisors' behavioral styles so that they qualified for placement in one of the four supervisory styles. Data were analyzed by a 2 X 2 analysis of variance design. Significant differences in morale scores were associated with variations in perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior. Blumberg and Weber concluded that differences in morale seemed to be related to the amount of emphasis teachers perceived their supervisors putting on indirect behavior in their interaction with teachers.

The six studies reviewed all found direct and indirect dimensions of behavior significantly related to a number of variables being investigated. Hupper found that from a group of twenty-four principals, those principals rated most successful by teachers exhibited more integrative behavior in conferences than principals

1The instrument used as a measurement of morale is discussed in: John H. Suehr, "A Study of Morale in Education Utilizing Incomplete Sentences." The Journal of Educational Research, LVI (October, 1962), 75-81.
rated as least successful. McInnes found supervisor conference behavior resembling the directive, dominative pattern of teachers' behavior typical of classroom settings. The Blumberg studies showed that perceptions measured through the constructs of directness and indirectness are related to interpersonal satisfaction, perceived productiveness of conferences, and morale. The fact that these variables have been related to the directness and indirectness of behavior provided justification for further use of these dimensions in the investigation of conference interaction.

The Relationship of Flexibility to Direct and Indirect Behavior

As a supervisor confers with a teacher, he has a multitude of decisions to make about how he is going to act and react in the conference interaction. Some of these decisions have been made prior to the conference and many more, probably most of them, will be made during the interaction between the teacher and supervisor. Some are conscious decisions, some are not. All of these decisions will be based on the intellectual and dispositional characteristics of that supervisor. The supervisor can be classified as flexible if these characteristics permit him to make decisions which are germane to the conditions at hand, react to ideas rather than their sources, are not predicated on simplifications of complex situations, and do not exhibit a compulsion to act for action sake. It is hypothesized in this study that supervisor flexibility is a factor related to (1) the manner in which a supervisor is perceived by teachers on the
dimensions of directness and indirectness of behavior, (2) the quality of interpersonal relations perceived by teachers, (3) satisfaction with the supervisory conference, and (4) congruency of supervisor and teacher perception of supervisory behavior.

An analysis of the concept of flexibility as defined by Felker and Smith\(^1\) provides a theoretical base for hypothesizing a relationship between flexibility and a supervisor's capacity or disposition to act in an integrative manner. They define the four characteristics of flexibility as:

1. being free of psychological rigidity.

   Psychological rigidity is thought of as the continuance of behavior in a new situation when it no longer is appropriate—the tendency to perform an activity beyond its proper task-situation. Exhibitions of rigidity seem to occur in three types of situations: first, when past experiences provide no background for acting in a way that is appropriate to a new situation; second, when a series of similar experiences is followed by an experience which is superficially similar but fundamentally different; and third, when situations involve considerable emotional stress.

2. evaluating ideas apart from their source.

3. seeing issues as many-sided rather than two-sided, and

developing relatively large numbers of alternative hypotheses, explanations, and viewpoints.
Most complex issues are not two sided, and as such have many possible "sides," many possible solutions, and intermediate points of view. The authors point out that white is not a contradiction of black. All things "non-black" constitute the contradiction of black.

4. maintaining a tolerance for tentativeness and suspended judgement and a willingness to take action in an ambiguous situation.

There is a difference between tolerance for tentativeness and urges to put off making a decision when quick decisions are called for. The authors stated that a flexible person "is not so emotionally anxious in an ambiguous situation that he will not make decisions; neither will he make unnecessary decisions simply to remove anxiety."

Flexibility, as defined by Felker and Smith, is evidenced in the thinking a person does. Their PM Scale attempts to assess such thinking by examining the kinds of decisions made in situations presented by the instrument. The four characteristics of flexibility include two characteristics—(1) evaluating ideas apart from their source and (2) seeing issues as many sided—which deal primarily with logical errors, and two other characteristics—(1) freedom

---

1Felker and Smith, p. 7.

2See PM Scale on page 168.
from psychological rigidity and (2) maintaining a tolerance for
tentativeness—which deal with dispositional tendencies. Recognition
of errors in thinking is seen as an intellectual skill; however,
dealing with the error involves dispositional aspects of behavior.
Flexibility is described as "... an interesting combination of
logical abilities and psychological dispositions."¹

Although supervisors function in a setting which presents
problems that have a degree of commonality, each individual relation­
ship with a teacher is sure to involve many factors unique to that
relationship. As a supervisor works with teachers for the improve­
ment of instruction it is a certainty that much of the interaction
will be centered with problems of discipline, classroom management,
organization of content and learning experiences, and like problems
which are inherent in education as it is organized in this country.
It is also a certainty that while the problems pursued with indiv­
dual teachers are classifiable by these common categories, the
individual teacher's problems and their solutions are unique from
teacher to teacher; this uniqueness being created by differences in
teacher personality, experience, and training; in characteristics of
the students being taught; in the school environment in which the
Teaching occurs; in expectations of the community supplying students
to the school; and in the grade level and subject areas being taught.

Many of the "problems" encountered by teachers are recurrent
"problems" in that they are manifestations of the growth and learning

¹Felker and Smith, p. 3.
processes of students, and their "solution" does not mean an absence of these problems in the future. Rather, "solutions" often involve identification of methods for working with these problems in a way that makes possible maximum growth for students, realizing that these problems will repeat themselves, probably in somewhat different form, with a change in assignments, the passage of time, or a change in students. Because teaching problems are endemic and are created by the interaction of many variables which are unique with each teacher's situation, it is impossible, other than in the broadest sense, for a supervisor to be prescriptive about their solution.

The rationale in this study is that, given these conditions and the nature of other militating considerations already mentioned, the role of the supervisor is to provide a helping, supportive relationship with which teachers are helped to become more effective, and that this kind of relationship is best achieved by indirect, integrative supervisor influence. The four characteristics of flexibility are seen as related to supervisors' abilities and dispositions to behave in an integrative mode.

It is possible that the presence of psychological rigidity in a supervisor would tend to create behavior in which the involvement of the teacher in the evaluation of problems, their sources, and of possible solutions is minimal or insincere. The supervisor brings to the conference a definition of problems and possible solutions based on past experiences. Smith\(^1\) warned, "All of us frequently

---

\(^1\)Philip G. Smith, Philosophic-Mindedness in Educational Administration (Columbus, Ohio: University Press, Ohio State University, 1956), p. 45.
'know too much' about how to deal with certain types of situations—our long experience tends to develop in us a kind of psychological rigidity." It is difficult to imagine any supervisor knowing too much about teaching and curriculum, so that this in itself would not pose a problem. What would pose a problem, is to have a supervisor with considerable knowledge who feels there is no use looking beyond that knowledge and who would then be disposed to direct teachers. Wiles acknowledged this danger in his plea for supervisors to provide assistance, not direction. He says the supervisor must function in a way that makes it possible for individuals to accept assistance. If a supervisor interprets his role as telling, the teacher cannot accept it. If he interprets his role as being superior, teachers cannot accept it. Croft reported changes in supervisor flexibility being accompanied by commensurate changes in supervisor tendencies to be person-centered. It would seem that psychological rigidness is not conducive to providing integrative influence. The factors which influence the supervisors' evaluation of ideas would appear to be related to the use of integrative or dominative influence. The tendency to either accept or reject ideas because of their source militates against evaluation of ideas on their own merits. Felker and Smith stated that fallacious acceptance or

---

1Wiles, p. 118.

2John C. Croft, "Changes in Flexibility and Supervisory Attitudes of Educational Administrators" (paper presented to the Canadian Council for Research in Education, June, 1969, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg).

3Felker and Smith, p. 5.
rejection of ideas can occur not only from rejecting the persons advancing the ideas but also from reactions to connotations of words used in expressing ideas. The tendency for the supervisor to take an accepting or rejecting stance toward ideas which have not been explored for their possible contribution to matters at hand can have a number of sources; feelings that initiating action should come from superiors in a superior-subordinate relationship, personal feelings about the teacher with whom they are working, a limited knowledge of theory and research in teaching, pressures they feel to produce specific kinds of teacher behavior, absence of an experimental attitude, or emotional attachments to ideas, techniques, or content. Whatever the source, behavior which fails to explore the usefulness of ideas cannot be expected to have an integrative effect.

Since, as Macdonald\(^1\) stated, education has not yet established chains from teacher behavior to pupil learning, there are few teaching problems where a packaged, pat answer constitutes a solution; where either the presence or absence of easily managed influences will alleviate a problem. This being the case, a disposition toward seeing issues as many-sided rather than two-sided, and to developing multiple alternative hypotheses, explanations and viewpoints is a desirable attribute in a supervisor; one not likely to be found in a direct, dominative supervisor. If, as is proposed in the concept of supervision found in this study, supervision is to foster self-

\(^1\)Macdonald, "Helping Teachers Change," p. 2.
development, there is a need, Combs\(^1\) claimed, for an experimental attitude. March\(^2\) noted that a primary method for influencing someone is by generating new alternatives which offer options for different behavior. In a situation where there are few pat answers that can be passed on to teachers \textit{in toto}, it seems that the most profitable supervisory behavior would help the teacher define problems and bring relevant data and knowledge to bear while developing and testing alternatives.

Any experimental attitude toward procedures to be used in instructional improvement requires a tolerance for tentativeness and suspended judgement as well as a willingness to take action in ambiguous situations. Experimentation itself is action taken in ambiguous situations for the purpose of making a situation less ambiguous. Characteristic of rigid behavior are attempts to confine or organize on narrow terms as opposed to comprehensive terms and to order, for purposes of security, ambiguous situations only in terms of past experiences. Such tendencies would be directly related to direct and indirect behavior. Flanders\(^3\) noted that when goals are ambiguous there is a definite "tendency to establish clarity by using a pattern of influence that is primarily direct." This same


\(^3\) Flanders, pp. 13-14.
tendency, he stated, persists when progress is halted and diagnosis is needed.

Many supervisory situations, except where the most elemental, routine kinds of problems are handled, will contain high degrees of ambiguity. The supervisor's ability to tolerate this ambiguity, but still show willingness to take experimental action in the face of this ambiguity, will affect his chances for providing indirect influence.

Rationale for Re-Investigating the Blumberg Studies

This study was designed to include re-investigation of the relationships between the variables reported by Blumberg; namely, perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor conference behavior and teacher assessments of communicative climate, interpersonal satisfaction, amounts and kind of learning, and the general productivity of the conference interaction. The design included the same instrumentation and measurement of variables found in the Blumberg studies with the exception of teacher morale. A re-investigation seemed justifiable for a number of reasons.

The Blumberg studies have reported strong and consistent relationships between a number of outcomes and the perception of indirect supervisor behavior. The direct and indirect dimensions of behavior have been heavily emphasized in research in teaching and have produced an accumulating body of important findings. The use of these dimensions for investigating supervisory behavior, however, though
increasing, has been limited in quantity and in the case of Blumberg's work, to a limited range of conditions. Continued investigation was needed to determine whether Blumberg's findings would hold up in another setting. Whether or not they hold up, additional information would be made available for use in identifying the role that the concepts of directness and indirectness could play in the improvement of supervisory performance. The importance of these concepts to research on teaching and the significant, but limited, findings they have provided to research on supervisory behavior thus far provided support for testing the predictive capacity of these findings in a different setting.

Blumberg's data collection was limited entirely to graduate students who were enrolled at Temple University. This procedure was not objectionable when perceptions of variables to be investigated for relationships came from the same person. However, where Blumberg compared perceptions of teachers and supervisors, he did so by analyzing data from a group of teachers and supervisors who had no functional relationship with one another. Unless there was some method by which to insure that these two groups were responding to conference interaction which was representative of the actual interaction both groups had in their own schools, the comparisons made were possibly misleading. The data regarding teacher evaluations of the conference and teacher rating of interpersonal satisfaction were obtained from different groups. This in itself is not objectionable but does not allow for direct comparisons between the evaluations and the measures of interpersonal satisfaction. In this re-investigation,
all data were collected from the same people and from supervisors and teachers who had a functional relationship with one another and who were in actual school settings at the time of the investigation.

Gathering data in the actual school setting was also viewed as a possible source of variance from Blumberg's findings since, in his studies, it was not known what intervening variables may have been operating because of the self-selection process of enrolling in graduate classes and because of the influence of the actual studies being pursued at the time the data were gathered.

Whereas Blumberg collected his supervisory data from forty-five supervisors who had direct responsibility for the improvement of instruction, supervisors who took part in this study must also have been working with teachers on a non-evaluative basis (in terms of formal organizational expectations). The purpose for inserting this criterion was twofold. First, it was felt that supervisors who work toward the improvement of instruction by interacting with teachers on a non-evaluative basis were operating on a concept of supervision similar to the one expressed in this study. Not having the onus of evaluation may have the effect of removing a source of directive behavior. Second, since the terms supervisor and supervision can represent a multitude of positions and processes, it was useful to achieve some homogeneity within the supervisory respondents by defining this important operational condition to be used for a selection criterion. In Michigan, which has mandatory tenure laws and mandatory negotiations with teacher organizations, the evaluative process has become more systematized and rigorous, so that supervisors who
work on a non-evaluative basis were a distinct group.

The decision not to re-investigate the relationship of perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor conference behavior to teacher morale came about because of the questionable basis for making such a comparison and because a maximum of teacher time had already been requested to respond to the Teacher Perception of Supervisor Behavior instrument and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Although Blumberg found a significant relationship between perceived supervisor directness-indirectness and a measure of teacher morale, his study did not investigate or consider the operation of other factors, of which supervisory conference style is symptomatic, which could have accounted for the high morale. Conference style could reflect a distinct theory of administration which results in overall administrative behaviors which create high morale. As such, ratings of morale may correlate highly with perceived conference style, however, to infer anything more than this covariance may not be justified. It was difficult to see where further investigation of this relationship as it was investigated by Blumberg would be of value toward improving conferences.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was: (1) to make explicit, and to present the rationale for the assumptions which are inherent in this study of supervisory conference interaction, (2) to present the rationale and supporting evidence for investigating supervisory conference behavior on the basis of perceived directness and indirectness,
and (3) to present the rationale for investigating the relationship of supervisor flexibility to the perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor conference behavior and to teacher reactions to conferences. Since a significant portion of this study was based on the previous work of Blumberg and associates, a rationale was also presented for this re-investigation.

The three assumptions presented as underlying this study are: (1) supervision is a process intended to improve instruction and teacher performance through the use of a helping, supportive relationship in working with teachers—its basic intent is change, (2) there are many similarities between teaching and the act of confer- ring, and (3) models used for investigating teaching as dynamic verbal interaction are appropriate for investigating teacher-supervisor conferences. Support for assumption 1 is based on (1) the need for change in education, (2) the compatibility of this assumption with modern views of man, (3) its compatibility with the democratic ethic, (4) the level of training of those to be supervisees, and (5) the variability of factors influencing the teaching act. Support for assumption 2 is found in the following similarities between teaching and conferring:

1. similarity of intent
2. superior-subordinate relationships
3. essentially verbal activities
4. stability of verbal behavior of supervisors
5. applicability of principles of learning

Assumption 3 is a logical extension of assumption 2.
The theoretical base for the dimensions of directness and indirectness is found in the research on teaching. Because these dimensions are based on a psychology of superior-subordinate relationships, they were seen as useful for investigating conference interaction. Also, since the dimensions of directness and indirectness of superior behavior represent the integrative and dominoative modes of exerting influence in a superior-subordinate relationship, these dimensions represented behavior styles which were viewed as instrumental in providing the helping, supportive relationship. Further rationale for using the dimensions of directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior as a model for investigating the conference was provided in the review of six studies of conferences which have utilized these dimensions in their research. All of the studies presented findings showing the importance of the dimensions of directness and indirectness in supervisor behavior.

A rationale for the hypothesized relationship between flexibility of supervisors and their capacity and inclination to provide integrative influence in conference interaction was given. The four characteristics of flexibility which relate to supervisor behavior are:

1. being free from psychological rigidity.
2. evaluating ideas apart from their source.
3. seeing issues as many-sided rather than two-sided, and developing a relatively large number of alternative hypotheses, explanations, and viewpoints.
4. maintaining a tolerance for tentativeness and suspended
judgement and a willingness to take action in an ambiguous situation.

The inability of supervisors to exhibit these four characteristics was associated with an inability to provide indirect, integrative influence in conferences.

The basic points in the rationale for re-investigating the studies reported by Blumberg were:

1. that the findings now available should be supported or questioned by additional data since the Blumberg studies were conducted under limited conditions.

2. that comparisons between teacher and supervisor perceptions should be made from data secured from people in a functional relationship.

3. that all data regarding the relationship of variables to the dimensions of directness and indirectness be gathered from the same subjects.

4. that data be gathered about and from supervisors who work with teachers on a non-evaluative basis since supervision under such conditions has removed from it one potential obstacle to providing a helping, supportive relationship.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to accommodate the re-investigation, under somewhat different conditions,\(^1\) of variables reported by Blumberg in his studies of teacher-supervisor conference interaction,\(^2\) and also to investigate the possible relationship of supervisor flexibility to perceived supervisory behaviors which are hypothesized to result in favorable teacher reactions toward teacher-supervisor conference interaction. Whereas Blumberg's data were gathered from teachers in graduate classes and comparisons were made between data from teachers and supervisors who had no functional relationship with one another, the data for this study were gathered in the public school setting from teachers and supervisors who were reacting to the same conference interaction.

Operational Definition of Terms

Direct supervisory behavior—operationally defined by ratings on items 1-a through 1-c of the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale,\(^3\) hereafter referred to in this chapter as the TPSB Scale.

---

\(^1\)See Chapter II, pp. 58-61.

\(^2\)For a review of these studies, see Chapter II, pp. 40-49.

\(^3\)See Appendix C, pp. 182-84.
Indirect supervisory behavior—operationally defined by ratings on items 1-d through 1-i of the TPSB Scale.

Supervisor flexibility—operationally defined as the sub-total and total scores on the Felker and Smith Philosophic-Mindedness Scale,¹ hereafter referred to in this chapter as the PM Scale.

Interpersonal satisfaction—operationally defined as the sub-total and total scores on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory,² hereafter referred to in this chapter as the B-L Inventory.

Population and Sample

The sample for this study consisted of thirty-eight supervisors³ in the state of Michigan who were meeting with teachers in individual conferences for the purpose of instructional improvement. Three criteria were used in soliciting supervisors to take part in this study. They were:

1. the supervisor must be working with teachers on a non-evaluative basis.

2. the supervisor must have had at least two conferences with at least five teachers prior to the completion of the instruments used for data collection.

3. the supervisor must have been employed in a Michigan school system.

¹See Appendix B, pp. 168-78. ²See Appendix C, pp. 185-89. ³See Appendix E, pp. 193-96.
Each supervisor who met these criteria and who agreed to take part in the study was asked to select, by means of a random selection process, a minimum of five or a maximum of six teachers who would respond to the data collection instruments used to secure teacher perceptions of and reactions to the teacher-supervisor conferences. From a potential 228 teacher responses, 177 responses were received and used as a source of data for this study.1

The process of identifying and soliciting the help of people, regardless of their titles, who were engaged in supervisory activities as defined by this study was begun by making initial contacts, by mail,2 with those members of the Michigan Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development whose titles indicated that they might be engaged in working with teachers on a non-evaluative basis or who would know of people in their school system who were. Response sheets3 which accompanied the initial letters and which were returned to the investigator indicated whether or not the supervisors met the criteria and, if they did, whether or not they were willing to take part in the study. These response sheets also asked for references to other supervisors who were likely to meet the criteria.

---

1See Appendix F, pp. 197-206 for data regarding teacher respondents. Note that 13 of the 177 respondents reported having only one conference. After determining that the ratings of these thirteen teachers represented a typical distribution of high and low ratings, it was decided to use their data in order to have as large a number of teacher respondents as possible.

2See Appendix A, pp. 157-58.

3See Appendix A, p. 159.
established for screening supervisors for the study. Letters were then sent to the people who were listed on these response sheets. This process continued until the sample of supervisors was obtained.

Method of Data Collection

Because supervisors who work with teachers on a non-evaluative basis comprise a relatively small percentage of the supervisors in Michigan school systems, and because the study relied on the voluntary participation of those who were identified by the mail inquiries, the supervisors who participated in this study were widely distributed throughout the state of Michigan. For this reason, it was necessary to design the study so that supervisors who agreed to take part in the study also took responsibility for the selection of teacher participants and for the distribution of study materials to these teachers. Supervisors were informed before they volunteered that they would be expected to perform these tasks. In order to reduce the possibility that supervisors might, knowingly or unknowingly, influence the study while performing these tasks, (1) teacher materials were furnished to the supervisors pre-packaged, (2) responses were returned directly to the investigator, (3) introductory, explanatory materials were furnished, and (4) a random selection procedure for selecting teachers was provided for use by those supervisors who had more than six eligible teachers.

Supervisors who qualified and had agreed to take part in the study were sent a packet of materials which contained the following items:
1. a complete set of instructions for the distribution and use of the contents of the packet.¹

2. a table of random numbers and instructions for a simplified method of randomly selecting teacher participants for the study.²

3. six packets of teacher materials for distribution to selected teachers. These packets, which were in sealed envelopes, contained an introductory letter from the investigator, instructions, the instruments to which the teacher was to respond, and a stamped, addressed envelope to be used for the return of the materials.³

4. six letters of explanation, to be signed by the supervisor, which were distributed with the teacher packets.⁴

5. the data collection instruments to which the supervisor was to respond and return via a stamped, addressed envelope.⁵

6. a card on which the supervisor listed the name and address of each teacher to whom study materials had been distributed. This information was used to mail reminder letters in cases where there was a low rate of return on materials.

Supervisors were instructed to select a minimum of five—six if possible—teachers for participation in the study by using the random selection procedure furnished in the instructions if the number

³See Appendix C, pp. 180-89. ⁴See Appendix B, p. 163.
⁵See Appendix B, pp. 165-178.
of teachers with whom they had conferred twice exceeded six. They were further instructed to distribute the sealed teacher material packets to the teacher participants along with a signed cover letter assuring the teachers that the information sought by the instruments was being solicited with the supervisors' approval. The cover letter made explicit the fact that the supervisor and teacher responses to the instruments would remain completely confidential. The only identification on any of the materials distributed to teachers was a code number used to identify the functional group (the supervisor and teachers with whom he had conferred and who were taking part in this study) from which the responses came. All participants were assured that neither their functional group nor employing school district would be identified at any time in any reports of the study.

In situations where the supervisors were negligent in carrying out their duties or in returning the materials they were to complete, or where there was a low rate of return from teachers within a functional group, a reminder letter was sent. These letters were sent about one month after the materials had been distributed. In cases where the supervisors did not complete their participation in the study after receiving a reminder letter, they were contacted by phone to encourage the completion of their obligations to the study.

Data Collected

Data collected from teachers consisted of:

\[1\] See Appendix D, pp. 191-92.
1. perceptions of supervisor behavior style on the dimensions of directness and indirectness as described on the TPSB Scale, items 1-a through 1-i.

2. teacher ratings of ideal supervisory conference behavior on the dimensions of directness and indirectness as described on the TPSB Scale, items 1-a through 1-i.

3. teacher reactions to the teacher-supervisor conference interaction as described by items 2 through 10 of the TPSB Scale.

4. teacher expressions of interpersonal satisfaction as described by responses to the B-L Inventory.

Data collected from supervisors consisted of:

1. supervisors' perceptions of their own behavior style on the dimensions of directness and indirectness as described on the TPSB Scale, items 1-a through 1-i.

2. supervisors' ratings of ideal supervisory behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness as described by items 1-a through 1-i of the TPSB Scale.

3. supervisors' perceptions of teachers' reactions to the teacher-supervisor conference interaction as rated on the TPSB Scale, items 1 through 10.

4. a measure of flexibility as described by responses to the PM Scale.

Instrumentation

All data were gathered for this study through the use of three instruments, the Blumberg-Amidon Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor
Behavior Scale, the Felker and Smith Philosophic-Mindedness Scale, and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory.

**Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale (TPSB Scale)**

The Blumberg-Amidon TPSB Scale¹ is a two-part instrument. The first part of the instrument—items 1-a through 1-i—provides a non-evaluative description of the direct-indirect dimensions of supervisor conference behavior as perceived by the teacher, while the second part—items 2 through 10—obtains teacher evaluations of communicative freedom and supportiveness, learning outcomes, and general productivity of the teacher-supervisor conference interaction. For each of the items, 1-a through 1-i, teachers indicate their perception of the extent to which they have perceived their supervisor exhibiting the behaviors described by checking one of six degrees of perceived emphasis which range from "very heavy emphasis" to "no emphasis." Responses to items 2 through 10 are marked on a nine unit continuum. Perceived direct behavior is determined by combining the ratings on items 1-a through 1-c. Perceived indirect behavior is determined by combining ratings on items 1-d through 1-i.

Blumberg and Amidon offer no data or information pertaining to the validity or reliability of the instrument. However, the content validity for the first part of the instrument is supported by a comparison between the supervisory behaviors described by the instrument.

¹Used with permission of Arthur Blumberg, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York. See Appendix C, pp. 182-84.
and Flanders'\(^1\) constructs of direct and indirect behavior of the
superior in a superior-subordinate relationship. This part of the
instrument is actually an operational definition of Flanders' con-
structs applied to a description of supervisory conference behavior.\(^2\)

In the second part of the instrument, content validity is sup-
ported by an examination of the items included. The items on com­
unicative freedom—item 2, productivity—item 10, and learning—items
3 and 4, are single, straightforward questions about the attainment
of outcomes universally held as desirable for conference interaction
where the superior is attempting to provide a helping, supportive
relationship. The remainder of the items—items 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9—
operationally describe those communicative behaviors defined by Gibb\(^3\)
as tending to create either supportive or defensive communicative
climates. More specifically, Gibb\(^4\) observed that in supportive
communicative climates one observes description instead of evalu­
ation—item 9, problem orientation rather than control—item 5, em­
pathy instead of neutrality—item 8, equality instead of superiority
—item 6, and provisionalism instead of certainty—item 7.

Further support for the validity of the instrment is provided
by the findings reported by Blumberg in those studies which have

\(^{1}\)Ned A. Flanders, *Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and
Achievement*, Cooperative Research Monograph, No. 12, OE-25040

\(^{2}\)See Chapter II, pp. 32-36 for a description of these constructs.

\(^{3}\)Jack R. Gibb, "Defensive Communication," *Journal of

\(^{4}\)Ibid.
made use of the TPSB Scale. The initial investigation by Blumberg showed that relationships did exist between the directness-indirectness of perceived supervisor behavior and generally desired outcomes for supervisory conferences. Those relationships found were consistent with outcomes that would be predicted on the basis of the theoretical statements about the effects of direct and indirect behavior in a superior-subordinate relationship. The findings from the initial investigation by Blumberg provided the basis for directional hypotheses about the relationship between perceived directness-indirectness of supervisors' conference behavior and the interpersonal satisfaction expressed by teachers. Since the predicted relationships were found to exist, this study offers some evidence for the predictive validity of the first part of the TPSB Scale.

A test of reliability was conducted by administering the instrument to thirteen teachers who were reacting to the conference behavior of their principal. A re-administration of the instrument to the same teachers ten days later revealed a test-retest coefficient of .84.

Philosophic-Mindedness Scale

Eighty-four forced choice selections provide a measure of

---

1 Arthur Blumberg and Edmund Amidon, "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor-Teacher Interaction," Administrator's Notebook, XIV (September, 1965).

flexibility when using the Felker and Smith Philosophic-Mindedness Scale. Flexibility, as defined by this instrument, is a combination of four characteristics:

1. freedom from psychological rigidity.
2. ability to evaluate ideas apart from their source.
3. seeing issues as many-sided rather than two-sided, and the development of relatively large numbers of alternative hypotheses, explanations, and viewpoints.
4. maintaining a tolerance for tentativeness and suspended judgement and a willingness to take action in an ambiguous situation.

Sub-scores representing these four characteristics were reported by the authors to have intercorrelations from .255 to .414, indicating that the sub-scales are fairly independent. Split-half reliability and test-retest reliability based on a retest interval of three months were reported to be .80. Construct validation for the instrument was indicated by relationships found between scores on the PM Scale and educational philosophy professors' ratings of students on flexibility, and by a negative correlation, -.393, with the respondents' scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. Further

---

1 Used with permission of Donald W. Felker, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana. See Appendix B, pp. 168-78.
3 loc. cit., pp. 59-60.
4 loc. cit., p. 69.
validation of the instrument was reported by Felker as the result of findings which showed a relationship existing between participation in the course "Introductory Philosophy of Education," which had as one of its purposes the increase of student flexibility, and pre and post-test scores on the PM Scale; between course grades received by students and the pre-test PM scores; and between course grades and post-test PM scores.

Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (B-L Inventory)

The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory is a sixty-four item instrument which requires the respondents to indicate the extent to which they perceive the level of regard, unconditionality of regard, empathy, and congruence of the person with whom they have interacted. Level of regard is an indication of the affective aspect of a person's response to another and is manifest in communicating positive feelings such as respect, liking, appreciation, and affection; or negative feelings such as impatience, contempt, or disliking. Unconditionality of regard is an indication of the constancy with which regard is held for a person; how little or how much variability there is in a person's affective response to another. Empathy refers to the ability of a person to receive communication from another and translate this communication into experienced meaning that matches


2Used with the permission of G. T. Barrett-Lennard, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada. See Appendix C, pp. 185-89.
those aspects of awareness that are most important to the other person. Congruence is the authentic, but not compulsive, communication of perceptions and feeling to another. A lack of congruence is reflected in the inconsistency between what an individual says and what is implied by other communicators such as expressions, gestures, and other physiological reactions.1

The inventory consists of sixteen items, eight positive and eight negative, for each of the four characteristics which are measured by sub-total scores. The extent to which the respondent perceives the condition described by each of the sixty-four items is indicated by a rating ranging from -3, which indicates that the rater strongly feels that the condition described is not true, to +3, which indicates strong feelings that the condition described is true.

Barrett-Lennard2 reported three test-retest correlations under conditions ranging from twelve days to six weeks between tests. The results were:

1. total test correlation: .89 to .92
2. level of regard subscale: .74 to .88
3. unconditionality of regard: .80 to .86
4. empathy: .86 to .91

---


2G. T. Barrett-Lennard, "Technical Note on the 64-Item Revision of the Relationship Inventory," University of Waterloo, 1969, pp. 2-4. (Mimeographed.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
5. congruence: .85 to .88

Evidence for the validity of the instrument consists of validation procedures cited in Barrett-Lennard's original work on the instrument.¹ Five judges, known to be client-centered therapists, were used to validate the positive and negative instances of variables built into the instrument. Since that time, a large number of carefully designed and controlled studies have furnished further evidence that the instrument is measuring what it purports to measure and is a useful measure of interpersonal satisfaction in any significant interpersonal relationship. Relationships and correlations predicted on the basis of the theory underlying the construction of this instrument have been found to exist where the B-L Inventory was used as a criterion measure.²

Hypotheses Investigated and Methods Used for Data Analysis

Since a major portion of this study was a re-investigation of previous studies by Blumberg and associates, seven of the thirteen hypotheses investigated were formulated on the basis of findings reported by Blumberg. These seven hypotheses are noted by an asterisk (*) placed before the number of the hypothesis.

Hypotheses regarding supervisor flexibility

1. Those supervisors who are identified as most flexible will

be perceived by teachers as behaving more indirectly than are supervisors identified as least flexible.

2. Teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction will be higher for those teachers who have conferred with supervisors who are most flexible than for teachers who have conferred with supervisors who are least flexible.

3. Those teachers who have conferred with supervisors who are most flexible will give higher ratings to perceived learning—items 3 and 4 on the TPSB Scale, and productivity—item 10 on the TPSB Scale, than will teachers who have conferred with the least flexible supervisors.

4. Supervisors who are most flexible will exhibit greater congruence with teachers' perceptions of their behavior than will supervisors who are least flexible.

Data analysis for hypotheses regarding flexibility

Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested by comparing, through the use of the one-tail t test, differences between the mean scores of teachers having conferred with the most flexible and least flexible supervisors. Compared were:

Hypothesis 1—the mean teacher ratings of perceived supervisor indirectness (indirectness is determined by the sum of ratings on TPSB Scale items 1-d through 1-i).

Hypothesis 2—the mean teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction (total score on the B-L Inventory).

Hypothesis 3—the mean teacher ratings of (1) learning about
classroom behavior (TPSB Scale item 3), (2) learning about self (TPSB Scale item 4), and (3) conference productivity (TPSB Scale item 10).

Hypothesis 4 was tested by comparing, through the use of the one-tail *t* test, the difference in the mean discrepancy score of the five most flexible supervisors with the mean discrepancy score of the six least flexible supervisors. The discrepancy score was based on the supervisor estimates of teacher perception of supervisor directness-indirectness and teacher reaction to the conference in general.

To obtain these mean discrepancy scores, the supervisor estimate of teacher ratings on all items on the TPSB Scale was compared with the rating of each teacher who had conferred with that supervisor. The numerical difference between the ratings on each item was recorded to obtain a cumulative discrepancy total representing the total of differences between the teachers' and supervisor's ratings. Since functional groups varied in size according to the number of teacher respondents, it was necessary to compute, for each functional group, a mean discrepancy score to be used for computational purposes.

Once a mean discrepancy score was obtained for each of the five most and six least flexible supervisors, a grand mean was computed for each group of supervisors.

**Hypotheses regarding perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior**

*5. Teachers who describe supervisor conference behavior as*
High-direct, High-indirect or Low-direct, High-indirect will rate interpersonal satisfaction higher than teachers who describe supervisor behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect or Low-direct, Low-indirect.

*6. Teachers rating supervisor conference behavior as High-direct, High-indirect or Low-direct, High-indirect will give more positive ratings on the TPSB Scale to learning—items 3 and 4, empathy—item 8, and productivity—item 10, than will teachers rating supervisor conference behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect or Low-direct, Low-indirect.

*7. Teacher ratings on the TPSB Scale will indicate more supervisor control—item 5, more supervisor superiority—item 6, and less freedom to initiate discussion—item 2 for supervisors rated High-direct, Low-indirect than for supervisors rated High-direct, High-indirect; Low-direct, High-indirect; or Low-direct, Low-indirect.

*8. Teachers who rate supervisor behavior as High-direct, High-indirect, or High-direct, Low-indirect will perceive their supervisors as being more evaluative—item 9 on the TPSB Scale, and as projecting more certainty that they have the "right" answers to teaching problems—item 7 of the TPSB Scale, than do teachers who rate supervisor behavior as Low-direct, High-indirect or Low-direct, Low-indirect.

*9. There will be less discrepancy between desired supervisor behavior and perceived supervisor behavior for those teachers who rate supervisor behavior as High-direct,
High-indirect and Low-direct, High-indirect than for teachers who rate supervisor behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect or Low-direct, Low-indirect.

Hypothesized relationships of directness-indirectness to the variables investigated in hypotheses 5 through 9 are shown in Table 1.

Data analysis for hypotheses regarding perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior

Analysis of data to test hypotheses 5 through 9 called for operationally defining the four direct-indirect behavioral patterns: High-direct, High-indirect; High-direct, Low-indirect; Low-direct, High-indirect; and Low-direct, Low-indirect.

Teacher perceptions of supervisor emphasis of direct and indirect behavior were determined by grouping the ratings of item 1-a through 1-i of the TPSB Scale. The cumulative scores of item 1-a through 1-c defined directness and items 1-d through 1-i defined indirectness. The four "extremes" of direct and indirect behavior were operationally defined as follows:

1. High-direct -- cumulative ratings of 3 to 9 on items 1-a through 1-c.

The ratings used to define the four behavior patterns are essentially the same ratings used by Blumberg.

In order to obtain a minimum number of respondents classifying supervisor behavior as High-direct, Low-indirect, the operational definition of High-direct was extended to 3 to 10 for respondents who had also rated supervisor behavior as Low-indirect. This exception, which affected the categorization of the responses of three teachers, was necessary because of the small number of Low-indirect ratings found in this study.
Table 1
Hypothesized Relationships
in Hypotheses 5-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis number</th>
<th>Outcome variable</th>
<th>Perceived supervisor behavior pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Most positive rating of interpersonal satisfaction ..........</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Most positive rating of amount of learning ...................</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Most evidence of empathy .......................................</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highest rating of productivity .................................</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most perceived supervisor need to control ....................</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Least teacher freedom to initiate discussion ..................</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most perception of supervisor attitude of superiority ..........</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Most perception of supervisor certainty of right answers ........</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Most perceived evaluation by the supervisor ....................</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Least discrepancy between supervisor behavior desired and that perceived by teachers ..................</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Low-direct—cumulative ratings of 14 to 18 on items 1-a through 1-c.

3. High-indirect—cumulative ratings of 6 to 19 on items 1-d through 1-i.

4. Low-indirect—cumulative ratings of 28 to 36 on items 1-d through 1-i.

Since it is possible for a supervisor to exhibit, to varying degrees, both direct and indirect behavior in a given interaction, these four operationally defined extremes were combined to describe the four direct-indirect behavior patterns which were used as independent variables in the analysis of data collected on other variables.

The four direct-indirect behavior patterns are:

1. High-direct, High-indirect (HD-HI)
2. High-direct, Low-indirect (HD-LI)
3. Low-direct, High-indirect (LD-HI)
4. Low-direct, Low-indirect (LD-LI)

The abbreviations shown in the parentheses will be used for further reference to these groupings.

The number ranges used to define the relative presence or absence of direct or indirect supervisor behavior increased the likelihood that the effects of behaviors so defined would become evident. Supervisor behavior which was described outside this range of numbers would be less likely to exhibit the attributes found in the concept of direct and indirect behavior. In order to be classified as either High-direct or High-indirect, the supervisor must have been rated as exhibiting "moderate emphasis" in all the behaviors listed, or must
have been rated as exhibiting from "moderate" to "heavy emphasis" on the majority of items and from "moderate" to "no emphasis" on one or two items. Low-direct and Low-indirect classifications required a minimum of "very little emphasis" on all behaviors or, if some behaviors were rated as having more than "very little emphasis," other behaviors which also define indirectness were then rated "no emphasis." Regardless of the combination of scores on items defining directness or indirectness, a "high" classification averaged near "moderate emphasis," while a "low" classification averaged, at most "very little emphasis."

Data for hypotheses 5 through 9 were analyzed by comparing, through the use of the one-tail t test, the difference between mean scores found for the various groupings of directness-indirectness which were used as independent variables for these hypotheses.¹

To test hypotheses 5, 6, and 9, the mean score of teachers perceiving supervisor behavior as HD-HI or LD-HI was compared to the mean score of teachers perceiving supervisor behavior as HD-LI or LD-LI.

Compared were:

Hypothesis 5— the means of teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction (total score on the B-L Inventory).

Hypothesis 6— the means of teacher ratings on the TPSB Scale of

¹The t test was used for data analysis instead of an analysis of variance design because the N's for the four perceived behavior groupings were not equal and because of the small number of N's in some groups. The t test was seen as the most powerful test to use in these circumstances.
(1) learning about classroom behavior (item 3), (2) learning about self (item 4), (3) empathy (item 8), and conference productivity (item 10).

Hypothesis 9—means of discrepancy scores derived from the differences between teacher ratings of ideal and perceived supervisor behavior on items 1-a through 1-i of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 7 was tested by comparing the mean score of teachers who rated perceived supervisor behavior as HD-LI with the mean score of teachers who rated perceived supervisor behavior as HD-HI, LD-HI, or LD-LI. Compared were means of ratings on the TPSB Scale of (1) supervisor control (item 5), (2) supervisor superiority (item 6), and (3) freedom to initiate discussion (item 2).

For hypothesis 8, comparisons were made between the mean scores of teachers who perceived supervisor behavior as HD-HI or HD-LI and teachers who perceived supervisor behavior as LD-HI or LD-LI. Compared were the means of ratings, on the TPSB Scale of (1) supervisor evaluativeness (item 9) and supervisor projection of certainty that they have the "right answers" to teaching problems (item 7).

Hypotheses regarding the congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions

*10. Supervisors will rate their behavior on TPSB Scale items 1-a through 1-i—descriptions of direct and indirect supervisor behavior—as being more indirect and less direct than will teachers.

*11. Supervisors will estimate teacher ratings on items 2
through 10 of the TPSB Scale—evaluation of communicative climate, learning, and productivity—to be more positive than the actual teacher ratings.

**Data analysis for hypotheses regarding the congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions**

Through the use of the one-tail $t$ test, comparisons of differences between mean scores were made on:

Hypothesis 10—the means of teacher and supervisor TPSB Scale ratings of perceived supervisor directness (sum of ratings on items 1-a through 1-c) and indirectness (sum of ratings on items 1-d through 1-i).

Hypothesis 11—the means of supervisors' estimates of teacher ratings on TPSB Scale items 2 through 10 and the means of teacher ratings on these items.

**Hypotheses regarding teacher and supervisor statements of ideal supervisor behavior on the dimensions of directness and indirectness**

12. There will be little difference between ideal supervisory behavior on the dimensions of directness and indirectness as described by teachers and supervisors.

13. Teachers will perceive supervisor behavior as less indirect and more direct than the expressed ideal of supervisors.

**Data analysis for hypotheses regarding teacher and supervisor statements of ideal supervisory behavior**

Using the one-tail $t$ test, a comparison was made between:

Hypothesis 12—the means of teacher and supervisor TPSB Scale ratings
of the ideal emphasis on directness (sum of items 1-a through 1-c) and indirectness (sum of items 1-d through 1-i) in supervisory behavior.

Hypothesis 13—the mean supervisor rating of ideal and the mean teacher rating of perceived directness (sum of ratings on 1-a through 1-c of TPSB Scale) and indirectness (sum of items 1-d through 1-i of the TPSB Scale) of supervisor behavior.

In the event that the analysis of data for testing hypotheses 12 did not show significant differences between means, these findings were to be treated as a general indication of similarity rather than as statistical evidence that no differences existed. This position was taken since the testing of statements of no difference cannot be done with the same degree of confidence as can the testing of predicted differences.

Summary

The design for this study provided for the re-investigation of the Blumberg teacher-supervisor conference studies in actual school settings where data were gathered from supervisors and teachers who were reacting to the same conference interaction. In addition to this re-investigation, the study also gathered data to investigate the relationship of supervisor flexibility to perceived directness—indirectness of supervisor behavior and to desired teacher reactions to conference interaction. Data were gathered from 38 supervisors who worked with teachers on a non-evaluative basis for the improvement of instruction, and from 177 teachers who had been involved in
at least two personal conferences with these supervisors during the 1969-70 school year.

Data were collected from these participants by distributing to supervisors who agreed to take part in the study materials to be used by teachers who had been selected to respond to the data collection instruments. Teacher responses to the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory were anonymous and were returned directly to the investigator by mail, as were supervisor responses to the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale and the Philosophic-Mindedness Scale.

Teacher responses to the study instruments provided the following information:

1. perceptions of supervisor behavior style on the dimensions of directness and indirectness,
2. ratings of ideal supervisor conference behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness,
3. evaluations of the communicative climate, amount of learning, and the general productivity of the conference, and
4. expressions of interpersonal satisfaction.

Gathered from the supervisor instruments were supervisor:

1. perceptions of their own behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness,
2. ratings of ideal supervisory behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness,
3. estimates of teachers' reactions to the teacher-supervisor conference interaction, and
4. a measure of flexibility.

The data collected were used to test the four hypotheses regarding the relationship of supervisor flexibility to directness-indirectness of supervisor behavior; to interpersonal satisfaction expressed by teachers; to teachers' perceptions of communicative climate, learning, and the general productiveness of conferences; and to the congruence of supervisors' and teachers' perceptions. Five of the hypotheses tested investigated the relationship of perceived directness-indirectness of supervisor behavior to teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction; to evaluations of communicative climate, learning, and the general productivity of the conference; to supervisor effort to control and evaluate the teacher; and to the discrepancy reported between desired and perceived supervisor behavior. Two hypotheses dealt with the congruence of teachers' and supervisors' perceptions of the conferences, and the last two hypotheses tested compared supervisor statements of ideal supervisor behavior with teachers' ratings of ideal supervisor behavior and perceived supervisor behavior.

All experimental hypotheses were tested by the use of the one-tail t test to compare differences between the mean scores of comparison groups. If differences were in the direction hypothesized and were shown to be significant at the .05 level or beyond, experimental hypotheses were accepted.
CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Because this study is, in part, a re-investigation of Blumberg's work on teacher-supervisor conferences, this chapter will present two different descriptions of the data collected. First, the major emphasis will be to present data as analyzed to support or reject the experimental hypotheses being tested by this study. Since the method of analysis used to test these hypotheses varies considerably from methods used by Blumberg originally, a supplemental description of findings, analyzed in a manner similar to Blumberg's analysis, will also be presented. This will allow for a more direct comparison of the similarities and differences in the relationships found within this study and in the previous work of Blumberg.

Presentation of findings regarding the experimental hypotheses will be organized around the four major areas of emphasis found in this study's hypotheses, namely; (1) supervisor flexibility, (2) perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior, (3) congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions, and (4) teacher and supervisor ratings of ideal supervisory behavior. Hypotheses, grouped in these areas of emphasis, will be stated and the findings summarized for this particular group of hypotheses. In some instances, major hypotheses refer to a predicted relationship between

---

1See Chapter II, pp. 40-49 for a resume of the work of Blumberg and associates.
the independent variable(s) and several dependent variables. Where this is the case, a series of sub-hypotheses which relate the independent variable(s) to a single dependent variable will be stated and data presented to test these sub-hypotheses.

A table presenting the results of the statistical analyses used to test the experimental hypotheses will be presented for each group of hypotheses. In this study, experimental hypotheses have been accepted if the statistical analysis has shown that differences observed would be likely to occur due to error variance only 5% or less of the time—p. = .05. Probability levels in all tables will be reported as p. = .05, p. = .01, or as n.s. (not significant) if the probability level of observing tested differences due to error variance is more than .05 or if differences are in a direction other than hypothesized. All tables list the critical ratios which must be achieved in order to reach the .05 and .01 probability levels. In the tables showing the results of t tests, these critical ratios represent the probability levels for the one-tail t test. Because of the nature of the rating scale used with the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale, smaller mean scores frequently represent a stronger indication of an effect or presence of a variable than do larger mean scores. Since mean scores in the tables, in most cases, are presented in the same order that the variations of independent variables are predicted in the hypotheses—often predicting the greater evidence of the variables first—the results of data analysis which tends to support the hypotheses are frequently expressed in negative t-ratios. To reduce the chances for any confusion which
might be promoted by this condition, all tables indicate which tests have smaller mean scores representing the greater degree of evidence concerning the variable being investigated.

Statistical analysis of data to test all experimental hypotheses consisted of a comparison of mean scores using the one-tail $t$ test.

Hypotheses Regarding Supervisor Flexibility

Data used for examining the relationship of supervisor flexibility to the variables contained in the following four hypotheses were gathered from the perceptions and reactions of the twenty-six teachers who had conferred with the five most flexible supervisors and the twenty-eight teachers who had conferred with the six least flexible supervisors. Supervisor flexibility was determined by supervisor scores on the Philosophic-Mindedness Scale (PM Scale).

Hypothesis 1. Those supervisors who are identified as most flexible will be perceived by teachers as being more indirect—sum of ratings on items 1-d through 1-i of the TPSB Scale—than those supervisors identified as least flexible.

Hypothesis 2. Teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction—total score on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (B-L Inventory)—will be higher for those teachers who have conferred with

---

1 Most and least flexible supervisors were determined by identifying the 1st and 4th quarter supervisor scores respectively.

2 Instrument can be seen in Appendix B, pp. 168-78.
supervisors who are most flexible than for those teachers who have conferred with supervisors who are least flexible.

Hypothesis 3. Those teachers who conferred with supervisors who are most flexible will give higher ratings to perceived learning than will teachers who have conferred with the least flexible supervisors.

Specifically, teachers who have conferred with the most flexible supervisors will:

- **sub-hypothesis 3-a** indicate a greater amount of learning about their classroom behavior—item 3 of the TPSB Scale.
- **sub-hypothesis 3-b** indicate more learning about self—item 4 of the TPSB Scale.
- **sub-hypothesis 3-c** rate the productivity of conferences more positively—item 10 of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 4. Supervisors who are most flexible will be more accurate in estimating teachers' perceptions of supervisor behavior than will supervisors who are least flexible.

To test hypothesis 4, a comparison was made between the mean discrepancy scores of the five most flexible supervisors and the six least flexible supervisors. Discrepancy scores were based on the supervisor estimates of teacher perception of supervisor directness—indirectness and teacher reactions to the conference in general.

Mean discrepancy scores were obtained by comparing the supervisor estimate of teacher ratings on all items of the TPSB Scale with
the ratings of each teacher who had conferred with the supervisor. The numerical difference in each rating was scored to obtain a cumulative discrepancy score representing the total of differences between the teachers' and supervisor's ratings. Since the functional groups varied in size according to the number of teacher respondents, it was necessary, for computational purposes, to compute a mean discrepancy score for each functional group.

Once a mean discrepancy score was obtained for each of the five most and six least flexible supervisors, grand means were computed to represent the most and least flexible supervisors respectively.

Summary of findings

The analysis of data collected to test the hypotheses regarding supervisor flexibility, the results of which are summarized in Table 2, indicate that:

1. teachers who have conferred with the most flexible supervisors do perceive their supervisors' behavior as more indirect (\( \bar{X} = 17.54 \)) than do teachers who have conferred with the least flexible supervisors (\( \bar{X} = 21.07 \)). Experimental hypothesis 1 is accepted.

2. the difference between ratings of interpersonal satisfaction by teachers who had conferred with the most and least flexible supervisors were not large enough to claim a relationship between the two variables. Experimental hypothesis 2 is not accepted.

3. the data did not show a strong enough relationship between
Table 2
The Relationship of Supervisor Flexibility and Teachers' Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Ratings from teachers conferring with:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>most flexible supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>supervisor indirectness(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>interpersonal satisfaction—total score</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>85.31</td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77.61</td>
<td>61.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>learning about classroom behavior(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>learning about self(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>productivity of conference(^a)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>supervisor congruence(^a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.77</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.16</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Lower mean scores signify that the variable investigated was perceived more frequently.

\(^b\)Critical ratios are 1.68 for p. = .05 and 2.42 for p. = .01 at 40 df.
supervisor flexibility and the amount of learning about self and classroom behavior reported by teachers to justify accepting the experimental hypotheses. Experimental hypotheses 3-a and 3-b are not accepted.

4. the degree of supervisor flexibility was not significantly related to teacher ratings of conference productivity, although the differences in mean scores, 1.69 compared with 2.68, does approach significance at the .05 level. Experimental hypothesis 3-c is not accepted.

5. the degree of supervisor flexibility was not significantly related to the accuracy with which supervisors predicted teacher reaction to the teacher-supervisor conference interaction. Experimental hypothesis 4 is not accepted.

Hypotheses Regarding Directness and Indirectness of Supervisor Behavior

Teacher perceptions of supervisor behavior on the dimensions of directness-indirectness were indicated by their ratings on items 1-a through 1-i of the TPSB Scale. Through the use of specific ranges of scores, teachers rating supervisory behavior as exhibiting a combination of "high" and "low" amounts of directness and indirectness were categorized for the data analysis required to test the following five hypotheses. To avoid repeated use of the awkward, lengthy names

1The reader is referred to Chapter III, pp. 82-85 for a complete description of the four direct-indirect behavior categories.
identifying the four categories, the following abbreviations will be used:

- HD-HI for High-direct, High-indirect
- HD-LI for High-direct, Low-indirect
- LD-HI for Low-direct, High-indirect
- LD-LI for Low-direct, Low-indirect

In addition to testing for the presence of the relationships predicted, the following five hypotheses also provided a test of the predictive validity of Blumberg's findings since these predicted differences are based on the significant relationships reported by him.

**Hypothesis 5.** Teachers who describe supervisor conference behavior as HD-HI or LD-HI will rate interpersonal satisfaction—total score on the BLI—higher than teachers who describe supervisor behavior as HD-LI or LD-LI.

**Hypothesis 6.** Teachers rating supervisor conference behavior as HD-HI or LD-HI will give more positive ratings to learning, empathy, and conference productivity than will teachers rating supervisor conference behavior as HD-LI or LD-LI.

Specifically, teachers who rate supervisor conference behavior as HD-HI or LD-HI will:

- **sub-hypothesis 6-a** indicate that they have learned more about their classroom behavior—item 3 of the TPSB Scale.
sub-hypothesis 6-b indicate that they have learned more about themselves personally—item 4 of the TPSB Scale.

sub-hypothesis 6-c indicate that their supervisors have greater empathy for their teaching problems—item 8 of the TPSB Scale.

sub-hypothesis 6-d rate conferences as being more productive—item 10 of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 7. Teachers will perceive more supervisor control, more supervisor superiority, and less freedom to initiate discussion for supervisors rated HD-LI than for supervisors rated HD-HI, LD-HI, or LD-LI.

Specifically, teachers who rate supervisor conference behavior as HD-LI will:

sub-hypothesis 7-a perceive more emphasis on the part of the supervisor to control teacher behavior—item 5 of the TPSB Scale.

sub-hypothesis 7-b perceive, to a greater extent, their supervisor exhibiting an air of superiority—item 6 of the TPSB Scale.

sub-hypothesis 7-c feel less free to initiate discussions about their teaching problems—item 2 of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 8. Teachers who rate supervisor behavior as HD-HI or HD-LI will perceive their supervisors as assuming they have the
"best" answer to teaching problems and as being more evaluative than do teachers who rate supervisor conference behavior as LD-HI or LD-LI.

Specifically, teachers who rate their supervisors' conference behavior as HD-HI or HD-LI will:

- Sub-hypothesis 8-a: perceive a greater tendency on the part of their supervisors to assume they have the best answer to teaching problems—item 7 of the TPSB Scale.
- Sub-hypothesis 8-b: perceive a greater tendency on the part of their supervisor to evaluate them—item 9 of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 9. There will be less discrepancy between desired supervisor behavior and perceived supervisor behavior for those teachers who rate supervisor conference behavior HD-HI or LD-HI than for teachers who rate supervisor behavior as HD-LI or LD-LI.

Summary of findings

The results of the statistical analysis of data to test the hypotheses regarding directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior are presented in Table 3. As is indicated by the table, all differences are as predicted in the hypotheses and, with the exception of interpersonal satisfaction, which is significant at the .05 level, all differences are significant well beyond the .01 criterion level.

Significantly related to teacher perceptions of supervisor
Table 3

Teacher Ratings Compared on the Basis of Perceived Supervisor Directness-Indirectness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Perceived supervisor directness-indirectness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-HI and LD-HI</td>
<td>HD-LI and LD-LI</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>interpersonal satisfaction</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104.76</td>
<td>45.26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about</td>
<td>classroom behavior^a</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about self^a</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity of</td>
<td>conferences^a</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>discrepancy between ideal and perceived</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Perceived supervisor directness-indirectness</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HD-HI, LD-HI, and LD-LI</td>
<td>HD-LI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>freedom to initiate discussion</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supervisor attitude of superiority(^a)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supervisor tendency to control(^a)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>supervisor emphasis on evaluation(^a)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supervisor assuming he has the right answers(^a)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Lower mean scores signify that the variable investigated was perceived more frequently.

\(^b\)Critical ratios are 1.68 for \(P. = .05\) and 2.42 for \(P. = .01\) at 40 df. The critical ratios at 40 df can be used with the least number of subjects found in any of the comparisons reported in this table and actually give a conservative criterion level for the larger groups.
behavior as either HD-HI or LD-HI rather than HD-LI or LD-LI are teacher indications of:

1. greater interpersonal satisfaction ($\bar{x} = 104.76$ vs. $\bar{x} = 68.95$). Experimental hypothesis 5 is accepted.

2. less discrepancy between expressed ideal supervisory behavior and perceived supervisor behavior ($\bar{x} = 3.44$ vs. $\bar{x} = 9.53$). Experimental hypothesis 9 is accepted.

3. greater amounts of learning about self ($\bar{x} = 4.21$ vs. $\bar{x} = 6.48$) and about classroom behavior ($\bar{x} = 3.55$ vs. $\bar{x} = 6.33$). Experimental hypotheses 6-a and 6-b are accepted.

4. stronger feelings that the supervisor has more concern and understanding for the teaching problems faced by the teachers ($\bar{x} = .71$ vs. $\bar{x} = 2.62$). Experimental hypothesis 6-c is accepted.

5. stronger feelings that teacher-supervisor conferences are more worthwhile and productive ($\bar{x} = 1.16$ vs. $\bar{x} = 4.1$). Experimental hypothesis 6-d is accepted.

Significantly related to teachers' perceptions of supervisor behavior as being HD-LI rather than HD-HI, LD-HI, or LD-LI (high directness in the absence of High-indirect influence) are teacher indications of:

6. more emphasis on the part of supervisors to control teacher behavior ($\bar{x} = 3.43$ vs. $\bar{x} = 7.21$). Experimental hypothesis 7-a is accepted.

7. stronger feelings that the supervisor conveys an air of superiority ($\bar{x} = 3.57$ vs. $\bar{x} = 7.23$). Experimental
hypothesis 7-b is accepted.

8. less freedom to initiate discussion about teaching problems
   ($X = 5.86$ vs. $X = 7.6$). Experimental hypothesis 7-c is accepted.

Significantly related to teacher perceptions of supervisor behavior as being HD-HI or HD-LI rather than LD-HI or LD-LI (high-direct behavior with or without high-indirect behavior) are teacher indications of:

9. stronger feelings that the supervisor assumes that there is a right answer to the person's teaching problems and that the supervisor has the answer ($X = 5.84$ vs. $X = 7.74$). Experimental hypothesis 8-a is accepted.

10. a stronger feeling that the supervisors' real interest in the teacher-supervisor conference is to evaluate them ($X = 5.16$ vs. $X = 7.35$). Experimental hypothesis 8-b is accepted.

Hypotheses Regarding the Congruence of Teacher and Supervisor Perceptions

Hypothesis 10. Supervisors will rate their behavior as more indirect and less direct than will teachers.

Specifically, supervisors will:

```
sub-hypothesis 10-a
rate their behavior as more indirect--sum of ratings on items 1-d through 1-i of the TPSB Scale--than will teachers.
```
Hypothesis 11. Supervisors will estimate teachers' ratings on items 2 through 10 of the TPSB Scale (these items evaluate supervisor behavior and conference productivity) to be more positive than the actual teacher ratings.

Summary of findings

Analysis of the statistical tests, summarized in Table 4, shows that the normally consistent pattern of the superior in a superior-subordinate relationship viewing matters more positively than do subordinates was not found. The manner in which these findings vary from Blumberg's earlier findings can be seen by examining Table 4. In the last column of the table, an asterisk (*) identifies those variables which Blumberg found were rated consistently higher by supervisors than by teachers. In only three instances did this study also find the supervisors estimating teacher rating to be more positive than they really were.

Specifically, the findings show that:

1. supervisors did rate themselves as being significantly more indirect than did teachers ($\bar{X} = 17.58$ vs. $\bar{X} = 20.34$). Experimental hypothesis 10-a is accepted.

2. supervisors did not rate themselves as being less direct than did teachers ($\bar{X} = 11.55$ vs. $\bar{X} = 12.17$). Experimental
Table 4

A Comparison of Teacher and Supervisor Perceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Teacher perceptions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Supervisor perceptions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directness of</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>n.s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor behavior^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirectness of</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor behavior^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis 11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher freedom to</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-4.31</td>
<td>n.s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiate discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher learning about</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching behavior^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher learning about</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor need to</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>n.s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control teacher behavior^a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Significant at the .05 level.

^b Significant at the .01 level.
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Teacher perceptions</th>
<th>Supervisor estimates of teachers' perceptions</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supervisor attitude of superiority^a</td>
<td>177 6.97 1.83</td>
<td>38 6.45 1.52</td>
<td>1.64c</td>
<td>n.s.*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor assuming he has the right answers^a</td>
<td>177 7.03 1.72</td>
<td>38 6.50 1.79</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor conveyance of empathy^a</td>
<td>177 1.76 1.97</td>
<td>38 2.34 1.54</td>
<td>-1.71c</td>
<td>n.s.*,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor emphasis on evaluation^a</td>
<td>177 6.50 1.96</td>
<td>38 5.79 1.73</td>
<td>2.07c</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity of conferences^a</td>
<td>177 2.78 1.33</td>
<td>38 3.03 1.38</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>n.s.*,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aLower mean scores signify that the variable investigated was perceived more frequently.

^bCritical ratios are 1.66 for p. = .05 and 2.36 for p. = .01 at 120 df.

^cAlthough the t-ratio exceeds the critical ratio for significance, the t-ratio is the result of differences between means that are opposite of predictions. As such these ratios are not significant (n.s.) to the support of the experimental hypothesis.

*On this variable, Blumberg found supervisors estimating teacher reactions to be more positive.
hypothesis 10-b is not accepted.

3. on seven of the nine items compared, supervisors have not estimated that teachers would react more favorably than they actually did. In only two cases, learning about self ($\bar{X} = 3.87$ vs. $\bar{X} = 4.7$) and about classroom behavior ($\bar{X} = 4.18$ vs. $\bar{X} = 5.42$), did supervisors overestimate teacher ratings. Experimental hypothesis 11 is not accepted.

Hypotheses Regarding Teacher and Supervisor Statements of Ideal Supervisory Behavior

Hypothesis 12. There will be little difference between ideal supervisory behavior on dimensions of directness-indirectness as described by teachers and supervisors.

Specifically, teacher and supervisor statements of ideal:

- sub-hypothesis 12-a: will not be significantly different on the dimensions of directness—sum of scores on items 1-a through 1-c of the TPSB Scale.

- sub-hypothesis 12-b: will not be significantly different on the dimensions of indirectness—sum of scores on items 1-d through 1-i of the TPSB Scale.

Hypothesis 13. Teachers will perceive supervisor behavior as less indirect and more direct than the expressed ideal of supervisors.

Specifically, when teacher ratings of perceived supervisor
behavior are compared with the ideal ratings of supervisors, teachers will:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sub-hypothesis 13-a</th>
<th>perceive supervisor behavior as less indirect than the expressed ideal of supervisors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sub-hypothesis 13-b</td>
<td>perceive supervisor behavior as more direct than the expressed ideal of supervisors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of findings

Analysis of the comparisons between mean ratings, summarized in Table 5, indicate that:

1. there was little difference between teacher and supervisor ratings of ideal supervisory behavior on the dimension of directness ($\overline{X} = 10.91$ vs. $\overline{X} = 10.95$).

2. teachers and supervisors do differ greatly in what they see as ideal indirect behavior. Supervisors feel more emphasis should be placed on indirect behavior than do teachers ($\overline{X} = 12.26$ vs. $\overline{X} = 17.28$).

3. teachers did not perceive supervisors as behaving more directly than the supervisor expressed ideal emphasis on directness ($\overline{X} = 12.17$ vs. $\overline{X} = 10.95$). The experimental hypothesis 13-b is not accepted.

4. teachers did perceive supervisors behaving much less indirectly than the expressed supervisor ideal for indirect behavior ($\overline{X} = 20.34$ vs. $\overline{X} = 12.26$). Experimental hypothesis 13-b is accepted.
Table 5

A Comparison of Teacher and Supervisor Ideal Ratings on the Directness-Indirectness of Supervisor Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable investigated</th>
<th>Teacher ratings</th>
<th>Supervisor ratings</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal directness^a</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal indirectness^a</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directness^a</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirectness^a</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aLower mean scores signify the greater emphasis on the variable.

^bCritical ratios are: 1.66 for p. = .05 and 2.36 for p. = .01 at 120 df.

^cAlthough the t-ratio exceeds the critical ratio for significance, the t-ratio is the result of differences between means that are opposite of predictions. As such these ratios are not significant (n.s.) to the support of the experimental hypothesis.
Supplemental Description
of Findings

It was the purpose of the previously reported statistical methods and findings to determine the presence of relationships predicted in the thirteen hypotheses; and in so doing, to also test the predictive validity of the findings Blumberg had previously reported. The purpose of presenting this supplemental data is to make possible, through the treatment and arrangement of data in a manner similar to Blumberg's studies, a more direct comparison of the relationships found within this study and within the previous work by Blumberg. The data supported the existence of many of the relationships predicted in this study as a result of Blumberg's work. This supplemental material enables the reader to observe the manner and degree to which the relationships investigated in this study resemble those found by Blumberg.

Three tables are used to facilitate the comparison of findings between the studies. Two of these tables, numbers 6 and 7, have special features. First, in order to represent the four groupings of perceived direct-indirect behavior in these tables the following letters will be used:

A . . . . High-direct, High-indirect
B . . . . High-direct, Low-indirect
C . . . . Low-direct, High-indirect
D . . . . Low-direct, Low-indirect

In the body of the tables, each of these groups is represented by its respective letter and is arranged, in order, from high to low
mean scores or low to high mean scores depending on the variable being reported. In all cases, the first mean score (group) listed represents the most favorable rating on that variable. Thus, all mean scores (the groups) are listed in order from the most favorable rating to the least favorable rating.

By (1) using letters in parentheses—(A)—to represent the groups from Blumberg's studies, (2) by also listing these groups in order of favorability, and (3) by placing these letters directly over the letters representing groups from this study, direct comparisons between the two studies can be made. The tables also show where Blumberg found significant differences between adjacent mean scores. This is done by placing an arrow between the two group designations: (A)\textendash\rightarrow(B). The same designation is used between groups from this study to indicate where significant differences had been predicted. A footnote reference on the arrow refers the reader to the significance level of the t-ratio found for the predicted differences.

**Perceived directness-indirectness and teacher reactions to conferences: a comparison of findings**

In this study, hypotheses 5-9 predicted the relationships between the four direct-indirect behavior categories and teacher reactions to conferences. These relationships have been tested and shown to exist. The findings from Blumberg's original study, in

---

which he used a one-way analysis of variance design with Tukey's significant gap and straggler test to determine the significance of differences between means, provided the groups used as independent variables in this study. This enabled the testing of a priori, directional predictions in this study through the use of the one-tail $t$ test.

To make a direct comparison with the relationships found by Blumberg, the data were also analyzed by use of the one-way analysis of variance design and by making $t$ comparisons between all combinations of the four individual group means.$^1$

An examination of Table 6 shows a very high degree of similarity between studies in the manner in which the teachers' reactions to the nine items on the TPSB Scale varied according to teacher perception of supervisor directness-indirectness. In eight out of the ten items listed in Table 6, the perceptions of direct-indirect behavior style resulted in the mean scores of four groups being arranged in the exact same order. In the two instances where this did not occur, the variations were contained within a grouping which had essentially similar positive or negative ratings.

As an example, the arrangement of groups according to mean scores varied on felt freedom to initiate discussion; however, the variations occurred within the combination of mean scores which express a greater freedom to initiate discussion and which are

$^1$See Tables 17 & 18, Appendix G for complete data on these analyses.
**Table 6**

A Comparison of the Rank of Mean Scores for Groups Based on Perceived Supervisor Directness-Indirectness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups arranged from most to least favorable responses according to mean scores on TPSB Scale items</th>
<th>FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freedom to initiate discussion</td>
<td>(C) (A) (D) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about classroom behavior</td>
<td>(A) (C) (\rightarrow) (B) (D)</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about self</td>
<td>(A) (C) (\rightarrow) (B) (D)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor control of teacher</td>
<td>(C) (D) (\rightarrow) (A) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor superiority</td>
<td>(C) (D) (\rightarrow) (A) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor empathy</td>
<td>(C) (\rightarrow) (A) (\rightarrow) (D) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor evaluation of teacher</td>
<td>(D) (C) (\rightarrow) (A) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumes he has right answers</td>
<td>(C) (\rightarrow) (A) (\rightarrow) (B)</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups arranged from most to least favorable responses according to mean scores on TPSB Scale items</th>
<th>( F^c )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conference</td>
<td>(C) (A) ( \rightarrow ) (D) (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity ( b )</td>
<td>C ( \rightarrow ) A ( \rightarrow ) e ( \rightarrow ) D ( \rightarrow ) B</td>
<td>0.85 1.50 3.30 5.70 18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrepancy</td>
<td>(C) (A) ( \rightarrow ) (D) (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between desired and perceived</td>
<td>C ( \rightarrow ) A ( \rightarrow ) d ( \rightarrow ) D ( \rightarrow ) B</td>
<td>3.35 3.53 7.44 12.67 13.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \)Capital letters in parentheses represent the order of ranking for the means of groups in Blumberg's study. The arrow \( \rightarrow \) between groups indicates significant differences reported by Blumberg.

\( b \)Lower mean scores signify that the variable investigated was perceived more frequently.

\( c \)The critical ratio for \( F \) at the .05 level of significance is 2.84 for df of 3 and 55. See Table 17, Appendix G for complete data regarding these analyses.

\( d_p. = .05 \)

\( e_p. = .01 \)

\( f_p. = .06 \)

\( g_p. = n.s. \)
separated (difference in sample means was significant at or beyond the .05 level) from the mean score which indicated the least freedom to initiate discussion. Both this study and Blumberg's study showed groups A, C, and D to feel more free to initiate discussion than group B even though the order of arrangement was C, D, A for this study and C, A, D for Blumberg's study. The same kind of minor variation was noted for teacher ratings of learning about classroom behavior.

The t test comparison between individual group means revealed that for seven out of the ten variables, predicted differences between means were found at the "gaps" identified in Blumberg's previous study and which were used for predicting outcomes for this study. Of the other three variables, two were found to have differences significant at the .06 level and the remaining variable had differences significant at the .10 level. Whereas differences in mean scores for these three variables were not quite significant at the .05 level with this method of analyzing the data, the analysis used for testing this study's hypotheses regarding these variables found differences on all three variables to be significant beyond the .01 level. To test these hypotheses, the scores of groups on either side of the "gaps" identified by Blumberg were grouped and comparisons were made between mean scores representing the teacher ratings separated by the "gap."

In both studies, analysis of variance of the differences between mean scores on all ten items produced F ratios significant at the .05 level or beyond.
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Perceived directness-indirectness and interpersonal satisfaction: a comparison of findings

In addition to obtaining the total scores on the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory for use in testing hypotheses 2 and 5, sub-scale scores were also obtained for use in making a direct comparison with Blumberg's findings1 about the relationships between perceived supervisor direct-indirect behavior and the interpersonal satisfaction expressed by teachers. Table 7 summarizes the findings of both this study and Blumberg's by listing the arrangement of groups from most positive to least positive ratings.

The table shows that the mean sub-scale scores, grouped by the perceived behavior styles of the supervisors, vary for the two studies considerably more than did the ten items dealing with teacher ratings of conference interaction. Most notably, group D (LD-LI) in the Blumberg findings was "gapped" toward the lower, least desirable ranking for each sub-scale while it is found to be placed near the most positive rankings in this study. Both studies consistently show group B (HD-LI) expressing the least amount of interpersonal satisfaction. The general pattern which emerged from the Blumberg investigation was that groups A and C exhibited the most positive expressions of interpersonal satisfaction and that groups B and D were associated with the least positive expressions. A modification of this pattern occurred in the ratings of unconditionality of regard where group A was also grouped with the least favorable

Table 7

Teacher Ratings of Interpersonal Satisfaction: A Comparison of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Groups arranged from highest to lowest mean scores on Sub-Scales of the B-L Relationship Inventory</th>
<th>p^b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regard</strong></td>
<td>(A) → (C) → (D) → (B)</td>
<td>6.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C → D → A → B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.85 → 33.46 → 29.05 → 11.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td>(A) → (C) → (D) → (B)</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C → D → A → B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.95 → 26.15 → 17.78 → -3.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconditionality of regard</strong></td>
<td>(C) → (A) → (B) → (D)</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C → D → A → B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.95 → 15.77 → 8.17 → -8.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruence</strong></td>
<td>(A) → (C) → (D) → (B)</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C → D → A → B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.80 → 29.23 → 25.56 → 3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Capital letters in parentheses represent the order of ranking for the means of groups in the Blumberg study. The arrow (→) between groups indicates significant differences reported by Blumberg.

^b See Appendix G, Table 19 for full data.

^c Differences between means are significant at the .05 level.
ratings.

The pattern which emerged from this study, however, shows that group B alone gave the lowest ratings on all four sub-scales while groups C, D, and A were bunched together representing the more positive expressions of interpersonal satisfaction. In all cases, the variation between the mean scores of groups A and B were greater than the variation in mean scores between groups C and A. The \( t \) test analysis of differences between group means indicated that the differences between groups A and B are significant at the .05 level in all cases. The arrangement of group mean scores remained the same for the four sub-scales, resulting in the most favorable reactions for all sub-scales coming from group C (LD-HI) and the least favorable reactions coming from group B (HD-LI).

Analysis of the differences between the four group means for each sub-scale obtained significant F ratios, significance level of .05 or beyond, for each of the four sub-scales.\(^1\) This was also the case in the Blumberg study.

The comparison of data in Table 7 has shown mean ratings of interpersonal satisfaction as a dependent variable, as did the testing of hypotheses 2 and 5 of this study. Blumberg also used interpersonal satisfaction ratings as the independent variable in order to examine variations in teacher perceptions of supervisor directness-indirectness. A similar comparison was made from data collected for this study. The results are shown in Table 8. As was the case with

\(^1\)See Tables 19 & 20, Appendix G for complete data.
Table 8

Mean Direct and Indirect Scores for Teachers Scoring in the First and Fourth Quarter on the B-L Relationship Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean direct score</th>
<th>Mean indirect score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blumberg findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quarter</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quarter</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First quarter</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>17.8&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quarter</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Mean differences are significant at the .01 level.

<sup>b</sup>Mean differences are significant beyond the .01 level.
Blumberg's findings, those teachers expressing the most interpersonal satisfaction perceived their supervisors as less direct and more indirect than did teachers expressing the least interpersonal satisfaction. These results give further evidence that supervisor directness and indirectness, as perceived by teachers, are systematically related to the lesser and greater expressions of interpersonal satisfaction on the part of teachers.

A comparison of findings regarding the congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions

The outcomes predicted in hypotheses 10 and 11 were based on comparisons Blumberg had previously made between teacher and supervisor data he had gathered. Unlike the statistical analyses used for testing the other hypotheses which were based on Blumberg's findings, the analysis of data to test hypotheses 10 and 11 consisted of the same statistical methods used by Blumberg. Consequently, a direct comparison of the findings of the two studies has already been made in Table 4, and in the report of the findings on pages 105-8.

Unlike the consistent similarities found in the other comparisons made between the results of this study and the reported findings of Blumberg, few similarities were found in the supervisors' estimates of teacher ratings on the TPSB Scale. Supervisors

---

estimated more positive reactions from teachers for only two of the nine evaluative items on the scale; amount of learning about classroom behavior and amount of learning about self. Blumberg found supervisors making excessively positive estimates for seven of nine items. The last column in Table 4 indicates how the two studies differ.

Summary

The findings of data gathered and analyzed to test the hypotheses of this study were presented in two different forms. The initial report of findings presented data analyzed by means of the t statistic to test the experimental hypotheses of this study. The hypotheses tested were grouped in four major areas of emphasis: (1) supervisor flexibility, (2) perceived directness-indirectness of supervisor behavior, (3) congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions, (4) teacher and supervisor ratings of ideal supervisory behavior. A supplemental description of the findings was made to make a more direct comparison of the findings of this study with the previous findings of Blumberg.

The extent to which the findings supported the hypotheses is summarized in Table 9. Mean ratings resulting in differences significant at the .05 level or beyond showed relationships between:

1. supervisor flexibility and teacher perception of supervisor indirectness.

2. perceived High-direct, High-indirect and Low-direct, High-indirect supervisor behavior and positive teacher ratings
## Table 9

**Summary of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships investigated</th>
<th>Experimental hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor flexibility and:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived indirect behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher ratings of learning about classroom behavior</td>
<td>3-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher ratings of learning about self</td>
<td>3-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher ratings of conference productivity</td>
<td>3-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived direct-indirect patterns of supervisor behavior and teacher ratings of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal satisfaction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about classroom behavior</td>
<td>6-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning about self</td>
<td>6-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor empathy</td>
<td>6-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference productivity</td>
<td>6-d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor control</td>
<td>7-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor attitude of superiority</td>
<td>7-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom to initiate discussions about teaching problems</td>
<td>7-c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships investigated</th>
<th>Experimental hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor evaluativeness</td>
<td>8-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor tendency to assume he has the &quot;right answer&quot;</td>
<td>8-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrepancy between expressed ideal and perceived supervisor behavior</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence of teacher and supervisor perceptions on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirectness of supervisor behavior</td>
<td>10-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directness of supervisor behavior</td>
<td>10-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>items on the TPSB Scale</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and supervisor statements of ideal on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor directness</td>
<td>12-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor indirectness</td>
<td>12-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher perceptions and supervisor statements of ideal on:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor directness</td>
<td>13-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor indirectness</td>
<td>13-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on interpersonal satisfaction, learning, supervisor empathy and conference productivity.

3. perceived High-direct, Low-indirect supervisor behavior and teacher perception of greater supervisor control and supervisor superiority, and less freedom to initiate discussions about teaching problems.

4. perceived High-direct, High-indirect and High-direct, Low-indirect supervisor behavior and teachers perceiving supervisors as being more evaluative and as assuming that there are "best answers," which they have, to teaching problems.

5. perceived High-direct, High-indirect and Low-direct, High-indirect supervisor behavior and less discrepancy between teachers' descriptions of ideal supervisor behavior and the way in which they perceive their supervisors.

Also supported were predictions that:

1. supervisors would rate their own behavior as more indirect than would teachers.

2. teachers and supervisors would express a similar ideal for amount of direct supervisor behavior.

3. actual teacher ratings would describe supervisors as less indirect than the expressed supervisor ideal for indirectness.

The supplemental description of findings, when compared with the results of Blumberg's studies, displayed:

1. great similarities in the relationship of perceived supervisor behavior on the dimensions of directness-indirectness
and teacher evaluation of conference interaction.

2. variations from Blumberg's findings in the relationship between perceived supervisor behavior and interpersonal satisfaction. Where Blumberg found perceived Low-direct, Low-indirect behavior associated with lower ratings of interpersonal satisfaction, this study found this perceived supervisor behavior associated with the more positive expressions. Both studies showed significant differences in perceived directness and indirectness of supervisor behavior when high and low interpersonal satisfaction measures were used as the dependent variable.

3. great dissimilarity in its comparison of supervisor estimates of teachers' reactions to the teacher-supervisor conferences. Blumberg found supervisors were consistently too positive in their estimates of the way teachers would react to conferences; however, the supervisors taking part in this study actually estimated teachers' responses to be less positive than they actually were. The only exception to this pattern was with expectations concerning teacher learning about self and about classroom behavior.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter will (1) provide the reader with a brief description of the purposes and design of the study, (2) summarize and discuss the findings, (3) present the conclusions drawn from these findings, and (4) briefly discuss the implications of these findings.

Summary

Because the teacher-supervisor conference is a much used, time consuming activity about which very little research is available, a need was seen for additional information which would be of use in working toward the improvement of the conference process. The purpose of this study, designed around the previous work of Blumberg, was to provide empirical data which might be of use in coming to know more about factors which influence conference outcomes.

Specifically, the purposes of this study were to:

1. investigate the relationship of perceived direct and indirect supervisory behavior to teacher perceptions of (a) productivity of the teacher-supervisor conference interaction, (b) interpersonal satisfaction, (c) learning, and (d) communicative climate.

2. investigate the congruence of (a) the perceptions of teachers and supervisors regarding the teacher-supervisor
interaction and (b) teacher and supervisor statements of ideal supervisory behavior described on the dimensions of directness and indirectness.

3. investigate the relationship of supervisor flexibility to (a) perceived direct-indirect supervisory behavior, (b) teacher perceptions of interpersonal satisfaction and amounts of learning, and (c) the congruence of teachers' and supervisors' perceptions.

The specific purposes of this study consisted, in part, of a re-investigation of previous work done by Blumberg and associates who investigated the relationship of teacher reactions to teacher-supervisor conference interaction and perceived direct and indirect supervisor influence.

To obtain participants for the study, supervisory personnel in the state of Michigan were contacted by mail and asked to participate in the study if (1) they worked with teachers on a non-evaluative basis for the improvement of instruction, and (2) had conferred at least twice with a minimum of five teachers. Through this method, 38 supervisor participants were obtained and responded to the supervisor data collection instruments. From the 226 teacher data collection packets sent to the supervisors for distribution to selected teachers, 177 teacher responses were obtained.

Since participants were scattered throughout the state, the supervisors who agreed to take part in the study were asked to assist the investigator with the selection of teacher participants and the distribution of study materials. They were sent a packet of
materials which contained (1) a set of instructions, (2) a set of letters to use for introducing the study to teachers, (3) a method for randomly selecting teacher participants when this was necessary, (4) the set of instruments to gather supervisor responses, and (5) the sealed packets of data gathering instruments to be distributed to teachers. The materials received by each participant included a stamped, pre-addressed envelope so that completed instruments could be returned to the investigator.

Data were collected from teachers through the use of the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisory Behavior Scale and the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. Supervisors also responded to the Teacher Perceptions of Supervisor Behavior Scale, and in addition, completed the Philosophic Mindedness Scale, a measure of flexibility. Use of these instruments provided the following information:

From teachers;

1. perceptions of supervisor behavior style on dimensions of directness-indirectness (TPSB Scale).
2. ratings of ideal supervisor conference behavior on dimensions of directness-indirectness (TPSB Scale).
3. evaluations of the communicative climate, amount of learning, and the general productivity of the conferences (TPSB Scale).
4. expressions of interpersonal satisfaction (B-L Inventory).

From supervisors;

1. perceptions of their own behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness (TPSB Scale).
2. ratings of ideal supervisory behavior on dimensions of directness and indirectness (TPSB Scale).

3. supervisor perceptions of teachers' reactions to the teacher-supervisor conference interaction (TPSB Scale).

4. a measure of flexibility (PM Scale).

Data analysis consisted of testing the experimental hypotheses through the comparison of the differences between mean scores by use of the one-tail t test. A supplemental description of findings was also presented in a form which would allow for a direct comparison of the relationships found within this study and the studies reported by Blumberg. To enable this comparison, a one-way analysis of variance design was used to compare differences between groups. In addition, a comparison between individual group means was made by use of the one-tail t test.

Discussion of the Findings

The following material will report and discuss the findings of the data analysis used to test the experimental hypotheses of this study and, in addition, will refer to the similarities of the findings to Blumberg's previous work. For a brief summary of findings, see Chapter IV, pp. 122-26.

Findings regarding relationships predicted from the Blumberg studies

Of the relationships predicted on the basis of findings reported by Blumberg, evidence gathered from this study indicates the presence of consistent, positive relationships between teacher perceptions of
supervisory emphasis on indirect behavior and:

1. teacher expressions of interpersonal satisfaction.
2. the amount of discrepancy between teachers' expressions of ideal supervisor conference behavior and the supervisor behavior they actually perceived.
3. teacher perceptions of learning about themselves personally and about their teaching behavior.
4. teacher feelings that the supervisor has concern for and understanding of teaching problems faced by the teacher.
5. teacher ratings of the worth and productivity of teacher-supervisor conferences.

Also indicated was the positive relationship of teacher perception of supervisor emphasis on direct behavior in the absence of emphasis on indirect behavior and teacher perception of:

6. supervisor's intent to control teacher behavior.
7. supervisor conveyance of an attitude of superiority.
8. less freedom to initiate discussion about teaching problems.

Perceived supervisor emphasis on direct behavior with or without an emphasis on indirect behavior was positively associated with:

9. teacher perceptions that the supervisor assumes there is a best answer to the teacher's problem and that the supervisor has that answer.
10. teacher feelings that the supervisor's real interest in the teacher-supervisor conference is to evaluate them, as a teacher and as a person.

The relationships between directness-indirectness and the variables
just discussed in items 3 through 10 are summarized graphically in Figure 1.

The evidence gathered to determine the congruency of teacher and supervisor perceptions showed that:

11. contrary to predictions, supervisors did not estimate teacher evaluations of the conferences to be more positive than they actually were.

12. contrary to predictions, supervisors did not rate themselves as being less direct than they were perceived by teachers.

13. supervisors did rate themselves as being more indirect than they were perceived by teachers.

These findings, supported by mean score differences significant at the .05 level where positive relationships are stated, give strong support to the predictive validity of Blumberg's findings regarding the relationship of the perceived supervisor directness-indirectness and teacher reactions to their experiences in conferences with supervisors. Without exception, those experimental hypotheses which predicted relationships between directness-indirectness were supported by the findings of this study. Not only did the data support the acceptance of the experimental hypotheses, but when analyzed in a manner similar to Blumberg's original analysis, exhibited an almost complete similarity in the variance between perceived supervisor directness-indirectness of behavior and teacher reactions to conferences. This was not the case for teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction.
**Figure 1**

Mean Item Scores on TPSB Scale for Groups Based on Perceived Supervisor Directness-Indirectness

A = HD-HI, B = HD-LI, C = LD-HI, D = LD-LI

Underscored items indicate that the lower mean score is the more positive rating on the TPSB Scale item.
As in the Blumberg study, findings indicated a relationship between teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction and perceived indirectness, however, the supplemental analysis of data shows some departures from Blumberg's findings. The findings differ in the relationship reported between interpersonal satisfaction and perceived supervisor behavior for those teachers who had perceived supervisor behavior as Low-direct, Low-indirect. In the Blumberg study, these teachers were identified with the least satisfactory ratings of interpersonal satisfaction. On the other hand, this study found their ratings of interpersonal satisfaction associated with the highest ratings.¹

This variation in findings concerning interpersonal satisfaction is considered minor since both studies are consistent in showing the association of perceived supervisor indirectness to the most positive ratings of interpersonal satisfaction and the least positive ratings of interpersonal satisfaction to be associated with perceived supervisor emphasis on directness when not combined with high indirect behavior. Further evidence of this association is provided in both studies by an analysis which used the highest and lowest expressions of interpersonal satisfaction as independent variables to test their relationship to perceived supervisor directness-indirectness. Teachers giving the highest ratings of interpersonal satisfaction perceived supervisors as more indirect and less direct than did teachers giving the lowest ratings of interpersonal satisfaction.

¹See Table 7, p. 118.
In the two instances where the data did not support the experimental hypotheses, (1) congruence of supervisor and teacher perception of supervisor directness and (2) congruence of supervisor estimates of teacher ratings and actual teacher ratings, the findings varied considerably from those of Blumberg. Contrary to predictions, supervisors taking part in this study perceived their behavior to be more direct, not less direct, than did teachers. They also estimated teacher ratings on the evaluative items of the TPSB Scale to be lower than were the teacher ratings. This finding is markedly different from that reported by Blumberg. Blumberg found supervisors overestimating the positiveness of teacher ratings on nine of eleven items, the exceptions being (1) supervisor assumption of having the right answers and (2) supervisor evaluativeness. This study found supervisors overestimating on only three of eleven items. They were: (1) supervisor indirectness, (2) teacher learning about self, and (3) teacher learning about classroom behavior. On the other eight items, supervisor estimates of teacher ratings were actually less positive than were the teacher ratings. Possible explanations for this difference in findings may exist in the differences to be found in the population of supervisors or in methods of conducting the studies.

Although this study was designed around variables investigated by Blumberg, differences in the way the study was conducted may have created conditions which affected the congruence of teacher and supervisor ratings. Such possibilities are found in the differences between the populations of supervisors used in the two studies. This study, to be consistent with the purposes held for supervision herein
defined, used supervisors who worked with teachers on a non-evaluative basis and who had a functional relationship with those teachers. Also, they knew that those teachers would be responding to their conference behavior. Blumberg, on the other hand, collected his data from supervisors who did not have a functional relationship with those teachers whose data were used for comparison purposes. These supervisors may or may not have been involved in the evaluation of teachers.

Another possible source of the difference in outcomes is the setting in which data were obtained from both the supervisors and teachers. Blumberg's data were obtained from graduate school enrollees who were responding to the TPSB Scale items by reacting to a private, individual referent (each teacher reacting to a supervisor with whom he had conferred). Supervisors, also reacting to the scale items by estimating the responses of teachers with whom they had conferred, probably did not know their reactions were to be used for comparisons with teacher reactions.

In contrast, for this study, data to test congruency of perceptions were gathered from teachers and supervisors who were responding to a common referent, their mutual experiencing of the same conference interaction. Supervisors, knowing that their reactions would somehow be compared to those of the teachers with whom they had conferred, may have been influenced to respond overcautiously. Regardless of the source of differences, the findings of both groups of studies are probably not valid measures of congruence.
Findings regarding teacher and supervisor ratings of ideal supervisory behavior

Relationships which were predicted and which were found are:

1. there is little difference in the ideal ratings of teachers and supervisors on the directness dimension of supervisor behavior.

2. teachers will perceive supervisor behavior as less indirect than the expressed supervisor ideal for indirect behavior.

Relationships which were predicted but not found are:

1. there will be little difference between teacher and supervisor ratings of ideal indirect behavior. The findings indicated that supervisors felt more emphasis should be placed on indirect behavior than did teachers.

2. that teachers would perceive supervisors' behavior as more direct than the expressed ideal of supervisors. To the contrary, teachers perceived supervisor behavior as less direct than the expressed ideal of supervisors.

The findings suggest that the supervisors who took part in this study are faced with a discrepancy between the behavior they feel they should be exhibiting as supervisors and the way they are perceived by teachers. The most important discrepancy appears to be on the dimensions of indirectness even though the summary of findings also reported differences from predicted relationships of directness. On the dimension of directness, expressions of ideal by teachers and supervisors were essentially the same and the differences between teacher perceived and supervisor ideal were relatively small when
compared to the differences between the ratings of teacher perceived and supervisor ideal indirectness. It would appear that since the other findings in this study have shown strong relationships between indirectness and desirable outcomes for supervision, the discrepancy on the indirect dimension is the most meaningful discrepancy.

It should be noted at this point that data used for determining the differences found in these relationships may have been influenced by the manner in which the study was conducted, although examination of the data does not point to this as having happened. Out of the 177 teacher respondents, 31 failed to complete the ratings of ideal supervisor behavior as instructed. Though instructions were revised and subsequent responses did show a reduction in the number of improperly completed instruments, the problem of teachers placing their ratings of ideal on the wrong items of the instrument was not completely alleviated. Very few teachers did not attempt to give ideal ratings.

The other, more subtle, source of possible influence on both supervisor and teacher ratings of ideal supervisor behavior was introduced by the necessity of obtaining both the ideal and perceived ratings at the same time. It appeared that the most consistent predictor of the pattern of teachers' ratings of ideal was the initial ratings of their perceptions of supervisor behavior. However, since both teachers' and supervisors' ratings of ideal and perceived supervisor behavior show differences which would rarely occur by chance, the existence of the influences of previous ratings would appear not to vitiate the differences reported in this study, but would suggest
the possibility of even greater differences in teachers' ratings if these had been acquired at different times.

Findings regarding supervisor flexibility

In Chapter II, a rationale was developed for hypothesizing a relationship between the personal characteristic of flexibility, as defined in this study, and the capacity and disposition of a supervisor to exert indirect, basically integrative influence in his conference relationship with teachers. It was the purpose of the hypotheses regarding supervisor flexibility to test for the presence of relationships between flexibility and indirectness, and between selected variables shown by Blumberg to have been related to indirectness; namely, teacher expressions of interpersonal satisfaction, teacher learning about self and classroom behavior, and teacher ratings of conference productivity. Also tested was the hypothesized relationship between flexibility and the accuracy with which supervisors would estimate teacher reactions to conferences.

Analysis of the data showed:

1. supervisor flexibility was positively related to teacher perception of indirect behavior.
2. supervisor flexibility was not shown to be related to interpersonal satisfaction, amount of learning, or conference productivity as perceived by teachers.
3. there was no appreciable difference in the accuracy with which the most flexible and least flexible supervisors estimated teacher ratings on the TPSB Scale.
The findings appear to show a minimal amount of evidence that flexibility is related to the variables investigated. There is also an apparent inconsistency in the findings which show flexibility to be significantly related to indirectness but not to the variables which have been shown elsewhere in this study to be strongly related to indirectness. A better understanding of this apparent lack of relationships is furnished by further examination of the data regarding these hypotheses.

The first characteristic of the data not evident in the summary of findings just presented is that, with the exception of the differences obtained for the supervisor accuracy of estimating teacher ratings of conferences, the differences found in the comparison of variables were all in the direction hypothesized. As well as being in the hypothesized direction, the differences found in the ratings of perceived learning about self, learning about classroom behavior, and conference productivity were substantial, if not significant at the .05 level. The ratings of conference productivity did assume significance at the .06 level of significance; the most positive ratings having come from teachers who had conferred with the most flexible supervisors. A re-examination of the data offers a possible explanation for the very strong relationship (approaching the .01 level of significance) found between flexibility and indirectness but not found between flexibility and the variables positively associated with indirectness.

In this study's investigation of the relationship between indirectness and teacher ratings of perceptions on learning and
conference productivity, only the ratings of teachers having perceived supervisor behavior as High-indirect or Low-indirect (in combination with some rating of directness) were used. Thus, the extremes of perceived indirectness were used as independent variables to assess the relationship of indirectness to teacher ratings of learning and conference productivity. Consequently, the differences in indirectness between these comparison groups represented a considerably wider spread between the highest and lowest amounts of indirectness perceived by teachers than did the comparison groups used to determine the relationship of flexibility to these variables.

In the investigation of the relationship between flexibility and indirectness, the degree of indirectness was the dependent variable and, although it was shown to differ significantly for most and least flexible supervisors, the spread between the amount of indirectness perceived was nowhere near as great as that found between the High-indirect and Low-indirect groupings. Whereas the mean for high indirectness was 15.7 and low indirectness was 30.1—a difference of 14.4—when indirectness served as the independent variable, a high directness mean of 17.5 and a low indirectness mean of 21.1—a difference of 3.6—represents the variance by which flexibility was judged to be related to indirectness.

The differences in the variation between high and low means of indirectness provides an alternative explanation for the apparent inconsistency found in having flexibility shown to be very much related to indirectness, but not to the variables related to indirectness. It is possible that the relationship between flexibility
and the variables highly related to indirectness was not more evident in the findings because the range of perceived indirectness, while broad enough to show the relationship of flexibility and indirectness, was considerably smaller than the range of indirectness used to verify the association between indirectness and teacher ratings of amounts of learning and conference productivity.

Suggested is the possibility that the relationship of flexibility to interpersonal satisfaction, amounts of learning, and conference productivity is not a direct relationship, but rather a relationship between flexibility and the intervening variable, indirectness. As such, the strength of the relationship between flexibility and indirectness would determine the strength of the relationships between flexibility and interpersonal satisfaction, learning, and conference productivity. These relationships would, in turn, be affected by the original strength of relationships between indirectness and these variables. The data offer some evidence to support this possibility.

The comparison of the relationships between perceived indirectness and the variables interpersonal satisfaction, learning, and conference productivity indicated that the most positive teacher ratings on these variables were associated with high indirectness. However, there was considerable variance in the size of the t-ratios—all significant at or beyond the .05 level—representing the significance level of these relationships. The smallest t-ratio was associated with interpersonal satisfaction, the next largest with amounts of learning, and the largest with conference productivity. This same
pattern exists when the t-ratios representing the relationships between high and low flexibility and these variables are compared.

The re-examination of data provided no basis for explaining the failure to support the hypothesized relationship of flexibility to the accuracy of estimating teacher responses to the TPSB Scale. The data show, however, some differences in the way the most and least flexible supervisors estimated teacher responses. The most flexible supervisors were more prone to underestimate rather than overestimate the positiveness of teacher evaluations of teacher-supervisor conferences. In estimating the way teachers would perceive the directness-indirectness of their behavior, the most flexible supervisors showed the same pattern of underestimating, more than overestimating, the amounts of directness and indirectness perceived by teachers. Least flexible supervisors varied from this pattern.

In estimating teacher ratings to conferences, the least flexible supervisors exhibited different patterns for estimating teacher evaluations of the conferences and teacher perceptions of the directness-indirectness of their behavior. For teacher evaluations of conferences, least flexible supervisors overestimated more frequently than they underestimated the positiveness of teacher responses. For teacher ratings of the directness-indirectness of their behavior, however, the least flexible supervisors over and underestimated at about the same frequency. No explanation is offered for this difference in patterns of estimating teacher ratings or for its meaning to the findings of no difference in the accuracy of the most and least flexible supervisors' estimates.
Conclusions

The primary importance of the data collected for this study is in the interrelationships shown to exist within it. Findings regarding these interrelationships are assumed to be applicable to the general field of supervision. The conclusions stated below have been drawn from these findings and, in many cases, both support and are supported by the previous findings of Blumberg.

Conclusions regarding supervisor flexibility

1. It would appear, from the relationships predicted and found in this study, that teacher perceptions of supervisor use of indirect influence in conferences are predictably related to supervisor flexibility. Greater amounts of perceived indirectness are associated with "high" flexibility.

2. The failure to show strong relationships between supervisor flexibility and teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction, amounts of learning, and conference productivity appears to be related to the strength of the relationship between flexibility and indirectness. This suggests that the relationships between flexibility and these variables are not direct, but are dependent on the intervening variable, indirectness.

3. The relationship found between flexibility and indirectness suggests that further investigation of this relationship is warranted. There is a need to determine whether the
"extremes" of flexibility will have stronger associations with the "extremes" of perceived indirectness under conditions where low indirectness and high directness are perceived to a greater extent than was the case for this population of supervisors and teachers.

Conclusions regarding perceived directness-indirectness of supervisor behavior

4. Teacher perceptions of Low-direct, High-indirect supervisor behavior are most likely to be associated with the most positive teacher reactions to teacher-supervisor conferences.

5. Teacher perceptions of High-direct, Low-indirect supervisor behavior are most likely to be associated with the least positive teacher reactions to teacher-supervisor conferences.

6. In general, it appears that the negative effect of perceived supervisor directness on the teacher reactions to teacher-supervisor conferences is overcome when High-direct behavior is combined with High-indirect behavior.

7. Perceived High-direct supervisor behavior, in the absence of High-indirect influence, appears to be least conducive to having teachers perceive a supportive climate. High-directness is associated with teacher perceptions of the supervisor's (a) need to control, (b) evidencing a superior attitude, (c) showing less empathy, (d) appearance of being
evaluative, and (e) projection of certainty that they have the right answers. Perceptions of High-indirect behavior in conjunction with High-direct behavior results in more positive teacher reactions to items a, b, and c, but does not change the influence of directness on items d and e.

8. The discrepancy between teachers' expressions of ideal supervisor behavior and the behavior they perceive in their supervisors is most influenced by the absence or presence of perceived indirectness.

9. The greatest amounts of interpersonal satisfaction expressed as the result of teacher-supervisor conference interaction appear to be related to perceived High-indirect influence while the least amounts of interpersonal satisfaction expressed are related to perceived High-direct influence.

Conclusions regarding teacher and supervisor congruence of perceptions and ratings of ideal supervisory behavior

10. Supervisors have a general tendency to rate their own behavior as more indirect than teachers rate them.

11. It is likely to be the general pattern that teachers will perceive supervisor behavior as less indirect than the supervisor expressed ideal for indirect behavior.

General conclusions

12. The findings of this study give very strong support to Blumberg's findings on the relationship between perceived
directness-indirectness of supervisor conference behavior and teacher ratings of interpersonal satisfaction, learning, communicative climate, and conference productivity. The cumulative effect of the findings of both studies is to provide consistent evidence that it is possible to predict, with some degree of certainty, the relationship between perceived supervisor indirectness and the most positive teacher reactions to conferences.

13. It appears that the incidence of perceived High-direct, Low-indirect behavior was less for this population of teachers reacting to supervisors who work with them on a non-evaluative basis than it was for the population of teachers which was used by Blumberg in his study.

Implications

The findings of this study have implications for the preparation of supervisors and for the continued research on teacher-supervisor conference interaction.

It has been the general practice in the past to assume that supervisors, or supervisors-to-be, would operationalize an appropriate set of teacher-supervisor interaction behaviors from their general studies in supervision. These studies have dealt with relatively non-behavioral considerations of supervision such as the nature and functions of supervision, a brief consideration of numerous supervisory activities, and the role of the supervisors within the school organization. Not uncommonly, there are those who
function in a supervisory capacity, because of their expertise in the program area being supervised, who have not had the benefit of even these most general considerations of supervisory influence. All in all, neither from the literature in the field of supervision, nor from their studies in supervision, have supervisors been aided in acquiring an operational set of behaviors which when perceived, have been shown to have predictable relationships with the outcomes desired from their work with teachers. The resultant "eclectic," common sense, and probably unplanned behavior patterns "chosen" to exert supervisor influence have provided little opportunity for systematic investigation and improvement of supervisory processes.

On the other hand, models of perceived direct-indirect influence patterns, used as the basis for defining influence in superior-subordinate relationships, have been shown to be systematically related to teachers' evaluation of their interaction with supervisors. These findings suggest the use and testing of these operationally defined behavior patterns in teacher-supervisor interaction.

An examination of items 1-a through 1-i of the TPSB Scale shows that indirectness, shown to be associated with the positiveness of teacher reactions to conferences, is more than an absence of direct influence. Rather, it is a pattern of influence which is based on assumptions about the relationship of the participants in the interaction, about the kinds of roles which are desirable for these participants, and about the outcomes which are desired for the interaction. In order for supervisors to understand and apply indirect influence, it appears there is a need for more specific training opportunities.
in which they come to understand (1) the nature of dominative and integrative influences and their relationship to direct and indirect behavior and (2) the implications of a superior-subordinate relationship on interaction patterns. They also need opportunities to learn, behaviorally, to apply this operational model. Skills for obtaining and feeding back to the teacher relatively objective information would appear to complement the application of indirect behavior.

In conjunction with the previous suggestion for training in the use of direct-indirect influences in teacher-supervisor interaction situations, it is also recommended that research be carried on to determine the effects of such training. The results of this study showed, and reinforced previous findings, that perceived indirectness was associated with the most positive reactions to conferences. Will the training of supervisors in the use of indirect influences predictably result in teacher perceptions of indirect influence? More important, will the use of indirect influence achieve the desired behavioral changes in teachers? The most appropriate research would involve the behavioral description of desired changes in teacher behavior, the application of "models" of indirect and non-indirect influence in supervisory contacts with the teachers, and an assessment of the relationship between measured change and application of indirect influence.
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APPENDIX A

Letter of Request for Supervisor Participation
Dear

I am presently engaged in a doctoral dissertation investigating teacher-supervisor conference interaction and am writing to solicit your help in exploring this important supervisory process. In order to request help from those most likely to have strong interests in supervision, I decided to contact MASCD members, thus my reason for writing you at this time.

In order to complete this study I need to secure the cooperation of people who are functioning in a supervisory capacity which involves them in a one-to-one, non-evaluative relationship with teachers. Non-evaluative, as used here, means not being involved in formal evaluative procedures used to determine retention, promotion, or tenure status of teachers. The term "supervisory capacity" refers to any person who has responsibility for working with teachers to improve instruction. Such persons may have the title of department head, consultant, supervisor, helping teacher, coordinator, instructional specialist, or any number of other commonly used titles. Because these various titles represent a wide variety of supervisory responsibilities it is impossible, without the aid of people like you, to identify those people who function within the limits I have just described.

The study itself will consist of securing the responses of teachers and supervisors on several rating instruments. Because the people who will be participating in the study will be widely scattered, I am asking each supervisor who agrees to participate in the study to perform two simple tasks in addition to responding to the rating instruments. First, each supervisor will be asked to list those teachers with whom he has conferred at least twice and, using a very simple random selection method furnished by me, select five teachers from this list; and second, distribute to these five teachers the packet of materials I will furnish for acquiring teacher responses. These two tasks should require no more than twenty minutes of time, but having them performed locally should improve the study considerably.

All materials are completely packaged so that once teachers have been selected for the study, the supervisor has only to distribute the packets to them. All materials are returned directly to me via stamped, self-addressed envelopes. All data are strictly confidential and are not used to evaluate any specific group or individual.
Participants will not be identified in any reports of the study. Participation in the study will require between sixty and seventy-five minutes of a supervisor's time and about twenty minutes of a teacher's time.

I acknowledge the fact that you are a busy person and are hardly in need of additional matters to occupy your time. At least this was always my state of affairs when I was a supervisor and administrator. However, if you do work with teachers on a non-evaluative basis, I am hopeful that you will take the time to participate in this study since only through the cooperation of people like you can a systematic investigation be made.

If you don't participate in the study, either by choice or because you don't meet the criteria for participation, you can still be of help by directing me to those people in your school system who do work with teachers on a non-evaluative basis. You can give me an indication of your interest in the study and information about other possible participants by completing the very brief check list attached to this letter.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I apologize for the length of this letter, but I felt I needed to give you enough information for you to get some idea of what it is I am requesting of you.

Charles Link

Doctoral Candidate
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN IN ENCLOSED ENVELOPE

Please circle either "yes" or "no" in response to the following statements.

1. I am working with five or more teachers on the improvement of instruction. yes no

2. I will have had a minimum of two personal conferences with at least five teachers by January 31, 1970. yes no

3. I work with these teachers on a non-evaluative basis. yes no

If you have circled "no" for any of the above statements, proceed to item 7.

Check the statement below which indicates your intentions as far as participating in the study are concerned.

4. I do not wish to be involved in this study. _____

5. I am willing to take part in this study. _____

6. I am interested in participating in this study but need more information before I commit myself. _____

If you checked item 6, indicate on the back of this sheet what additional information you would like.

7. Please indicate those people in your school system who work with teachers for instructional improvement but do not evaluate teacher performance.

Name School Address

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

___________________________________________

Signature __________________________

(school)
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Study Materials Sent to Supervisor Participants
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Dear

Before giving you instructions on how to carry out your part in this study of teacher-supervisor conference interaction I want to thank you for providing me with your assistance. It is an act of kindness and consideration which goes a long way toward offsetting the many frustrations involved in this kind of venture. Thank you!

You will find the following materials in this packet:

**Introductory Letters**

It is essential that you introduce the teachers to the study in some manner before they open their packet of materials. These letters are included for this purpose, however, you may wish to write a letter of your own or deliver the packets of materials in person.

In addition to introducing the teacher to the study, the letter attempts to convey an expectation that the materials should be completed and returned to the researcher.

**Five Packets of Teacher Materials**

These packets contain the instructions, measurement instruments, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the materials to me. Do not open these packets.

**Supervisor Materials Packet**

This packet contains the instruments to which you are to respond and a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the materials to me.

**Random Selection Instructions**

You need to use these instructions only if you have more than five teachers with whom you have had two or more conferences.

**Teacher Participants Name and Address Card**

In case some of the materials are not returned to me, I will need the names and school addresses of those teachers who received the materials so that I can send a reminder note to them. Since I will not know which teachers have not responded, I will have to mail the note to all five teachers. Furnishing the teachers' names on this card will not affect the confidentiality of teacher responses since they do not sign the materials they return to me.
PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW

1. Identify those teachers with whom you have had two or more supervisory conferences. If there are more than five, use the Random Selection Instructions for determining the five teacher participants for the study. If there are only five teachers on the list initially, you will, of course, use all of them.

2. Place the names of the selected teachers on the packets of teacher materials.

3. Address and sign the introductory letter.

4. Distribute a packet of materials and an introductory letter to each of the selected teachers.

5. Place the names and school addresses of the selected teachers on the enclosed card and return it with the other materials you will send back to me.

6. Complete and return to me the supervisor measurement instruments you have received.

RANDOM SELECTION INSTRUCTIONS

1. List the names of those teachers with whom you have had two or more conferences.

2. Number this list consecutively starting with number 1.

3. Beginning with the column of random numbers which is checked, read down the column until you come to a number which is also used to number your list of eligible teachers. Include in the study the teacher represented by this number.

4. Continue down the column until you find the next number which is also used to number the list of eligible teachers. Include the teacher represented by this number.

5. Repeat this process until five teachers are selected. If five teachers haven't been selected after having used the checked column of numbers, move right to the next column. Continue this process until five teachers have been selected. (after finishing the last column, move to the first column)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear

We have been asked by Charles Link of Western Michigan University to assist in a study of teacher-supervisor conference interaction. Our reactions to the conferences we have had together are needed.

For each supervisor taking part in the study, five teachers are randomly selected from those teachers with whom the supervisor has had conferences. In my case, you are one of the five teachers selected.

Please complete the materials you find sealed in the envelope and, using the stamped, self-addressed envelope, return them directly to Mr. Link. A more complete explanation of your part in the study is included with the materials.

You will find that the procedures which are built into the study insure that your responses to the instruments will remain completely confidential.

Sincerely,
INFORMATION SHEET

Please provide the following information:

1. Title of position:
   a. Supervisor 
   b. Coordinator 
   c. Department Head 
   d. Consultant 
   e. Instructional Specialist 
   f. Director of Curriculum 
   g. Director of Instruction 
   h. Helping Teacher 
   i. Other 

2. Sex: male ___ female ___

3. Age: ___

4. Degrees earned:
   a. B.A. or B.S. ___
   b. M.A. or M.S. ___
   c. Specialist ___
   d. Doctorate ___

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

TPSB
1. a. ___ f. ___ 4. ___ PM
2. b. ___ g. ___ 5. ___ 1. ___
3. c. ___ h. ___ 6. ___ 2. ___
4. d. ___ i. ___ 7. ___ 3. ___
5. e. ___ 2. ___ 8. ___ 4. ___
6. 3. ___ 10. ___ Total ___

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING INSTRUMENTS

Instrument 1 - "Teacher Perception of Supervisor Behavior"

This is one of the instruments that will be completed by the five teachers you have selected for the study. You too are to respond to this instrument, however, YOU ARE TO FOLLOW DIRECTIONS GIVEN ON THIS SHEET!

Step 1 - Following the marking instructions on the instrument, indicate on items 1 through 10 how you think teachers will perceive and rate your conference behavior. IGNORE ITEM 11!

Step 2 - For item number 1 only (a through i), indicate the emphasis that you feel you put on each of the behaviors listed. Indicate this by putting a check mark (✓) in the appropriate space.

Step 3 - For item number 1 only (a through i), indicate the way you think supervisors should behave (ideal supervisory behavior). Indicate this by placing a capital I (I) in the appropriate space.

Step 4 - Check item 1 (a through i) to make sure that you have three marks, an X, a check mark (✓), and an I for each behavior listed.

Instrument 2 - follow directions given on the instrument.
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TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOR

1. Listed below are a number of ways that your supervisor might behave in a supervisory conference with you. We are interested in the extent of emphasis you see him putting on these areas in his conferences with you. Please react on the basis of how you perceive your supervisor's behavior, not how you feel he should behave. Place an X in the appropriate space to the right of each behavior specified. It is possible for your supervisor to place heavy or little emphasis on any or all of the behaviors specified. **Mark only on the lines provided! Do not mark between the lines!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Very Heavy Emphasis</th>
<th>Fairly Heavy Emphasis</th>
<th>Moderate Emphasis</th>
<th>Not Too Much Emphasis</th>
<th>Very Little Emphasis</th>
<th>No Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gives his opinions about current teaching practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Suggests that you do things in a specific way or tells you specifically what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Criticizes your teaching behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Accepts and clarifies your ideas about your teaching problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Asks you non-critical questions about your teaching behavior. (i.e., How did you decide what to do?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Gives you objective information about your teaching behavior. (i.e., leaves his feelings out)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Praises your teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Asks for your opinions about how to overcome your teaching problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Engages you in discussions of your feelings about his supervisory relationship with you. (i.e., productiveness, ease of communication, threat, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To respond to the following questions, please circle the X which best indicates what your feelings are about the conference interaction you have had with this supervisor. EXAMPLE:

```
X --- X ------ X Circle an X.
```

2. How free do you feel to initiate discussion with your supervisor about the problems you are having in your classroom? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X
Not free Very
at all Free
```

3. In your discussions with your supervisor concerning your classroom, do you ever find out things about your behavior as a teacher that you weren't aware of before? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X
Very Practically
Often Never
```

4. In your discussion with your supervisor concerning your classroom, do you ever find out things about you, personally, (i.e., something about your feelings, needs, etc.) that you weren't aware of before? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X
Very Practically
Often Never
```

5. In discussion with your supervisor, do you feel that what he is really trying to do is to control your teaching behavior so that you will teach the way he wants you to? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X
Very Practically
Often Never
```

6. Do you get the feeling that your supervisor conveys to you an air of superiority? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X ------ X
Very Practically
Often Never
```
7. Do you get the feeling from your supervisor that there is one best answer
to your teaching problems and that he knows the answer? (Circle an X on
the scale)

X-------X------X------X------X------X-------X------X-------X
Very       Practically
Often      Never

8. Does your supervisor convey to you an attitude of real understanding and
concern for your teaching problems? (Circle an X on the scale)

X-------X------X------X------X------X-------X------X-------X
Very       Practically
Often      Never

9. Do you ever get the feeling that your supervisor's real interest in your
conferences, though it may not appear on the surface, is to evaluate your
teaching and, by implication, you as a teacher and a person? (Circle an
X on the scale)

X-------X-------X-----X-------X------X------X------X------*
Very       Practically
Often      Never

10. In general, do you feel your supervisory conferences are (Please circle
an X on the scale)

X-------X-------X-----X-------X------X------X------X------X
Very productive use of time and energy
Useless - a waste of time and energy

11. Please go back to question 1. Re-examine each of the supervisor
behaviors listed (a to i) and think about the emphasis you wish your
supervisor would place on each behavior. Indicate the emphasis you
desire by placing an O in the appropriate space to the right of each
behavior listed. If the O coincides with the X previously marked, this
is perfectly all right.
PHILOSOPHIC-MINDEDNESS SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

This is a study of your attitudes and preferences. Since people differ in their attitudes and preferences, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers to the questions.

The study consists of a number of pairs of statements. Please indicate your choice on each item by circling the letter (a or b) preceding the statement of your choice. DO NOT SKIP ANY ITEMS!

EXAMPLE:

1. a. Would definitely not read the article.
   b. Would probably read the article.

READ CAREFULLY THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL BEFORE GOING ON TO THE QUESTIONS:

You are writing a paper for your economics class of "The Economic Benefits of Nuclear Research." You come upon the following article in the American Economic Review, a highly respected journal in economics:


Dr. Stolslav is presently a professor of economics at Moscow University. He holds a B.A. degree from the University of Michigan and a Ph. D. from the University of Leningrad. He is an active member of the economic planning board of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. and is doing research on the use of economic pressure as a means of state control of the churches in the U.S.S.R.. Dr. Stolslav is also a noted novelist. His best known work is A Short Step, set against a background of dealing with economic pressures upon scientists to defect to the West. The hero of the novel ultimately defects to the West.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the one action in each of the following pairs which you would more likely take if you came upon this article under the conditions described above. Do not skip any items. Make a choice in each pair!

1. a. Would definitely not read the article.
   b. Would probably read the article.

2. a. Would definitely read the article.
   b. Would probably not read the article.

3. a. Would probably not read the article since it would represent a communist viewpoint.
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b. Would probably read the article since it would represent a communist viewpoint.

4. a. Would read the article since it would probably give me some ideas for my paper.
   b. Would rate the article as being of no value since Dr. Stolslav's position would demand that he adopt a communist line.

5. a. Would accept Dr. Stolslav's material as authoritative analysis of the problem I am facing in my paper.
   b. Would tend to question the article because of Dr. Stolslav's research work in using economics to suppress freedom.

6. a. Although Dr. Stolslav is a communist, his novel indicates that he understands the West, so I would read the article.
   b. Would read the article since Dr. Stolslav has good academic credentials.

7. a. Would read the article but I would pay particular attention to places where his line of thought irritated me.
   b. Would read enough of the article to see whether he used communist ideas and terminology.

8. a. Would read the article out of interest even though it does not appear that it would help much with my paper.
   b. Would read the article and try to separate Dr. Stolslav's philosophy from the rest of the article.

READ CAREFULLY THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL BEFORE GOING ON TO THE QUESTIONS:

In the office where you work, a position is being created which would appear to demand someone with experience in selling or advertising. There are two men who would seem to be qualified. One has an excellent background in selling; the other has an equally excellent background in advertising. Since there is no certainty as to which type of experience will be more valuable for the new position, both men seem to be equally well qualified. After some thought on the matter you still are not sure which man would be best. Your boss asks for your recommendation.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the one action in each of the following pairs which you would more likely take if you were faced with the situation described in the paragraph above. Do not skip any items. Make a choice in each pair.

9. a. Would give definite and positive recommendations for the man with the advertising experience.
   b. Would recommend the man with selling experience, but with some hesitancy.
10. a. Would give a positive recommendation for the man with the selling background.
   b. Would give a mild recommendation for the man with the advertising background.

11. a. Recommend a provisional appointment of one of the men.
   b. Ask to put off a recommendation until I can be more sure.

12. a. Recommend the appointment of one of the men and explain that the preference is not very definite.
   b. Recommend that the boss decide on some other basis since I could not honestly make any recommendation.

13. a. Recommend the hiring of the advertising man and begin tentative preparation of plans to break him in on the new job.
   b. Recommend the hiring of the advertising man but begin preparing a rather definite plan of work for the new position which will govern whoever takes the job.

14. a. Recommend the selling man but wait until the appointment is made before making plans so that the secretarial set-up in the office can be definite and will not have to be changed.
   b. Recommend the selling man and start making tentative plans for his approval as to the secretarial set-up in the office.

READ CAREFULLY THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL BEFORE GOING ON TO THE QUESTIONS:

In your teaching experience you have found that there are two methods which always have been successful in dealing with aggressive students; Method One, give the student an over amount of attention, since aggression is an attention getting device; Method Two, be harsh and restrictive with the student since aggression is the result of too mild discipline. In one of your classes you have an extremely aggressive student and have decided to use Method One. The method does not work and after a month the student is more aggressive than before. The stress upon you in dealing with the class in which this student is present has increased considerably.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the one action in each of the following pairs which you would more likely take if you were faced with the situation described in the paragraph above. Do not skip any items. Make a choice in each pair!

15. a. Go back and try to be even more attentive to the student.
   b. Do some study on novel ways of handling aggressive behavior in the classroom.

16. a. Review the student's behavior to see the similarities between his behavior and the aggressive behavior of former students.
b. Review the student's behavior to see how it differs from the aggressive behavior of former students.

17. a. Go back over my actions and try to see where I slipped up in the use of Method One.

b. Probably discard both Method One and Method Two and try something new.

18. a. Would keep the student in the class since the stress caused by his behavior would not bother me too much.

b. Since the stress of having him in class would impair my other teaching, I would recommend that the student be put in a special class.

19. a. Switch to Method Two since I obviously have misjudged the real reason for his aggressiveness.

b. Switch to Method Two in order to see whether "lack of discipline" is the cause of the aggressiveness.

20. a. Follow common sense and try Method Two since Method One failed.

b. Look to see whether there is an unusual and novel reason for the student's aggression.

21. a. Consult a teacher who does many things which are contrary to common sense.

b. Consult a teacher who has a lot of common sense.

22. a. Would probably discuss the student with the principal.

b. Would probably send the student to the principal for discipline.

READ CAREFULLY THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL BEFORE GOING ON TO THE QUESTIONS:

You have been appointed to a faculty committee that is to bring in a recommendation on the problem of whether to use letter grades or percentile grades. In your first meeting the group is almost equally divided—about half feel that letter grades should be recommended, the other half feel that percentile grades should be recommended. Both sides seem to have valid arguments. The time has come for the committee to take action before adjourning the meeting.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the action in each of the pairs which you would more likely take if faced with the situation described above. Do not skip any items! Make a choice in each pair.

23. a. Would probably suggest that we try to look at the variations which are possible in the two systems.

b. Would probably make a decision for either letter grades or percentile grades.
24. a. Would stick by the group or side which I felt was right on the issue.
   b. Would avoid taking sides even though I were accused by both sides of being in favor of the other side.

25. a. Would suggest that one member in favor of each of the two systems bring in a report on the advantages of that system.
   b. Would suggest that we appoint a sub-committee to bring in a report on grading systems different from the two mentioned.

26. a. Would sincerely try to see both sides of the issue.
   b. Would try to find a position somewhat between the two proposals.

27. a. Would suggest that the committee decide upon a compromise system.
   b. Would suggest that the committee determine which is the right grading system by working until we reach a consensus of opinion.

28. a. Would suggest that the committee hear from other interested parties.
   b. Would suggest that each committee member try to see the opposite side of the issue.

READ CAREFULLY BEFORE BEGINNING THE NEXT GROUP OF ITEMS:

Choose the one characteristic in each pair that would more likely be possessed by a person whom you would admire and whose judgement you would respect.

If both characteristics in a pair are objectionable to you, choose the one that is least objectionable. **You must choose one of each pair!**

29. a. Knows how to use recognized methods well.
   b. Handles novel ideas and plans well.

30. a. Does not like unusual plans but possesses a great measure of common sense.
   b. Has many ideas which are contrary to common sense.

31. a. Looks for experts in his field for guidance as to how he might improve his work.
   b. Feels that people who are on the job know more than outside experts about how things can be improved.

32. a. Is willing and inclined to study ideas of men who hold to a wrong or inadequate "philosophy of life."
   b. Looks at a person's "philosophy of life" as a basis for judging that person's ideas.
33. a. Refuses to waste time on magazine articles with titles that are making a definite appeal with emotionally-laden words.
   b. Reads magazine articles that have titles that tend to irritate him.

34. a. Feels that the tried and true methods are better than experimenting when it comes to problems.
   b. Is particularly interested in new approaches to problems.

35. a. Is able to make a definite decision about other persons' abilities and character after knowing them only a short time.
   b. Occasionally allows people to "pull the wool" over his eyes because he withholds forming an opinion about them until he knows them quite well.

36. a. Likes plans which are tentative rather than fixed.
   b. Likes things organized so that they run smoothly without changes in plans.

37. a. Has the ability to decide on an issue and to stick with his decision.
   b. Has the ability to propose many alternate explanations and views on most issues.

38. a. Operates effectively under pressure to finish a job.
   b. Plans things very well because he does not like to work under pressure.

39. a. Is good at finding compromise solutions to problems.
   b. Stands firm for what he thinks is the correct solution to a problem.

40. a. Tends to look at both sides of most issues.
   b. Tries to find many sides to most issues.

41. a. If the situation is urgent he will make a decision even when he is not certain it is the correct decision.
   b. Very seldom makes a wrong decision because he will wait until he feels he knows the right way to go before deciding.

42. a. Feels that as a rule you can judge the worth of a person's ideas by the group to which he belongs.
   b. Feels that knowing the group to which a person belongs will be of only minimum help in judging the worth of the person's ideas.

READ CAREFULLY BEFORE BEGINNING THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF ITEMS:
Choose the one characteristic in each pair that would more likely be possessed by a teacher that you would admire and whose judgement you would respect. If both characteristics in a pair are objectionable to you, choose the one that is less objectionable. You must choose one of each pair!

43. a. Does not spend time in class on ideas that are contrary to common sense.
   b. Tries to interest students in unusual or odd-ball plans and ideas.

44. a. Is expert at using the more commonly recognized teaching methods.
   b. Has a number of unusual and novel lesson plans and ideas for each subject he teaches.

45. a. Organizes lesson plans in great detail and does not depart from the plans unless it is absolutely necessary.
   b. Favors a lesson plan that can be easily changed in the middle of a class period.

46. a. Feels that a consistent application of present ideas and plans is the best approach in solving school problems.
   b. Feels that greater emphasis should be put on new ideas in meeting school problems.

47. a. When planning a program for teachers he is likely to set up a panel discussion to give information on an issue.
   b. When planning a program he is likely to set up a pro-and-con debate to clarify both sides of an issue.

48. a. Would not hesitate to use ideas of men whose philosophy is fundamentally different from his own.
   b. Feels that it would be inconsistent to adopt the educational ideas of a person with whom he disagrees on a moral issue.

49. a. When speaking at teachers' meetings, he usually makes decisions more difficult by proposing many possible views.
   b. When speaking at teachers' meetings he has the ability to put arguments so that you can make a clear decision for one side or the other.

50. a. Would rather be wrong than too cautious in deciding what to do about school problems.
   b. Would rather put off a decision on school problems than take a chance on being wrong.

51. a. Does not hesitate to let his students know that teachers have intellectual contradictions which they have not worked out yet.
b. Does not hesitate to take a definite stand on current national problems.

52. a. Strives to find compromises in disputes between fellow teachers.

b. Can be counted on to defend you if he feels that you are correct in a dispute with another teacher.

53. a. If he is not able to find a specific reason for doubting educational experts he will accept what they say as being correct.

b. Tries to put into practice most of the latest educational ideas found in educational journal articles.

54. a. Enjoys it when students disagree with him.

b. Enjoys giving a lecture which answers almost all of the questions which students have on the subject.

55. a. Feels that membership in professional organizations or labor unions can tell us nothing about the worth of a teacher's ideas.

b. Feels that the general worth of a teacher's ideas about the teaching profession can be fairly well gauged by whether the teacher belongs to the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers.

56. a. Finds many good educational ideas in articles that have titles that irritate him.

b. Has the ability to check key words or passages in a book and tell if the book has any worthwhile educational ideas in it.

READ CAREFULLY BEFORE BEGINNING THE NEXT GROUP OF ITEMS:

Choose the statement in each pair that is more acceptable to you. If both statements are objectionable, choose the one which is less objectionable. You must choose one of each pair!

57. a. Most failures in solving problems are due to mistakes in applying the correct techniques.

b. Most failures in solving problems are due to using an incorrect approach to the problem.

58. a. It is better to have men in high political office who have a long history of working out compromises.

b. It is better to have men from outside politics in top elective positions because a man has to compromise to come up through the ranks in politics.

59. a. Vacations should be planned with the expectation of changing plans while on the trip.
b. Vacations should be planned well enough so that you do not have to worry about making changes in plans on the trip.

60. a. Common sense is a good guide in solving problems.

b. Common sense is many times a hindrance in solving problems.

61. a. It is important for a person to become interested in some new and novel ideas about his job.

b. It is important for a person to master the material that is needed in his job routine.

62. a. The most important thing about making a decision is that you feel sure it is the right decision.

b. It is sometimes worse to be cautious than to be wrong.

63. a. Since most of the people in the United States live in cities, legislation proposed by urban representatives is probably better legislation.

b. Even though most of the people in the United States live in cities, legislation proposed by rural representatives should be given equal consideration.

64. a. A person who is intellectually honest will not tolerate contradictory ideas, but will make a choice between the conflicting ideas.

b. It is desirable at times for a person to admit that he has, and to tolerate, two ideas which are contradictory.

65. a. Deadlines are helpful in getting work done well and on time.

b. When people are rushed at the last minute it is because they haven't planned well enough.

66. a. One good way to judge the worth of a man's ideas is to look at his "philosophy of life."

b. Even though Marx was a communist, we might find some of his ideas useful for America.

67. a. Neutral nations are trying to dodge the issue of whether Russia or the United States is right.

b. It makes good sense to say that the United States and Russia are both wrong.

68. a. It is important for parents in the North to help their children look at current social strife from the viewpoint of the South and for parents in the South to help their children look at the problem from the viewpoint of the North.

b. Parents should attempt to convey to their children the correct view on social problems.
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69. a. If a man is an expert in a field it means that you can trust what he says about matters in that field as being correct.

b. Unless you have some specific and definite reasons to doubt what he says you should accept what an expert says as being correct.

70. a. You can usually tell what a professor's "philosophy of life" is after the first few lectures just by the terms he uses.

b. When a professor's lectures irritate you, it is a good idea to try to put the professor's ideas into different words from the ones he used in presenting the ideas.

71. a. I could rate teachers more effectively if I used this scale:

   Honest______ Dishonest______

b. I could rate teachers more effectively if I used this scale:

   Honest____ Partly honest____ Mostly dishonest____ Dishonest____

72. a. It is better to make decisions before the school year begins on school policy in handling problems.

b. It is better to avoid having to change policies by waiting until it can be seen how things are going to work out before establishing policies.

73. a. Teachers should admit to their students that teachers have intellectual problems which they have not solved.

b. It is important for teachers to take a definite stand on current academic and social issues.

74. a. You should try to find a compromise solution when two teachers cannot agree on how to handle a problem.

b. You should stick up for the teacher you sincerely feel is right when two teachers cannot agree on how to handle a problem.

75. a. It is possible for common sense to be the biggest obstacle against making progress in school.

b. If an idea is contrary to good "common sense" it is best not to spend classroom time in considering the idea.

76. a. We need to work at finding new ways of looking at school problems.

b. The best plan for solving school problems is to put into action what we now know.

77. a. As a rule you should question what the educational experts have said or else you might accept something which is later shown to be false.

b. As a rule you should not question experts in education unless there is some specific reason why you should doubt what they have said.
78. a. A teacher's plans for most class periods should be definite and they should be changed only if it is absolutely necessary.

b. A teacher's plans for most class periods should be tentative rather than fixed.

79. a. A Christian should hesitate to use educational ideas that were developed by anti-Christian writers.

b. It is not inconsistent for the churches to use secular methods in their educational programs.

80. a. Knowing the socioeconomic class of the people who belong to a PTA can suggest many useful hypotheses about the actions of the group.

b. When in doubt, you can usually judge the worth of a man's educational ideas by the groups in which he belongs.

81. a. I like to defend ideas by anticipating questions and answering them in my lecture.

b. I like to defend my ideas in a "hot" question and answer session.

82. a. It is usually possible to put arguments into noncontroversial language without changing their meaning.

b. You can usually pick out key words like "core-curriculum," "child-centered," and "growth" and tell whether an article is worth reading or not.

83. a. A teacher should encourage his students to find questions which will clarify the main points of a subject.

b. A teacher should encourage students to find unusual questions to ask about a subject.

84. a. School problems are solved better by adopting the correct view and sticking to it.

b. School problems are solved better by trying to see things from other person's point of view.
Dear Colleague:

Conferences with supervisors are a part of a professional person's life. In order to learn more about those factors which seem to make some conferences more worthwhile than others, more information is needed. Such information must come from people like you since, as a teacher and conference participant, you represent a unique and invaluable viewpoint concerning what happens in conferences.

Following directions carefully, please complete the accompanying instruments (about a twenty minute task) and return them directly to me. **It is essential that all participants respond to and return all instruments.**

Your response to these instruments will be completely confidential. These materials were sent to your supervisor as you received them; sealed in this envelope. They will be returned directly to me. **You do not sign anything.** The only identification involved is a code number at the bottom of the instruments and this number identifies only the group from which this response comes, not individuals.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles Link
INFORMATION SHEET

The term supervisor, as used in this study, is defined as "one who is employed by the school system and has been assigned the responsibility of working with teachers for the purpose of improving instruction."

You may or may not think of ____________________ as a supervisor, however, his/her duties in the school system do include those responsibilities found in this study's definition of supervisor.

Using the conference interaction you have had with this supervisor as a basis for your responses, please complete the two attached instruments.

FOLLOW DIRECTIONS CAREFULLY or the information you provide may be of little use to the study. RESPOND TO ALL STATEMENTS AND QUESTIONS!

Please provide the following information:

1. Teaching level:
   - elementary ___
   - secondary ___

2. Number of years of teaching experience (including this year): __________

3. Sex: male ___ female ___

4. Age: ___

5. Tenure status:
   - have tenure ___
   - probationary ___

6. Number of conferences you have had with this supervisor since Sept., 1969:
   - 1 ___
   - 2 ___
   - 3 ___
   - 4 or more ___

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

TPSB

1. a. ___
   b. ___
   c. ___
   d. ___
   e. ___
   f. ___
   g. ___
   h. ___
   i. ___
   2. ___
   3. ___
   4. ___
   5. ___
   6. ___
   7. ___
   8. ___
   9. ___
   10. ___

B-L

1. LR ___
   2. E ___
   3. UPR ___
   4. C ___
   Total ___
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**TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISOR BEHAVIOR**

1. Listed below are a number of ways that your supervisor might behave in a supervisory conference with you. We are interested in the extent of emphasis you see him putting on these areas in his conferences with you. Please react on the basis of how you perceive your supervisor's behavior, not how you feel he should behave. Place an X in the appropriate space to the right of each behavior specified. It is possible for your supervisor to place heavy or little emphasis on any or all of the behaviors specified. **Mark only on the lines provided! Do not mark between the lines!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Heavy Emphasis</th>
<th>Fairly Heavy Emphasis</th>
<th>Moderate Emphasis</th>
<th>Not Too Much Emphasis</th>
<th>Very Little Emphasis</th>
<th>No Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Gives his opinions about current teaching practices.  

b. Suggests that you do things in a specific way or tells you specifically what to do.  

c. Criticizes your teaching behavior.  

d. Accepts and clarifies your ideas about your teaching problems.  

e. Asks you non-critical questions about your teaching behavior. (i.e., How did you decide what to do?)  

f. Gives you objective information about your teaching behavior. (i.e., leaves his feelings out)  

g. Praises your teaching.  

h. Asks for your opinions about how to overcome your teaching problems.  

i. Engages you in discussions of your feelings about his supervisory relationship with you. (i.e., productiveness, ease of communication, threat, etc.)
To respond to the following questions, please circle the X which best indicates what your feelings are about the conference interaction you have had with this supervisor. EXAMPLE:

```
  X X X X Circle an X.
```

2. How free do you feel to initiate discussion with your supervisor about the problems you are having in your classroom? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
Not free X X X X X X X X X Very
at all                                             Free
```

3. In your discussions with your supervisor concerning your classroom, do you ever find out things about your behavior as a teacher that you weren't aware of before? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
Very X X X X X X X X X X Practically
Often                                             Never
```

4. In your discussion with your supervisor concerning your classroom, do you ever find out things about you, personally, (i.e., something about your feelings, needs, etc.) that you weren't aware of before? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
Very X X X X X X X X X X Practically
Often                                             Never
```

5. In discussion with your supervisor, do you feel that what he is really trying to do is to control your teaching behavior so that you will teach the way he wants you to? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
Very X X X X X X X X X X Practically
Often                                             Never
```

6. Do you get the feeling that your supervisor conveys to you an air of superiority? (Circle an X on the scale)

```
Very X X X X X X X X X X Practically
Often                                             Never
```
7. Do you get the feeling from your supervisor that there is one best answer to your teaching problems and that he knows the answer? (Circle an X on the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Practically</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Does your supervisor convey to you an attitude of real understanding and concern for your teaching problems? (Circle an X on the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Practically</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Do you ever get the feeling that your supervisor's real interest in your conferences, though it may not appear on the surface, is to evaluate your teaching and, by implication, you as a teacher and a person? (Circle an X on the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Practically</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. In general, do you feel your supervisory conferences are (Please circle an X on the scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very productive use of time and energy</th>
<th>Useless</th>
<th>a waste of time and energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Please go back to question 1. Re-examine each of the supervisor behaviors listed (a to i) and think about the emphasis you wish your supervisor would place on each behavior. Indicate the emphasis you desire by placing an O in the appropriate space to the right of each behavior listed. If the O coincides with the X previously marked, this is perfectly all right.
BARRETT-LENNARD RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

This instrument lists a variety of ways a person may feel about his relationship with another person.

As you react to this instrument, please think about conference behavior as you have experienced it. Mark each statement so that it best describes the feelings you have about the conference interaction you have had with this person.

PLEASE MARK EACH STATEMENT!

Rate the extent that you feel each statement is true or not true by using the following rating system. Place the appropriate number to the left hand side of each statement.

+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true
-2: No, I feel that it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.
+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel that it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

1. He respects me as a person.
2. He wants to understand how I see things.
3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
5. He feels a true liking for me.
6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
9. He is impatient with me.
10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
13. I feel appreciated by him.
14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
15. His feelings toward me don't depend on how I feel toward him.
16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
17. He is indifferent to me.
18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

_21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting._
_22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me._
_23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me._
_24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does._
_25. He cares for me._
_26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels._
_27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like._
_28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship._
_29. I feel that he disapproves of me._
_30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it._
_31. His attitude toward me stays the same; he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times._
_32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it._
_33. He just tolerates me._
_34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean._
_35. If I show that I am angry with him, he becomes hurt or angry with me too._
_36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me._
_37. He is friendly and warm with me._
+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel that it is probably true, more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

___38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.
___39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.
___40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.
___41. I feel that he really values me.
___42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.
___43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.
___44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.
___45. He doesn't like me for myself.
___46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.
___47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.
___48. He is openly himself in our relationship.
___49. I seem to irritate and bother him.
___50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.
___51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feelings toward me.
___52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.
___53. At times he feels contempt for me.
___54. He understands me.
+3: Yes, I strongly feel that it is true.
+2: Yes, I feel it is true.
+1: Yes, I feel it is probably true, or more true than untrue.
-1: No, I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true.
-2: No, I feel it is not true.
-3: No, I strongly feel that it is not true.

55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.

56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feel with me.

57. He is truly interested in me.

58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.

59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.

60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.

61. He feels deep affection for me.

62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.

63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the way he feels toward me.

64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.
APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Letters
Dear

Many of the teacher and supervisor responses to the instruments to be used in my study of teacher-supervisor conference interaction have been returned to me, however, I have not received these materials from you or the teachers you have selected to take part in the study.

I hesitated sending this letter to you since I have already imposed on your time and good graces, however, the April 1 target date for having all instruments returned to me is fast approaching. Since the study was designed around those of you who agreed to assist me, having you distribute the teacher materials and complete the supervisory instruments is of paramount importance.

Efforts on your part to have the study materials returned to me by April 1 will be greatly appreciated. Thanks again for your help!

Sincerely,

Charles Link
Dear Colleague:

I am still in need of your help! You are one of six teachers who was asked to respond to the conference behavior of As of this time several of the teacher responses from this group of six teachers have not yet been returned to me.

Because teacher responses are unsigned, I have no way of knowing who has returned the study materials and who hasn't. If you already have done so, please disregard this letter. If you haven't completed and returned the materials, please take twenty minutes to do so.

The time and effort spent by your supervisor and colleagues who have already returned their materials to me will be much more useful to the study if all materials from a group are returned. Your opinions and reactions are valuable to this study.

Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Charles Link
APPENDIX E

Supervisor Data
Table 10

Sex, Age, Degree and Titles of Supervisor Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees held</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. or B.A.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title held</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11

**Breakdown of the Number of Teacher Responses for Individual Supervisors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers responding</th>
<th>Number of supervisors</th>
<th>Teacher totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>178</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>not useable 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key to Master Data Table**

In Table 12, columns designated by the following headings (here underlined) have numbers representing information about the supervisor respondents. The following keys indicate how information is represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age categories</th>
<th>Title held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 20-24</td>
<td>1 - Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 25-29</td>
<td>2 - Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 30-34</td>
<td>3 - Department Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 35-39</td>
<td>4 - Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 40-44</td>
<td>5 - Instructional Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 45-49</td>
<td>6 - Director of Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 50-54</td>
<td>7 - Director of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 55-59</td>
<td>8 - Helping Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 60-65</td>
<td>9 - Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - B.S. or B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 12

## Master Data Table—Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal data</th>
<th>Supervisor estimate of teachers' ratings on TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor perception of own behavior on TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor rating of ideal teacher behavior on TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor estimate of teacher ratings on TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Supervisor score on PM Scale</th>
<th>Characteristic I</th>
<th>Characteristic II</th>
<th>Characteristic III</th>
<th>Characteristic IV</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>No. of teacher responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Degree held</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Item 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 13

Sex, Teaching Level, and Tenure Status of Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have tenure</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probationary</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Number of Conferences Held With Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of conferences</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15

Age and Experience Categories of Teacher Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age - years taught</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of years taught</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key to Master Data Table

In Table 16, columns designated by the following headings (underlined) have numbers or letters representing information about the teacher respondents. The following keys indicate how information is represented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching level</th>
<th>Age categories</th>
<th>Experience categories</th>
<th>Tenure status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E - elementary</td>
<td>1 - 20-24</td>
<td>1 - 0-5</td>
<td>T - tenure teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S - secondary</td>
<td>2 - 25-29</td>
<td>2 - 6-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 30-34</td>
<td>3 - 11-15</td>
<td>P - probationary teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 35-39</td>
<td>4 - 16-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 40-44</td>
<td>5 - 21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 45-49</td>
<td>6 - 26-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 50-54</td>
<td>7 - 31-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 - 55-59</td>
<td>8 - 36-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 - 60-65</td>
<td>9 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Master Data Table—Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to</th>
<th>Personal data</th>
<th>Teacher rating of ideal supervisor behavior - TPSS Scale</th>
<th>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - TPSS Scale</th>
<th>Teacher evaluation of conferences</th>
<th>Teacher ratings on B-L Relationship Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 4 M 6 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5 M 7 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 3 F 7 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 2 F 3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 2 F 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1 M 2 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2 F 3 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1 M 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2 F 5 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1 F 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3 F 4 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3 F 5 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1 M 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3 F 7 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1 F 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 5 M 7 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 1 M 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1 F 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions to:</td>
<td>Personal data</td>
<td>Teacher rating of ideal supervisor behavior - IPSB Scale</td>
<td>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - IPSB Scale</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation of conferences</td>
<td>Teacher ratings on B-L Relationship Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Directness rating</td>
<td>Indirectness rating</td>
<td>Directness rating</td>
<td>Indirectness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 (continued)
## Table 16 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to</th>
<th>Personal data</th>
<th>Teacher rating of ideal supervisor behavior - TPSB Scale</th>
<th>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - TPSB Scale</th>
<th>Teacher evaluation of conferences</th>
<th>Teacher ratings on B-L Relationship Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 15</td>
<td>S 1 F 1 P</td>
<td>3 2 2 2 1 2 4 2 6</td>
<td>10 17</td>
<td>4 2 5 2 5 2 5 6 4 6</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 2 P</td>
<td>3 4 3 5 6 5 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>3 6 3 4 3 3 3 4 2 4</td>
<td>12 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 3 T</td>
<td>3 4 6 3 5 6 3 5 6</td>
<td>14 20</td>
<td>2 6 6 3 5 5 5 6 4 6</td>
<td>14 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 4 T</td>
<td>3 4 6 3 4 3 3 3 5</td>
<td>13 21</td>
<td>3 5 6 4 6 6 6 6 6 6</td>
<td>14 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 5 T</td>
<td>3 4 5 3 2 3 2 4 3 4</td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>4 3 5 3 6 3 2 2 4 4</td>
<td>12 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 16</td>
<td>S 1 F 1 P</td>
<td>2 5 6 2 3 5 4 4 4</td>
<td>13 22</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 3 3 4 4 4 3</td>
<td>14 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 1 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 3 3 4 4 4</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>3 6 3 4 3 5 2 5 2 3</td>
<td>13 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 2 T</td>
<td>2 6 3 1 3 1 6 3 3</td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>2 6 4 1 3 2 5 2 3</td>
<td>12 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 3 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 3 3 4 4 4</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>3 6 3 4 3 5 3 5 4 5</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 4 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 3 3 4 4 4</td>
<td>13 14</td>
<td>2 3 6 3 4 3 5 4 5 5</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 17</td>
<td>S 1 M 2 T</td>
<td>1 5 6 2 2 2 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>12 08</td>
<td>1 4 6 3 3 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>10 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 3 T</td>
<td>1 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td>05 12</td>
<td>1 2 3 2 2 2 3 2 3</td>
<td>06 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 4 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 2 3 3 2 4 6</td>
<td>14 21</td>
<td>3 4 6 2 3 3 2 4 6 4</td>
<td>13 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 5 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 3 3 4 4 4</td>
<td>14 22</td>
<td>2 3 6 3 4 3 5 4 5 6</td>
<td>11 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 18</td>
<td>S 1 M 7 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 5 3 6 3 1</td>
<td>14 18</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 5 3 6 3 1 4</td>
<td>13 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 M 8 T</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 6 3 6 3 1</td>
<td>14 18</td>
<td>3 5 6 3 6 3 6 3 1 4</td>
<td>13 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 19</td>
<td>S 1 F 1 T</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 2 T</td>
<td>3 4 5 1 3 1 3 3</td>
<td>12 16</td>
<td>5 4 6 2 2 2 3 3 5</td>
<td>15 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 20</td>
<td>S 1 F 1 T</td>
<td>1 6 5 3 3 3 1 3 3</td>
<td>12 16</td>
<td>1 4 5 3 1 3 1 3 4</td>
<td>10 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 1 F 2 T</td>
<td>3 4 2 3 1 3 3 3 5</td>
<td>12 16</td>
<td>2 3 4 1 3 1 3 3 4</td>
<td>11 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 21</td>
<td>E 1 F 1 P</td>
<td>1 6 4 3 3 4 3 4 6</td>
<td>11 23</td>
<td>1 6 5 3 3 3 3 3 3</td>
<td>12 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 1 F 2 P</td>
<td>3 4 3 3 3 3 3 3 3</td>
<td>09 18</td>
<td>2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 5</td>
<td>44 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 4 F 1 T</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 22</td>
<td>E 1 F 4 T</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
<td>- - - - - - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactions to</td>
<td>Personal data</td>
<td>Teacher rating of ideal supervisor behavior - TPSB Scale</td>
<td>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - TPSB Scale</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation of conferences</td>
<td>Teacher ratings on B-L Relationship Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
<td>Adequacy rating</td>
<td>Effectiveness rating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Personal data</th>
<th>Teacher rating of Ideal supervisor behavior - IFPS Scale</th>
<th>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - IFPS Scale</th>
<th>Teacher evaluation of conferences</th>
<th>Teacher ratings on S-L Relationship Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 (continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions to</th>
<th>Personal data</th>
<th>Teacher rating of ideal supervisor behavior - TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Teacher rating of perceived supervisor behavior - TPSE Scale</th>
<th>Teacher evaluation of conferences</th>
<th>Teacher ratings on B-L Relationship Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching level</td>
<td>Indirectness rating</td>
<td>Directness rating</td>
<td>Indirectness rating</td>
<td>Directness rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 37</td>
<td>1 P 1 P</td>
<td>2 3 3 1 1 3 4 2 2</td>
<td>08 13</td>
<td>2 3 6 1 2 2 4 3 2</td>
<td>11 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 P 3 P</td>
<td>1 4 3 2 1 3 4 1 5</td>
<td>08 16</td>
<td>1 4 5 1 1 1 1 1 5</td>
<td>12 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 M 1 P</td>
<td>1 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 0</td>
<td>06 16</td>
<td>3 6 2 3 2 6 4 6 15</td>
<td>23 76 5 8 8 2 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor 38</td>
<td>2 P 3 T</td>
<td>3 6 6 1 2 1 1 4 6</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>3 6 6 1 2 1 1 4 6</td>
<td>15 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 P 5 T</td>
<td>1 3 3 2 1 1 3 2 2</td>
<td>07 10</td>
<td>1 3 3 1 1 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 M 1 T</td>
<td>1 4 4 1 3 3 3 3 11</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>3 4 4 1 3 3 2 3 3</td>
<td>11 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 P 2 T</td>
<td>2 5 6 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>13 17</td>
<td>2 5 6 1 3 1 3 1 3</td>
<td>13 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 (continued)
APPENDIX G

Supplemental Analyses of Data
Table 17

Analysis of Variance of TPSB Scale Scores from
Four Teacher Groups Based on Perceived
Supervisor Directness-Indirectness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to initiate discussion</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>86.26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about classroom behavior</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>106.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>266.44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about self</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>70.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.51</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>296.44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor control</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>122.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>179.87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor superiority</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>118.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>12.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>176.92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>72.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>145.88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor evaluation</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>74.48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>207.92</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean square</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right answer tendency</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.52</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>165.17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>148.22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49.41</td>
<td>18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>145.33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy between desired and perceived</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>477.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>159.31</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervisor behavior</td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>519.17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Multiple Comparisons Between Group Means
Used in Analysis of Variances
of TPSB Scale Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group means compared</th>
<th>First group listed</th>
<th>Second group listed</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to initiate discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about classroom behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Group means compared</td>
<td>Ratings of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First group listed</td>
<td>Second group listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning about self</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisor empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group means compared</th>
<th>Ratings of:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First group listed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second group listed</td>
<td></td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor empathy (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor evaluation of teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor certainty of &quot;right answers&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Group means compared</td>
<td>Ratings of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First group listed</td>
<td>Second group listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy between ideal and desired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source of variation</td>
<td>Sum of squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>4135.53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1378.51</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>10897.60</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>201.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>6606.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2202.22</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>8793.49</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>162.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditionality of regard</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>4605.61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1535.20</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>7100.62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>131.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>5680.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1893.65</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>13423.96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>248.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>between groups</td>
<td>83363.90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27787.97</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within groups</td>
<td>112474.30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2082.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Multiple Comparisons Between Group Means
Used in Analysis of Variance
of B-L Inventory Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group means compared</th>
<th>Ratings of:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First group listed</td>
<td>Second group listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.85</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.78</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.95</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Group means compared</td>
<td>Ratings of:</td>
<td>First group listed</td>
<td>Second group listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(\bar{X})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unconditionality of regard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-8.14</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-8.14</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congruence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.55</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.80</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. HD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79.44</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79.44</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79.44</td>
<td>48.38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-HI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD-LI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD-HI vs. LD-LI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>127.55</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>