Helping teachers look at "what they preach" and "what they practice" through videotaped sequences gives much promise as a technique in clinical supervision.

Clinical supervision is based on the assumption that enhancing professional effectiveness is contingent upon the integration of thought and action. Many professionals, however, remain unaware of the differences between "what they practice" and "what they preach." Lack of reflection about attitudes and assumptions leads to inconsistencies. What a professional espouses may not be perceived by others as consistent with action.

With the assistance of Thomas J. Sergiovanni and a group of professors from the University of Illinois, the author has developed a four-stage process of supervision using videotaping techniques and a modification of the Chris Argyris and Donald A. Schön (1974) model for increasing professional effectiveness. Sergiovanni notes that this approach could be called a hybrid of clinical supervision in that clinical supervision is combined with assumptions that characterize naturalistic approaches.


2 The naturalistic approach to supervision "sees value in describing as opposed to measuring and in discovering as opposed to determining." See: Thomas J. Sergiovanni. "Changing Patterns of Supervision: Prophecy and Fact." Address, Maryland Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Baltimore, October 13, 1976.

* The supervisory strategy discussed in this article was presented as Action Lab 30 at the ASCD Annual Conference in Houston last March.
A Supervision Strategy

This strategy of supervision involves identification of a teacher’s espoused platform and the construction of that teacher’s platform-in-use from what has been observed in a videotaped classroom sequence. Espoused platforms are what teachers say governs their behavior. Platforms-in-use are inferred from actual behavior.

It is assumed that the integration of thought and action in professional practice depends on discovering and distinguishing between espoused educational platforms and platforms-in-use. An educational platform is a position from which a teacher justifies actions. Such platforms exist on different levels. An espoused platform is a set of assumptions and action patterns to which a professional publicly asserts allegiance and that he/she communicates to others. A platform-in-use is a construction of what takes place in that classroom based on observation of activities and analysis of classroom artifacts (that is, teacher-made materials, bulletin boards, classroom arrangement). Thus, a vocabulary is provided that focuses on intents and happenings.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Purposes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Videotaped interview</td>
<td>To record a teacher’s views about a lesson and about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Videotaped classroom sequence</td>
<td>To record actual student-teacher interactions and to facilitate construction of the teacher’s platform-in-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Replay of tapes for supervisor</td>
<td>To allow careful note-taking in preparation for final videotaping session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Videotaped supervisor comments</td>
<td>To construct teacher’s espoused platform and platform-in-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Replay of tapes for teacher (with and/or without supervisor)</td>
<td>To facilitate instructional improvement by helping the teacher focus on his/her ideas, performance in the classroom, and another person’s observation of and consistency between thought and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation instrument, audiorecorded and/or videotaped interview</td>
<td>To record teacher reactions (searching, denying) to the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A four-stage process uses videotaping techniques to analyze educational platforms and to determine whether this approach evokes search behavior in teachers. The first three stages of this process focus on identification of a teacher’s educational platform and construction of his/her platform-in-use. The last stage involves teacher reactions to the process and determinations about the usefulness of the approach.

The process begins with a videotaped interview between teacher and supervisor about a teaching situation to follow immediately. During the interview, the teacher is asked two types of questions: General questions relating to beliefs and values about education, and specific questions relating to the teaching situation. The second stage documents the teaching situation that was discussed in the interview. The third stage involves a videotape of the supervisor’s attempt to construct the teacher’s platform-in-use and relate the espoused platform of the interview to actual practices.

The third stage is critical to the process. It is important that the construction of the teacher’s platform-in-use attempts to fit the style of the teacher. The supervisor has a variety of options available to facilitate construction of platform-in-use. The supervisor can make a videotape or write an analysis, and the teacher could respond. A second option involves a cooperative effort. The supervisor and the teacher could construct the platform-in-use together as they watch the videotaped interview and classroom sequence. A third option has other teachers constructing educational platforms with or without the supervisor.

The final stage of the process relates to the usefulness of the approach as measured by the evoking of search behavior in teachers. Search behavior is defined as statements made by teachers that indicate that the teachers are scrutinizing their ideas and strategies of teaching as the result of the videotaping process. A variety of methods are being used to elicit teacher searching responses. Teacher reactions to the process are recorded on an instrument, videotaped, and/or audiotaped. Another method has the teacher and

supervisor discussing issues and situations as they are presented on videotape. Sometimes an outside observer helps with the analysis.

The type or types of methods used should be geared to the individual style of the particular teacher and supervisor. It is hoped that teachers will scrutinize their ideas and strategies of implementation as they are confronted with comparisons and contrasts between espoused platforms and platforms-in-use. From time to time, however, conflict may develop when a teacher is confronted with the reality of his/her platform-in-use and finds that it conflicts with what was espoused. When that happens, it is the joint task of teacher and supervisor to deal with the dilemma that has surfaced. Argyris and Schöen feel that this is the key to enhancing professional effectiveness: “Understanding how we diagnose and construct our experience, take action, and monitor our behavior while simultaneously achieving our goals is crucial to understanding and enhancing effectiveness.”

Analyzing Educational Platforms and Clinical Supervision

The assumptions behind the use of videotape as a self-evaluation device relate directly to the Morris Cogan (1973) model of clinical supervision. For example, video self-appraisal assumes that the teacher can become his/her own supervisor. It is assumed that the teacher is capable of changing his/her own behavior after supervisory analysis, an interchange of ideas, and experience in self-observation. In the case of video, professional training in self-examination can lead to professional growth. Paul M. Jense points out that using videotape gives teachers opportunities to view themselves and to want to change certain types of behaviors. Thus, the goals in video self-appraisal and the clinical supervision scheme center around self-awareness and self-improvement.

The strategy of clinical supervision involves a relationship based on observation of teaching and dedicated to the welfare of the students. The focus of that relationship is on observing teacher strengths and the cultivation of teacher self-direction. Using the strategy of supervision described in this article within a clinical supervisory framework is one means of eliciting searching behavior in teachers with the focus on improving instruction. Thus, the goal is for the teachers to become their own supervisors by learning to observe themselves. Questioning one's activities in the teaching situation leads to improved technique.

The key to the integration of video illustrations of the concepts of espoused platform and platform-in-use with clinical supervision is the cultivation of the relationship between the teacher and the supervisor. Morris Cogan sees the purpose of clinical supervision as “the development of a professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his own performance, open to help from others, and withal self-directing.”

---

4 Argyris and Schöen, op. cit., p. xi.
7 Cogan, op. cit., p. 12.
illustrations can facilitate the accomplishment of those purposes. The methods proposed in this strategy can facilitate cooperation and communication between teacher and supervisor if undertaken in the spirit of professional improvement.

Applications

This strategy of supervision could be used as an in-service training tool for supervisors since the process uses available technology to capture the situation as it unfolds. Many school districts and most universities own videotape machines and have competent personnel for operating the equipment. Supervisors, for example, could be instructed to use this technique in conjunction with other methods of teacher appraisal or as a means of inducing self-improvement in teachers who are relatively satisfied with their performance. Graduate students could be given a mini-course in the use of videotape equipment in the instructional supervisory situation. These graduate students could practice identifying espoused theories and constructing theories-in-use with other students, professors, student teachers, and teachers.

Other professional educational practices can be examined with videotaping using the concepts of espoused platforms and platforms-in-use. For example, the paradigm could be used to help superintendents and principals analyze meetings. A superintendent or principal could record his/her views on the need for meetings, their use, and the degree of board or faculty involvement necessary for a successful meeting. Videotaped sequences from actual meetings could provide the
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