

BARRY: A CASE STUDY OF TEACHER REFLECTION IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION

PETER P. GRIMMETT, *University of British Columbia*

E. PATRICIA CREHAN, *University of British Columbia*

A number of recent articles in the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* have dealt with clinical supervision and reflective practice. Sergiovanni has described the dual dangers of poetism (unexamined intuitive thinking) and scientism (rationalistic, propositional forms of knowledge used predictively) in instructional supervision, suggesting that a more adequate metaphor for the process is that of a craft practiced by highly skilled artisans who reflect on their actions.¹ Smyth's articles have tried to salvage Goldhammer's original conception of clinical supervision from the throes of scientific, technical rationality by reframing it as a vehicle for freeing teachers from institutional, political, and social constraints.² While arguing for interpretive and critical approaches to the study of supervision, Holland has traced the empirical or technical rational strand of clinical supervision back to some elements of Cogan's conception of the model.³ Nolan and Huber have focused their review of conditions in supervision that nurture reflective practitioners on interpretive and critical studies of teacher reflection in clinical supervision.⁴

Despite this emphasis in the last few issues of the *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, no article has appeared on supervision and teacher reflection that is grounded in the observable events—classroom action and conference interaction—that take place in the clinical supervision approach. Indeed,

¹Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Science and Scientism in Supervision and Teaching," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 4 (Winter 1989): 93-105.

²John Smyth, "A 'Critical' Perspective for Clinical Supervision," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (Winter 1988): 136-156; John Smyth, "An Alternative Vision and an 'Educative' Agenda for Supervision as a Field of Study," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 4 (Winter 1989): 162-177; Robert Goldhammer, *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969).

³Patricia E. Holland, "Keeping Faith with Cogan: Current Theorizing in a Maturing Practice of Clinical Supervision," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (Winter 1988): 97-108, Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973).

⁴James F. Nolan and Tonya Huber, "Nurturing the Reflective Practitioner through Instructional Supervision: A Review of the Literature," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 4 (Winter 1989): 126-145.

Nolan and Huber end their review of reflective practice and instructional supervision in the following way:

The literature review leads to one final undeniable conclusion: The need for empirical inquiry that looks at the process of supervision more directly from the reflective practitioner's perspective is great. Case studies and research programs are needed that delve more deeply into the process of nurturing reflective teaching through instructional supervision. . . . Case studies are needed that link supervision to teacher reflection in both short- and long-range time frames.⁵

This paper presents such a case study. Barry, an experienced and capable teacher, interacts with Margaret, his principal and clinical supervisor.⁶ This dyad represents, not the teacher-teacher supervisory relationship that Smyth contends is more in keeping with the spirit of the original conception of clinical supervision, but the more typical principal-teacher relationship that many claim can still epitomize a collegial relationship working to improve classroom practice.⁷ Thus, this case of a collegial principal-teacher clinical supervision dyad allows us to begin to examine how far a teacher can reflect on practice when the supervision conditions contain an element of hierarchical differentiation.

Barry and Margaret had spent considerable time working together on problems of classroom practice. Because of the circumstances of Barry's class, the focus had become sharpened around aspects of classroom management, notably managing the instructional process and preventing mildly disruptive student behavior. This working relationship over a two-year period had produced the kind of collegiality in which supervision became, as Cogan and Goldhammer claimed, a joint learning experience in which both participants, but particularly the teacher, developed their potential as professional educators.⁸

Schön has suggested that teachers develop in instructional supervision settings when they engage in the "reflective transformation of experience"⁹

⁵Ibid., p. 144.

⁶Fictitious names have been used for participants in this case study.

⁷John Smyth, "A 'Critical' Perspective for Clinical Supervision," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (Winter 1988): 136-156. See also Carl D. Glickman, *Supervision of Instruction: A Developmental Approach* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1985); Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, *Supervision: Human Perspectives*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1988).

⁸Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973); Robert Goldhammer, *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969).

⁹Donald A. Schön, "Coaching Reflective Teaching," in *Reflection in Teacher Education*, ed. Peter P. Grimmer and Gaalen L. Erickson (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), p. 25. Schön prefers to talk in terms of "coaching" rather than instructional supervision, but his conception of coaching differs considerably from that of Joyce and Showers. See Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, "The Coaching of Teaching," *Educational Leadership* 40 (October 1982): 4-10; Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, *Staff Development through Research in Training* (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983).

Teacher development seems theoretically possible, then, in clinical supervision settings that emphasize collegiality. How much does a teacher develop by reflectively transforming his or her classroom practice in a clinical supervision setting involving a principal who holds conferences with a teacher?

This paper has four sections. The first examines how the benefits and conditions of collegiality can become part of the clinical supervision process in a manner that permits teachers to engage in the "reflective transformation of experience." The second section presents an overview of the case of Barry. A profile of his classroom practice over two observation cycles is developed on the basis of "thick-focused" descriptions derived from extensive field notes taken by two observers. A reconstruction of the conference interaction is presented on the basis of videotaped recordings and stimulated-recall interview transcripts (conducted with principal and teacher individually and separately). The third section presents episodes taken from the conference interaction and analyzes them for the conditions that constrain or permit teacher development through reflection. The final section offers some concluding observations about the nature of teacher development through reflection in the collegial setting of clinical supervision.

COLLEGIALITY, REFLECTION, AND CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Little has documented the benefits that teachers gain from close colleagues.¹⁰ Teachers derive instructional range, depth, and flexibility from working together. The structures of collaborative group work—for example, visiting and observing one another's classes and studying classroom-related issues together—enable teachers to try curricular-instructional innovations that they would probably not have tried as individuals. But team work alone does not produce this effect—the joint action that flows from the group's purposes and obligations as they shape the agreed task and its outcomes does

Teachers derive influence among their ranks, as well as respect from others—administrators, pupils, and parents—through collegial work conditions: "The more *public* an enterprise teaching becomes, the more it both requires and supports collective scrutiny."¹¹ This collective scrutiny breeds influence and respect among teachers. In studies conducted by Meyer, Cohen, Brunetti, Molnar, and Lueders-Salmon at Stanford, teachers reported the highest levels of reciprocal influence at schools where they were both routinely visible to one another and routinely and intensively involved in teams.¹² A

¹⁰Judith W. Little, "Teachers as Colleagues," in *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, ed. Virginia Richardson-Koehler (New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 491–518.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 495 (Little's italics).

¹²John Meyer, Elizabeth Cohen, Frank Brunetti, Sheila Molnar, and Erika Lueders-Salmon, *The Impact of the Open-Space School upon Teacher Influence and Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational Innovation*, Technical Report (Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1971).

combination of visibility, shared responsibility, and widespread interaction heightens teachers' influence on one another and on the school as a whole.

Little has also suggested that teachers derive career rewards and daily satisfaction from conditions of collegiality.¹³ Working with colleagues helps teachers to shape their perspectives on their daily work. It also enables them to reduce what Lortie has referred to as "the endemic uncertainties of teaching," which typically deny teachers a sense of success.¹⁴ According to Little, "Instead of grasping for the single dramatic event or the special achievements of a few children as the main source of pride, teachers [enjoying conditions of collegiality] are more able to detect and celebrate a pattern of accomplishments within and across classrooms."¹⁵ Professional recognition, professional involvement, and professional influence become rewards that keep teachers career-oriented and help them establish a high sense of efficacy.

Conditions of Collegiality and Clinical Supervision

Little's study of the norms and work conditions conducive to school improvement highlights four conditions that, when present, appear to cultivate norms of collegiality and experimentation in schools:

Teachers engage in frequent, continuous and increasingly concrete and precise *talk* about teaching practice (as distinct from teacher characteristics and failings, the social lives of teachers . . .). By such talk, teachers build up a shared language adequate to the complexity of teaching, capable of distinguishing one practice and its virtue from another. . . .

Teachers and administrators frequently *observe* each other teaching, and provide each other with useful (if potentially frightening) evaluations of their teaching. Only such observation and feedback can provide shared *referents* for the shared language of teaching, and both demand and provide the precision and concreteness which makes the talk about teaching useful.

Teachers and administrators *plan, design, research, evaluate, and prepare teaching materials together*. The most prescient observations remain academic ("just theory") without the machinery to act on them. By joint work on materials, teachers and administrators share the considerable burden of development required by long-term improvement . . . and make rising standards for their work attainable by them and by their students.

Teachers and administrators *teach each other* the practice of teaching.¹⁶

¹³Judith W. Little, "Teachers as Colleagues," in *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, ed. Virginia Richardson-Koehler (New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 491-518.

¹⁴Dan C. Lortie, *Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 134.

¹⁵Judith W. Little, "Teachers as Colleagues," in *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, ed. Virginia Richardson-Koehler (New York: Longman, 1987), p. 497.

¹⁶Judith W. Little, "The Power of Organizational Setting: School Norms and Staff Development" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, 1981), pp. 12-13 (Little's italics).

The major educators writing about clinical supervision would claim that each of these four conditions can occur when principals and teachers work together in the clinical approach to instructional supervision.¹⁷ This approach emphasizes "colleagueship," the purpose of which is "the development of a professionally responsible teacher who is analytical of his own performance, open to help from others, and withal self-directing."¹⁸

This collegial relationship between supervisor and teacher does not imply similar and equal professional competencies. Rather, clinical supervision draws its strength from the heterogeneity nurtured in the association of dissimilar and unequal competencies:

In clinical supervision the interaction of similar competencies at equal levels is generally less productive than the interaction of unequal levels of competence and dissimilar competencies. Such productive heterogeneity may be observed when the clinical supervisor, highly competent in observation, the analysis of teaching, and the processes connected with the cycle of supervision, works with a teacher who is more competent in knowledge of the curriculum, his students, their learning characteristics and transient and persistent problems, and the school subsocieties to which they belong.¹⁹

Thus, principals and teachers working together in clinical supervision can, theoretically, talk about teaching, observe classroom practice, plan and prepare materials together, and generally teach each other the practice of teaching. Further, these conditions can permit, if not foster, what Schön calls the "reflective transformation of experience."²⁰

Reflection as Teacher Development

Reflectively transforming experience occurs when teachers show evidence of *naming* the things they will attend to and *framing* the context they will use to attend to them.²¹ By reframing a problem, practitioners can use their existing "repertoire of examples, images, understanding, and actions"²² Reflective transformation thus engages teachers "in a kind of 'seeing' and 'doing' as—seeing their own situation as a version of the one they had observed . . . a process of metaphor, carrying a familiar experience over to a

¹⁷Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), Robert Goldhamer, Robert H. Anderson, and Robert J. Krajewski, *Clinical Supervision Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980); Ralph L. Mosher and David Purpel, *Supervision. The Reluctant Profession* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972)

¹⁸Morris L. Cogan, *Clinical Supervision* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), pp. 68, 12

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 68.

²⁰Donald A. Schön, "Coaching Reflective Teaching," in *Reflection in Teacher Education*, ed. Peter P. Grimmett and Gaalen L. Erickson (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), p. 25

²¹Donald A. Schön, *The Reflective Practitioner How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), p. 40 (Schön's italics).

²²Donald A. Schön, *Educating the Reflective Practitioner* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987), p. 66.

new context, transforming in that process both the experience and the new situation."²³ In this process, research findings would function in teachers "as a catalyst for seeing new puzzles in their classroom practice, enabling them to reframe tried-and-true patterns of classroom interaction in ways that permit exploration, experimentation, and subsequent improvement as a metaphor that facilitates the reconstruction of prevailing views and patterns of practice to lead to new understandings of teaching and classroom action."²⁴

This view assumes that teachers derive the important concepts they use to structure their world and experiences, not analytically, whether in the technological or deliberative modes of knowing or in the instrumental or conceptual approaches to decision making, but through experiential metaphors that permeate their thinking.²⁵ Lakoff and Johnson introduce the notion of metaphor:

We have found . . . that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language, but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. The concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning, down to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities. If we are right in suggesting that our conceptual system is largely metaphorical, then the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor.²⁶

They essentially point to how our concepts are products of all our life experiences, personal biography, and professional socialization. The metaphors that permeate our minds structure how we think and act. For example, if we think of teachers as responsible professionals, we presume that there are reasons

²³Donald A. Schön, "Coaching Reflective Teaching," in *Reflection in Teacher Education*, ed. Peter P. Grimmett and Gaalen L. Erickson (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), p. 25.

²⁴Peter P. Grimmett, "Teacher Planning, Collegiality, and the Education of Teachers," in *Advances in Teacher Education*, vol. 4, ed. Lillian Katz and James Raiths (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1989), p. 124.

²⁵On the technological and deliberative modes of knowing, see Karen K. Zumwalt, "Research on Teaching: Policy Implications for Teacher Education," in *Policy Making in Education*, 81st Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, ed. Ann Lieberman and Milbrey W. McLaughlin (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), pp. 215–248. On the instrumental and conceptual approaches to decision making, see Mary M. Kennedy, "How Evidence Alters Understanding and Decisions," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 6 (Fall 1984): 207–226. For an exposition of how three broad ways of knowing—which I have labeled the technological, the deliberative, and the reflective—relate to teachers' understanding of research-validated knowledge and to their understanding of reflective practice, see Peter P. Grimmett, "Teacher Planning, Collegiality, and the Education of Teachers," in *Advances in Teacher Education*, vol. 4, ed. Lillian Katz and James Raiths (Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1989); Peter P. Grimmett, Allan M. MacKinnon, Gaalen L. Erickson, and Theodore J. Riecken, "Reflective Practice in Teacher Education," in *Encouraging Reflective Practice. An Examination of Issues and Exemplars*, ed. Robert Houston, Renee Clift, and Marlene Pugach (New York: Teachers College Press, 1989).

²⁶George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 3.

for a teacher's classroom behavior that (even if the behavior per se were dysfunctional) must first be explicated, respected, and considered before we can seriously expect that teacher to change. According to this metaphor, any imitation of new behaviors inconsistent with the teacher's fundamental values and beliefs about teaching is, at best, short-lived and, at worst, illusory.

Metaphors seem to appeal to what Connelly and Clandinin have termed an *image*.²⁷ For them, an image represents a filament within teachers' experience, embodied in them as persons and expressed and enacted in their practices and actions:

An image reaches into the past, gathering up experiential threads meaningfully connected to the present. And it reaches intentionally into the future and creates new meaningfully connected threads as situations are experienced and new situations anticipated from the perspective of the image. Thus, images are part of our past, called forth by situations in which we act in the present, and are guides to our future. Images as they are embodied in us entail emotion, morality, and aesthetics.²⁸

The presence or absence of evidence of teachers metaphorically transforming their classroom experience is an acid test—like indicator of whether collegial conditions are working and teacher development is occurring in the setting of clinical instructional supervision.

THE CASE OF BARRY

This case has some intriguing features. It demonstrates how a principal can unwittingly prevent teacher reflection from taking place. Yet it also shows how a principal can facilitate it. Remarkably, both instances occur within minutes of each other in the same conference, suggesting that teacher reflection can take place at any time, depending on the conditions at work in the conference. We specifically chose this case because it exemplifies the conditions that constrain and foster teacher reflection.

Barry has a total of 20 years' teaching experience, the most recent 2 years at the intermediate level (grades 4–7). His prior experience includes 16 years at the secondary level (grades 8–12) and 2 as a district consultant. Barry has taught in his present school for 2 years, both with his current principal. Margaret, the principal, has a total of 8 years' experience as an administrator, 3 years as an elementary school vice-principal and 5 years as an elementary principal. All 8 years were spent in her present district, during the last 5 years, she has been principal in her current school. During these last 2 years, Barry had engaged in five supervisory cycles with Margaret, and they had worked collaboratively in studying classroom management for at least six months.

²⁷F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin, *Teachers as Curriculum Planners. Narratives of Experience* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

²⁸*Ibid.*, p. 60.

Barry and Margaret both viewed classroom management proactively. Both saw managing groups in classrooms as a form of prevention, not as "after-the-fact coping."²⁹ For them, group management was their foundation for working to extend students' thinking. In Stalling's terms, "techniques are enabling" of higher cognitive activities.³⁰ Consequently, although some discussion topics in the supervisor-teacher dialogue revolved around knowledge derived from research based on a traditional-behaviorist view of teaching, both participants approached the supervision experience aware of their preventive, developmental bias. They focused on classroom management because that was the area of classroom instruction in which Barry had had some difficulties. This focus was a means to Barry's espoused goal of teaching pupils to think for themselves. The classroom-observation data confirm that Barry's conception of teaching is far removed from the traditional-behaviorist metaphors frequently associated with topics of classroom management.

How, then, did Barry and Margaret use classroom-management research? They regarded the technical knowledge of the research as a source of information that could, on careful evaluation, "enlarge their thought processes" about teachers' daily predicaments.³¹ This critical stance toward the knowledge of classroom management enabled Margaret and Barry to transcend its traditional-behaviorist undertones and appreciate how it applied to what Barry was ultimately trying to do in his classroom teaching.

Barry's Classroom-Management Practices

At the time of both observations, Barry was teaching a grade 6 class seated in a traditional rows configuration, with the boys on one side of the room and the girls on the other. The first observation began with a short, drill-type math review, followed by a science lesson dealing with the skeletal structure of the human body. The second observation, which started with a brief interval of silent reading, was a mathematics lesson involving three activities: speed drills, arithmetic limericks, and a newspaper article about the cost of car rentals. The objective of the latter two activities was to develop numerical reasoning.

The data collected by the two observers were used to create profiles of Barry's classroom-management practice. His management of instruction and

²⁹Thomas L. Good and Jere E. Brophy, *Looking in Classrooms*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).

³⁰Jane Stallings, "Implications from Research on Teaching for Teacher Preparation," in *Teaching and Teacher Education. Generating and Utilizing Valid Knowledge for Professional Socialization*, ed. Ian E. Housego and Peter P. Grimmett (Vancouver: WEDGE Publications, 1985), pp. 161-179.

³¹Carl D. Glickman, "Knowledge and Certainty in the Supervision of Instruction," in *Reflection in Teacher Education*, ed. Peter P. Grimmett and Gaalen L. Erickson (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), p. 60.

transitions, of rules and procedures, and of pupil behavior appeared to be somewhat inconsistent from the first to the second observation.

Barry seemed to maintain a task-oriented, businesslike approach to class activities while fostering a warm, friendly atmosphere between the pupils and himself. He appeared relaxed and unflappable as he laughed and joked with the pupils, who clearly knew that when he called for quiet, he meant business. Although they were obviously having fun and enjoying their work, the pupils were also challenged by the stimulating, thought-provoking activities, particularly in the second observation.

At the same time, Barry's classroom seemed overcrowded. Although it looked small for the 30 pupil desks, the sense of crowding came more from all the other furniture on the room's perimeter. On three sides, the wall space was taken up by cupboards, shelves, and tables. Because of the amount and size of the peripheral furniture, the rows of desks were close together, thus restricting the traffic lanes and creating congested movement for both Barry and the pupils. Besides the effect on free movement, the excess furniture also interfered with the pupils' view of instructional displays. The overhead projector and screen were placed in the back corner of the room, and the pupils had to turn around in their desks to see the visuals. Without removing some of the furniture, however, there appeared to be nowhere else for the overhead projector.

From Barry's management of instruction, we could clearly see that he thoughtfully planned the lesson's substantive content and effectively used various monitoring techniques to ensure that the pupils were actively engaged in the task at hand. He incorporated various materials and activities into both the math and health science parts of the lesson. During the review segments, the pupils were eager to respond to Barry's questions. For the most part, the brisk pacing and sequencing that characterized the lesson sustained their effort. Throughout both review segments and the ensuing activity on the skeletal structure, Barry fostered active pupil involvement and checked pupil progress by purposefully circulating around the room, he used visual scanning and "selective pausing" to make eye contact and communicate encouragement. Barry was also sensitive to auditory cues and seemed to exercise sound judgment in response to them. Sometimes he looked in the direction of the sound and apparently decided to ignore it, other times, he looked and reacted nonverbally, yet other times, he responded verbally. He seemed to have a favorite saying, "I don't want spectators and workers; I just want workers." The pupils' almost instant return to their work suggested that they knew he meant business when he used those words.

Apart from the introductory silent-reading segment, the second observation began as the first did, with a series of math speed drills. This review covered addition and subtraction instead of multiplication, but the drill was conducted in an identical manner. Barry's subsequent presentation and explanation of the math limericks required a high level of abstract reasoning from

the pupils. Although he clarified terms, provided examples, and asked the class for examples, he seemed to be teaching only part of the class. About one-third of the 23 pupils in the class appeared uninvolved during the presentation.³² They did not misbehave; they just sat passively, and Barry did not press them to participate nor call on them to answer questions. These same pupils later had trouble with the limerick worksheets. If Barry was aware of this nonparticipating group, he did not act to encourage their involvement in this segment of the lesson. Barry did not watch them as actively as he had done during the first observed lesson. He seemed engulfed by his own tide of enthusiasm and by the energetic cooperation of the involved pupils—to the virtual exclusion of the others. Only during the seatwork segment did Barry use his favorite exhortation about “no spectators, just workers.” But the pupils’ response was less salutary than it had been in the first observed lesson.

It could be argued that Barry needs two separate math groups in this class. For the academically engaged pupils, Barry’s questioning techniques emphasized higher-order thinking skills. But for those not engaged in the interactive phase of the lesson, the math segment seemed pitched beyond their level. During the third segment on the cost of rental cars, however, the whole class was actively and enthusiastically involved.

During each transition point between the three segments in the first lesson, Barry gave clear, concise instructions before starting the transition itself. The only observed problem came during the transition before the seatwork activity. Rather than circulating as the pupils were carrying out the pre-transition instructions to ensure that all pupils were doing as asked, Barry stood at the front of the room. Some confusion ensued as the pupils did the circulating while asking for procedural clarification.

The clarity of Barry’s pre-transition instructions continued during the second observed lesson, which, like the first, consisted of three main segments. He also maintained his practice of giving the class advance warning of impending change and finish-up reminders for the segment at hand. Although he still did not circulate actively during the transitions themselves, the data indicate two changes in the way Barry handled transitions. First, instead of standing at the front of the room and attending only to the individual pupils approaching him, Barry was scanning the classroom to see that the pupils were following his directions. Second, unlike the tendency noted in the first observation for transitions and activities to overlap and sometimes merge, a clear demarcation came between the end of a structured activity and the beginning of a transition. For example, Barry not only informed the class that they had two minutes to get ready for the limericks, but he told them what they were to do to get themselves ready. Here Barry did not try to explain how to do the limericks activity as part of the transition. Rather, he waited

³²Seven pupils were not in class for this lesson. According to Barry, four were in the library, and three were helping in the gymnasium.

until the transition was complete and then gave the instructions for the structured activity.

Generally, Barry had clearly established expectations for pupil behavior and academic work. The pupils clearly knew how to undertake certain functions and tasks in the classroom. For example, they were entirely familiar with the procedure for distributing the worksheets for the math speed drills. Barry also had various reminders about file folders, report cards, and notebooks written on the chalkboard. As in the first observation, the math materials for both the speed drills and the limericks problem-solving activity for the second lesson were distributed and collected quickly and without confusion.

In terms of consistency, however, a minor occurrence during the first observed lesson became problematic in the second one. Although Barry did not state explicitly that the pupils were to raise their hands to answer, they seemed to know that call-outs were not permissible. Indeed, there were few during the first lesson, despite the opportunity when Barry requested answers to the math and bones questions. But in the second lesson, Barry did not consistently reinforce the no call-outs expectation. This lack of consistency was most evident in the final segment of the lesson when the pupils had become excited and voluble over the activity on car rental costs. The call-outs, together with some arguing over car names and many pupils speaking simultaneously, contributed to a mounting noise level that made hearing what was being said difficult for many.

Barry successfully orchestrated pupil learning toward independent thinking during the first observed lesson. Because the class seemed to be well aware of his expectations, Barry must have established them long before this late-November observation. Throughout this first lesson, he acted promptly to redirect pupils toward his expectations. During the two seatwork activities, he scanned the room frequently, walked around with purpose, and paused selectively in different places. These selective pauses seemed to be an anticipatory action intended to ensure that the pupils continued with the learning activity. Barry scanned the classroom to oversee the seatwork and to respond to specific actions. On these occasions, he frequently made eye contact with certain pupils.

Although Barry continued to use these same practices during the second observed lesson, he did so with much less consistency. While he had previously tried to ensure that all pupils were at least attentive to the learning task, Barry seemed to lose some of his attentiveness during the second observed lesson. Nowhere was the inconsistency between expectations and actual behavior more evident than during the final segment of the lesson. Indeed, because of the frequency and loudness of the call-outs then, some pupils, particularly those seated farthest away from the overhead projector, did not hear what was being said by other pupils or by the teacher. The corner location of the overhead projector only made the situation worse because Barry had to have his back to most of the class. He turned around to face the

class from time to time, but not often enough to know what was going on. Moreover, because of the noise level, Barry could not always hear what the students were saying, much less respond to them. Relocating the overhead to the center and front of the classroom would allow Barry to face the whole class and thus be in a position to observe the class more fully.

The Margaret-Barry Conferences

A generally supportive atmosphere characterized the conferences between Margaret and Barry. Both participants appeared to enjoy an easy, relaxed disposition, they engaged in much good-natured banter and humor. In the first conference, Margaret focused on Barry's clear expectations and his consistent enforcement of them, the timing and clarity of his directions for seatwork activities, and his classroom organization as it related to distributing and collecting worksheets and to the class seating plan. In addition, she focused on pupils' on-task behavior, particularly Barry's monitoring behavior of standing near and making eye contact with specific pupils, and on back-up activities for pupils who finished assignments early.

The second conference also focused on Barry's expectations, the class seating plan, and pupils' on-task behavior. Margaret also dealt with the challenging instructional material Barry presented, the variety of activities included in the lesson, the transitions that these changes brought about, and her own agenda for schoolwide, goal-directed teaching.

Margaret was extremely supportive in her feedback to Barry in both conferences. One aspect of her supportiveness was her frequent use of a *wc* strategy to identify her own teaching with Barry's. She also presented data to Barry neutrally and generally adopted an eliciting orientation through her questions. In addition, she used positive statements before raising a concern. She showed a deep sense of respect for the teacher's approach to instruction, even though it differed in some ways from her own. Margaret began both conferences with some rapport-establishing banter and closed the conferences on a positive note. Her way of dealing with this experienced teacher could be characterized as enabling.

Margaret's supportive style allowed Barry to examine his classroom behaviors openly, particularly the ones Margaret complimented him on, and to explicate his specific expectations for pupils. He clearly let Margaret know that her supportive approach allowed him to examine his own teaching. From the conference discussion, he was able to reassess his own interpretation of a specific pupil's behavior. When he saw that Margaret was using the conference to work toward her own agenda of more goal-directed teaching in the school, Barry's confidence and concentration remained undisturbed. Further, when Margaret's preoccupation with this agenda caused her to engage in a somewhat convoluted monologue (even to the point of forfeiting an opportunity to follow up a teacher-volunteered concern), he listened politely but

did not participate. Throughout the conference, Barry carefully weighed the principal's behavior and adjusted his own actions to accommodate her agenda without compromising his own priorities.

Barry also defended his own actions by explicating the reasons for his choices without a hint of defensiveness. Barry admitted, however, that if Margaret had not been so supportive of his different yet acceptable teaching style, he would have found it difficult to refrain from acting in compliant or counterdependent ways. One measure of the level of support he perceived was how much he told Margaret about his pupils and his own teaching. He volunteered information about how pupils cooperated in his class, and he voiced his intent to involve the pupils on the left side of the room more fully in the interactive phase of instruction. He also volunteered his concern about dead time at the end of a lesson when the students had finished their assigned work, had worked hard, and needed a change of pace. Barry asked Margaret if she had any specific advice, and he welcomed her suggestion because it presented him with an opportunity to develop his instructional practice by reflectively transforming his classroom experience.

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH THE REFLECTIVE TRANSFORMATION OF EXPERIENCE

Both of the following episodes selected from Barry's case occurred during the second conference. In the first episode, Barry and Margaret discussed teacher proximity to pupils and its relationship to active pupil involvement during the interactive phase of the lesson. The second episode focused on what a teacher can do to fill the final few minutes of a lesson in an educationally sound way so that vital instructional time is not lost. Each episode consists of the relevant portion of the transcribed conference dialogue and an interpretive analysis of the presence or absence of teacher reflection.

The analysis of these episodes illustrates both the conditions that foster reflective transformation and the constraints that militate against the process. An assumption running through this analysis is that evidence of teachers reflectively transforming their classroom experience strongly indicates that collegial conditions and teacher development are actually occurring. In each of the two cycles, fleeting examples of reflection are taking place.

Episode 1: Involving Pupils in the Lesson Interaction

In this episode, Margaret and Barry discussed how to involve certain disengaged pupils in the interactive phase of the lesson.

Principal: Now the ones I did wonder about I commented on later in here [the observation notes]...

Teacher: Like ...

Principal. Yes, but you know when you went into that second one, the second limerick, then you moved over to those kids. Now they were amazingly involved, but even so ...

Teacher. It's interesting that you picked that up because I think it was before we left the left side of the room. And with my own class, I think it's a couple of things; there's some strong personalities on the center and right side of the classroom. So there's Frank sort of central, Laura and Angie over on the right ...

Principal: Paulo ...

Teacher. Paulo way over on the right side, Dario toward the right center, and those kids tend to attract my attention and the attention of the rest of the kids. That leaves ...

Principal: The quiet Annas and ...

Teacher. That's right, the four or five not really flag-waving kids, either, so my attention tends to get directed to that part of the room, and I know that I don't even get eye contact with them as much as I should.

Principal: Yes.

Teacher. I think that though the kids that are involved there are also fairly reliable, are quite comfortable not being noticed.

Principal: Yes, yes, they are.

Teacher: So that they reinforce for me ...

Principal: But they're also hard-working.

Teacher: Yes.

Principal. They're a hard-working group. You're still getting results with them, too.

Teacher: But I'm not sure what to do ... you know, find some technique ...

Principal. Well, especially for instance, when you're moving near the overhead . . . When I think of it, those kids with whom you generally interact are much closer to the overhead, which is where you are. And you might think at a certain point of sort of changing that position so it's on the other side [of the room].

Teacher: I think I could almost flip the room around.

Principal. You could try it. It would be really interesting to see how that affects what you see is happening with those kids.

Teacher: Because I don't get over to the left side of the room as much.

Principal. Well, you know, you're certainly successful in the sense that I watched the kids, and they were just as involved, from their own point of view, they were just as involved, even though they were not doing as much talking, not as much actual obvious interaction with you. They were still into it, so you're successful at that. Probably if you found that those kids were just doing nothing, then that would be sort of like jumping up and down and saying ... and get a wheelchair, and that's really not happening.

Teacher. There's this thing, too. The kids that are there don't interact with the rest of the class very much.

Principal: No.

Teacher. You know, either way, the others don't interact with them very much. It seems like they're almost a little class within the larger class. It's strange.

Principal. Anyway ... just moving on in the lesson, you know, in some ways, a lesson like that could tend to be ...

The focus on the teacher's interaction with pupils was extended to include specific individuals discussed in the first conference. Both Margaret and Barry talked about Paulo and others who had strong personalities, who seemed to attract the teacher's attention and eye contact a good deal, and who sat on the right side of the room. Quieter pupils sat on the left side of the room who seemed comfortable getting less attention from the teacher; Margaret noted, however, that they still worked hard and stayed on task. Barry admitted that he was not sure how to involve the quieter pupils in the interactive phase of the lesson. In her recall interview, Margaret suggested some research on classroom management had helped both her and Barry focus on the room arrangement and the seating plan. The seating arrangement in the classroom had emerged as a focus in the first conference, but the research helped them connect the seating plan, teacher movement, and teacher-pupil interaction. In the second conference, Margaret's response to Barry's concern about involving the quieter pupils built on this connection. Although she ostensibly suggested that pupil proximity to the overhead projector could be a factor, she essentially reinforced the theme of teacher proximity to pupils for purposes of stimulating teacher-pupil interaction. This theme had emerged in the first conference, and from Margaret's reiteration here in her suggestion to change the position of the overhead, Barry decided to consider a different room arrangement.

Margaret was quick to add that all pupils in the class appeared to be fully involved in the lesson regardless of how much interacting they had or had not done with Barry. In her recall interview, she reported her reasons for the timing of this positive feedback. She was concerned that Barry might have perceived her suggestion to change the position of the overhead as a negative criticism of what had happened in the lesson. Therefore, she quickly passed on positive feedback to alleviate any possible anxiety. Margaret thus reported working toward ways of improving basically competent practices by helping Barry understand why the lesson had succeeded despite the seating arrangement and his lack of eye contact and interaction with some pupils on the left side of the room. She also believed that despite her concern precipitating the anxiety-reducing feedback, Barry knew she was not criticizing him.

Margaret went to some length to dissuade Barry from taking her comments negatively when she reportedly knew that he would understand her intent. Barry had admitted that he was unsure of how to involve the pupils on the left side of the room. After Margaret's suggestion for change and immediate positive feedback, Barry was still musing about involving the quieter pupils "It seems like they're almost a little class within the larger class." Clearly, Barry was too wrapped up in his concern about involving these pupils to interpret Margaret's suggestion negatively. Moreover, he had essentially asked for help here, and most teachers who request help expect the principal to offer suggestions. There appears, then, to be little basis for Margaret's concern about Barry interpreting her comments negatively. Perhaps she was a captive of her own

experience as a supervisor; perhaps she has made suggestions before without the teacher first asking for them, causing the teacher to perceive her comments negatively, and she now remembers the consequence but not the context of what happened. Still, Margaret failed to pick up on Barry's concern about the pupils on the left being a class within a larger class.

When Barry admitted to being unsure of how to involve the quieter pupils in the lesson discussion, an intriguing dialogue followed about the relationships between the seating plan, the teacher's movement, and teacher-pupil interaction. The principal suggested that pupil proximity to the overhead projector (and thus to the teacher) could be a factor preventing the quieter pupils on the far left side of the room from entering fully into the interactive phase of the lesson. She concluded by suggesting that Barry consider changing the position of the overhead projector. This suggestion appeared to spark Barry to reframe the classroom's arrangement. But this potential reframing—"I think I could almost flip the room around"—was essentially a minor aspect of what was, for Barry, the more consequential problem: how to involve the quieter pupils who happened to sit on the left side of the room and who appeared to function as a class within a class. Barry did not name teacher proximity to the pupils as the thing he would attend to; Margaret did. Consequently, his potential framing of the context in which he would attend to this dilemma—changing the room around to restructure pupils' proximity to the overhead projector—essentially had an insouciant ring and did not constitute an instance of reflective transformation on his part.

Barry was struggling to name the potentially different levels of mathematical ability that seemed to be creating "a little class within the larger class." Although he succeeded in naming this problem as one he wanted to attend to, he could not focus the conference dialogue on exploring its details. Margaret's preoccupation with the theme of teacher proximity to pupils, her reported concern that Barry not interpret negatively her suggestion to move the overhead projector, and her ultimate decision to move on to a different aspect of the lesson largely prevented Barry from focusing the conference as he wished.

Ironically, the next few minutes of the conference contained Margaret's somewhat convoluted monologue, which Barry listened to respectfully but did not participate in. Barry was left to muse alone on how to address the aspect of the lesson that had, for him, emerged as a consequential dilemma: how to engage previously uninvolved pupils who, for whatever reasons, functioned as a class within a class.

The data are unclear about whether Barry successfully thought through this dilemma on his own and reframed the instructional context. In any case, the reframing did not take place during the supervisory experience. The conference dialogue did not explore the critical instructional dilemma Barry alluded to, thus, he lost an opportunity to transform his classroom teaching reflectively.

Episode 2: Avoiding Dead Time

In this episode, Barry and Margaret discussed how to prevent the last few minutes of a lesson from becoming "dead time."

Principal: One of the kids asked about the overhead, and you made the comment about ... the overhead, and that's exactly what I was requesting ... that when you bring in what may seem to be extraneous material that you want to use, to kind of open up a thing or whatever, you can lose your whole class ... and I felt that you didn't this morning. And in some cases, it's sometimes circumstantial, and the kids really are into it, and in other cases ... This morning, it was clear that you had a very well-planned lesson. You knew what you were doing. You had your goals set, and you've done some work, some good work, with the students to lay the foundation for being able to proceed. But we do know that there are times when I can be in the lesson and ... you just lose them completely ... but you certainly didn't this morning.

Teacher: I try to get them redirected on, about quarter after, to begin on the problems that I have up there on the board. There's no way, they've had it, the day was over! So, you know, I really didn't ...

Principal: You didn't feel too successful after that time?

Teacher: No, no. They got the information off, they wrote all the questions, they understood when it was to be done, because it didn't have to be done, finished, right then, that was ...

Principal: Ok, so you know ... the ten minutes [before the end of the lesson] ... what sort of thing do you do there?

Teacher: I boil. [*Both laugh.*] I get mad at the situation. I don't mind if, maybe up to five minutes, I've accomplished what I wanted to accomplish, and we happen to finish a bit early. Let's just gather up our books and sit for a couple of minutes. If you like, you can go on with something you want to do ... But that was just a couple of minutes longer than what I wanted ... I just wanted to pack it up, and that's it for now. Well, it was after eight problems, you know, once you provide interest for diverting ... they get carried away with that, and they have trouble with the smallest thing, the personal responsibility to them, you know, let's get on with the job.

Principal: Of course, try to think about it, not just in your class but in all classes, because there are those five- to ten-minute times when maybe we just have to recognize the fact, as you have, that in many of these cases, that's it as far as the kids are concerned. You're not going to get more out of them, and maybe we need to look at, although you had such a variation, maybe just for that time, you need to be thinking of some very sort of short productive kind of thing that can be done at these times. Kind of have those sorts of things there. It may be just a recognition of, well, what's realistic, I suppose.

Teacher: Yes, well, maybe it's just like we were saying before ... on the Arts Network. We do it for the kids all the time [*laughs*], but you know that's an hour and a half, and by the end of an hour, they're just getting fed up with the whole thing. Don't want to work.

Principal: Well, I don't know ... maybe that's the time for each teacher to find something they're really comfortable with spending long periods on, like poetry. But I did find that, in a short few minutes, I could maybe do something, the kids would often be quite willing to just sit and be read to.

Teacher: That's a good idea. But what sort of things? I hate giving something to the kids that they see quite clearly as, This is to keep us busy for the next four minutes. And has absolutely nothing to do with what we were doing.

Principal: But something important for you.

Teacher: Yes, but something that is recognized as a poem; this is just a little bit of relaxation, and whether you have to pick some things out of the newspaper, for instance. Or, you know, the poetry comes in and just to have on hand so that, Right, we're finished a few minutes early; you just go to that, just relax for a minute.

Principal: Or maybe . . .

Teacher: Let me read this.

Principal: So that may be something you're reading from the library that's interesting . . . so that may be something to think about. But you know, in thinking about this after and thinking how can we have a conference about this because it was absolutely super, just a super lesson.

Teacher: Well, I was really pleased with it, and I'm glad you . . . [*Overlap of voices, teacher laughs.*]

Principal: Well, I really enjoyed it, it was a good time, and certainly a very, very productive time, too . . . not just with what they learned, but it was a highly motivating lesson, and I think it was very, very productive in the way that it focused the kids on math as being something that was not just out of the textbook . . . Anyway, thank you very much.

Toward the end of the conference, an interesting turn of events took place. Margaret noted how Barry used extraneous material in the lesson to arouse the pupils' interest but was impressed that he did not lose the pupils' attention or the lesson's focus. Indeed, she made the point twice that such situations could easily go awry but that had not happened here because Barry had carefully planned the lesson. These comments, together with Barry's respect for Margaret's professional, supportive approach to instructional supervision, gave him the chance to explore how the lesson began to fall apart at the end.

In her recall interview, Margaret characterized this episode as one of successful conferencing. When a teacher can feel good about something that happens in the classroom but can also reflect on what he or she could have done if things had gone differently, the conference has enjoyed an element of success. By initiating the discussion about the lesson's disintegration just before the end of the period, Barry confirmed Margaret's hunch that such diversions can sometimes lead the lesson astray and provided an example of what Margaret regarded as successful conferencing.

Barry suggested that his difficulties came about because the pupils had worked hard for too long. Margaret chose to explore what he typically does when a breakdown occurs up to ten minutes before the end of the lesson. Barry responded that, if it occurred with less than five minutes remaining, he effected closure. But if it happened sooner in the lesson, then he admitted to being sometimes bereft of ideas and asked the principal for advice. Margaret

empathized with the predicament Barry had described (she used the *we* strategy here), adding that for this typical dilemma teachers need to plan some short activities to fill the remaining minutes productively. Margaret's empathetic exploration of Barry's predicament enabled him to admit that, in these situations, he frequently did not know what to do. In so doing, Barry was naming the problem: He was unable to come up with educationally sound ways of filling the remaining minutes of a lesson when the planned material had been exhausted. Margaret accepted Barry's statement as the problem and shared how she used to read poetry to her pupils when she thought they had reached their saturation point. Reading aloud gave them a change of pace but still fulfilled the teacher's mandate to be educating them. Margaret's report of how she had tackled a similar situation immediately fired Barry's interest, he saw, perhaps for the first time, that back-up activities did not necessarily constitute busy work.

Barry's fresh appreciation of the potentially educative purpose of end-of-lesson additional activities is a noteworthy instance of the generative quality of reflective transformation. Margaret's shared experience made reconstructing his prevailing view of back-up activities easier; Barry has a new understanding of their educational significance. Having reframed the context within which he thought of such activities, Barry then experienced a further enriching instance of reflective transformation. He realized that he could have read something else out of the newspaper material he had used in the final segment of the lesson. He was thus seeing his end-of-lesson teaching as a version of his principal's. Her reported actions had served as a metaphor that prompted him to reframe his own teaching in a highly creative yet exploratory way. He did not transfer Margaret's reported activity, poetry, to the context of his teaching; rather, he transformed both the activity (from reading poetry to reading a newspaper article) and his teaching context (from dead time or busy work to educationally significant work) in the process.

Four factors working together may account for this double portion of teacher development through reflective transformation. First, the teacher himself named the problem that they explored in the conference. Second, the principal did not appear, in this instance, to have an agenda of her own and consequently accepted and explored the problem the teacher identified. Third, Barry felt secure enough in the supportive atmosphere Margaret created to take a professional risk in admitting a shortcoming and asking for help. Fourth, Margaret's empathetic sharing of how she tackled a similar problem enabled Barry to reconstruct his view of back-up activities and reframe the context of the lesson.

THE NATURE OF REFLECTION IN CLINICAL SUPERVISION

These two episodes depict instances of a teacher seemingly on the verge of reflectively transforming his classroom experience. Yet the analysis has

shown that this process was consummated in only one of the two episodes. How, then, did conditions at work in this second episode differ from those in the first?

In the first episode, Barry named the problem: engage the uninvolved pupils who formed a class within a class. Margaret refocused the problem around the theme of teacher proximity to pupils. Thus, she suggested changing the position of the overhead projector; she reframed the instructional context according to her own definition of the problem, not Barry's. The principal did not deliberately override an indomitable teacher; although supportive and respectful, she failed to grasp the deeper significance of Barry's problem. Thus, this case differs from the "private cold war" metaphor that Blumberg used to characterize typical instructional supervision practices.³³ Also, she offered her suggestion as a tentative hypothesis to be tested out in action; typical principals would, according to Leithwood and Montgomery, try to impose their suggestion as a solution to the problem they themselves had named.³⁴

The second episode differs from the first. Barry named the problem: to deal with end-of-lesson activities in an educationally sound manner. Margaret accepted his articulation of the problem and empathetically explored the issue with him. She shared how she had tackled a similar problem, and Barry began to reconstruct his view of the educational significance of end-of-lesson activities and to reframe the context in which the disintegration had occurred. In this episode only, then, did Barry reflectively transform his classroom experience.

In the first episode, either wittingly or unwittingly, Margaret did not accept Barry's naming of the problem. Therefore, he did not own the subsequent reframing of the instructional context. The reflective transformation of classroom experience did not occur. In the second episode, however, Margaret accepted Barry's articulation of the problem, and he, not the principal, reframed the context in which the problem could be addressed.

Can principal-led clinical supervision truly foster the kind of collegiality that enables teachers to transform their classroom experience reflectively? The case of Barry suggests that we cannot consider collegiality the only essential precondition to teacher development through reflection. Both episodes demonstrate that the principal entered most supportively into the collaborative ventures that Little characterized as practices of collegiality: talking about teaching, observing, planning together, and teaching each other the finer points of teaching.³⁵ Yet teacher reflection was evident only in the second

³³Arthur Blumberg, *Supervisors and Teachers. A Private Cold War*, 2nd ed. (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1980).

³⁴Kenneth A. Leithwood and Deborah J. Montgomery, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement," *Review of Educational Research* 52 (Fall 1982): 309-339

³⁵Judith W. Little, "Teachers as Colleagues," in *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*, ed. Virginia Richardson-Koehler (New York: Longman, 1987), pp. 491-518.

episode. Collegiality, then, is a necessary but not sufficient condition to bring about the reflective transformation of experience. Something else has to happen within a supportive, collegial environment: The teacher must name the problem; the principal must accept the teacher's designation and explore it collaboratively; the teacher must feel secure enough professionally to risk reconstructing tried-and-true views of classroom practice and then reframe the context in which further teaching will take place.

To reconstruct their views and reframe their instructional contexts, teachers need to feel a sense of efficacy and empowerment in conference discussions. Collegial conditions set the tone, but they do not, in and of themselves, release the reflective process. The case of Barry suggests that the transforming powers of reflection come into play when the classroom observer, whether a superordinate or a peer, accepts the teacher's naming of the problem as a legitimate focus for conference discussion and exploration. Collegial supportiveness and acceptance of the teacher's designated area of instructional concern thus constitute necessary and sufficient conditions for fostering teacher reflection in clinical supervision. Under both these conditions, distinctions between clinical supervision as a collegial variation of the hierarchically differentiated principal-teacher relationship and clinical supervision as teachers helping colleagues become somewhat blurred. Essentially, these conditions enable principals to function as, and to be perceived by teachers as, true colleagues.

Unfortunately, as Smyth has pointed out, these conditions occur all too rarely today.³⁶ Conditions that prevent teacher reflection from taking place tend to predominate. Smyth has documented how principals and teachers fail to experience the necessary precondition of collegiality because of the political nature of school reform and its effect on teacher supervision. But the case of Barry shows how a principal's inability or unwillingness to accept what the teacher has named as the problem for discussion constrains reflection. Our present-day practice of clinical supervision may have two strikes against it. It lacks conditions in which principals are regarded as true colleagues, and it lacks principals who can discern and accept the area of instructional concern most relevant to the teacher's practice.

Smyth's claim may be true: Teachers are more likely to develop when clinical supervision provides an opportunity for them to work together with other teachers "to problematise . . . the settings in which they work" than when it features teachers working collaboratively with principals.³⁷ However,

³⁶John Smyth, "A 'Critical' Perspective for Clinical Supervision," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (Winter 1988): 136-156.

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 153.

the case of Barry suggests a different explanation. It also shows one instance when Smyth's dismal view of a politicized clinical supervision process might just not apply. Clinical supervision can foster the conditions in which teachers reflectively transform their classroom experience, but few principals are sufficiently empowered to "midwife" the birth of reflective transformation.³⁸

PETER P. GRIMMETT is Associate Professor and Director of the Centre for the Study of Teacher Education, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, 2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z5, Canada.

E. PATRICIA CREHAN is Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, 2125 Main Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z5, Canada.

³⁸We wish to acknowledge the insightful comments of anonymous reviewers on an earlier draft of this paper. The study reported here was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Grants #410-85-0339 and #410-86-2014). We gratefully acknowledge that we could not have carried out this work without this funding. The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the policy, position, or endorsement of the council. Also, we wish to acknowledge the contributions of Maryl Stewart with data collection, Bruce McGillivray with data analysis, and Cindy Drossos with manuscript preparation.

Copyright © 1990 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.