

**A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON THE STYLES OF  
SUPERVISORS IN PRE-OBSERVATION  
CONFERENCES**

**İLKNUR İSTİFÇİ  
(Doktora Tezi)  
Eskişehir, 2006**

**A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON THE STYLES OF SUPERVISORS IN  
PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES**

**İLKNUR İSTİFÇİ**

**PH.D. THESIS**  
**English Language Teaching Program**  
**Advisor: Asc. Prof. Dr. F. Hülya Özcan**

**Eskişehir**  
**Anadolu University**  
**Institute of Educational Sciences**  
**March 2006**

## DOKTORA TEZ ÖZÜ

### GÖZLEM ÖNCESİ GÖRÜŞMELERDE REHBER ÖĞRETİM ELEMANLARININ YAKLAŞIMLARI ÜZERİNE BETİMLEYİCİ BİR ÇALIŞMA

İlknur İstifçi

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı  
Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Mart 2006  
Danışman: Doç. Dr. F. Hülya Özcan

Öğretmen adaylarının okul ortamında öğretim şansına sahip oldukları öğretmenlik uygulamasının önemi ve evrenselliği tartışılmaz. Bu süreçte, rehber öğretim elemanları öğretmen adaylarının gelişmesinde önemli yeri olan kişiler arasındadır. Öğretmen adayları ve rehber öğretim elemanı arasındaki etkileşim araştırmacıların her zaman ilgisini çekmiştir. Rehber öğretim elemanı ve öğretmen adayları arasındaki etkileşimi inceleyen çalışmalar genellikle gözlem sonrası görüşmeler üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır. Bu çalışmalar hem rehber öğretim elemanı hem de öğretmen adaylarının konuşmalarını söz eylem özellikleri, kişiler arasındaki güç ilişkisi ve rehber öğretim elemanlarının dönüt verirken sahip oldukları yaklaşım açısından incelemiştir.

Bu çalışma gözlem öncesi görüşmelerde bulunan bir deneyimli ve bir deneyimsiz rehber öğretim elemanının yaklaşımını, bu yaklaşımın ders planları üzerindeki etkisini ve rehber öğretim elemanlarının kendi yaklaşımlarını nasıl algıladıklarını bulmak üzere düzenlenmiştir. Veri toplanmasındaki bu üçleme yöntemi daha güvenilir ve gerçekçi sonuçlara ulaşmak için yapılmıştır.

Çalışmanın verileri iki rehber öğretim elemanının (her biri 6 öğretmen adayına rehberlik eden) gözlem öncesi görüşmelerini teybe kaydetme, öğretmen adaylarının ders planlarını toplama ve rehber öğretim elemanları ile yapılan görüşmelerdir. Gözlem öncesi yapılmış olan görüşmelerin çözümlenmesi “*dinleme, açıklama, cesaretlendirme, yansıtma, tavsiye etme, problem çözme, uzlaşma, yönlendirme, ayarlama ve takviye*

*etme*” gibi rehber öğretim elemanlarının belli davranışlarına göre yapılmıştır. Veri çözümlemesinde Glickman, Gordon ve Ross-Gordon’un (2004) sınıflandırması kullanılmıştır. Bununla birlikte, bazı davranışlar bu çalışmada ortaya çıkmış ve o davranışlar Constant Comparative Method yoluyla sınıflandırılmıştır. Ortaya çıkan davranışlar: “*öğrencinin anlayıp anlamadığını kontrol etme, hatırlatma, espri ve örnek vermedir*”. Tüm davranışların kullanım sıklığı belirlenmiş ve listelenmiştir. Davranışların sıklığı bulunduktan sonra rehber öğretim elemanlarının yaklaşımı belirlenmiş, deneyimli ve deneyimsiz rehber öğretim elemanlarının yaklaşımları karşılaştırılmıştır. Ayrıca, gözlem öncesi görüşmelerde rehber öğretim elemanlarının dönüt verdiği ders planları ve görüşmelerin çözümlemeleri rehber öğretim elemanlarının yaklaşımlarının etkisini bulmak için karşılaştırılmıştır. Son aşama olarak, rehber öğretim elemanlarının kendi yaklaşımlarını algılamaları ile ilgili olarak onlarla görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Bu görüşmeleri yapmanın başka bir amacı da rehber öğretim elemanlarının sonuçlarla ilgili yansıtma yapmalarını sağlamak ve rehber öğretim elemanlarının kendi davranışları ile ilgili algılamaları ve gerçekte görüşmelerde kullandıkları davranışları bulmaktır. Görüşmeler teybe kaydedilmiş ve çözümlenmiştir.

Veriler analiz edildiğinde, deneyimli ve deneyimsiz rehber öğretim elemanlarının geniş bir davranış yelpazesi kullandıkları görülmüştür. Açıklama, yansıtma ve yönlendirme gibi çok kullanılan davranışlar iki öğretim elemanı tarafından aşağı yukarı birbirine yakın sayıda kullanılmıştır. En çok kullanılan yaklaşımların Bilgi Verici Yönlendirme, Kontrol Edici Yönlendirme ve Paylaşımçı yaklaşımlar olduğu görülmüştür. Farklılıklar arasında görüşmelerin süresi, davranışların çeşitliliği, sayısı ve bazı davranışların diğerlerinden daha fazla kullanılması sayılabilir. Öğretmen adaylarının ders planlarının incelenmesi sonucu görüşme sonrası planlarda değişiklikler yapıldığı ve bu değişikliklere en çok “*yönlendirme*” davranışının sebep olduğu görülmüştür. Rehber öğretim elemanlarıyla yapılan görüşmelerde de onların kendi davranışlarını algılamaları ile gerçekte görüşmelerde sergiledikleri davranışların farklı olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçların hizmet öncesi eğitime, öğretmenlik uygulamasına ve rehber öğretim elemanlarının eğitilmesine olan yansımaları incelenmiştir.

## ABSTRACT

The universality and importance of the practicum where student teachers have the chance to practice teaching in school settings cannot be underestimated. In this process, supervisors are one of the key figures in the development of student teachers and the interactions of supervisors and student teachers have always been a concern for researchers. Studies investigating the interactions of supervisors and student teachers have mostly concentrated on post-observation conferences where supervisors and student teachers reflect about student teachers' teaching in schools. These studies have investigated the speech of both supervisors and student teachers in terms of discourse features, the power relationships between the parties and the styles of supervisors in giving feedback to student teachers. However, studies investigating the styles of supervisors in pre-observation conferences have not been found in literature.

This study was designed to find out the supervisory styles of a novice and an experienced supervisor in pre-observation conferences, the effects of the styles on the lesson plans and the perceptions of the supervisors on their styles. This triangulation in the collection of the data helped to get more reliable and sound results.

The data were collected by audio-recording of pre-observation conferences of two supervisors (each supervising 6 student teachers), by collecting lesson plans of student teachers and by carrying out a structured interview. The transcribed data obtained from the pre-observation conferences were analyzed in terms of specific behaviors such as listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, presenting, problem solving, negotiating, directing, standardizing and reinforcing. In analysing the data, Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization was used. However, it was seen that there were other behaviors emerged and these behaviors were categorized according to Constant Comparative Method. The other categories added were checking understanding, reminding, humour and giving examples. The frequencies of all behaviors were taken and listed. Using the frequencies of all behaviors, the supervisory styles of the supervisors were detected and the behaviors of the novice and experienced supervisor were compared. Moreover, student teachers' lesson plans on which the supervisors gave feedback in the pre-observation conferences were compared with the

transcripts of the conferences in order to find the effects of supervisory styles on lesson plans. As a final step, a structured interview was carried out with the supervisors in order to detect their perceptions of the styles they used in the conferences. Another aim was to get the reflections of the supervisors on the findings, and to find whether there were differences between their perceptions of their behaviors in pre-observation conferences and which behaviors they actually employed in pre-observation conferences. This session was also recorded and transcribed.

Having analyzed the data, it was found that the novice and the experienced supervisor applied a wide range of behaviors. The mostly used behaviors such as clarifying, reflecting and directing were more or less the same with the two supervisors. It was seen that the mostly applied styles were Directive Informational, Directive Control and Collaborative styles. The differences included the length of the conferences, the variety of behaviors applied, the number of behaviors and the use of certain behaviors more than the other categories. The lesson plans of student teachers revealed that the student teachers applied changes in their lesson plans after pre-observation conferences and the behavior that caused the change was directing. The interview session showed that the perceptions of the supervisors on their supervisory behaviors were different from their actual behaviors in the conferences. A number of implications were drawn from the study for pre-service teacher education, teaching practicum and the training of supervisors in the final chapter.

## JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

İlknur İSTİFÇİ'nin "A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY ON THE STYLES OF SUPERVISORS IN PRE-OBSERVATION CONFERENCES" başlıklı tezi 20/03/2006 tarihinde, aşağıda belirtilen jüri üyeleri tarafından Anadolu Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngilizce Öğretmenliği Programında, Doktora tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

|                     | Adı-Soyadı                | İmza |
|---------------------|---------------------------|------|
| Üye (Tez Danışmanı) | : Doç.Dr.Hülya ÖZCAN      |      |
| Üye                 | : Prof.Dr.Aydan ERSÖZ     |      |
| Üye                 | : Prof.Dr.İlknur KEÇİK    |      |
| Üye                 | : Prof.Dr.Zülal BALPINAR  |      |
| Üye                 | : Yard.Doç.Dr.Aysel BAHÇE |      |

Prof.Dr. İlknur KEÇİK  
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank and express my appreciation to my thesis advisor, Asc. Prof. Dr. F. Hülya Özcan, for her contributions, guidance and patience.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. İlknur Keçik for her suggestions, support and help.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Aydan Ersöz for her valuable suggestions and support.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Zülal Balpınar for her suggestions.

I would like to thank Ass. Prof. Dr. Aysel Bahçe, Ass. Prof. Dr. Rıdvan Tunçel, Ass. Prof. Dr. Hasan Çekiç and Instructor İpek Gönen for their helps.

I am grateful to Dr. Zehra Karacaer for her suggestions and being the co-rater in the analysis of the data.

I am grateful to Bill Synder for his suggestions and ideas.

Many thanks go to my office-mate Meral Melek Ünver for her helps in transcribing and proofreading and her patience and support throughout the process.

Special thanks are for Handan Girginer, Figen Tezdiker and Özlem Uzun for their help and support.

I am grateful to my family and my husband's family for their supports.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to my great husband Kadir for his support, patience and help. My special thanks are for my son, Arda and my daughter, Damla for their patience and being good children.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|---|--------------------|
| TEZ ÖZÜ .....   | ii                 |
| ABSTRACT .....  | iv                 |
| JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI .....   | vi                 |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | vii                |
| ÖZGEÇMİŞ .....  | viii               |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....   | ix                 |
| LIST OF TABLES .....  | xii                |
| LIST OF FIGURES .....   | xiv                |
| <br>  |                    |
| <b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION</b>  |                    |
| 1.1. Introduction .....   | 1                  |
| 1.2. Teaching practice or practicum .....   | 1                  |
| 1.3. Significance of the Study .....  | 4                  |
| 1.4. Statement of Research Questions .....  | 11                 |
| 1.5. Limitations of the Study .....   | 12                 |
| 1.6. Terminology .....  | 12                 |
| <br>  |                    |
| <b>CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE</b>  |                    |
| 2.1. Introduction .....   | 14                 |
| 2.2. Teacher training, teacher development and teacher education...                       | 14                 |
| 2.2.1. Reflective teaching .....  | 16                 |
| 2.3. Practicum or teaching practice .....   | 19                 |
| 2.3.1. Supervision .....  | 22                 |
| 2.3.2. The role of supervisors in practicum .....   | 24                 |
| 2.3.2.1. Studies concerning the interactions of<br>supervisors and student teachers ..... | 31                 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 2.3.2.2. Supervisory styles/behaviors .....  | 34 |
| 2.3.2.3. Studies on supervisory styles ..... | 38 |
| 2.4. Summary .....                           | 39 |

### CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

|                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| 3.1. Introduction .....              | 40 |
| 3.2. Subjects .....                  | 41 |
| 3.3. Data collection procedure ..... | 42 |
| 3.4. Data analysis procedure .....   | 43 |

### CHAPTER 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 4.1. Overview of the study.....   | 50 |
| 4.2. Supervisory styles/behaviors in the pre-observation conferences  |    |
| 4.2.1. The novice supervisor's the first two pre-observation conferences .....  | 50 |
| 4.2.2. The novice supervisor's the last two pre-observation conferences .....   | 57 |
| 4.2.3. Comparison of the pre-observation conferences that were carried out by the novice supervisor at the beginning and at the end of the practicum .....      | 64 |
| 4.2.4. The experienced supervisor's the first two pre-observation conferences .....   | 64 |
| 4.2.5. The experienced supervisor's the last two pre-observation conferences .....  | 70 |
| 4.2.6. Comparison of the pre-observation conferences that were carried out by the experienced supervisor at the beginning and at the end of the practicum ..... | 75 |
| 4.3. Comparison of the novice and the experienced supervisor .....  | 76 |
| 4.4. The changes in the lesson plans .....  | 82 |
| 4.5. Supervisory styles/behaviors leading to changes .....  | 83 |
| 4.5.1. The lesson plans of student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor .....  | 83 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 4.5.2. The lesson plans of student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor .....                              | 85  |
| 4.5.3. Comparison of the lesson plans of student teachers who were supervised by the novice and the experienced supervisor ..... | 85  |
| 4.6. Interviews .....  | 87  |
| 4.6.1. The novice supervisor's interview .....   | 87  |
| 4.6.2. The experienced supervisor's interview .....  | 90  |
| 4.6.3. Interpretation of the novice supervisor's interview .....   | 91  |
| 4.6.4. Interpretation of the experienced supervisor's interview.....   | 92  |
| 4.6.5. Overall interpretation of the results .....   | 92  |
| <br>CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION  |     |
| 5.1. Summary of the study .....  | 94  |
| 5.2. Conclusions .....   | 95  |
| 5.3. Suggestions for pre-service teacher education .....   | 99  |
| 5.3. Suggestions for further research .....  | 102 |
| REFERENCES .....   | 103 |
| APPENDICES .....   | 112 |
| Appendix A:  |     |
| Sample of a pre-observation conference carried out by the novice supervisor .....  | 113 |
| Appendix B:  |     |
| Sample of a pre-observation conference carried out by the experienced supervisor .....   | 117 |
| Appendix C:  |     |
| Sample of a first and second drafts of a lesson plan of a student teacher  |     |

## LIST OF TABLES

| <b><u>Table</u></b>  | <b><u>Page</u></b> |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. The supervisory continuum of behaviors.....   | 49                 |
| 2. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2. ....                             | 51                 |
| 3. The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2. ....                                | 55                 |
| 4. The skills taught in lesson plans 1. and 2. by the student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor .....      | 57                 |
| 5. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4. ....                             | 58                 |
| 6. The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4. ....                                | 62                 |
| 7. The skills taught in lesson plans 3. and 4. by the student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor.....       | 63                 |
| 8. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.....                         | 65                 |
| 9. The experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.....                            | 68                 |
| 10. The skills taught in lesson plans 1. and 2. by the student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor..... | 69                 |
| 11. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4. ....                       | 70                 |
| 12. The experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4.....                           | 74                 |
| 13. The skills taught in lesson plans 3. and 4. by the student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor..... | 75                 |
| 14. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors and styles in all pre-observation conferences .....                      | 80                 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>15.</b> The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors and styles in all pre-observation conferences ..... | 81 |
| <b>16.</b> The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in the lesson plans.....                | 84 |
| <b>17.</b> The experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in the lesson plans. ....          | 86 |

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1. The supervisory continuum of behaviors ..... 8

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Introduction

Teaching is an intelligent and purposeful activity intended to promote learning, focused on and relating to the learners themselves, adopting the best means to achieve that end and engaging the motivation of the learners to maximize their learning (Goodwyn, 1997:50).

Teaching is to touch someone's life forever since it is accepted as an art, as a craft, as a technology, or as a science (Richards & Crookes, 1988; Freeman & Richards, 1993). Hence, the role of teachers in our life cannot be underestimated. As teachers are very important figures in our lives, the importance of the education of teachers becomes a crucial issue.

The aim of teacher training programs is the preparation of effective teachers and teacher candidates experience practice teaching, carry out observations, participate in seminars and discussion activities for learning how to teach effectively (Richards, 1987). According to Richards (1990), in second language teaching, teacher education programs typically include a knowledge base, drawn from linguistics and language learning theory, and a practical component, based on language teaching methodology and an opportunity for practice teaching. Freeman and Johnson (1998) point out that educating pre-service language teachers is not about giving them only the necessary knowledge about language, language learning and language teaching; but also teaching them several language teaching methodologies, and providing them with a teaching practice opportunity where they try and struggle to put what they have learnt theoretically into practice. For successful language teaching, both education and practical training are needed in the "tools" of the teaching profession: in methods, materials, curriculum and evaluation (Pennington, 1990).

#### 1.2. Teaching practice or practicum

The practice teaching course or practicum is the major opportunity for the student teacher to acquire the practical skills and knowledge needed to function as an

effective language teacher. That's why the practicum or practice teaching experience is the central component in many teacher education programs. Through teaching experience the student teacher has a chance to apply theoretical knowledge and skills gained beforehand or to develop strategies for handling different dimensions of a language lesson. In other words, teaching experience allows the student to develop practical skills from theory learned and the purpose is to facilitate the growth of the student through professional learning experience. It also provides an area where knowledge and skills can be developed. In particular, it can help the student teacher develop self knowledge and knowledge of the students as a result of observing and working with real students, teachers, and curriculum in natural settings through practicum (Richards & Nunan, 1990). Pennington (1990) states that practical training experiences also assist in the development of attitudes that are open to differing perspectives and to modification through experience. "The culminating or capstone practicum in teacher preparation is typically student teaching in which the candidate gradually assumes total teaching responsibility under the joint supervision of a cooperating teacher and a university supervisor" (Huling, 2001:5).

Practicum is largely dependent on supervised practice teaching; the choice of cooperating teacher and the kind of supervision provided are clearly key factors in determining the success of the practicum (Richards, 1990; Richards & Crookes, 1988). Since practicum is a key aspect of a teacher education program; a poor practicum experience may be of little or no value (Beck & Kosnik, 2002).

As research in this area suggests, the supervision of student teachers is a complex and multifaceted process, and it has the potential to be a major force in the restructuring of teaching and teacher education. For Rust (1988) a good pre-service supervision includes teaching experience, the ability to reflect on practice and the ability to talk about teaching. According to Malderez (2001), mentoring or supervision can be described as the support given by one (usually more experienced) person for the growth and learning of another, and for their integration into and acceptance by a specific school community. As Sloboda (1986) states, real life skills are usually learnt with the aid of some coaching and appropriate feedback on practice is essential to skill acquisition. Supervisors are key figures in supervision since they help student teachers move toward an understanding of effective teaching and they are responsible for the



growth of student teachers. They are expected to provide a model of instruction, a source of support, feedback and evaluation (Shantz & Brown, 1999). Therefore, the ability to form and sustain a good relationship between a student teacher and a supervisor is more important than certain knowledge and skill factors. During practicum, supervisors supervise the students before and after the students engage in practice teaching. They act as mediators between university and schools where practice teaching takes place by facilitating dialogue between the student teachers and cooperating teachers and by negotiating between the student teachers' current thinking and the existing classroom practices (Freidus, 2002:75).

Supervisors conduct pre-observation conferences where they give feedback on student teachers' lesson plans. Student teachers make necessary modifications in their lesson plans and then supervisors observe their actual teaching in class. In post-observation conferences, supervisors reflect about their observations, comment on student teachers' teaching and plan about future teaching. Supervisors' knowledge needs to be accompanied by interpersonal skills for communicating with student teachers and technical skills for planning, assessing, observing and evaluating instructional improvement (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004).

Another crucial role of the supervisors in practice teaching is to assist student teachers and cooperating teachers, set directions for requirements, evaluation, or assessment of the student teacher's experience in the school site; and they make critical contributions to the student teachers' progress. Thus, supervised teaching experiences constitute the core of the practicum (Zimpher, de Voss & Nott, 1980).

"Effective supervision is a debated area and factors such as incongruent role expectations by cooperating teachers and university supervisors, lack of substantive communication and collaboration may hamper the process" (Kauffman, 1992:2). These barriers to effective supervision can be overcome by means of training university supervisors to reconceptualize their roles, training cooperating teachers to analyze their own teaching and supervisory techniques and selecting and matching the triad members (student teachers, supervisors and cooperating teachers) in a systematic way. Thus, a working relationship based on mutual respect and understanding for each other's expertise, perspectives and roles is inevitable (Boydell, 1986; Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

As Maynard and Furlong (1994) state, thinking critically about teaching and learning is essential and this notion demands open-mindedness and involves confronting beliefs and values about their roles since they adopt different roles. Supervisors change their roles to facilitate reflective process. This is difficult and challenging work but it is an essential element in what a true supervisor must be. Effective mentoring is therefore a difficult and demanding task and teachers performing the role need the time and in-service support appropriate to the increased responsibilities being placed on them. Being the most important part of teacher education, the role of supervisors in practicum process become central since supervisors develop student teachers' cognition that underlie their professional knowledge and performance. Thus, they help student teachers make sense of their work in ways that will translate into future practice (Koerner & Rust, 2002).

### **1.3. Significance of the Study**

In Turkey, graduates of Departments of Foreign Language Education, Departments of English or American Language and Literature and The English medium Department of Linguistics become teachers of English. Among these, the students who graduate from Departments of Foreign Language Education get extensive pre-service teacher training since methodology courses are in the curricula of these departments. According to the regulations of Council of Higher Education, the practicum process spreads to the whole year of fourth class consisting micro-teaching in the first term and practice teaching or school experience in the second term.

Student teachers at Education Faculty of Anadolu University are required to have practicum on their last year of the faculty. In the first term, they go to secondary schools, observe cooperating teachers and teach a small portion of the lesson (micro teaching). In the second term, on the other hand, they go to secondary schools for 6 hours a week for practice teaching. For the first and second weeks, groups consisting of three students only observe the cooperating teacher. Then, they start teaching and they have to teach at least 8 times. Before teaching, cooperating teacher determines the subject they teach and s/he can see the lesson plan before the actual teaching. Supervisors observe student teachers' teaching 2 to 6 times in the term. Before every teaching session, they read the lesson plans and give feedback. Student teachers make

necessary changes in their plans and consequently, in their teaching. After teaching, they meet with their supervisors and reflect on their teaching. Every supervisor is responsible of 25-30 student teachers.

Interaction between supervisors and the student teachers is of utmost importance and it offers student teachers opportunities to change their teaching behavior. Professional growth of student teachers can be enhanced or retarded by the quality of the dialogue between supervisor and student teacher since conversations between them are central to developing student teachers' cognitions that underlie their professional knowledge and performance (Timperley, 2001; John, 2001). By providing student teachers with opportunities to change their teaching behaviors through interaction, supervisors are also providing student teachers with opportunities to raise their questions and to make decisions (Gebhard, 1990).

Conferencing between the supervisor and the student teacher is one of the critical activities between supervisors and student teachers in supervision process. They are good opportunities to develop some specific aspect of the student teacher's performance such as teaching procedure, development of plans and ideas, or the acquisition of information about school, teaching or pupils. A conference helps student teachers view their role more clearly, and it provides the needed direction for better action. Weller (2001) points out that conferences conducted on a regular basis in an area free from distractions can provide a valuable vehicle for continuous feedback and promote an interchange of ideas. According to Drafall and Grant (1994), conferences should focus on the continued progress of the student teachers' instructional skill, i.e. the remarks of the supervisor should correspond to the student teachers' developmental level. Related literature suggests two aspects of supervisory behavior for the conferences to be successful: 1) effective interpersonal communication skills, and 2) the implementation of systematic conferencing procedures (Hoover, O'Shea & Carroll, 1988).

Implementing successful interpersonal communication skills in conferences help student teachers improve their performance. As Hoover et. al (1988) state there are some constructs in effective interactive communication such as unconditional positive regard, empathy and congruence, and these constructs can be seen overtly in conferences in the form of attending behaviors, using open-ended responses,

paraphrasing/clarifying responses, facilitating by giving honest feedback and encouragement.

Conferences can be divided into two parts as pre-observation conference and post-observation conference. During the pre-observation conference the supervisor clarifies the purpose of the lesson, and identifies specific goals the teacher is planning to accomplish and the goals the teacher has identified for the students to accomplish. By emphasizing the need for planning for instruction, the supervisor assists the student teacher in developing instructional objectives, selecting appropriate audio-visual material to support and facilitate instruction, incorporating a variety of teaching strategies into the instructional program. Furthermore, lesson plans are examined; the supervisor takes this opportunity to clarify question, discuss specific issues about the lesson content or modifications for particular students in the upcoming class, or offer suggestions prior to the lesson. The role of the supervisor is like an advisor who tries to build relationships with student teachers by establishing the kind of trust that promotes risk taking and exploration. In post-observation conferences, on the other hand, the supervisor encourages student teachers to articulate their intended goals, reflect on the design and implementation of their lessons, and consider the ways in which the lessons were successful or unsuccessful (Freidus, 2002).

Research suggests that lesson plans are essential ingredients of effective supervision process and they constitute the core of pre-observation conferences. Toney (1991) points out that a lesson plan is a road map and it includes the introduction, the body, the opportunity for questions, and the summary. Although there are variations on lesson planning, the aim is to achieve instructional competence in the classroom. For Weller (2001), planning efforts foster candid communication between supervisor and intern, and provide the intern with a “road map” which becomes the foundation for more comprehensive planning. Through making available a series of lesson plans and demonstrating their use in the classroom, the supervising teacher provides an example for expediting the transition of the intern from the role of an observer to that of a practitioner. By emphasizing the need for planning for instruction, the supervising teacher assists the intern in developing instructional objectives, selecting appropriate audio-visual material to support and facilitate instruction, incorporating a variety of

teaching strategies into the instructional program and using student test results as a basis for planning for instruction (Weller, 2001:215).

In examining the lesson plans, the supervisor clarifies questions, discusses specific issues about the lesson content or modifications for particular students in the upcoming class, or offers suggestions prior to the lesson. Student teachers modify their lesson plans in the light of feedback they receive from their supervisors in the pre-observation conferences and in actual teaching they use their modified plans. Student teachers can also use the pre-observation conference to ask questions or to discuss any information that would be pertinent to the observation. The pre-observation conference allows the supervisor to gather information prior to actual observation, and thus enhance the validity and reliability of the observation.

Supervisors have different styles and behaviors in supervising student teachers and their styles may be called as nondirective, collaborative, directive informational and directive control. These categories permit for varying degrees of guidance by the supervisor and for varying degrees of ownership by the student teacher (see Figure 1). In the directive approach, the outcome is a supervisor-assigned plan. With the directive informational approach, the outcome is a supervisor-suggested plan. For the collaborative approach, the outcome is a mutual plan, for the nondirective approach the outcome is a student teacher self-plan (Rettig, Lampe & Garcia, 2000). Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) have developed a supervisory behavior continuum to focus the supervisor's tasks and relationships with student teachers in these four categories (see Table 1 for a detailed continuum of behaviors and their definitions). They also categorize each style in terms of behaviors and they claim that these 10 behaviors seem to appear in every style but with a different sequence.

**Figure 1**

|       |              |               |                         |             |               |   |   |   |   |    |
|-------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|----|
|       | 1            | 2             | 3                       | 4           | 5             | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|       | Listening    | Encouraging   | Presenting              | Negotiating | Standardizing |   |   |   |   |    |
| T     | Clarifying   | Reflecting    | Problem Solving         | Directing   | Reinforcing   |   |   |   |   |    |
|       | t            |               |                         |             |               |   |   |   |   |    |
| <hr/> |              |               |                         |             |               |   |   |   |   |    |
| s     | Nondirective | Collaborative | Directive-Informational | Directive   |               |   |   |   |   |    |
|       | S            |               |                         |             |               |   |   |   |   |    |

Note: T: Maximum teacher responsibility  
t: Minimum teacher responsibility  
s: Minimum supervisor responsibility  
S: Maximum supervisor responsibility

Research to date has shown that a particular style is not necessarily better than others and effectiveness of different supervisory styles or approaches is dependent on characteristics of individuals. That is to say, supervisors employ their conferencing styles according to their student teachers.

Reviewing the related literature, it has been found that there have been studies concerning the supervisory practice and supervisors' conceptual frameworks (Rust, 1986; Zeichner, 1983; Boydell, 1986), characteristics of good supervision (Koerner & Rust, 2002; Kauffman, 1992; Freidus, 2002; Borders, 1994; Dye, 1994; Hart, 1994; Bourke, 2001), supervisory discourse (John, 2001; Roberts, 1994; Lopez-Real, Stimpson & Bunton 2001; Tsui, Law, Tang & Shum, 2001; Zeichner et.al, 1988) and supervisor-intern relationship (Hoover et.al, 1988). As Tsui et al. (2001) state most studies of supervision were based on questionnaires or interviews; relatively few investigated the actual supervisory process. The exceptions include a study by Zeichner and Liston (1985) that investigated the quality of thinking as revealed in supervisory conferences between supervisors and student teachers; a study by Zeichner and colleagues (1988) that focused on the form and substance of the discourse between the university supervisor and the student teacher; a study by Roberts (1994) that

investigated supervisory discourse as a potentially face-threatening event; and a study by Waite (1992) that analyzed conference discourse from an anthropological linguistic perspective.

There are few studies comparing novice and experienced supervisors. Rust (1988) compared novice and experienced supervisors in terms of supervisory experience and ability to reflect on and talk about practice by collecting journals from them. One of the findings of Rust's study was that novice supervisors appeared to go through stages similar to those of teachers. Another finding was that novice supervisors' primary concern were role and methods whereas experienced supervisors focused more on their students' placement and progress, i.e. they wanted their student teachers to achieve a full professional life, not just technical competence.

It is important to define experienced and novice supervisors at this stage. Unfortunately, there is no clear cut definition of experienced and new supervisors in literature. According to Rust (1988), experienced supervisors are experienced teachers who have one or more years of supervisory experience, and new supervisors are the ones who are participants in a pre-service internship programme (teachers who have three or fewer years of teaching experience are defined as novice teachers by Freeman, 2001). For Borders (1994), novices are characterized as self-doubtful, leery of being evaluative or confrontive, tending to be highly supportive and/or didactic, concrete, structured, and task-oriented; they seem to have personalized supervision styles that remain stable across supervisees. Waite (1994) suggests that supervisors seem to follow a similar path of teachers' developmental growth. According to Borders (1994) supervisors receive no training for their role, but change with experience and age. However, Wiles and Bondi (2000) claim that supervisors should have minimum two years of classroom teaching and one year of leadership experience, and they should prepare themselves for this role by having certification with courses and experience in supervision, curriculum instruction, educational psychology and leadership.

Supervisor training is an important area since supervisors are responsible of monitoring and guiding the progress of student teachers. Rust (1988) suggests that teacher education programs should employ supervisor training because supervisors have the potential to enhance the effectiveness of teacher education. Supervisor training balances supervision activities in an institution since there are new and experienced

supervisors. According to Rust (ibid.) novice supervisors need guidance and modeling of supervisory practice and they can be helped to develop a reflective capacity. As Rust (1988) states supervisors need to be taught directly and practically how to do the 'basics' of supervision - how to read and respond to journals, how to conference and what to look for in a classroom. For Bourke (2001), setting up a mentoring course for supervisors in order to ensure that they share a common theoretical and methodological background that emphasizes reflection is essential since the most important role of a supervisor is being a mentor.

In the light of above mentioned studies, the first purpose of the study is to find the supervisory styles/approaches of the supervisors by examining the interaction between supervisors and student teachers while they are examining the lesson plans in pre-observation conferences. This study aims to find out the effect of supervisory styles on student teachers' lesson planning and how supervisors having different supervisory styles comment on the plans in pre-observation conferences since objective data is important in refining and changing behaviors. Thus, this study aims at raising supervisors' consciousness on conferences. As Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) state understanding how we behave as supervisors and then refining our present behaviors are the first steps toward acquiring new interpersonal behaviors. "We need to check the validity of our own perceptions because invalidity of perceptions creates cognitive dissonance that is based on the premise that a person cannot live with contradictory psychological evidence-that is, thinking of himself or herself in one way while other sources of information indicate that he or she is different" (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:137). When supervisors learn their behaviors, they can change their behaviors, i.e., they may develop a repertoire of supervisory styles or approaches, and they may match their supervisory style to student teachers' developmental levels.

The second purpose of the study is to find out whether there are differences between the pre-observation conferences that were carried out at the beginning and the pre-observation conferences that were carried out at the end of the practicum process.

The third purpose of the study is to detect differences or similarities between the novice and the experienced supervisor in terms of supervisory styles they employ in pre-observation conferences. The pre-observation conferences of the novice and



experienced supervisor may give insights on the feedback they give on the lesson plans, which behaviors/styles they accept, how they adjust their supervisory styles according to the developmental level of student teachers and how they develop as supervisors.

The fourth purpose of the study is to examine the lesson plans and find out the differences and similarities between the first and second drafts of the lesson plans.

The fifth purpose of the study is to compare lesson plans and the transcripts of the interviews in order to find which supervisory styles or behaviors led changes in the lesson plans.

The sixth purpose of the study is to learn the perceptions of the novice and the experienced supervisor on their styles and to detect whether there are differences between their perceptions and their actual styles in the pre-observation conferences.

#### **1.4. Statement of Research Questions**

In the light of the findings stated above, this study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the supervisory styles/behaviors employed by the novice and experienced supervisor in pre-observation conferences?
2. Are there any differences or similarities between the pre-observation conferences carried out at the beginning and at the end of the practicum in terms of styles?
3. What are the differences between the novice and the experienced supervisor in terms of supervisory styles?
4. What kind of changes did the student teachers do in their revised lesson plans?
5. Which supervisory style caused the changes in the lesson plans?
6. What are the novice and the experienced supervisor's perceptions of their styles? Are there differences between their perceptions and the styles they actually employed in pre-observation conferences?

By finding the supervisory behaviors/styles of the novice and experienced supervisor, differences and similarities between novice and experienced supervisor in terms of their supervisory styles, finding the type of changes in the lesson plans and the type of supervisory style/behaviors that caused the change in the plans, this study hopes to give some insights on pre-observation conferences and supervisory styles. Thus, the supervisors may have a chance to evaluate their supervisory styles, make some changes and plan their future studies.

### **1.5. Limitations of the study**

This study is limited to a teacher education context in Turkey. The participants of the study are two supervisors and their 12 student teachers in AU-ELT department so the findings of the study cannot be generalized to other contexts.

The nature of the study is descriptive since the study aims to find the supervisory behaviors of the novice and the experienced supervisor, compare their supervisory behaviors, examine the lesson plans, find the behaviors which lead to changes in the lesson plans and get the reflections of supervisors on their supervisory behaviors.

The data of the study consisted of audio recordings of the conferences, lesson plans of the student teachers and audio recording of the reflection sessions with the two supervisors. Other data collection methods such as surveys, questionnaires, journals and observation were not used in this study.

The data were analyzed qualitatively; and the quantitative analysis of the data was limited to the frequencies and percentages.

### **1.6. Terminology**

The following terms will be used throughout the study in order to be consistent with the literature:

The terms student teacher, pre-service teacher, trainee, intern and teacher candidate all refer to anyone engaged in learning to teach through a formal educational setting such as practicum or the students in teacher education programs who are teaching in schools in practicum.

The terms supervisor, university-based teacher educator, university tutor, teacher educator, mentor and teacher trainer all refer to the teachers who facilitate student teachers' learning process and help them develop as future teachers.

The terms practice teaching, teaching practice and practicum refer to the placement of student teachers in certain schools as part of their teacher education programs under the supervision of expert teachers.

The following terms will be used in this study:

- student teachers for the students of teacher education programs who are engaged in teaching in practicum,
- practicum for student teachers' placements in certain schools under the supervision of expert teachers,
- supervisors for the teachers who facilitate student teachers' learning process by employing observation and conferences, help them develop as future teachers and work at the university.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

This chapter will start with the definition of teacher training, teacher development and teacher education, give brief information about teacher training models, explain what reflective teaching is, define practice teaching or practicum, supervision, the role of supervisors in practicum and the supervisory styles. Since the main focus of the study is the conferences between supervisors and student teachers, studies concerning the interactions of supervisors and student teachers, and supervisory styles will be reviewed.

#### **2.2. Teacher training, teacher development and teacher education**

Research to date suggests various definitions about teacher training, teacher development and teacher education. As Kocaman (1992) states, teacher training is an important aspect of ELT education and is a well-planned, continuous process. Larsen-Freeman (1983) makes a distinction between teacher training and teacher education:

Teacher training involves a situation-oriented approach, characterized by finite objectives, in which trainees master a particular model of teaching. Teacher education, on the other hand, involves an individual-oriented approach with a focus on developing decision-making and hypothesis-generating skills. The emphasis is on the process rather than on a specific method or model of teaching (Larsen-Freeman, 1983).

Teacher training has been mostly defined as preparation for professional practice usually through formal courses at colleges or universities. Teacher development, on the other hand, usually refers to professional learning by teachers already engaged in professional practice, usually through reflective discussion sessions based on current classroom experience. Freeman (1982; cited in Hockly, 2000:122) describes teacher training and teacher development 'not as opposites but as part of a continuum' in which pre-service teachers' needs are initially for 'training', and only afterwards, once certain basic techniques and skills have been mastered, can 'development' be focused on. She claims that teachers who are learning to teach have a 'hierarchy of needs', through which they pass 'on the road from training to development'.

As Roe (1992) points out the term ‘teacher training’ has begun to be replaced by the terms as ‘teacher development’, ‘teacher preparation’ and ‘teacher education’. He suggests that the use of ‘development’ and ‘education’ may have long-term implications because they take place over a time-scale longer than the limits of any period of institutionalized pre-service or in-service training. The process, whatever it is, takes place not in the institution but in the person concerned. Ur (1997) states that the terms “training” and “development” may be used interchangeably to refer to the pre-service and in-service teacher training courses.

Reviewing the related literature, it has been found that there are different teacher training models. Wallace (1991) offers three models as the craft, applied science and reflective models. The craft model means learning teaching in the way apprentices learn crafts: the novice watches and imitates a master teacher, and obeys the master teacher’s directions for improvement. This model implies that teaching is a practical skill. In the applied science model, teachers learn to be teachers by being taught research-based theories, and then applying them in practice. This model implies that the most important professional knowledge is generalizable theory. According to reflective model, teachers learn by reflecting on their own experience and apply what they have learned in order to develop the professional abilities further.

Ellis (1990) divides teacher preparation practices into two types as experiential and awareness-raising practices. Experiential practices involve the student teacher in actual teaching through teaching practice or simulated practice and this type of experiential practice is more common in pre-service courses.

According to Zeichner et al. (1988) teacher training can be divided into two models. The traditional-craft orientation aims to bring to each teacher the knowledge, dispositions and skills of experienced practitioners and the main goal is to assist novice teachers in attaining technical competence. Inquiry-oriented approach, on the other hand, aims to develop in student teachers habits of active, persistent and careful examination of educational beliefs and practices. Thus, student teachers are encouraged to reflect and examine the most effective and efficient means, question the assumptions embedded in educational practices (Zeichner, *ibid.*).

Competency approach is another model which is based on the assumption that teaching can be broken down into sets of hierarchically arranged skills that the student

has to master to specified levels (Boydell, 1986). This approach deals with the mechanistic view of teacher education program guided by the pre-determined outcomes which serve as the basis for the professional development of teachers, supervision of teaching activities and the evaluation of the curriculum process (Luitel, 2002).

According to constructivist approach, student teachers observe and are observed by others, so they reassess their pedagogical practices and assumptions, and gradually build individual theories of teaching. This approach includes reflection on participant's own beliefs and practice into the process of learning about different classroom approaches (Klapper, 2001). As Tardif (2001) states, students' pre-existing notions are the starting point for a process of negotiating a satisfactory role within a broader vision of good practice in this model. Learning to teach is equivalent to learning to deal with one's own conceptions in relation to the expectations of university, school and society. In short, learning about teaching must necessarily take into account the subjectivity of future teachers (Tardif, *ibid*:4).

Since there are different teacher training approaches and models, it is difficult to accept one model and apply it in training future teachers. As Luitel (2002) suggests, a single teacher education/training approach cannot render a practical teacher education model in preparing teachers for the challenging and hi-tech future school contexts. Thus, eclectic model may be applied in designing the teacher-training program.

### **2.2.1. Reflective teaching**

Reflective approach to teaching can be explained as the one in which teachers and student teachers collect data about teaching, examine their attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, and teaching practices, and use the information obtained as a basis for critical reflection about teaching (Richards & Lockhart, 1996:1). Reflective teaching is a developing process in which the teacher implements various tasks according to the needs of the students. There is a close relationship between reflective teaching and teacher development because reflective teaching allows teachers to experiment and examine their relations with students, their abilities, successes and failures. It aims to develop teachers professionally by making them aware of looking critically at their own

teaching practices, apply new methods of teaching and reconstruct their own educational perspective.

An empowered teacher is a reflective decision maker who finds joy in learning and in investigating the teaching/learning process – one who views learning as construction and teaching as a facilitating process to enhance and enrich development (Fosnot, 1989:xi).

For Schon (1987), reflective practice is thinking through one's own experiences, putting knowledge to practice while under the supervision of experienced experts in the field (cited in Ferraro, 1999:1). As Ferraro (ibid.) states reflective practice is used at both pre-service and in-service levels of teaching, and coaching and peer involvement are seen most often at pre-service level. According to her, the primary benefit of reflective practice for teachers is a deeper understanding of their own teaching style and ultimately, greater effectiveness as a teacher.

As Farrell (1998) states reflective teaching can benefit ESL/EFL teachers in four main ways: (1) reflective teaching helps free the teachers from impulse and routine behavior, (2) it allows teachers to act in a deliberate, intentional manner and avoid the "I don't know what I will do today" syndrome, (3) it distinguishes teachers as educated human beings since it is one of the signs of intelligent action, (4) as teachers gain experience in a community of professional educators, they feel the need to grow beyond the initial stages of survival in the classroom to reconstructing their own particular theory from their practice (Farrell, 1998:16).

Reflective practice can be seen as teaching which involves constant inquiry about one's own teaching and then attempting to take a more systematic approach to practices and to work with others who have such common interests and questions as yours (Pickett, 1999).

According to Richards (1998) the benefits of reflections are:

1. Reflection provides feedback that is thought important for teachers' professional development.
2. It gives teachers the chance to reflect on their teaching.
3. It aids teachers close the gap between their imaged view of teaching and their real teaching.
4. It helps teachers to see whether their classroom applications work or fail.

According to Taggart and Wilson (1998), reflective teaching:

- allows experimentation and sharing of teaching experiences
- fosters self-review and peer review of teaching skills
- provides an opportunity to observe others
- provides an atmosphere that promotes peer communication
- allows practitioners to come to value practical knowledge
- develops collegiality
- focuses on insights into teaching (p.121).

Teaching journals, lesson reports, surveys and questionnaires, audio and video recordings, observation and action research are the suggested tools of reflection (Richards and Lockhart,1996). These tools can be used in both pre-service and in-service teacher training.

Reflective practice is founded on the assumption that increased awareness of one's own professional performance can result in considerable improvement in performance (Blase, 1998). For Schon (1987) the practitioner who is engaged in reflection as a builder of repertoire through inquiry, rather than a collector of procedures and methods. Reflective supervision is like using a lens or personal framework to view a newly encountered situation, and having an alternate lens available increases one's chances of dealing effectively with professional problems. By asking questions, avoiding judgments, and guiding a teacher through a process of inquiry, a supervisor may help a teacher view a dilemma through an alternate lens (Schon, 1987). The practice of reflection provides new insight into the meaning of teaching events; it is also a vehicle for developing metateaching skills, that is, the ability to think about the thinking of teaching (Marchant, 1989; cited in Blase, 1998:84).

Proponents of reflective teaching suggest that experience alone is insufficient for professional growth, and that experience coupled with reflection is a much more powerful impetus for development (Bartlett, 1990). Reflection has a double meaning; it involves the relationship between an individual's thought and action and the relationship between an individual teacher and his or her membership in society.

Richards and Lockhart (1996) claim that critical reflection involves examining teaching experiences as a basis for evaluation and decision making and as a source for change. It involves posing questions about how and why things are the way they are,



what value systems they represent, what alternatives might be available, and what the limitations are of doing things one way as opposed to another (Richards and Lockhart,1996:4).

As Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) state critical reflection is the processing of information gained through innovation in relation to the teacher's existing schema for teaching and it should be pivotal in the development of professional teachers. Becoming a critically reflective teacher is not only intended to allow us to develop ourselves individually and collectively; to deal with contemporary events and structures and not to take these structures for granted but also to involve the realization that as second language teachers, we are both the producers and creators of our own history. Asking 'why' and 'what' questions gives us a certain power over our teaching (Bartlett, 1990).

According to Gale and Jackson (1997), critically reflective teachers take into account the broader issues of teaching and learning when constructing the meaning of the problems they face and they act on the basis of reflecting on their practice and the environment in which they practice so they give their actions more than just a technical meaning.

### **2.3. Practicum or teaching practice**

Learning to teach is a process that continues throughout a teacher's career and no matter what we do in our teacher education programs and no matter how well we do it, at best we can only prepare teachers to begin teaching. Consequently, teacher educators must be committed to helping prospective teachers internalize the dispositions and skills to study their teaching and to become better at teaching over time, that is, to help teachers take responsibility for their own professional development (Zeichner, 1992, cited in Richards and Lockhart, 1996:202).

Teaching practice or practicum can be described as a process in which student teachers are required to teach actual students in real classrooms, or in simulated practice, and experience experiential practices (Ellis, 1990). Practicum also requires guided, systematic and focused observation of student teachers by supervisors. Participating in a formal program of observation, student teachers can: 1) develop a terminology for understanding and discussing the teaching process, 2) develop an awareness of the principles and decision making that underlie effective teaching, 3) distinguish between effective and ineffective classroom practices, 4) identify techniques and practices they can apply to their own teaching (Day, 1990).

According to Zeichner (1990), the primary purpose of teaching practicum is to give the to-be teachers a chance to prepare themselves as future teachers. Pre-service teachers see teaching practicum as the most important constituent of their teaching experience and as a vital component of their teacher education.

For Koerner and Rust (2002), student teaching is the culminating experience in a teacher education program; for good or ill, this experience has a significant impact on the student teacher who must juggle the responsibilities of teaching while establishing and developing relationships with one or more cooperating teachers and a university supervisor. Thus, student teaching is a complicated emotional and interpersonal experience that is often critically important to the making of a teacher.

As Merç (2004) states the practicum in teacher education programs are composed of mainly five aspects: a) student teachers as the active participants of the practicum, b) university supervisors as the experts to help student teachers before and after they practice teaching, c) cooperating teachers as the experts helping student teachers in their practicum schools, d) students as the receivers of knowledge that student teachers present during their practice teaching, and e) educational context and system that student teachers are required to complete their student teaching requirements in.

For Chapman (1999), practicum encourages the learners to think critically and to constantly redefine the content and process of the learning experience, and the practicum is expected to heighten individual awareness of community issues, motivate learners to create opportunities, embrace new ideas and give direction to positive change.

Teaching practices are stress-creating experiences due to factors such as lack of role clarification, the evaluation procedure, not knowing the expectations of the cooperating teacher and the supervisor, and lack of time to talk with the cooperating teacher (Murray-Harvey et al 2000, MacDonald 1992). Practicum is both valuable and the most stressful component of the teacher education programs.

According to Gower et al. (1995), teaching practice focuses on four areas: 1) sensitivity to problems of language use for learners, 2) sensitivity to how learners learn,

the skills they need, the strategies they employ and the problems they have, 3) classroom management skills, 4) teaching techniques.

Freeman (1990) uses the term intervention to refer to the way in which the teacher educator expresses specific perceptions and input about the practice teaching to the student teacher. For him, intervention in practice teaching is based on the view that the student teacher can be helped to teach more effectively through the input and perceptions of the teacher educator, and he proposes three types of intervention as the directive option, the alternatives option and the nondirective option. In the directive option, the teacher educator comments on the student teacher's teaching and makes concrete proposals for change. The teacher educator "directs" and the student teacher "does". In the alternatives option, the educator chooses a point from the practice teaching, raises it with the student teacher and proposes a limited number of alternative ways to handle that point in the lesson. The student teacher rejects or selects from among the alternatives. In the nondirective option, the student teacher is provided with a forum to clarify perceptions of what he or she is doing in teaching and s/he is allowed to identify a course of action based on his or her own perceptions and what the educator offers, and to decide whether and how to act (Freeman, 1990:112).

Stating that candidates do not have actual chances to teach until the end of their program, Pennington (1990) proposes that a pre-practicum or two-phase practicum program in which students gain simulated and actual teaching experience in the middle of their graduate program may enhance integration of theory and practice.

Developing reflectivity in practicum is important because student teachers maximize their learning from the practicum and accept responsibility for their own professional development, and acknowledge that teaching, as well as being a practical and intellectual activity, is also a moral endeavor (Dobbins, 1996).

Dobbins (1996) claims that a reflective practicum has positive effects on student teachers, the supervisory personnel and the students. The supervisory personnel benefit from the learning aspect of the reflective practicum by thinking and by being more aware of the facts in the practicum. According to Dinkelman (2000), reflection can be taken as an aim of the pre-service teacher education. When student teachers are encouraged to reflect on their classroom practices, they will be reflective teachers, who

have the ability to thoroughly consider their strengths and weaknesses, and take the necessary measures for their future teaching.

As Gale and Jackson (1997) state, if teachers are to adopt reflecting with a collective and collaborative dimension in their professional lives, student teachers should be involved in these processes during their teacher preparation, and such activities involve a significant degree of risk-taking. Therefore, they claim, student teachers need a supportive context for their development as committed educators, a context which values reflection and enquiry, rejects the notion of educational and social contexts as being given, and encourages critical dialogue between professionals (Gale & Jackson, 1997).

Zuzovsky (1996, cited in Lunenberg, 1999) states that “without reflection, practice might become a drill” and teacher education programs should not only familiarize student teachers with techniques and skills they can use in the classroom, but also involve teachers in developing theories of teaching, understanding the nature of teacher decision making, developing the strategies for critical self awareness and self evaluation.

### **2.3.1. Supervision**

The dictionary definition of supervision is to “watch over”, “direct”, “oversee” and “superintend” and effective supervision requires knowledge, interpersonal skills, and technical skills (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004). Supervision is not the act of instructing students-that is, teaching- but rather the actions that enable teachers to improve instruction for students (Waite, 2000).

Effective supervision is a debated area and factors such as incongruent role expectations, i.e. assuming different roles by cooperating teachers, student teachers and university supervisors, lack of substantive communication and collaboration may hamper the process (Kauffman, 1992). These barriers to effective supervision can be overcome by means of training university supervisors to reconceptualize their roles, training cooperating teachers to analyze their own teaching and supervisory techniques and selecting and matching the triad members (student teachers, supervisors and cooperating teachers) in a systematic way. Thus, a working relationship based on mutual respect and understanding for each other’s expertise, perspectives and roles is

inevitable (Boydell, 1986; Richardson-Koehler, 1988). Although the related literature suggests various types of supervision, three of them such as clinical supervision, instructional supervision and developmental supervision will be mentioned in this study.

According to literature, clinical supervision is a valuable process which can be applied in pre-service and in-service teacher training programs. Teachers can gain lots of insights from this process and make changes or improvements in their teaching. Clinical supervision can be used in detecting what aspects of teaching needs development and it helps teachers reflect their performance in class. It is a cooperative process in which supervisor and teacher work together and decide the aspects which will be observed in class, method and period of observation. According to Acheson and Gall (1997) clinical supervision process has three phases such as planning conference, classroom observation and feedback conference. They claim that the aims of clinical supervision are as follows:

- To provide teachers with objective feedback on the current state of their instruction
- To diagnose and solve instructional problems
- To help teachers develop skill in using instructional strategies
- To evaluate teachers for promotion, tenure or other decisions
- To help teachers develop a positive attitude about continuous professional development (Acheson Gall, 1997:13).

As Gaies and Bowers (1990) state clinical supervision is an ongoing process of teacher development that is based on direct observation of classroom teaching performance and it aims at promoting more effective teaching.

Instructional supervision is one of the types of supervision that is used to describe a wide variety of processes carried out by a diverse group of educators within the context of educational institutions. The focus is on the teaching and learning that goes on and seeks to help teachers and supervisors collaboratively provide high quality learning experiences for students. It is a process that is collaborative in nature, requiring a cultural acceptance where an active partnership exists between and among students, teachers, and supervisors. Instructional supervision is a professional way to help teachers to grow by providing them objective feedback on their performance. It helps to identify and solve instructional problems and to form a positive attitude about continuous professional development (Glickman, 2002).

Developmental supervision is a term suggested by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) and it is developmental because the entry-level supervisory approach is matched with the teacher's current developmental levels and the immediate situation; and supervisory behaviors are gradually modified to promote and accommodate long-range teacher development toward higher levels of reflection and problem solving ability. According to them, there are three phases in developmental supervision: 1) In this phase, the supervisor diagnoses the teacher's developmental levels, expertise, commitment, and educational situation, and selects the interpersonal approach that creates the best supervisory match. 2) In this phase, the supervisor uses the selected interpersonal approach to assist the teacher in instructional problem solving. 3) In this phase, the supervisor changes his or her interpersonal behavior in the direction of less supervisor control and more teacher control (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004:152). For them, the long-term goal of developmental supervision is teacher development toward a point at which teachers, facilitated by supervisors, can assume full responsibility for instructional improvement.

### **2.3.2. The role of supervisors in practicum**

As Slick (1998) states the word supervisor comes from the Medieval Latin word, *supervidue* meaning to 'look over and oversee' and the supervisor title implies status and authority in the hierarchical structure of professional settings. In the United States, often a supervisor is either a faculty member who is given this role as an add-on to what is commonly a full teaching load or is an adjunct educator, sometimes a retired administrator or teacher, and in neither case are these educators afforded status or offered support in defining or enacting their roles. In larger universities a supervisor is often a graduate student teaching assistant who has very little status as a teacher educator within a university teacher education program (Slick, 1998).

Related literature suggests that supervisors contribute significantly and complement the interaction between the cooperating teacher and student teachers (Griffin, Barnes, Hughs, O'Neal, Defino, Edwards & Huckill, 1983; Koehler, 1984; Zahorick, 1988), and they are necessary to enhance the growth and development of student teachers, but their roles should be more clearly defined and/or changes (Emans, 1983; Zeichner & Teitelbaum, 1982). They perform liaison and support functions of a

personal nature and act as trouble-shooters and problem solvers to resolve communication problems (all cited in Slick 1997).

Weller (2001) points out that since the performance in student teaching is the single most important criterion for predicting success in inservice teachers, supervisors, therefore, must be exemplary and of the highest caliber if the internship phase of the program is to produce the desired end product -a highly competent, successful, practicing professional. Effective supervision requires essential competencies in areas such as coordinating a team approach, long and short range planning, interpersonal relations and conference skills, evaluation techniques, instructional skills and classroom management and professional role modeling (Weller, 2001:213).

When the role of the supervisors are taken into account, it is seen that the supervisors' main area of influence is in coaching in traditional teacher training models since they defined and communicated the purposes and expectations to be fulfilled by the student teacher and cooperating teacher. They had relatively little influence on student teachers and cooperating teachers. With the emergence of new approaches and models, the role of the supervisors have been questioned as to whether abolish the supervisor, reconceptualize the supervisor's role vis-à-vis the student teacher, and base the supervisor's work in the schools with teachers. According to Emans (1983), supervisors' role must be redesigned radically since they are the main change agents for schools and teacher education. They act as the liaison between the university and the schools, and by affecting the cooperating teacher and the student teacher, the supervisors indirectly affect the education at school.

According to Millwater & Yarrow (1997), university programs in the United States are focusing on renaming and redefining university supervisor's roles since the role of cooperating teachers are redefined and renamed. They propose that all teacher education programs might consider replacing the traditional supervisor with the title 'university-based teacher educator' and redefining the role of the university supervisors by validating their work at their school sites as well as at the university. Slick (1998) further claims that if teacher educators believe that supervisors are equal partners in education and can be important in supporting and guiding students in learning-to-teach-in-action, they need to be committed to helping to establish and define goals, support

supervisors (university-based teacher educators) and to recognize them as valuable and legitimate members of the teacher education communities.

Graham (1993) points out that if a teacher education program considers the reciprocal learning-to-teach and sharing-of-professional-insights benefits and goals of the student teaching experience, the supervisor should be viewed as a facilitator of these learning-to-teach opportunities, and she should be recognized as having the potential to enhance the teaching and learning agendas for both cooperating teachers and student teachers.

It has also been suggested in literature that not only do student teachers but also supervisors get some benefits in the supervision process (Kauffman, 1992; Beck & Kosnik, 2002). As Huling (2002) states supervisors improve their own professional competency, reflect about their supervisory relationships, renew themselves, increase their self-esteem, develop collegial interactions and examine their own practice and become more aware of the complexity of teaching when they assist their students.

Edwards and Collison (1996) suggest various ways in which supervisors might support or scaffold student teachers, including:

*listening to students; modeling teaching and general classroom management; observing students; negotiating with students, their own learning goals; supporting students while they teach; and providing constructive criticism....*

( Edwards and Collison 1996:27).

The supervisory relationship is subject to influence by personal characteristics of the participants and by a great many demographic variables such as gender, role, attitudes, supervisor's style, age, race and relationships dynamics. Conflict has been found to affect the supervisory relationship and originates from the power differential between the parties, differences relative to the appropriateness of technique, the amount of direction and praise, and willingness to resolve differences (Dye, 1994).

Apart from personality clashes, other problem area is the miscommunication that may appear in the conferences between student teachers and supervisors. Student teachers and the supervisors have some problems in their interactions because of different expectations and perceptions. Sometimes the feedback given by the supervisors in the pre-observation and post-observation conferences cannot be



understood by the students. Improving the quality of both supervisor and student teacher interaction is vital to the continued professionalisation of teaching (John, 2001: 166). “Learning blocks can be overcome if both coach and learner search actively for a convergence or negotiation of meaning through a dialogue of reciprocal reflection-in-action and this would mean both mentor/supervisor and student extending their ladder of reflection by adding an extra rung to it” (Schon, 1987).

According to Borders (1994), good supervisors have the following characteristics:

1. Good supervisors seem to have many of the qualities of good teachers and good counselors. They are empathic, genuine, open and flexible. They respect their supervisees as persons and as developing professionals, and are sensitive to individual differences of supervisees.
2. Good supervisors really enjoy supervision, are committed to helping the student grow and they commit themselves to the supervision enterprise. They evidence high levels of conceptual functioning, have a clear sense of their own strengths and limitations as a supervisor and can identify how their personal traits and interpersonal style may affect the conduct of supervision.
3. Good supervisors have a sense of humor which helps both the supervisor and the supervisee get through rough spots in their work together and achieve a healthy perspective on their work.
4. Good supervisors are knowledgeable; they have extensive training and wide experience of supervision.
5. Good supervisors have the professional skills of good teachers and consultants. They are able to function effectively in the roles of teacher, counselor and consultant, making informed choices about which role to employ at any given time with a particular supervisee

(Borders, 1994: 2).

Supervisors should, therefore, possess certain competencies such as understanding their role, initiating the relationship, establishing a climate of peer support, modeling reflective teaching practices, applying and sharing effective

classroom management strategies and embracing mentoring as an investment in professional development (Denmark & Podsen 2000). For Pajak (1993; cited in Chamberlain, 2000), sincerity, professional and intellectual respect, active listening, openness, genuine interest, supportiveness, expertise, loyalty, and trust are also some qualities of an effective supervisor. Trust, as stated by Chamberlain (2000), is a pervasive underlying construct in teacher-supervisor relationships; when trust is perceived, self-disclosure has the potential to increase and increased self-disclosure can afford greater opportunity for discussion and reflection, without established trust, the threat of supervision may hinder the process.

Supervisors are also responsible for facilitating reflection, they need to be reflective practitioners themselves and committed to the self-conscious development and enhancement of that reflective capacity. If learning to teach is at the heart of training then reflection on teaching must be part of that learning process. Supporting trainees in reflective process necessarily demands a shift in the role of the supervisor. To facilitate this process, supervisors need to be able to move from being a model and instructor to being a co-enquirer (Frost 1994). In promoting critical reflection a more equal and open relationship is essential. The aim of reflection must be to learn something wider and of more significance by “making the tacit explicit” (Freeman, 1990: 110). Thus, it allows the trainees to make their developing concepts of practical knowledge and educational values known to themselves. This in turn gives them greater control over their own practice and therefore in a sense empowers them.

In order to engage in critical reflection, supervisors should adopt a collaborative and supportive framework. Being a sub-discipline of reflective practice, “reflection as critical inquiry” takes in ethical and moral dimensions and uses discourse analysis. For Zeichner (1988), four types of discourse take place between supervisor and the trainee in the process of supervision in pre-service teacher training: factual, prudential, justificatory and critical discourse. According to Adler (1991), critical discourse is an essential element of teacher education and it has to begin with pre-existing beliefs of student teachers in engaging them in the analysis of their own actions in the classroom in order to reveal their personal values and call them into question. For Frost (1994), there are stages such as preparation, observation, analysis, outcomes and

review/assessment in the supervision process and the most fruitful reflection arises in the post-observation dialogue between mentor and mentee.

It has been cited in literature that university supervisors should work closely with associate / cooperating teachers, support the student teachers and visit the school sites often (Kauffman, 1992; Freeman, 1990; Borders, 1994; Dye, 1994). Teaching is first and foremost a “helping profession” which depends on the relationship created between the teacher and the learner. It is crucial, therefore to determine which forms of help, or teaching, are most effective within that relationship. Such a decision depends on a number of variables: the purpose of the help (its objective), the particular context in which the help is being offered and the interactions that make up the process of offering and receiving it (Freeman, 1990). As Gale and Jackson (1997) point out, the development of professionalism in student teachers is encouraged within supervisory relationships where teachers help student teachers to fully explore the meanings associated with the problems of teaching practice and such exploration is dependent on critically reflective conversations.

It is inevitable to have conflict in supervisory relationships. Bernard and Goodyear (1992, cited in Dye, 1994) point out that conflict in supervisory relationship stems from the power differential between the parties, differences relative to the appropriateness of techniques, the amount of direction and praise, and willingness to resolve differences. For them, these influences can be moderated to some extent by mutual respect but the supervisor should take the lead in modeling this attitude if it is to be attained by both parties because of the greater power inherent in the role.

According to Gebhard and Oprandy (1999), supervision leads to a deeper awareness of teaching for both the teacher and the supervisor and they support less supervisor-dominated pattern of communication in teacher-supervisor conversations. In terms of the role of the supervisors, Chamberlain (2000) claims that the role of the supervisor has shifted from that of a detached expert to that of an engaged colleague who encourages teachers to talk about their work and reflect on their practice in a new way. The supervisor was once viewed as an expert evaluator but now he is charged with the responsibility of gaining teachers’ trust and creating an environment that cultivates reflection, exploration and change.

According to Gebhard (1990), the roles of the supervisors is to: direct or guide the teacher's teaching, offer suggestions on the best way to teach, model teaching, advise teachers and evaluate the teacher's teaching. He proposes six models of supervision such as directive, alternative, collaborative, nondirective, creative and self-help – explorative. The role of the supervisor in *directive supervision* is to direct and inform the teacher, model teaching behaviors and evaluate the teacher's mastery of defined behaviors. In *alternative supervision*, the supervisor's role is to suggest a variety of alternatives to what the teacher has done in the classroom. In collaborative supervision, the supervisor's role is to work with teachers but not direct them, instead the supervisor participates with the teacher in any decisions that are made and attempts to establish a sharing relationship. In *creative supervision*, the creativity and freedom is encouraged through a combination of models or a combination of supervisory behaviors from different models, shifting of supervisory responsibilities from the supervisor to other sources and an application of insights from other fields that are not found in any of the models. In self-help – explorative supervision, the aim is to explore teaching through observation of their own and others' teaching in order to gain an awareness of teaching behaviors and their consequences as well as to generate alternative ways to teach (Gebhard, 1990: 163).

Examining the roles of supervisors, student teachers and cooperating teachers in student teaching placement, Koerner and Rust (2002) state that the university supervisor plays a complex and critical role in helping student teachers make sense of their work. Collecting data from 7 supervisors, 21 student teachers and their cooperating teachers, they have classified the roles of supervisors as professional and personal qualities. Good communication skills, being realistic, believing in student teachers, being collaborative and punctual have been among the professional dispositions of supervisors while being encouraging, empathic, caring, motivating, helpful, honest, ethical, supportive, flexible and helpful have been among the personal qualities of supervisors.

Supervisors also act as coaches; they support and scaffold the growth and development of the learners with whom they work. Like athletic coaches, they do not hedge. They are fair and honest; they praise learners' accomplishments (Freidus, 2002).

### **2.3.2.1. Studies concerning the interactions of supervisors and student teachers**

Slick (1997) examined an elementary supervisor's interactions with a student teacher and a cooperating teacher and her study suggested that teacher educators at the university need to take more active role in not only defining standards and expectations for student teachers, but also in becoming more involved in helping the supervisor to interpret and uphold these expectations.

Having carried out three case studies with three supervisors in order to define the mission and goal of supervision, the role and expectations of the supervisor, Slick (1998) states that the university supervisor, being a strong teacher role model, is an important figure in contributing to successful experiences for student teachers and cooperating teachers

Although most studies related to supervisors focused on post-lesson conferences and examine the spoken data (Zeichner et al., 1988; Waite, 1992; Roberts, 1994, John, 2001), few studies examined written feedback given by the supervisors. Spear et al. (1997) studied the written comments of supervisors and found out the style of writing (friendly/formal, descriptive/evaluative) and whether the advice was authoritative or cooperative.

Examining the discourse features of teaching practice supervision reports, Glenwright (1999) stated that judgment and appraisal were universal and the most frequent functions were expressing approval, expressing reservations or criticisms, and giving suggestions, advice or directives.

Freeman (1990) examined supervisor-student teacher relationship in terms of three interventions that can take place in order to achieve particular purposes. By intervention, he refers to the way in which the teacher educator expresses specific perceptions and input about the practice teaching to the student teacher. This includes both the process and the content. The purpose of intervention is change; change that moves the student teacher toward, or in relation to, a view of the whole of language teaching. Student teacher – teacher educator (supervisor/mentor) relationship must not be seen as something to be systematically controlled or eliminated; rather it is the key that must be exploited. The educator's job is to help the student teacher move toward an understanding of effective teaching and independence in teaching (Freeman, Ibid: 103).

Zeichner et al. (1988) categorized supervisory discourse as factual (including descriptive, informational), prudential (including instruction, advice, evaluation), justificatory (reasons and rationale) and critical discourse (assessing values or adequacy of rationales). Findings of their study suggested that factual discourse dominated both an inquiry-oriented teacher-education programme and one of a traditional-craft kind, followed by prudential discourse and justificatory discourse, with neither programme having much critical discourse.

Waite (1992) analyzed conference discourse from an anthropological linguistic perspective and studied university tutors' use of questions, criticisms and suggestions in conferences and found out that criticisms and suggestions were mitigated by the use of modal auxiliaries.

Bunton et al. (2002) conducted a study to investigate the format and content of lesson observation notes given by 27 university tutors to their trainees. They used 5 types of observation forms in different formats. They found out that university tutors applied four categories of content: descriptive, questioning/reflective, evaluative and advisory and all tutors in the study gave evaluative and advisory comment to their trainees. However, certain less structured formats tended to include more descriptive and questioning comments. Their data suggested that less structured observation forms, in allowing more descriptive and questioning comments, may encourage a reflective approach to teaching.

Having carried out a study on the qualities and characteristics of the verbal interchange between the student teacher and the mentor by recording a series of post-lesson discussions, John & Gilchrist (1999) proposed five categories of mentor dialogue as suggesting, questioning, supporting, directing and silence. Their study indicated that there was a need for solid blocks of support to make sure that the student's confidence is boosted. They state that this must never be in the guise of directive 'single loop' behavior, dispensing 'elder statesman' advice and recipes for action. Instead the support should come in the form of suggestions which always require a response from the student to 'fly solo' and plan his or her future teaching in an autonomous fashion (John & Gilchrist, 1999:110).

Tsui et al. (2001) carried out a study in order to investigate the roles and relationships of supervisors, mentors and student teachers in tripartite supervisory

conferences. They examined the discourse of six conferences and found out some broad categories such as eliciting, offering and managing interaction which also had some subcategories. Another concern was to look at conversational dominance by examining the amount of talk, who was doing most of the eliciting and to whom these elicitations were addressed, who steered the direction of the conference and the juncture at which speakers made contributions to the conference and the manner in which they made these contributions. Their study revealed that offering constituted the bulk of the interaction and the university tutors were the dominant contributors in the conferences. Their study also revealed that there is a natural hierarchy of power, university supervisor being the dominant person and this inequality in power relationship does not necessarily lead to conflict and tension. Furthermore, the study suggested that contextual factors such as the prior experience of the university supervisor and the mentor teacher, their relationship, and their self-perception can have considerable impact not only on the content of the conference but also on the way it is managed.

Investigating the supervisory conferences, Lopez-Real et al. (2001) identified the most difficult topics for student teachers and supervisors in the conferences. Their study revealed that the most difficult topics of supervisors were: lack of enthusiasm, possible failure, dress and appearance, lack of presence, general attitude to job, language fluency and lack of support to pupils. They found out that supervisors were sensitive in discussing these difficult topics and tried to be gentle with student teachers, therefore an open and trusting relationship between supervisor and student teacher has to be formed over a period of time within the context of the program at university or in teaching practice observation visits.

In a case study by Gordon and Brobeck (1995; cited in Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004) a supervisor recorded conferences with teachers and then the supervisor reviewed conference tapes, with the aid of a facilitator, in order to compare her actual supervisory behaviors with her espoused platform. The supervisor experienced three different types of cognitive dissonance, i.e. thinking of herself in one way while other sources of information indicate that she is different. The differences the supervisor detected were in the use of behaviors such as using directive style but claiming to have used nondirective style.

### 2.3.2.2. Supervisory styles / behaviors

Supervisors have different styles/ behaviors in supervising student teachers and their styles may be called as nondirective, collaborative, directive informational and directive control. These categories permit for varying degrees of guidance by the supervisor and for varying degrees of ownership by the student teacher (see Figure 1). In the directive approach, the outcome is a supervisor-assigned plan. With the directive informational approach, the outcome is a supervisor-suggested plan. For the collaborative approach, the outcome is a mutual plan, for the nondirective approach the outcome is a student teacher self-plan (Rettig, Lampe and Garcia (2000). Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) have developed a supervisory behavior continuum to focus the supervisor's tasks and relationships with student teachers in these four categories (see Table 1 for a detailed continuum of behaviors and their definitions). They also categorize each style in terms of behaviors and they claim that these 10 behaviors seem to appear in every style but with a different sequence.

Nondirective supervision is based on the assumption that an individual teacher knows best what instructional changes need to be made and has the ability to think and act for his or herself. The role of the supervisor is that of listening, clarifying, encouraging, and reflecting. The student teacher makes the decisions, taking responsibility for analyzing the lesson and identifying the changes that may occur for the next lesson. The non-directive approach is usually used with student teachers who are at a higher developmental stage and thus take responsibility for how the teaching process impacts student achievement. These teachers are usually competent in the classroom, and are able to focus on individual student needs and the impact of their own values and beliefs on their teaching practice (Glickman, 1990). The supervisor listens to the student's opinions, clarifies the issue being discussed, encourages the student to draw conclusions, and reinforces the student's assessment of the situation and the subsequent course of action. According to Drafall & Grant (1994) nondirective supervision style should only be used with a highly reflective student teacher, but student teachers will not reach this stage by the end of their student teaching. However, supervisors can promote developmental progress by switching to nondirective communication near the conclusion of the student-teaching experience. Research indicates that nondirective supervision style is the most difficult supervisory style to



implement. Nondirective supervision begins with listening and ends with asking the student teacher to present his or her decision. Nondirective continuum of behaviors is as the following:

1. Listening: Waiting until the student teacher's initial statement is made.
2. Reflecting: Verbalizing your understanding of the initial problem.
3. Clarifying: Probing for the underlying problem and/or additional information.
4. Encouraging: Showing willingness to listen further as the student teacher begins to identify real problems.
5. Reflecting: Constantly paraphrase understanding of the student teacher's message.
6. Problem solving: Asking the student teacher to think of possible actions.
7. Problem solving: Asking the student teacher to consider consequences of various actions.
8. Presenting: Asking the student teacher for a commitment to a decision.
9. Standardizing: Asking the student teacher to set time and criteria for action.
10. Reflecting: Restating the student teacher's plan (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:191).

The collaborative supervision shifts some of the responsibility to the supervisor, where the intern or intervention teacher has input on the decision-making process, but it is a shared process. The role of the supervisor is presenting, problem-solving, negotiating, and demonstrating a shared responsibility for planning changes for the next lesson. Student teachers for whom the collaborative approach is best are usually at a middle stage of development, where they have mastered the management strategies, and are able to focus on instructional needs of students. They are looking for new ideas, and will be ready to explore a variety of approaches to teaching and learning. Suggestions and guidance from the supervisor will be welcomed, but the student teachers will also be capable of critiquing their own attempts to implement new ideas. A collaborative conference represents a decrease in supervisor responsibility and an increase in student teacher responsibility regarding instructional decisions. Student teachers are urged to share their concerns and perceptions, and supervisors use this input to guide the discussion. Functioning as a team, the participants clarify the issues to be discussed,

reach a common understanding, exchange points of view, discuss alternatives, and negotiate a plan for future action. Supervisors should attempt to move toward this approach partway through the student teaching experience when the student teachers' self confidence has been established and they are more capable of formulating their own ideas (Glickman, 1990; Drafall & Grant, 1994). Collaborative continuum of behaviors is as the following:

1. Clarifying: Identifying the problem as seen by the student teacher.
2. Listening: Understanding the student teacher's perception.
3. Reflecting: Verifying the student teacher's perception.
4. Presenting: Providing the supervisor's point of view.
5. Clarifying: Seeking the student teacher's understanding of the supervisor's perception of the problem.
6. Problem solving: Exchanging suggestions of options.
7. Encouraging: Accepting conflict.
8. Negotiating: Finding an acceptable solution.
9. Standardizing: Agreeing on details of plan.
10. Reflecting: Summarizing the final plan (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:182).

Directive supervision includes the high level of supervisor responsibility since the supervisor gives directions and establishes specific goals for the student teacher. It can be divided into two types as directive informational and directive control.

Directive informational supervision is used to direct student teachers to consider and choose from clearly defined alternative actions. The supervisor still acts as the information source, but asks for and considers student teacher feedback. Supervisors are also careful to allow for several alternative actions for improvement to be implemented by the student teacher that fall within a set of criteria established by both parties. The student teacher is allowed to exercise some control in this process. As Block, Korth and Lefebvre (2001) point out this approach is best when the person in authority is thought to have credible knowledge to solve the problem, and has the trust of the teacher as a reasonable person to take advice from in the situation. The supervisor constantly takes a very active role in terms of "framing the direction and choice of the teacher" and s/he utilizes such supervisory behaviors as reinforcing, standardizing and directing, but is

more open to suggestions from the student teacher. Directive informational continuum of behaviors is as the following:

1. Presenting: Identifying the goal.
2. Clarifying: Asking the student teacher for input into the goal.
3. Listening: Understanding the student teacher's point of view.
4. Problem solving: Mentally determining possible actions.
5. Directing: Telling alternatives for teachers to consider.
6. Listening: Asking the student teacher for input into alternatives.
7. Directing: Framing the final choices.
8. Clarifying: Asking the student teacher to choose.
9. Standardizing: Detailing the actions to be taken.
10. Reinforcing: Repeating and following up on the plan (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:169).

Directive control supervision is used to clearly transmit supervisor expectations to teachers. The supervisor should be demonstrating new ideas, directing the conversation toward suggested changes, and reinforcing pieces that were successful and should be maintained. The conference is directed and controlled by the supervisor and the supervisor takes maximum responsibility for determining the next plan of action. The supervisor makes direct statements and suggestions to the student teacher regarding his/her teaching performance and subsequent changes. Although discussion should occur between the supervisor and the intern, the ultimate decisions of what should occur next are made by the supervisor. The directive approach is usually used with student teachers who are struggling at a low stage of development, and are attempting to implement management and basic instructional strategies in order to survive in the classroom (Glickman, 1990). This type of supervision is used to clearly transmit supervisor expectations to student teachers and it places an emphasis on the authority and weight a supervisor carries in their role. The supervisor uses such supervisory behaviors as reinforcing, standardizing and directing. Directive control continuum of behaviors are as the following:

1. Presenting: Identifying the problem.
2. Clarifying: Asking student teacher for input into the problem.
3. Listening: Understanding the student teacher's point of view.

4. Problem solving: Mentally determining the best solution.
5. Directing: Telling expectations to the student teacher.
6. Clarifying: Asking the student teacher for input into the expectations.
7. Standardizing: Detailing and modifying expectations.
8. Reinforcing: Repeating and following up on expectations (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:156).

According to Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004), matching the best supervisory approach to the teacher or group's current developmental levels, facilitating teacher development by gradually decreasing supervisor control and increasing teacher control over the decision-making process can promote some degree of teacher development.

### **2.3.2.3. Studies on supervisory styles**

In a study of Gordon, who addressed the issue of supervisor flexibility, (1989, 1990; cited in (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004), the supervisors were first trained in developmental supervision and each supervisor conducted conferences using directive supervision, collaborative supervision and nondirective supervision. The results of the study suggested that supervisors being trained to use developmental supervision must receive their most intensive training in nondirective supervision which seems to be the most difficult approach for many to use. In Gordon's study, the majority of teachers and supervisors involved in each of the three types of supervision reported that the supervisory approach, when effectively implemented, was the appropriate approach for the individual teacher and had assisted the teacher to improve his or her instruction. Teachers experiencing each type of supervision made substantial progress toward instructional improvement objectives identified during supervisor-teacher conferences. However, teachers matched with nondirective supervision made the most progress toward improvement objectives, and teachers matched with collaborative supervision made more progress than those matched with directive informational supervision. The results support the argument that the supervisor-teacher relationship should move toward less supervisor control as the teacher becomes capable of assuming more decision-making responsibility (Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004).

Siens and Ebmeier's (1996) study revealed that teachers assisted by supervisors trained to tailor their conference approaches to teachers' levels of motivation, analytical skill, and knowledge experienced significantly more growth on a measure of reflective thinking than did a control group of teachers receiving only the regular supervision provided at their schools.

#### **2.4. Summary**

Being the main component of teacher education programs, the practicum or teaching practice is universal and continues to be the most important part in student teachers' lives in which they establish relationships with supervisors, cooperating teachers and other student teachers. Supervisors play a crucial role in the development of student teachers since they act as models. The interactions between the supervisors and student teachers have always been a concern for researchers and several studies have been conducted on this issue.

Supervisory styles as suggested by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) have been a concern of researchers for years but few studies have been conducted on this issue. The studies have generally been conducted in post-observation conferences of supervisors and student teachers. To date, no research has been noted to investigate the supervisory styles in pre-observation conferences. Thus, this study aims at examining the supervisory styles of a novice and experienced supervisor in pre-observation conferences with their student teachers. This study also aims at investigating the effects of supervisory styles on the lesson plans and the kind of changes according to the feedback given in the conferences. The final purpose of the study is to find whether the perceptions of the supervisors on their styles and their actual styles in the conferences match.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Introduction

This study was conducted with two supervisors at English Language Teaching Department of Education Faculty, Anadolu University in 2003-2004 academic year. In order to obtain data, pre-observation conferences of two supervisors (each supervising 6 student teachers) were audio-recorded, the lesson plans of student teachers were collected and a structured interview was carried out with the supervisors. This triangulation helped to maintain a more complete picture of the data.

The transcribed data obtained from the pre-observation conferences were examined in terms of specific behaviors such as **listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, presenting, problem solving, negotiating, directing, standardizing** and **reinforcing**. In analysing the data, Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization was used. However, it was seen that there were some other behaviors emerged and these behaviors were categorized according to Constant Comparative Method and the other categories added were checking understanding, reminding, humour, giving examples and reproaching. The frequencies of all behaviors were taken, listed and the supervisory style of the supervisors were detected.

As a second step, the lesson plans of the student teachers were collected and the lesson plans and the transcripts of the conferences were compared to find which supervisory styles/behaviors caused changes in the lesson plans.

The final step was to carry out a structured interview with the supervisors. The questions had been prepared before the interviews and the aim of the interviews was to get the reflections of the supervisors on the findings and whether there were differences between their perceptions of their behaviors in pre-observation conferences and which behaviors they actually employed in pre-observation conferences. This session was also recorded and transcribed.

### **3.2. Subjects**

The subjects of the study were an experienced and a novice supervisor who were supervising 6 student teachers.

The novice supervisor was working at English Language Teaching Department of Education Faculty, Anadolu University. He had been working as an instructor for 2 years, and as a supervisor for a year in the same department at the time of the study. He had some sort of apprenticeship on how to conduct supervisory conferences, especially on how to give feedback to student teachers' lesson plans in the pre-observation conferences. In this process, he firstly observed an experienced supervisor (who was teaching English for 20 years and was a supervisor and teacher trainer for 15 years) while she was giving feedback to student teachers, then the student teachers started bringing their lesson plans to him and he gave feedback to their plans. After that another novice supervisor, the experienced supervisor and the novice supervisor in this study started to give feedback to lesson plans together. The novice supervisor stated that this apprenticeship process was very beneficial for him.

The novice supervisor was given a consent form in which he accepted to participate in the study in Spring Term of 2003-2004 academic year. Other participants of the study were randomly selected 6 student teachers of the novice supervisor. The number of student teachers was thought to be 5 at the beginning of the study but they had been organized as a group of three. Thus, the number of student teachers was 6. Three student teachers held pre-observation conferences as a group but the supervisor gave one-to-one feedback to them.

The experienced supervisor was working at English Language Teaching Department of Education Faculty, Anadolu University. She had been working as an instructor for 13 years, and as a supervisor for 10 years in the same department at the time of the study. She also had apprenticeship at the beginning of her career as a supervisor. The same experienced supervisor guided her in giving feedback to the lesson plans and their relationship with the supervisor was like master/apprentice. She stated that the experienced supervisor was a good model for her and she modeled her when she gave feedback to student teachers. The experienced supervisor also signed a consent form in which she accepted to participate in the study in Spring Term of

2003-2004 academic year. Other participants of the study were randomly selected 6 student teachers of the experienced supervisor.

### **3.3. Data Collection Procedure**

Before collecting the data for the study, a pilot study was carried out with one supervisor and 6 student teachers in the Fall Term of 2003-2004 academic year. The pilot study lasted for two weeks. The supervisor conducted interviews with 6 student teachers prior to lesson observation and gave feedback on their lesson plans.

The actual study was carried out with 12 fourth year students (student teachers) and two supervisors at English Language Teaching Department of Education Faculty, Anadolu University in Spring Term of 2003-2004 academic year. The initial pre-observation conferences were held in the second and third week of March. The last two conferences were held in the last week of May and the first week of June. Each conversation lasted for 20-30 minutes. The student teachers were in groups of three but the pre-observation conferences were carried out individually. The rationale of recording the conferences at the beginning and at the end of the practicum was to find if there was a change in supervisory styles or behaviors of the supervisors during the practicum. Since the practicum lasted for 3 months, there might be changes in the styles of the supervisors due to the development of student teachers.

A total of 96 pre-observation conferences were recorded and transcribed. Furthermore, first and second drafts of the lesson plans in each pre-observation conference were taken in order to see if the student teachers made necessary changes in their plans according to the feedback they received in pre-observation conferences. Second drafts of the lesson plans were investigated in detail and they were compared with the transcript of the conferences in order to find what type of supervisory behaviors caused student teachers to make changes in the plan.

As a last step, interviews were carried out with the novice and experienced supervisors after all the data were analyzed. The aim was to get the reflections of the supervisors on the behaviors emerged in the conferences and whether there were differences between their perceptions of their behaviors in pre-observation conferences and which behaviors they actually employed in pre-observation conferences. As Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) state, understanding how we behave as



supervisors and then refining our present behaviors are the first steps toward acquiring new interpersonal behaviors.

### **3.4. Data Analysis Procedure**

The data obtained in the pilot study were transcribed first and the supervisory behaviors were detected according to Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization. On deciding the categorization of behaviors, a meeting was held with three experienced supervisors after the behaviors were categorized individually by them and by the researcher. The supervisors and the researcher discussed the categories and came to an agreement.

The data of this study were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. In order to identify supervisory behaviors of the supervisors, the transcribed data were divided into meaningful chunks in order to identify idea units more easily. The notion of 'idea unit' which consists of a phrase, a sentence or a number of sentences was taken into account in the analysis of the data. Each idea unit contained a clearly distinguishable idea. As Tsui et al. (2001) state, the analytical unit should be informative in terms of the content of supervisory talk. As the focus of the study was supervisors' feedback, the supervisors' speech was written in bold in order to detect the behaviors easily. After that the researcher started to analyze the data according to Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization. Their categorization consisted of 10 behaviors: *listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, negotiating, problem solving, presenting, directing, standardizing and reinforcing* (see Table 1). At the same time another rater also read all the transcripts of the conferences and detected the behaviors of the supervisors. For instance, directing was categorized as an idea unit; the phrases or sentences which express direction were detected. Since the focus of the study was investigating supervisory styles and behaviors of the supervisors, student teachers' behaviors and speech were not given much emphasis in analyzing the data. While the analysis process was going on, some other behaviors emerged which did not exist in Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) checklist. These emerging categories were analyzed by the two raters separately. Then, the two raters had a meeting to decide the final wording of the new categories. Inter-rater reliability was found to be 86% (Pearson correlation coefficient) and since values greater than 0.70 are

typically acceptable for consistency estimates of inter-rater reliability, the reliability score was acceptable.

Clarifying was employed by the supervisors using paraphrases or restatements, and using questions. Some of the idea units were in the form of paraphrase and some of them were in the form of questions. The idea units which were in the form of paraphrases or restatements were used to clarify the supervisor's point of view and the idea units which were questions were used to clarify the student teacher's point of view. The following chunk can be given as an example:

**Ö: Sırayla mı gidiyor bunlar? (clarifying)**

C: Evet sırayla ama karışık mı yapsaydım?

**Ö: Yok canım sordum yani.(clarifying)** Şurası çok uzun olmuş. Anlatman gereken şeyler ama uzun, anlatırken bir taraftan da bunu eline al. İşe görsellik kat birazda, elinde albüm olsun. Gary'nin resmini göster önce. Hobileri var, bu onun albümü bir sürü fotoğrafı var der anlatırsın. **Yoksa Gary'i anlatırsan sadece sıkıcı olur (clarifying)**. Buradaki instruction'ı biraz clear etsek daha iyi olmaz mı? Fotoğraflara bakarak present perfect ve present continuous tense'le cümleler kuracaksınız, chart size yardımcı olacak. **Aradaki farkı biliyorlar mı acaba (clarifying)?** Bir defa buraya bir şey ekle. Gary'nin neler yaptığını söyleyelim de. **Present continuous diyince ne olduğunu biliyor mu (clarifying)?**

C: Hepsini öğrendiler biliyorlar diye düşünüyorum zaten fotoğraflarda fark açıkça görülüyor.

**Ö: Fotoğrafların iyi onlara bir şey demiyorum canım. Çocuk bunu 3-4 haftadır görmüyorsa unutmuş olabilir (clarifying)**, çok basit bir review yaratsan veya aynı bu şekilde resim bulup birini continuous diğerini perfect tense'le yapsan, onların background knowledge'ını bir activate etsen anladın mı?

C: Anladım.

The behaviors in directing category were classified into direct, indirect and confirmation styles. In direct style, the supervisors told student teachers what to do directly whereas in indirect style the supervisors did not tell them what to do directly. They implied or told student teachers what to do indirectly. Confirmation style is used after direct style to have the confirmation of student teachers. The following chunks exemplify these styles:

**Ö: Tamam. Madem cümle yapısını görmelerini istiyorsun o zaman şu zaman zarflarını karıştırma istersen yada every Sunday gibi bir şey kullan (directing-direct style). Ben sana yapma demiyorum**

**nasıl öğreneceklerine inanıyorsan öyle yap (directing-direct style) .** Peki bu resimler olmasaydı bu aktivite olur muydu gene?

C: Resimleri görsel olsun diye kullandım. Eğlenceli olsun diye ilgilerini çeksin diye.

Ö: **1. aktiviteyle ilgili o zaman zarflarını bir düşün(directing-direct style) .** Herşeyi çok güzel yapıyorlar, ya hata yaparlarsa?

C: O zamanda fantastic.

Ö: Hata yaparlarsa nasıl düzeltirsin? **Yazmamış olsan bile bir düşünsen iyi olur (directing-indirect style).** (Pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 1)

.....

Ö: **Is he comfortable or not gibi falan diye belki sorabilirdin (directing-indirect style).** Sad deyince üzgün olması lazım, ya da üzücü bir olay olmuş olması lazım. O yüzden söylüyorum. Kontrol ettin mi, var mı sad in öyle bir kullanımı? Hoşnut olunmayan..

C: Emin değilim hocam ya

Ö: **Bir bak, varsa eğer kullanabilirsin (directing-direct style). Ben sanki hani çok comfortable mı değil mi gibi bir şey sorabilirsin (directing-direct style), tamam mı (directing-confirmation style)? Ona bakarsın (directing-direct style).** So, do you think Can can drink coffee? Ken ken drink coffee☺ No. Good. Can cannot drink coffee because it is very hot. So he can say, the coffee is too hot to drink” hı, ben şey bekliyordum, taşımak için çok sıcak falan gibi bekliyordum. Sen içmek için çok sıcak demişsin. Tamam, her neyse öbür resme geçelim. Resmi asıyorsun... (Pre-observation conference 4 of student teacher 1)

As the analysis process was going on, some other behaviors emerged. These emerging categories were categorized by the researcher and another rater. Having reached the negotiation of categories, they were named as *checking understanding, reminding, humour and giving examples.*

**Checking understanding** was a new category emerged in the study. The supervisors used language items to check if student teachers understand what they were saying. The supervisors used the following phrases to check understanding:

- **OK?**
- **Anladın mı?**
- **Anlatabildim mi?**
- **Anladın mı demek istediğimi?**

In **reminding** category, the supervisors reminded student teachers about the previous lessons and sometimes they referred to their methodology classes:

- **Yanlış söylerse çocuk nasıl davranmanız gerektiğini biliyorsunuz.**
- **Demin Ebru ile de konuşurken söyledim, behavioral objectiveleer overall objectiveleerin altında yer alır.**
- **İyi olur ama diğer pronounlar için resim kullanman konusunda anlaşmıştık.**
- **Ama iki dakika önce öğrettin.**
- **Daha önce ne demiştik, simple'dan karışık olana doğru gitmek lazım.**

The supervisors made some humorous remarks or jokes while they were reading the plans:

- **Siz bütün dönem practice yaptırдыңız ha ☺**
- **Üüh planın yarısını buna ayırmışsın ☺**
- **Real olsun diye gerçekten kokan çorap mı getirmeyi düşünüyorsun? ☺**
- **What's at the middle of the sea? Haa, ada demesi gerek Böyle sorular sorup çocuklara "ööö" yaptırıyorsun ☺**

**Giving examples** was another category emerged in this study. In order to clarify what they advise student teachers to do, the supervisors gave some examples:

- **Yoksa normalde belki kullanabiliriz böyle bir cümleyi günlük hayatımızda fakat yine de tam anlamı bunlar çok güzel veriyor, bak, taşınması için çok ağır, araba kullanmak için çok genç, içmek için bu kahve çok sıcak, tavan çok yüksek gibi, tam böyle to the point resimler.**
- **Mesela iki resim verdin, doğru olanı seçmesini istiyorsun, bu davranış olur.**

- **Şimdi sınıfı düşün, 40 kişilik veya 30 kişilik diyelim. Bir öğrenci kalktı şu cümleyi okudu, öteki kalkıp genel öğrenci davranışıyla şunu okumak isteyecek. Sen ondan bunu istiyorsun aşında.**

As a second step, the first and second drafts of the lesson plans were compared and the changes were identified. After that the lesson plans and the transcripts of the conferences were compared in order to find the supervisory behaviors that caused changes in the plans.

Finally, a structured interview was carried out with the two supervisors separately. The following questions were asked by the researcher:

1. What kind of behaviors do you think you applied most in the pre-observation conferences?
2. What do you think about the results?
3. Would there be a change if you carried out post-observation conferences?
4. What kind of behaviors do you think caused changes in the lesson plans?
5. What kind of changes do student teachers apply in their second drafts of lesson plans?
6. Did you have training before you start supervising? If yes, tell about the process.

The aim of carrying out the interviews with the supervisors was to get the perceptions of supervisors on their supervisory behaviors, find whether their perceptions and the behaviors obtained in the study matched and to triangulate the data in order to have a more complete picture of the supervisors and their supervisory behaviors.

In order to find out an answer to the first research question, the behaviors of the two supervisors were detected and written in the checklist. The frequency of the behaviors of each supervisor in each pre-observation conference was calculated and each conference of each supervisor was discussed in detail. Then, the frequencies and percentages of the behaviors of all conferences were calculated and the supervisors' styles were detected.

In order to find out an answer to the second research question, the pre-observation conferences that were held at the beginning and at the end of the practicum were compared in order to see whether there were differences between these conferences.

In order to find out an answer to the third research question, experienced and novice supervisors' frequency of the behaviors were compared and discussed. The similarities and differences between the novice and experienced supervisors' behaviors in the pre-observation conferences were found out and discussed in detail.

In order to find out an answer to the fourth research question, the lesson plans of student teachers were examined. The first and the second drafts of lesson plans were checked in order to find the differences and changes between the plans.

In order to find out an answer to the fifth research question, the lesson plans of student teachers and the transcripts of interviews were compared and the behaviors that led changes in the lesson plans were detected. The behaviors that led changes in the lesson plans were categorized in a table for each supervisor.

In order to find out an answer to the sixth research question, structured interviews were carried out by the novice and the experienced supervisor to find out their perceptions of their styles and whether there were differences between their perceptions and what they actually did in the conferences.

**TABLE 1. THE SUPERVISORY CONTINUUM OF BEHAVIORS  
(Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon, 2004).**

| BEHAVIORS       | Definitions   |
|-----------------|---|
| Listening       | Listening for the silence<br>Listening reflectively<br>Listening attentively using acknowledgment tokens such as 'uh huh' and 'um'.   |
| Clarifying      | Clarifying the issue using paraphrases or restatements<br>Asking questions and statements to clarify the speaker's point of view such as "Do you mean that?" "Would you explain this further?" "I'm confused about this" "I lost you on..."   |
| Encouraging     | Supporting students to draw conclusions<br>Providing acknowledgment responses that help the speaker continue to explain his or her positions: "Yes, I'm following you." "Continue on." "Ah, I see what you are saying."   |
| Reflecting      | Looking back at the work and synthesize<br>Incorporating what the other speaker says in one's own talk<br>Summarizing and paraphrasing the speaker's message for verification of accuracy: "I understand that you mean..." "So, the issue is..." "I hear you saying..."                         |
| Negotiating     | Reaching agreement<br>Arriving at consensus and building commitment<br>Discussing the consequences of each proposed action or narrowing down choices with questions such as: "Where do we agree?" "Can we find a compromise that will give each of us part of what we want?"                    |
| Problem solving | Identifying instructional problems and determining how the problems will be addressed.<br>Generating a list of possible solutions such as: "Let's stop and each write down what can be done." "What ideas do we have to solve this problem?" "Let's think of all possible actions we can take." |
| Presenting      | Giving the ideas about the issue being discussed: "This is how I see it." "What can be done is..." "I believe that..."  |
| Directing       | Telling what is to be done: "I have decided that we will do..." "I want you to do..."   |
| Standardizing   | Standardizing the subsequent course of action<br>Setting the expected criteria and time for the decision such as: "By next Monday, we want to see..." "Report back to me on this change by..."  |
| Reinforcing     | Reinforcing the student's assessment of the situation and the subsequent course of action using praise such as: "I know you can do it!"   |

## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.1 Overview of the Study

The aim of the study is to find whether being an experienced and a novice supervisor has an effect on the supervisory styles, whether the changes the student teachers do in their lesson plans depend on the nature of the supervisory styles and whether there is a relationship between their supervisory styles and the changes applied in the lesson plans. Thus, this study tried to answer the following research questions:

7. What are the supervisory styles/behaviors employed by the novice and experienced supervisor in pre-observation conferences?
8. Are there any differences or similarities between the pre-observation conferences carried out at the beginning and at the end of the practicum in terms of styles?
9. What are the differences between the novice and the experienced supervisor in terms of supervisory styles?
10. What kind of changes did the student teachers do in their revised lesson plans?
11. Which supervisory style caused the changes in the lesson plans?
12. What are the the novice and the experienced supervisor's perceptions of their styles? Are there differences between their perceptions and the styles they actually employed in pre-observation conferences?

#### 4.2 Supervisory styles/behaviors in the pre-observation conferences

##### 4.2.1 The novice supervisor's the first two pre-observation conferences

When the first two pre-observation conferences are taken into account, it is seen that a total of 1038 behaviors were employed by the novice supervisor. Of these 1038 behaviors, clarifying (27%) had the highest percentage and it was followed by reflecting (26%) and directing (20%) (see Table 2.).

The other categories such as negotiating (8%), presenting (6%), reinforcing (4%), problem solving (3%), checking understanding (2%) and reminding (1%) were



used less and the categories such as listening, encouraging, standardizing and giving examples were used 5 times and humor were used 4 times. Since there were 1038 behaviors, their percentage appeared as 0%.

**Table 2. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.**

|                           | Conference 1 | Conference 2 |       |      |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|------|
| Behaviors                 | Number*      | Number*      | Total | %    |
| Clarifying                | 147          | 132          | 279   | 27%  |
| Reflecting                | 165          | 103          | 268   | 26%  |
| Directing                 | 99           | 107          | 206   | 20%  |
| Negotiating               | 41           | 39           | 80    | 8%   |
| Presenting                | 36           | 30           | 66    | 6%   |
| Reinforcing               | 24           | 19           | 43    | 4%   |
| Problem solving           | 16           | 18           | 34    | 3%   |
| Checking understanding    | 12           | 11           | 23    | 2%   |
| Reminding                 | 9            | 6            | 15    | 1%   |
| Giving examples           | 3            | 2            | 5     | 0%   |
| Standardizing             | 4            | 1            | 5     | 0%   |
| Listening                 | 0            | 5            | 5     | 0%   |
| Encouraging               | 1            | 4            | 5     | 0%   |
| Humour                    | 1            | 3            | 4     | 0%   |
| Total                     | 558          | 480          | 1038  | 100% |
| * Number of the behaviors |              |              |       |      |

These results reveal that the novice supervisor either used questions to clarify the topic or paraphrased or explained the topic under discussion. Of these 279 clarifying behaviors, 185 of them were in the form of questions (66%) and 94 of them were paraphrases or explanations (34%). The novice supervisor asked questions to clarify the student teacher's point of view or explained the topic under discussion as in the following examples:

### 1.

Ö: **Hım... what's the day today in ne demek olduğunu anlayacaklar mı?** (clarifying)

A: Anlamazlar mı?

Ö: **Sana soruyorum... what's the day today?** (clarifying) **Bilmiyorum anlayacaklar mı?**

A: Orda yine açıklama mı yapsam nasıl soruyunuz, biliyor muyuz diye,

Ö: **Bence yapma yani (directing), her sevi yani böyle Türkçe açıklamaya gerek yok yani** (clarifying).

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 2)

## 2.

Ö: **Checkingde karşılaştırarak mı gidiyorsun her cümleyi tek tek?** (clarifying)

F: Evet... daha hoşlarına gider diye düşündüm. Şimdi buna focus olacaklar, burada uyanacaklar olaya.

Ö: **Niye böyle bir şey yapmak istiyorsun? (clarifying) Bu kafa karıştırıcı olmaz mı daha çok? (clarifying) Şimdi sınıfı düşün, 40 kişilik veya 30 kişilik diyelim. Bir öğrenci kalktı şu cümleyi okudu, öteki kalkıp genel öğrenci davranışıyla şunu okumak isteyecek. Sen ondan bunu istiyorsun aslında. Orada bir kaos çıkmasın?** (clarifying)

F: Haklısınız da ben de şey düşündüm işte, bu paragrafı okuduğu zaman burada bunları yapacaklar, burada da otomatik olarak, aynı fiiller var hemen hemen, onun altını çizecekler. Karşılaştırma yoluyla gidersem "I" da bunu "he" öznesinde bunu, daha rahat görürler gibime geldi. Çünkü cümleler birbirine çok yakın, anlamın değişmediğini ama fiilin değiştiğini vurgulamak istedim.

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 3)

## 3.

E: Ben aslında öğrenci cevaplarını yazma konusunda çok işengecim kabul ediyorum.

Ö: **Genelde zaten yazmasan da olurdu, hani bazen gerekebiliyor, yoksa yazmak zorunda değilsin** (clarifying). (reads) Bu soruları sorarak gidiyorsun parçaya (reads) **Peki, hani, ilk başta birkaç dakika süre verdin ya düşünceleri için, yanlarına not falan alsınlar mı ufak ufak.**

E: Alabilirler. Bence gerek yok, sizce var mı?

Ö: **Sordum, sınıfı sen tanıdığın için** (clarifying). Daha önce derste anlattın, en azından seyrettin yani.

E: Biraz durumları zayıf yani

Ö: **İşte zaten zayıf olduğu için, böyle sözlü olarak cevap verebilecekler mi sence?** (clarifying) **Onlar, her şey akıllarına gelecek mi?** (clarifying) **Burda veriyorlar gerçi güzelce ☺ ama gerçekte verebilecekler mi?** (clarifying)

E: Genius ones ☺ Ya, zaten birebir aynısını sormadım, mesela şurada baya uzatmış,neden süpermarketlerden almak bazen daha iyidir falan demiş, ben avantajları diye sordum, basit düzeyde

Ö: **Anladım. Tamam o zaman, böyle kalsın.**

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 5)

Reflecting type of behaviors were also used 268 times (26%) with 6 student teachers in the first two conferences. The supervisor looked back at the work and synthesized, incorporated what the student teacher said in his own talk and summarized or paraphrased the student teacher's message for verification of accuracy as in the following examples:

## 4.

Ö: **Overall objektifin 'to teach students how to use negative form.....'** (reflecting)

C: Sadece what'la sorulan sorular

Ö: **Tamam, negative form divince hepsi giriyor** (reflecting), bir de Yes, No tarzı soruları öğretmiyor musun?

C: Sadece what'la sorulan soruları öğretiyorum. Önce what questionlara başlamıyor muyduk hocam?

Ö: Hayır onu sormuyorum. Sen şimdi normal present simple tensteki cümleleri öğretiyorsun (reflecting), what'la ilgili ne öğretiyorsun?

C: What'la ilgili yaptıkları işleri soruyorum. What do you do gibi.

Ö: Şimdi 'get the meaning from the context in Simple Present Tense şey gibi reading dersi yapıyorsun gibi geldi bana (reflecting).

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 1)

## 5.

Ö: Evet sonra ne yapıyorsun?

E:2. aktivite önce veriyorum, sonra altına soruları veriyorum. Soru kalıbını 'does'lı kalıp olarak verdim

Ö:Burada verdiklerin 'Wh' sorular (reflecting) , çocuklar 'Wh' question gördüler mi?

E:Hayır.

Ö:Görmediler (reflecting), bu birazcık reading kaçmıyor mu amaçtan sapıyor mu comprehension sorusu gibi aynı zamanda (reflecting), şimdi bak amacını hiçbir zaman unutma amacın ne simple present tense üzerine alıştırmayı yapmak. Ee bu amaca uyuyor mu bir parça okuyacak onu anlayacak ve parçayla ilgili sorulara yazılı cevap verecekler (reflecting). Ayrı bir reading aktivitesi gibi (reflecting).

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 4)

## 6.

E: Reported Speech anlatıyorum. Simple Present formunda. Hocamız daha önce anlattığını söyledi. Yani presentation yapılmış

Ö: Sen practice yapıyorsun (reflecting).

E: Evet, practice ve production.

Ö: Anladım (reflecting), peki bakalım. (reads silently) The next students relate to topic to their life. Hmmm... Güzel bir option (??) nasıl yapıyorsun bunu peki?

E: Ben en son kısımda, production kısmında böyle bir şeye ulaşabiliyorum ancak. Pair work yaptırıyorum. A kişisi mesela anlatıyor bir gününü, mesela I get up at 7 o'clock, I have breakfast falan. Ondan sonra, S kişisine de ben soruyorum. What does she say? O da bana anlatıyor. Daha sonrada değiştiriyorum.

Ö: Kendi günlük hayatlarına böylece biraz girmiş oluyorsun. Biraz değil, baya girmiş oluyorsun (reflecting).

E: Evet.

Ö: (reads silently) Zaten bunları da o şekilde yapıyorsun. Write demissin (reflecting). Behavioral objectiveilerin güzel senin ya.

E: Evet, işte bugün alıştırmayı yapacağız diye girmektense, biraz hatırlatma yapayım diye tercih ettim reported speechi. Sonuçta biraz zaman geçmiş, görmüşler ama.

Ö: İyi de olur aslında evet yani şöyle (??) yönelik bir şey yapman. İyi de olur, çünkü unutanlar şunlar bunlar olursa, olabilir, practice aktiviteni yaparken zorlanabilirler. (reflecting) (reads...) Şu bak, what does reported speech mean? How do we use it? gibi bir soruya nasıl bir cevap bekliyorsun?

E: Onu aslında laf olsun diye sordum ben, sonra çünkü anlatıyorum ben onları☺

Ö: ☺ Evet sormadan (reflecting)

E: Biraz çocuklarımız duysunlar yani, ingilizce duysunlar diye hocam. Çünkü bizim çocuklarımız anlamıyorlar İngilizceyi.

Ö: İngilizce duysun çocuklar da, what does reported speech mean?, bu bir soru sonuçta, bu da demek oluyor ki bir cevap gerektiriyor (reflecting)

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 5)

Directing type of behaviors were used 206 times (20%) in the first two pre-observation conferences by the supervisor. When the supervisor adopted directing behavior, he told the student teachers what to do. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the directing type of behaviors were divided into three parts as indirect style, direct style and confirmation. Of these 206 behaviors in the first pre-observation conferences, 159 of them were in direct style (77%), 29 of them were in indirect style (14%) and 18 of them were in the form of confirmations (9%). The following chunks have examples of directing behaviors:

## 7.

Ö: Ama şurada açık zaten. **Peki bu ne kadar real life'a uygun? Herkes wakes up in the morning.**

C: Hocam her sabah yapılan bir iş olduğundan.

Ö: **Peki buna bir early eklemek? (directing- indirect style)**

C: Cümleyi olabildiğince basite indirgemeye çalıştım.

Ö: **Onun için mi böyle?**

C: Evet, in the morning desem şimdi olaya zaman zarfları da karışacak.

Ö: **Karışsın ama o kadar. Onları da katmazsan işin sürekli olduğu, rutin olduğu anlamını kaçırarak çocuk. Cümlevi basit tutucam derken meaningi kaçırmaman lazım (directing-direct style). Amacın ne, simple present tense'in meaning olarak ne olduğunu öğretmen. Ana amacın Tony olunca 's' takısı geliyor öğretmek değil sonuçta.**

C: Öyle de every'yi işin içine soktuğun zaman diğer zaman kelimelerini de öğretmen gerekir.

Ö: **Hayır, hepsini öğretmene gerek yok (directing-direct style).**

C: Orada sadece kullanmam sadece every kullanmam saçma mı olur.

Ö: **Hayır, saçma olmaz önemli olan çocuklara her sabah bunun yapıldığını anlatmak. Şimdi wake up'ın anlamını öğrettin resmi de koydun. Tony wakes up in the morning deyince sence burada meaning clear mi? (directing-indirect style) Yani o routine olayı clear mi?**

C: Sabahları Tony'nin kalktığını buradan çıkarabilirlerse demek ki bu her sabah yapılan bir iş diye anlamı çıkarabilirler diye düşündüm ama.

Ö: **Doğru düşünmüşsün ona bir şey demiyorum. İstersen early'yi koy (directing-indirect style). Meaningi kaçırmamak lazım (directing-direct style). Sonra?**

C: Şu resim var.

Ö: **Tamam, bunların hepsini yapar ama routine olduğunu belirt (directing-direct style).**

C: O zaman every'yi koyayım hocam.

Ö: **Koy istersen, tamam. "Tony washes his hands ever morning" de diyebilirsin (directing-direct style).**

C: Every aklıma geldi de önce.

Ö: **Hepsinde every kullanmak zorunda değilsin bazısında in the morning kullan, bazısında every kullan (directing-direct style).**

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 1)

## 8.

Ö: **Bunu tahtaya mı asacaksın ellerine mi vereceksin?**

E: Bilgisayarda yazıp büyütücü, tahtaya asıcam.

Ö: **Sonra nasıl check ediyorsun onu yazmamışsın ama. Instruction vermişsin, şimdi diyelim ben buldum gelip hemen circle'mı edicem?**

E: Evet, parmak kaldırıp söz alacaklar.

Ö: **Sen de önce bir zaman ver bulsunlar ama (directing-direct style). Let's find the others demeden önce booklarına yazmalarını iste, ondan sonra tek tek söyleyin neleri bulduunuz de gelip yapınlar (directing-direct style).**

E: Tamam.

- Ö: Aynı Aysundaki gibi bir karışıklık sende de çıkmasın (directing-direct style). İlk önce mutlaka zaman verin onlara, hepsini vapsınlar ondan sonra beraber yapın (directing-direct style). Böyle yaptığında birisi bulacak birisi bulmayacak 'karışmasın' (directing-direct style) tamam mı? (directing-confirmation)
- E: Tamam. (pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 4)

**Table 3. The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.**

| Behaviors              | Pre-observation conference 1. |            |             | Pre-observation conference 2. |            |             |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                        | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           |
| Listening              |                               | 0          | 0%          | DI                            | 5          | 1%          |
| Clarifying             | DI, DC, C                     | 147        | 26%         | DC, DI, C                     | 132        | 28%         |
| Encouraging            | C                             | 1          | 0%          | C                             | 4          | 1%          |
| Reflecting             | C                             | 165        | 30%         | C                             | 103        | 22%         |
| Negotiating            | C                             | 41         | 7%          | C                             | 39         | 8%          |
| Problem solving        | DC, DI, C                     | 16         | 3%          | DC, DI, C                     | 18         | 4%          |
| Presenting             | DC, C                         | 36         | 6%          | DC, C                         | 30         | 6%          |
| Directing              | DC, DI                        | 99         | 18%         | DC, DI                        | 107        | 22%         |
| Standardizing          | DC, DI                        | 4          | 1%          | DC, DI                        | 1          | 0%          |
| Reinforcing            | DC, DI                        | 24         | 4%          | DC, DI                        | 19         | 4%          |
| Checking understanding |                               | 12         | 2%          |                               | 11         | 2%          |
| Reminding              |                               | 9          | 2%          |                               | 6          | 1%          |
| Humour                 |                               | 1          | 0%          |                               | 3          | 1%          |
| Giving examples        |                               | 3          | 1%          |                               | 2          | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>           |                               | <b>558</b> | <b>100%</b> |                               | <b>480</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*number of the behaviors

\*\* DC for Directive Control Style

DI for Directive Informational Style

C for Collaborative Style

When the first and second pre-observation conferences are taken into account in terms of the most frequent behaviors, it is seen that in pre-observation conference 1 reflecting (30%) is the mostly used behavior and is followed by clarifying (26%), directing (18%), negotiating (7%) and presenting (6%). The novice supervisor seems to adapt an eclectic supervisory style. In terms of the behaviors in pre-observation conference 2, clarifying (28%) is the mostly used behavior, and is followed by directing

(22), reflecting (22%), negotiating (8%) and presenting (6%). There seems to be slight differences in the use of behaviors between conference 1. and 2.

In terms of reflecting, there is a decrease in the second conference compared to the first conference. The novice supervisor seems to reflect more in the first conference (30%).

In terms of standardizing, the frequency of this behavior decreases in the second conference. The novice supervisor does not seem to set the expected criteria and time for the subsequent course of action or give details of the actions since the student teachers learned what to do about the lesson plan.

There is a striking difference between the two conferences in terms of listening behavior. The novice supervisor did not employ listening with 6 student teachers in pre-observation conference 1 whereas he employed this type of behavior 5 times in pre-observation conference 2 with student teacher 2. (n=1), student teacher 3. (n=2) and student teacher 5. (n=2). This increase can be due to the student teachers' development as prospective teachers since the novice supervisor employed less behaviors in pre-observation conference 2 and preferred to listen to student teachers or the supervisor wanted student teachers to talk.

In terms of encouraging behavior, there is an increase in the frequency of this behavior. The supervisor employed encouraging only once with student teacher 5. in pre-observation conference 1 while he used this behavior 4 times with student teacher 1. (n=1) and student teacher 5. (n=3).

When the number of behaviors for each student teacher are taken into account, the first and second pre-observation conferences carried out with the student teacher 5. had the highest number of behaviors compared to the conferences with other student teachers. The novice supervisor used a total of 150 behaviors in the first pre-observation conference and a total of 107 behaviors in the second pre-observation conference with student teacher 5. Compared to other student teachers' conferences, the results of pre-observation conference 2. revealed that the supervisor used 13 behaviors out of 14 and the number of behaviors were the highest.

In order to find whether the skills taught in the lesson plans had an effect on the use of behaviors, the lesson plans of the student teachers in the first and second pre-observation conferences were also investigated. It was seen that grammar was the

mostly employed skill that was followed by reading and vocabulary in pre-observation conferences 1 and 2 as in the following:

**Table 4. The skills taught in lesson plans 1. and 2. by the student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor.**

|                    | Skills taught in lesson plan 1. | Skills taught in lesson plan 2. |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Student teacher 1. | Grammar                         | Grammar                         |
| Student teacher 2. | Vocabulary                      | Vocabulary                      |
| Student teacher 3. | Grammar                         | grammar + reading               |
| Student teacher 4. | Grammar                         | Grammar                         |
| Student teacher 5. | Grammar                         | Reading                         |
| Student teacher 6. | Grammar                         | Grammar                         |

Investigating the supervisory behaviors and the skills taught, it was found that the skills taught in the lesson plans and the supervisory styles employed in the conferences had no relationship since most of the skills were grammar and the supervisor's style did not change according to the skill.

As mentioned before, the differences may stem from the student teachers as every individual student teacher is different in terms of his/her development as a future teacher. It is evident that student teachers pass through stages in the practicum process and their improvements may be different. Educational backgrounds of student teachers may also affect their developments. As Tang (2002) states, student teachers do not enter the teacher education program as empty vessels to be filled in with new theories and principles of teaching. Instead, years of experience with teaching as a school pupil constitute pre-training influences which provide part of the backdrop for teachers' professional learning to take place.

#### **4.2.2. The novice supervisor's the last two pre-observation conferences**

When the last two pre-observation conferences of the novice supervisor are taken into account, it is seen that a total of 832 behaviors were applied by the supervisor. Of these 832 behaviors, clarifying (29%) was the mostly used behavior and

was followed by reflecting (25%) and directing (18%). The other categories were negotiating (7%), presenting and reinforcing (6%), reminding (3%), humour (2%), giving examples, problem solving and listening (1%). The frequency of encouraging and standardizing behaviors were so low that their percentage was 0% out of 832 behaviors (see Table 5.)

These results reveal that the three most occurring categories (clarifying, reflecting and directing) were the same in conferences 3. and 4. but there were differences in their frequencies.

**Table 5. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4.**

|                          | <b>Conference 3</b> | <b>Conference 4</b> |              |          |
|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|----------|
| <b>Behaviors</b>         | <b>Number*</b>      | <b>Number*</b>      | <b>Total</b> | <b>%</b> |
| Clarifying               | 121                 | 118                 | 239          | 29%      |
| Reflecting               | 93                  | 112                 | 205          | 25%      |
| Directing                | 64                  | 84                  | 148          | 18%      |
| Negotiating              | 25                  | 34                  | 59           | 7%       |
| Presenting               | 23                  | 31                  | 54           | 6%       |
| Reinforcing              | 27                  | 20                  | 47           | 5%       |
| Reminding                | 11                  | 11                  | 22           | 3%       |
| Checking understanding   | 9                   | 8                   | 17           | 2%       |
| Humour                   | 6                   | 11                  | 17           | 2%       |
| Problem solving          | 4                   | 3                   | 7            | 1%       |
| Listening                | 3                   | 4                   | 7            | 1%       |
| Giving examples          | 1                   | 5                   | 6            | 1%       |
| Encouraging              | 3                   | 1                   | 4            | 0%       |
| Standardizing            | 0                   | 0                   | 0            | 0%       |
| Total                    | 390                 | 442                 | 832          | 100%     |
| *Number of the behaviors |                     |                     |              |          |

As Table 5. reveals clarifying was the mostly employed category by the supervisor. Of 239 behaviors, 180 of them were in the form of questions (75%) and 59 of them were paraphrases or explanations (25%). The novice supervisor asked questions to clarify the student teacher's point of view or explained the topic under discussion as in the following examples:

## 9.

Ö: Aysun sen ne yapıyorsun? (clarifying)

A: Ben reading yapıyorum.

Ö: Cocuklara nasıl okumaları gerektiğini mi öğreteceksin? (clarifying)

A: Detailed information bulacaklar.

Ö: Ha, bulmayı mı öğreteceksin? (clarifying)



A: Yani normal bir reading parçası, true-false sorular var.

Ö: İste anlamadım da onun için soruyorum (clarifying).

A: Normal bir reading.

Ö: Sanki strateji öğretimi gibi anladım da onun için soruyorum (clarifying). “To have the students read a text in order to get detailed information” desen belki daha iyi olabilir.

Çünkü. Detailed information için şunları şunları yapacaksınız diye bir şey öğretiyor musun? (clarifying)

A: Öğretmiyorum da bende tereddütte kaldım.

(pre-observation conference 3 of student teacher 6)

Reflecting came after clarifying category and it was employed by the supervisor 205 times (25%) in the third and fourth conferences. The following chunk has examples of reflecting behavior:

## 10.

Ö: **Must ve mustn't karışık veriyorsun değil mi?**

E: Evet, aslında ben sadece must vermek istiyordum ama kitapta ikisini birden almış.

Ö: Olur problem değil. **Önce must'a dikkatlerini çekersin sonra mustn't anlatırsın, karışıkta olsa natural kullanımda yeri geldiğinde ikisini de kullanıyoruz. Sen burada yapılmaması gerekenler için mustn't olduğunu yapılması gerekenler için must olduğunu vurgulayarak onlardan alırsın. Tahtaya yazarken de 1, 2 yi sen yazarsın diğerlerini onlardan almaya çalışırsın.**

E: Genelde yapıyorlar hocam.

Ö: **Evet genelde üretiyorlar** (reflecting). **O zaman siz söyleyin ben yazayım falan dersin. “When do we use must, mustn't diyorsun” niye böyle söylüyorsun?**

E: Yapmamız ve yapmamamız gereken şeyler gibi birşeyler.

Ö: **Peki sen bunun üstüne gramer açıklaması yazıyor musun?**

E: Hayır

Ö: **Tamam, anlayıp anlamadıklarını kontrol ediyorsun** (reflecting). **Öyle şeyler kullanma gramer açıklaması gibi. Türkçede söyleyebilirsin.**

E: Zaten buradaki konuşmaların hiçbiri İngilizce olarak geçmiyor ki sadece.

Ö: **Hayır, canım olur mu şunlar geçiyor** (reflecting). **Türkçede geçsin problem değil. Şimdi artık exersizlere geçtim. Bu presentation ile hiç bilmeyen birine anlatırım diyorsun yani** (reflecting).

E: Umarım diyorum.

(pre-observation conference 3 of student teacher 4)

Directing behaviors appeared 148 times (18%) in the data. Of these 148 behaviors, 119 of them were in direct style (80%), 12 of them were in indirect style (8%) and 17 of them were confirmation (12%). When the number of directing behaviors in the first two pre-observation conferences and the last two pre-observation conferences are compared, it is seen that directing type of behaviors were used less in the last conferences. This may be due to the fact that student teachers developed themselves as future teachers and the supervisor did not need to tell the student teachers what to do. The following chunk includes examples of directing:

## 11.

Ö: Picture elicitation yaptırıyorsun ya burda. (reading) Evet işte şunu yaptıracağsın. Sen onu yapmışsın. Onların dikkatini çekmen lazım (directing-direct style). Ne var demek, her şey hazır di mi, ne yapacak. He is going to make a cake. Yani, bu going to nun function olarak nerde kullanıldığını iyice anlasınlar (directing-direct style), tamam? (confirmation) Bütün resimlerde ona dikkat et (directing-direct style). Mesela şöyle adamdan bahsediyorsan, bakın sırt çantası var, otobüs var, başına şortunu şapkasını giymiş. Ne yapacak bu, ha, seyahate gidecek, belli artık. He is going to travel. Gibi, tamam. Burda yaptığının hepsini yine yap (directing-direct style). Tahtaya yazıyorsun, altına cümleleri yazıyorsun. (reading) in the bedroom...

A: Arkada...

Ö: Şu mu? Bak mesela burda ayısını yapmamışsın, yani planda göstermemişsin, ama yap (directing-direct style) tamam mı? (confirmation) Where is he? Demişsin, she herhalde olacak. In the bedroom.

A: Onda fazla bir şey göremedim de o yüzden orda fazla bir şey yazmadım.

Ö: Niye canım, bakın ne yapıyor, yatağa giriyor. Efendim, saat kaç, saat on.

A: Anladım.

Ö: Hani, yatma saati falan gibi. Tamam? Şu she ve sleep gözükmese zaten (directing-direct style).

A: Yok, yok.

Ö: Onlardan alıyorsun. Yatacak artık, her şey belli artık görüyorsun, yatmak üzere. Tamam.

A: Hı-hı.

Ö: Tamam? Pijamalarını giymiş.

A: Ha, evet.

Ö: Tamam. Bunların hepsine onların dikkatini çekip, ondan sonra, en son, she is going to sleepi ver (directing-direct style).

A: Tamam.

Ö: Tamam, bu daha iyi. (reading silently) Burda çocuklara, bakın hava kapalı, dark, and clouds, çocuk bir de bak havayı, gökyüzünü gösteriyor, özellikle de havanın karanlık olması falan, ne olabilir o zaman. Hep onlardan al bunları (directing-direct style), tamam mı? (confirmation) Ha, ondan sonra it's going to rain diye ver (directing-direct style), tamam? (confirmation)

(pre-observation conference 4 of student teacher 6)

The following chunks can be given as examples of less frequent behaviors such as presenting, negotiating, reinforcing, reminding, checking understanding and humor:

## 12.

Ö: (reads silently)

A: Şöyle bir göz atıyoruz... neden bahsediyor

Ö: Göz atmasınlar ya, okusunlar işte (directing-direct style).

A: Yani, işte, first reading olduğu için

Ö: Ama, glance deme ama, read the story and find out what it is about (directing-direct style). Ya da read the story and see whether your guess is true or false gibi bir şey diyebilirsin (presenting).

A: Hı-hı.

Ö: Ok? Tamam, sonra good diyorsun. Sonra burda bitiyor bu. (reads silently) Şöyle resimler veriyorsun, sonra onları hikayeye göre sıraya koyuyorlar (reflecting).

A: Evet.

Ö: Ok. Güzel bir aktivite (reinforcing). (reads silently) Tamam, checkingini yapıyorsun.

Ö: Burda bitiyor mu plan?

A: Hı-hı.

Ö: Bence, tavsiyem, bir tane daha ekle bir şeyler, şey, during readinge. True/False question olabilir, comprehension question olabilir. Belki de bu tür bir şey ekle bence (presenting). Çünkü duringte çocuklara yaptırdığım tek aktivite resimleri sıraya koydurmak (clarifying). Bence ona bir dikkat et (directing-direct style). Birde vocabulary teaching steplerini göz önünde bulundur. Sadece türkçelerini verip geçme. Tamam mı, yani en azından o şekilde anlatmaya çalış (directing-direct style).

A: Burda Türkçesini ben vermedim

Ö: Biliyorum, biliyorum, hayır, sonra students(?) yazıyor, onu gördüm ben. Zaten ben bu (???) az olduğunu düşünüyorum, seni zorlayacağımı düşünmüyorum (reflecting). Tamam. Bence buraya sana tavsiyem bir şeyler daha ekle ki (presenting), çünkü bizim bu during aktivitelerini kullanmamızın amacı ne, çocukların parçayı daha iyi anlamalarına yardımcı olmak (clarifying). Tamam. Sadece bunu yaparak biraz zayıf(?), ya true false ya da comprehension tarzı bir şey ekle sen. Ya da başka bir during reading aktivitesi olabilir, daha anlamlı mantıklı olduğunu düşündüğün başka bir şey varsa (presenting). Daha iyi olur diyorum ben. OK? (checking understanding)

A: Hı-hı.

(pre-observation conference 4 of student teacher 6)

### 13.

Ö: Ne demek "litter" biliyor musun? (clarifying)

E: Evet.

Ö: Onlar biliyorlar mı peki? Senin bilmen normalde (reflecting).

E: Söyleyim mi bilmiyorlarsa?

Ö: Söylersin (directing-direct style). Bu zaten çok güzel kendi contextlerinde (reflecting). Az önce kuralları konuşmuştuk ya (reminding), onların daha geniş kapsamlısı burada var, bunlar yapmanız zorunda olduğunuz ya da yapmamanız gerekenler hadi yazın diyip yazdırabilirsin (presenting), güzel (reinforcing). Sonra Ok that's enough diyorsun sonra niye kitaplarımı açmalarımı istiyorsun?

E: Ödev veriyorum.

Ö: Ödev olduğu belli değil (reflecting), homework olduğunu mutlaka belirt (directing-direct style). Çünkü onlar anlamıyorlar açıklamak lazım (clarifying).

Tamam (negotiating), senden sonra bu sınıfta devam edecek var mı?

E: Yok.

Ö: Tamam, anca bu kadar olur diyorsun zaten (reflecting). Su son aktiviten güzel meaningful (reinforcing). Zaman artarsa ne yapacaksın?

E: Kitaplarına devam edebilirim.

Ö: Biraz daha productive birşeyler yap (directing-direct style).

E: Aktivitelerin daha devamı var.

Ö: Tamam ama zaman kalırsa daha productive bir şey olsun (directing-direct style).

E: Evde mesela neler yapmalı.

Ö: Evet onlardan almaya başla, daha free production'a yönelik birşeyler olsun (directing-direct style). Ona bir bak planla (directing-direct style), organizasyon gidışat gavet iyi (reinforcing). Teşekkür ederim. Konuştuğumuz şeyleri yine bir düşünürsün (directing-direct style). Hadi kolay gelsin (encouraging).

(pre-observation conference 3 of student teacher 4)

**Table 6. The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4.**

| Behaviors              | Pre-observation conference 3. |            |             | Pre-observation conference 4. |            |             |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                        | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           |
| Listening              | DI                            | 3          | 1%          | DI                            | 4          | 1%          |
| Clarifying             | DI, DC, C                     | 121        | 31%         | DC, DI, C                     | 118        | 27%         |
| Encouraging            | C                             | 3          | 1%          | C                             | 1          | 0%          |
| Reflecting             | C                             | 93         | 24%         | C                             | 112        | 25%         |
| Negotiating            | C                             | 25         | 6%          | C                             | 34         | 8%          |
| Problem solving        | DC, DI                        | 4          | 1%          | DC, DI                        | 3          | 0%          |
| Presenting             | DC, C                         | 23         | 6%          | DC, C                         | 31         | 7%          |
| Directing              | DC, DI                        | 64         | 16%         | DC, DI                        | 84         | 19%         |
| Standardizing          |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| Reinforcing            | DC, DI                        | 27         | 7%          | DC, DI                        | 20         | 5%          |
| Checking understanding |                               | 9          | 2%          |                               | 8          | 2%          |
| Reminding              |                               | 11         | 3%          |                               | 11         | 3%          |
| Humour                 |                               | 6          | 2%          |                               | 11         | 3%          |
| Giving examples        |                               | 1          | 0%          |                               | 5          | 1%          |
| <b>Total</b>           |                               | <b>390</b> | <b>100%</b> |                               | <b>442</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*number of the behaviors

\*\* DC for Directive Control Style

DI for Directive Informational Style

C for Collaborative Style

When the third and fourth pre-observation conferences are taken into account in terms of the most frequent behaviors, it is seen that in pre-observation conference 3. clarifying comes the first and is followed by reflecting, directing, reinforcing, negotiating and presenting. Compared to the first and second pre-observation conferences, the novice supervisor seems to use less behaviors. It is seen that there is a decrease in the number of all behaviors. The novice supervisor seems to adapt an eclectic supervisory style in this conference, too. In terms of the behaviors in pre-observation conference 4, clarifying is the mostly used behavior, and followed by reflecting, directing, negotiating and presenting. There seems to be slight differences in the use of behaviors between conference 3. and 4.

In terms of clarifying, the number of clarifying behaviors decreased in the fourth conference. This may be due to the lesson plan or the development of student teachers.

The novice supervisor might not have needed to ask questions related to the plan or he might not have needed to explain or clarify the topic under discussion.

In terms of listening, the novice supervisor employed listening with only one student teacher in pre-observation conference 3. whereas he employed this type of behavior 4 times in pre-observation conference 4. with student teacher 1. (n=3) and student teacher 4. (n=1). The novice supervisor did not employ standardizing at all. As the practicum process was about to finish, the supervisor did not standardize the subsequent course of action. It can be due to the student teachers' development and they might have learned what to do about the lesson plan. In terms of encouraging behavior, there is a decrease in the frequency of behaviors. The supervisor employed encouraging 3 times with student teachers 4., 5. and 6. in pre-observation conference 3. while he used this behavior once with student teacher 6. (n=1). The supervisor might not need to provide acknowledgment responses since the 4th conference was near the end of practicum process.

In order to find whether the skills taught in the lesson plans had an effect on the use of behaviors, the lesson plans of the student teachers in the third and fourth pre-observation conferences were also investigated. It was seen that grammar outweighed reading and it was used 8 times in 12 lesson plans in pre-observation conferences 3 and 4 as in the following:

**Table 7. The skills taught in lesson plans 3. and 4. by the student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor.**

|                    | Skills taught in lesson plan<br>1. | Skills taught in lesson plan<br>2. |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Student teacher 1. | Grammar                            | grammar                            |
| Student teacher 2. | Grammar                            | reading                            |
| Student teacher 3. | Grammar                            | reading                            |
| Student teacher 4. | Grammar                            | reading                            |
| Student teacher 5. | Grammar                            | grammar                            |
| Student teacher 6. | Reading                            | grammar                            |

Investigating the supervisory behaviors and the skills taught, it was found that the skills taught in the lesson plans and the supervisory styles employed in the conferences had no

relationship since most of the skills were grammar and the supervisor's style did not change according to the skill.

#### **4.2.3. Comparison of the pre-observation conferences that were carried out by the novice supervisor at the beginning and at the end of the practicum**

The pre-observation conferences that were held at the beginning and at the end of the practicum were compared in order to find out whether there were differences between these conferences. The novice supervisor used less behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4. compared to the pre-observation conferences 1. and 2. There was an overall decrease in the number of most of the behaviors. However, the mostly used behaviors did not change in all the conferences; clarifying, reflecting and directing were the mostly employed behaviors and Directive Control, Directive Informational and Collaborative Styles were the mostly employed styles.

In terms of negotiating and presenting, the number of behaviors decreased in the 3rd and 4th conferences but the use of reinforcing type of behaviors increased in the last two conferences. In the first two conferences, problem solving type of behaviors were used more than they were used in the last two conferences. There is a striking decrease in the use of this behavior. The novice supervisor and the student teachers may not have encountered a lot of problems near the end of the practicum and the student teachers may have developed themselves. Checking understanding was another category that was used more in the first two conferences. The novice supervisor may have not needed to check whether the student teachers understood what he said but he used reminding more in the last two conferences. Similarly, there is an increase in the use of listening type of behaviors in the last two conferences. There is a striking increase in the use of humor type of behaviors in the last two conferences. The novice supervisor made humorous remarks or jokes more since the supervisor and the student teachers got accustomed to one another and started to feel comfortable as teacher candidates.

#### **4.2.4. The experienced supervisor's the first two pre-observation conferences**

When the two pre-observation conferences are taken into account, it is seen that a total of 547 behaviors were employed by the novice supervisor (see Table 8). Of these

547 behaviors, clarifying (32%) had the highest percentage and it was followed by reflecting (28%), directing (17%), negotiating and presenting (7%), reinforcing (3%), problem solving (2%). Checking understanding, encouraging, reminding and standardizing were used less and listening and giving examples type of behaviors were not used at all by the experienced supervisor.

In the second conference with student teacher 6., a new category emerged which was named as reproaching because the supervisor was angry with student teacher 6. about something he was supposed to do but did not do. The supervisor used phrases that express reproaching or showed her anger with intonation such as: “20 tane alıştırmamı yazdın?”, “Hani zaten planda yok ortada!”, “Böyle mi öğrendik kelime öğretimini?” However, compared to other behaviors reproaching was used very little. Since there were 547 behaviors, percentage of reproaching category was 0%.

**Table 8. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.**

|                          | Conference 1 | Conference 2 |       |      |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|------|
| Behaviors                | Number*      | Number*      | Total | %    |
| Clarifying               | 85           | 91           | 176   | 32%  |
| Reflecting               | 76           | 78           | 154   | 28%  |
| Directing                | 49           | 42           | 91    | 16%  |
| Negotiating              | 17           | 19           | 36    | 7%   |
| Presenting               | 11           | 27           | 38    | 7%   |
| Reinforcing              | 3            | 11           | 14    | 2%   |
| Problem solving          | 5            | 4            | 9     | 2%   |
| Encouraging              | 5            | 3            | 8     | 1%   |
| Standardizing            | 4            | 2            | 6     | 1%   |
| Checking understanding   | 4            | 1            | 5     | 1%   |
| Reminding                | 1            | 4            | 5     | 1%   |
| Humour                   | 3            | 1            | 4     | 0%   |
| Listening                | 0            | 0            | 0     | 0%   |
| Giving examples          | 0            | 0            | 0     | 0%   |
| Reproaching              | 0            | 1            | 1     | 0%   |
| Total                    | 263          | 284          | 547   | 100% |
| *The number of behaviors |              |              |       |      |

These results reveal that the experienced supervisor used either questions to clarify the topic or paraphrased or explained the topic under discussion. Of these 176 clarifying

behaviors, 100 of them were in the form of questions (57%) and 76 of them were paraphrases or explanations (43%); the experienced supervisor asked questions to clarify the student teacher's point of view or explained the topic under discussion as in the following examples:

#### 14.

S: **Bu mu cue card? (clarifying)**

ST: Evet, may in tekrarı gibi bir şey. Olumsuz şeklini öğrenmediler.

S: **"May I use it?" derse "Yes, of course" diyemez mi ?(clarifying)**

ST: Diyebilir, olumsuz cevap yok daha ziyade olumlu cevap var. Olumsuz derken....

S: **Negatif cümleyse positif, positif cümleyse negatif anlamlı (clarifying)**

ST: Ama sonuçta may not geçmiyor.

S: **Ben şunu demek istiyorum. "May I use it?" in cevabı illa "sorry" mi olmak zorunda? (clarifying)**

ST: O şekilde düşünmemiştim ben kitaba bağlı kaldığım için.

S: **Kitapta öyle mi diyor? (clarifying)**

ST: Genelde egzersizler o şekilde ilerliyor, kafalarını karıştırmayım diye başka türlü vermedim. Çünkü bu kalıplar önceden verilmiş paket halinde.

S: **Şimdi bak, "sorry I need it myself" dedi, sonra "of course, you can" mi diyecek? (clarifying)**

ST: Evet, bu kalıp var çünkü

S: **Outline söyle herhalde. A S'den bir şey istiyor, o da havır veremem diyor, A'da tamam olsun diyor, sonra S A'dan bir şey istiyor, o da tamam olabilir diyor. Böyle mi gelişiyor? (clarifying)**

ST: Evet.

(pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 2)

Reflecting came after clarifying category and it was employed by the supervisor 154 times (28%) in the third and fourth conferences. The following chunk has examples of reflecting behavior:

#### 15.

Ö: **Burada homework demişsin (reflecting), neymiş bu?**

S: Şurada practice 1.

Ö: **In which falan koyma.**

S: Tamam, onları atıcam zaten.

Ö: **A Bir dakika sen "who" nun kullanımını öğrettin.**

S: Evet.

Ö: **Hepsini değiştir (directing), hepsi karışmış. Okuduğum bütün örnekler subject konumundaydı (reflecting). Which'i de subject konumunda öğrettin. Ne güzel context yaratmışsin (reflecting), nereden çıktı, bu combine cümleler? (reproaching)**

S: Ama bu da 2. bölümü.

Ö: **Ama senin asıl yaptığın sev cümleler (reflecting). Yıllarca hep öyle görmüşsünüz farklı bir model görmemişsiniz ki sizi suçlamıyorum.**

S: Şu production bölümü. Resimlerin hepsini tahtaya yapıştırıyorum, en sonuna da şuradakileri yazıyorum. Bunları resimlere bakıp cümle kuracaklar.

(pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 1)



Directing behaviors appeared 91 times in the data. Of these 91 behaviors, 83 of them were in direct style (91%), 6 of them were in indirect style (7%) and 2 of them were confirmation (2%). The following chunk has examples of directing behavior:

## 16.

A: Pardon, "The person who wears sunglasses is Arnold" da olabilir.

Ö: **Olabilir tabi. Tamamen bir production aktivitesi yapıyorsun. O zaman Semra sen o resimlerden Ali'ye ver, daha doğrusu sen onları kullanmaya fırsat bulamayacaksın, Ali sen onlarla başla (directing), ya da Artundan aldığın alıştırmalarla başla bunlarla devam et (directing). Bunları da ders vermeden yaptırılmazsın çocuklara ya fiili ver, ya başka bir sevi, birşeyler vermek zorundasın (directing).** Bu çocuklar o resimlere bakıp hemen birşeyler üretmez.

A: Bu alıştırmayı yapacak mıyım?

Ö: **Hiç yapma (directing). Çünkü zaten onlarda subjectler objectler karışmış. Ya da 6-7 ye indir (directing), yarım sayfalık bir aktivite hazırlayabilirsin. Ama alıştırmaları mutlaka kontrol edin birbirinizden, subject object konumundakilere bakın (directing)**  
(pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 6)

## 17.

S: Burada bunu vermek zorundayım hocam, çünkü may ve can'ı anlatmak zorundayım. Kitapların hepsi bunu birlikte vermiş.

Ö: **O zaman "when we want to be more polite" yaz buraya (directing-direct style).**

S: Tamam.

Ö: **Burada çocuklar no diyebilirler sana, onu da eklersin (directing-direct style).**

S: Olur. Kitaplarında geçiyor bu konu.

Ö: **Tamam, bu resimleri boyayacaksın herhalde (directing-indirect style).**

S: Bunlar daha belirgin olsun diye boyamadım. Resimleride kitaptan seçtim zaten.

Ö: **Tamam, checking understanding yapıyorsun sonra. "You are going to make one dialogue for each picture" demişsin, bakabilir miyim ona da?**

S: Şunlar, bunlar biraz controlled, üçünü birden yapmalarını istedim, zaman verdim.

Ö: **Peki hepsinde mi aynı kişi sorup cevaplıyor?**

S: Hayır, change your roles yazmıştım oraya.

Ö: **Ben göremedim. Tek tek yaptırarsana (directing-direct style).**

S: Nasıl?

Ö: **Birini yapınlar check edin (directing-direct style). Sonra change your roles de diğerlerini check et (directing-direct style).**

S: Karışıklık olur diye ben hepsini birden yaptırarak istedim.

Ö: **Yo, hepsi birden karışabilir, tek tek yaptır (directing-direct style).**

S: Tamam. Burada da pairler bir diyalog yapacaklar, birbirinden bunları isteyecekler. Bu durumda A ve B rollerini değiştirecekler, ikisi de birbirinden isteyecek.

Ö: **Ama sen şey öğretmedin. Mesela excuse nedir.**

S: Ben onu öğrenciler diye kabul ettim, burada direk verilmiş çünkü burada vurgulanmadığı için vermedim.

Ö: **Hocaya onu sorsaydın keske biliyorlarmı bilmiyorlarmı diye (directing-indirect style).**

S: Onlar bayağı ilerlemişler ben öyle düşündüm.

(pre-observation conference 1 of student teacher 3)

When the first and second pre-observation conferences are taken into account in terms of the most frequent behaviors, it is seen that in pre-observation conference 1. and 2. clarifying is the mostly used category and it is followed by reflecting and directing. In pre-observation conference 1. negotiating comes in the fourth place and followed by negotiating whereas in pre-observation conference 2. presenting comes in the fourth place and followed by presenting.

**Table 9. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 1. and 2.**

| Behaviors              | Pre-observation conference 1. |            |             | Pre-observation conference 2. |            |             |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                        | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           |
| Listening              |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| Clarifying             | DI, DC, C                     | 85         | 32%         | DC, DI, C                     | 91         | 32%         |
| Encouraging            | C                             | 5          | 2%          | C                             | 3          | 1%          |
| Reflecting             | C                             | 76         | 29%         | C                             | 78         | 28%         |
| Negotiating            | C                             | 17         | 6%          | C                             | 19         | 7%          |
| Problem solving        | DC, DI                        | 5          | 2%          | DC, DI                        | 4          | 1%          |
| Presenting             | DC, C                         | 11         | 4%          | DC, C                         | 27         | 10%         |
| Directing              | DC, DI                        | 49         | 19%         | DC, DI                        | 42         | 15%         |
| Standardizing          | DC                            | 4          | 2%          | DC                            | 2          | 1%          |
| Reinforcing            | DC, DI                        | 3          | 1%          | DC, DI                        | 11         | 4%          |
| Checking understanding |                               | 4          | 2%          |                               | 1          | 0%          |
| Reminding              |                               | 1          | 0%          |                               | 4          | 1%          |
| Humour                 |                               | 3          | 1%          |                               | 1          | 0%          |
| Giving examples        |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| Reproaching            |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 1          | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>           |                               | <b>263</b> | <b>100%</b> |                               | <b>284</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*number of the behaviors

\*\* DC for Directive Control Style

DI for Directive Informational Style

C for Collaborative Style

There seem to be slight differences in the use of behaviors between conference 1. and 2. However, in terms of standardizing, the frequency of this behavior decreases in the second conference. The experienced supervisor does not seem to standardize the subsequent course of action since the student teacher learned what to do about the

lesson plan (see Table 9. for the frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conference 1. and 2). In terms of reinforcing behavior, there is an increase in the frequency of behaviors. The supervisor employed reinforcing three times with student teacher 1. and 5. and in pre-observation conference 1. while she used this behavior 11 times with student teacher 1. (n=4), student teacher 2. (n=3), student teacher 3. (n=3) and student teacher 5. (n=1). In terms of presenting, there is an increase in the use of behaviors in the second conference. The supervisor preferred to give suggestions or her ideas to student teachers instead of telling what to do. Thus, the number of directing behaviors decreased in the second conference. In order to find whether the skills taught in the lesson plans had an effect on the use of behaviors, the lesson plans of the student teachers in the first and second pre-observation conferences were also investigated. It was seen that grammar was the mostly employed skill that was followed by reading in lesson plans 1 and 2 as in the following:

**Table 10. The skills taught in lesson plans 1. and 2. by the student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor.**

|                    | Skills taught in lesson plan 1. | Skills taught in lesson plan 2. |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Student teacher 1. | Grammar                         | grammar                         |
| Student teacher 2. | Reading                         | grammar                         |
| Student teacher 3. | Grammar                         | grammar                         |
| Student teacher 4. | Grammar                         | reading                         |
| Student teacher 5. | Grammar                         | grammar                         |
| Student teacher 6. | Grammar                         | grammar                         |

After examining the behaviors in the conferences and the skills taught, there appeared to be no differences in the use of behaviors. Since the majority of the skills were grammar, it is difficult to detect whether the skill has an effect on the use of supervisory behaviors.

#### 4.2.5. Experienced supervisor's the last two pre-observation conferences

When the third and fourth pre-observation conferences are taken into account in terms of the most frequent behaviors, it is seen that in pre-observation conference 3. clarifying comes the first and is followed by reflecting, directing, presenting and negotiating (see Table 11. for the distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conference 3. and 4.). Compared to the first and second pre-observation conferences, the experienced supervisor seems to use less behaviors.

In terms of the behaviors in pre-observation conference 3. and 4., clarifying is the mostly used behavior, reflecting comes the second, directing comes the third, presenting comes the fourth and negotiating comes in the fifth place. There seems to be slight differences in the use of behaviors between conference 3. and 4. The number of presenting type of behaviors increased in the fourth conference and as a result directing type of behaviors decreased. The experienced supervisor seemed to give suggestions or her ideas to student teachers instead of telling them directly what to do.

**Table 11. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4.**

|                           | <b>Conference 3</b> | <b>Conference 4</b> |              |             |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Behaviors</b>          | <b>Number*</b>      | <b>Number*</b>      | <b>Total</b> | <b>%</b>    |
| Clarifying                | 96                  | 83                  | 179          | 32%         |
| Reflecting                | 82                  | 80                  | 162          | 28%         |
| Directing                 | 46                  | 39                  | 85           | 14%         |
| Presenting                | 25                  | 30                  | 55           | 10%         |
| Negotiating               | 18                  | 15                  | 33           | 6%          |
| Problem solving           | 7                   | 7                   | 14           | 2%          |
| Reinforcing               | 8                   | 4                   | 12           | 2%          |
| Reminding                 | 5                   | 5                   | 10           | 2%          |
| Humour                    | 3                   | 7                   | 10           | 2%          |
| Encouraging               | 2                   | 4                   | 6            | 1%          |
| Standardizing             | 2                   | 3                   | 5            | 1%          |
| Checking understanding    | 0                   | 4                   | 4            | 1%          |
| Reproaching               | 3                   | 0                   | 3            | 1%          |
| Giving examples           | 0                   | 0                   | 0            | 0%          |
| Listening                 | 0                   | 0                   | 0            | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>297</b>          | <b>281</b>          | <b>578</b>   | <b>100%</b> |
| * The number of behaviors |                     |                     |              |             |

As the Table 11. reveals, clarifying is the mostly employed category by the experienced supervisor. The supervisor used either questions to clarify the topic or paraphrased or explained the topic under discussion. Of these 179 clarifying behaviors, 115 of them were in the form of questions (64%) and 64 of them were paraphrases or explanations (36%); the experienced supervisor asked questions to clarify the student teacher's point of view or explained the topic under discussion as in the following examples:

18.

Ö: Ne yapıyorsun bakalım. Detailed information mı var burada? (clarifying)

S: True-falselar var.

Ö: Çocuklar detailed information'a focus oluyor, implied meaning falan yok değil mi? (clarifying)

S: İşte true.- falselarda implied olanlar var, mesela yorum olan sorular var.

Ö: O inference, implied meaning o değil, oradaki texti düşün öyle direk söylemeyeip ima ediyordu ya implied meaning o (clarifying). Resmi arkada mı görecekler? (clarifying)

S: Evet.

Ö: "May" öğretiyorsun burada. Aynı picture mı? (clarifying)

(pre-observation conference 4 of student teacher 3).

Reflecting came after clarifying category and it was employed by the supervisor 162 times (28%) in the third and fourth conferences. The following chunk has examples of reflecting behavior:

19.

Ö: Kaçlara anlatıyorsunuz?

M: 7. sınıflara.

Ö: "Understand what is omitted" pek açık olmamış (reflecting).

M: Reference wordlerle ilgili.

Ö: Ha, reference wordlerle ilgili (reflecting). Active vocabulary hangilerinin?

M: Burada.

Ö: Ona bakayım istersen ben elimizde kalacak olan o (reflecting). Bunları tahtaya mı yazacaksın?

M: Evet tahtaya yazıcam. İlk önce böyle sormayıp biraz alıştırıcam.

Ö: Anlamayacaklar sen bir espri yapmışsın (reflecting) ama çocuklar bunu anlamıyacaklar (reproaching).

M: Genelde öyle oluyor ama olsun kulaklarında kalıcaktır. Biraz zorluyor gibi oluyor ama öteki türünde bir şey yapabilirim eğer beğenmediyseniz.

Ö: Ben beğenmedim demiyorum (reflecting) çocuklar anlamayınca sen amacına ulaşamıyorsun da o yüzden.

(pre-observation conference 3 of student teacher 2).

Directing behaviors appeared 85 times in the data. Of these 85 behaviors, 79 of them were in direct style (93%), 4 of them were in indirect style (5%) and 2 of them were confirmation (2%). The following chunk has examples of directing behavior:

## 20.

Ö: **Ne anlatıyorsun?**

C: hocam listening yapıyorum.

Ö: **Listening yapacaksın şarkı bulacaktın, buldun mu?**

C: Buldum, Mustafa Sandal'ın bir şarkısı vardı, Athenanın şarkısı da vardı ama past perfectler var çocuklar bilmiyorlar. O yüzden onu almadım.

Ö: **'How to listen to a song' and understand literal information diyebilirsin burada.**

C: Song desek daha güzel olurmuş aslında. Specific information yapacaktım da hangi information olduğunu bilemedim.

Ö: **'Listen to' hiç unutma bunu (directing-direct style). Sözlerini mi önce verdin?**

C: Hayır, duydukları kelimelere tick atacaklar.

Ö: **Hangi Pre-reading? Bunların hepsi var mı?**

C: Everbody yok.

Ö: **Şarkının adı neydi?**

C: Moonlight diye geçiyor.

Ö: **Şimdi Ceyhuncum bir pre-listening yapıp çocukları hazırlaman gerekiyor şarkının contextinin ne hakkında olabileceğine dair. İstersen 'Love like a moonlight' diye tahtaya yaz. Bu şarkı ne hakkında olabilir diye çocuklara prediction yaptır (directing-direct style). Ya da başka bir şey sadece love versen çok dağılırlar.**

C: Moonlight da diyebilirim.

Ö: **Yok bence bunu yaz sonra da niye sizce aşkı moonlighta benzetiyor diye sor (directing-direct style).**

C: Bu şekilde aklıma gelmemişti.

Ö: **Direk listening gibi yapıyorsunuz, yine çocukları hazırlıyorsunuz, yine contextten idea bulmalarını sağlıyorsunuz. Predictionları check etmek için dinletirsin o zaman (directing-direct style).**

C: Tamam.

(pre-observation conference 4 of student teacher 4).

The number of presenting type of behaviors showed an increase in the third and fourth conferences. The experienced supervisor gave her ideas and suggestions more in these conferences. As a new category, reproaching was applied 3 times in pre-observation conference 3 with student teacher 5 and student teacher 6. The following chunk has examples of presenting and reproaching type of behaviors:

## 21.

Ö: **Bunu ilk defa görmüyorlar değil mi, öğrendiler sadece practice.**

A: Önce passive practice

Ö: **Peki burada neyi practice yapacaklar?**

A: Yapıyı görecekler, kitaptan aldım.

Ö: **Çok mekanik geldi de.**

A: Direk yapıyı görecekler.

Ö: **O zaman şöyle ortaya büyük büyük yapsan (presenting).**

A: Olabilir hocam, hepsi için büyük yapmadım. Her seferinde yapacaklar zaten, hepsi için yapmadık.

Ö: **Şöyle oklarla (presenting).**

A: Yapı şurada büyük olsaydı diyorsunuz, tamam, hocam öyle ayarlayım.

Ö: **Sonuçta forma focus olunan bir aktivite. Bu da başka bir aktivite, sıkıcı gibi görünüyor. E, başka aktivite yok mu?**

A: Bir tane daha sıkıcı var hocam.

Ö: **Niye sıkıcı sıkıcı aktiver yapıyorsunuz çocuklar? Ay, bu aktivite iğrenç, en sıkıcısı. 3 tane sıkıcı aktivite üst üste yapılırsa çocuklar ne olur, Artun sürekli bağırarak susturmaya çalışır, sıkılırlar çünkü değil mi? Passive ile ilgili çok güzel aktiviteler var.**

A: Bu kabul görmedi mi hocam şimdi?

Ö: **Ne meaningful ne communicative aktiviteler var. Rica ediyorum.**

A: Hocam nasıl bulayım yarına?

Ö: **Bulsaydınız kardeşim (reproaching).**

A: Hocam bulsaydınız da, yarın anlatıyoruz, sabah 7.40 da.

Ö: **7.40 da anlatıyorsan 5 demi gelinir, 2 de gelinir, 11 de gelinir (reproaching).**

A: Akşamda hocamıza okutcaz, o yüzden randevu almaya gerek görmedik. Değişiklik yapıp plana ekleyelim o zaman.

Ö: **Onları verin çocuklara evde yapsınlar. İkisini üçünü derste check edin sadece, hepsini birden yapmayın. Tamam evde de yapsın çocuklar forma alışsınlar ama meaningful birşeyler de yapın lütfen.**

(pre-observation conference 3 of student teacher 5).

When the third and fourth pre-observation conferences are taken into account in terms of the most frequent behaviors, it is seen that in pre-observation conference 3. and 4. clarifying is the mostly used category and it is followed by reflecting, directing and presenting. There seem to be slight differences in the use of behaviors between conference 3. and 4.

In terms of encouraging behavior, there is an increase in the frequency of behaviors. The supervisor employed encouraging twice with student teacher 3. in pre-observation conference 3. while she used this behavior four times with student teachers 3., 4. and 6. The supervisor may have needed to provide acknowledgment responses since the 4th conference was near the end of practicum process and student teachers were about to finish practicum and start to work as teachers. Another reason may be due to reproaching type of behaviors the supervisor used with student teacher 6. The supervisor may have needed to support the student teacher she scolded in the previous conference.

Humour type of behaviors increase at the last conference and there is no reproaching type of behaviors in the fourth conference. This may be due to the relationship between the student teacher and the supervisor because they may have got

used to each other and may have felt comfortable. The supervisor may have wanted to create a friendly atmosphere in the last conference.

**Table 12. The experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4.**

| Behaviors              | Pre-observation conference 3. |            |             | Pre-observation conference 4. |            |             |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
|                        | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           | Supervisory style **          | number *   | %           |
| Listening              |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| Clarifying             | DI, DC, C                     | 96         | 32%         | DC, DI, C                     | 83         | 32%         |
| Encouraging            | C                             | 2          | 1%          | C                             | 4          | 1%          |
| Reflecting             | C                             | 82         | 28%         | C                             | 80         | 28%         |
| Negotiating            | C                             | 18         | 6%          | C                             | 15         | 7%          |
| Problem solving        | DC, C                         | 7          | 2%          | DC, C                         | 7          | 1%          |
| Presenting             | DC, C                         | 25         | 8%          | DC, C                         | 30         | 10%         |
| Directing              | DC, DI                        | 46         | 15%         | DC, DI                        | 39         | 15%         |
| Standardizing          | DC                            | 2          | 1%          | DC                            | 3          | 1%          |
| Reinforcing            | DC, DI                        | 8          | 3%          | DC, DI                        | 4          | 4%          |
| Checking understanding |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 4          | 0%          |
| Reminding              |                               | 5          | 2%          |                               | 5          | 1%          |
| Humour                 |                               | 3          | 1%          |                               | 7          | 0%          |
| Giving examples        |                               | 0          | 0%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| Reproaching            |                               | 3          | 1%          |                               | 0          | 0%          |
| <b>Total</b>           |                               | <b>297</b> | <b>100%</b> |                               | <b>281</b> | <b>100%</b> |

\*number of the behaviors

\*\* DC for Directive Control Style

DI for Directive Informational Style

C for Collaborative Style

In order to find whether the skills taught in the lesson plans had an effect on the use of behaviors, the lesson plans of the student teachers in the third and fourth pre-observation conferences were also investigated. It was seen that most of the plans were in teaching reading and it was followed by grammar. There was only one lesson plan that taught listening in pre-observation conferences 3. and 4. as in the following:



**Table 13. The skills taught in lesson plans 3. and 4. by the student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor.**

|                    | Skills taught in lesson plan 1. | Skills taught in lesson plan 2. |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Student teacher 1. | grammar                         | grammar                         |
| Student teacher 2. | reading                         | reading                         |
| Student teacher 3. | grammar                         | reading                         |
| Student teacher 4. | grammar                         | reading                         |
| Student teacher 5. | listening                       | reading                         |
| Student teacher 6. | reading                         | reading                         |

After examining the behaviors in the conferences and the skills taught, there appeared to be no differences in the use of behaviors. There were no differences among the conferences in which the lesson plans which included the teaching of grammar, reading and listening were given feedback.

#### **4.2.6. Comparison of the pre-observation conferences that were carried out by the experienced supervisor at the beginning and at the end of the practicum**

When the first two and the last two conferences were compared, it was seen that the experienced supervisor used more behaviors in the last two conferences. However, there were not striking differences in the use of clarifying, reflecting and directing type of behaviors. Their numbers were more or less similar. Presenting type of behaviors increased in the last two conferences. The experienced supervisor gave her ideas or suggestions more in the last two conferences. There is an increase in the use of problem solving and reminding behaviors. Giving examples and listening type of behaviors were not used at all by the experienced supervisor. The use of humor type of behaviors increased in the last two conferences. There were not many differences in the use of encouraging, standardizing and checking understanding type of behaviors. The behaviors were mostly used in Directive Informational, Directive Control and Collaborative Styles.

### **4.3. Comparison of the novice and the experienced supervisor**

The results reveal some similarities and differences between the novice and experienced supervisor. Similarities include the use of certain behaviors more than the others such as clarifying, reflecting and directing behaviors. Although their percentages differ between the novice and experienced supervisor, these categories outweigh the other categories.

Both the novice and experienced supervisor seem to apply an eclectic supervisory style since they do not stick to one style and use the behaviors typical of that style and use them with every student teacher in every conference. Instead, they employ a wide range of behaviors. For instance, they use directing that is a typical category in directive control and directive informational style, clarifying and reflecting that are typical categories in collaborative style. It was interesting to reveal that both supervisors did not use behaviors that were typical to nondirective style.

When the number of the behaviors in the first and the last pre-observation conferences are compared, it is seen that there is a decrease in the number. This decrease has support in literature. The results of Sinclair's (1997) study suggests that student teachers face intensive application of supervision at the beginning of the practicum and then a gradually decrease as the student teacher matures as a teacher. She claims that it is not to be expected that the frequency of the supervisory practices should be maintained or increased but rather it should be expected that supervision should gradually decrease as student teachers gain in confidence as teachers. Supervisors give a lot of support and help initially, both with what to teach and with techniques and materials to use; this detailed guidance is often gradually withdrawn as trainees' ability increases in identifying the students' language needs and in preparing activities and materials to satisfy them (Gower et al., 1995).

One of the differences between the supervisors is the length of pre-observation conferences. The conferences the novice supervisor carried out lasted for about 30 minutes while the conferences the experienced supervisor carried out lasted for about 15-20 minutes. Thus, the idea units emerged in each supervisor's conference were different. Novice supervisor seemed to apply 558 behaviors in pre-observation conference 1., 480 behaviors in pre-observation conference 2., 390 behaviors in pre-observation conference 3. and 442 behaviors in pre-observation conference 4. The total

number of behaviors is 1870. The experienced supervisor, on the other hand, applied 263 behaviors in pre-observation conference 1., 284 behaviors in pre-observation conference 2., 297 behaviors in pre-observation conference 3. and 281 behaviors in pre-observation conference 4. The total number of behaviors is 1125 (see Table 14 and Table 15 for the novice and the experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors and styles in all pre-observation conferences).

These differences may stem from the supervisors as well as from student teachers. In order to find the causes of this difference, lesson plans of the student teachers were also collected and checked. It was found out that the student teachers who had conferences with the novice supervisor prepared very detailed lesson plans so their conferences lasted longer compared to the conferences of experienced supervisor. Furthermore, the novice supervisor seemed to give feedback on every aspect of the lesson plan in detail. However, the lesson plans of some of the student teachers who had conferences with the experienced supervisor were short (especially 4th, 5th and 6th student teachers' plans). They were criticized by the supervisor because their plans lacked the necessary qualities of lesson plans (e.g. overall and behavioral objectives, warm-up part, wrong instructions, etc.). As a result, the experienced supervisor applied fewer behaviors in the conferences.

In terms of the variety of behaviors, the novice supervisor seemed to apply all the categories suggested by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004). The emerging categories, checking understanding, humor, giving examples, were also found out in novice supervisor's conferences. The categories such as clarifying, reflecting and directing were mostly used by the novice supervisor. In terms of clarifying, the novice supervisor's use of this behavior decreased in the last pre-observation conference but it was still the mostly used category. In terms of reflecting, the number was very high in pre-observation conference 1, there was a decrease in pre-observation conference 2 and 3, and an increase in the last conference. The supervisor may have wanted to be a model for student teachers to be reflective by applying reflecting type of behaviors. As Blase (1998) suggests the process of reflective practice is a potentially powerful enhancement to supervisor-teacher interaction and the development of reflection skills requires verbal support and modeling. Verbal guidance and modeling of metacognitive and reflective thinking are critical to a teacher's development of reflection skills. This has implications

not only for aspiring teachers, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and teacher educators, but also for principals who supervise pedagogy and student academic achievement (Glasner, 1997; Manning & Payne, 1996; cited in Blase, 1998).

Directing type of behaviors were applied more in the second conference than the first conference, and the number decreased in the third conference but increased in the fourth conference. However, the novice supervisor applied the other categories in the conferences but their percentages were low compared to reflecting, directing and clarifying categories. These were negotiating, presenting, reinforcing, checking understanding. The novice supervisor preferred to use presenting behavior in giving suggestions or his ideas, and he tried to negotiate with student teachers as much as possible. He also tried reinforcing type of behaviors a lot using praise to appreciate the work of student teachers and this type of behaviors were used more in the first two conferences. The novice supervisor might have wanted to decrease the anxiety of student teachers by using supportive remarks. This result matches with John and Gilchrist's (1999) study which has demonstrated that the effective supervisor is one who recognizes and reacts in an appropriate way to the student's state of mind. In a conference it is just as important to listen as it is to talk. It is vital, when presented with a student in an anxious state, to elicit their perceptions and bolster their confidence with supportive remarks (John & Gilchrist, 1999).

The novice supervisor used phrases or words to check if student teachers understood the feedback he gave. In terms of reminding category, it was used more in the first two conferences but the number decreased in the last two conferences. This may be due to the student teachers' development as future teachers and the supervisors may not have needed to remind them their previous courses or previous parts in the lesson plans under discussion. As stated before, the novice supervisor did not employ standardizing in the third and fourth conferences because he may have thought that student teachers achieved a level of competence as teachers at the end of the practicum process.

The experienced supervisor, on the other hand, applied certain behaviors such as clarifying, reflecting and directing mostly and used other categories fewer than them. Clarifying was again the mostly used category and the use of reflecting behaviors increased near the end of the practicum, and the number of directing behaviors

decreased at the end of the practicum. Directing type of behaviors were mostly in direct style; there were a few indirect style and confirmation types. The number of negotiating and presenting were not as much as the first three behaviors but their numbers were high compared to other categories. Moreover, reinforcing, checking understanding, reminding and humor categories were not used as much as they were used by the novice supervisor. The categories such as listening and giving examples were not used at all by the experienced supervisor. In terms of listening behavior, the supervisor may have listened to the student teachers and may have showed it nonverbally. Although verbal behaviors such as asking questions and making nonjudgmental comments are vital, Burgoon (1994; cited in Chamberlain, 2000) claims that almost 70% of meaning is conveyed through nonverbal messages in adult communication. Although the results reveal that the supervisor did not use listening type of behaviors, it is difficult to detect whether she used nonverbal behaviors.

As mentioned before, a new category named as reproaching emerged in the data. The experienced supervisor scolded some student teachers because she criticized some student teachers as being lazy and not preparing lesson plans carefully. There is another striking point with the experienced supervisor. That was her intonation when talking to student teachers. Her intonation was sarcastic and reproachful with all student teachers, especially with the fourth, fifth and sixth student teachers.

As a result, it can be said that there are a few differences between the novice and the experienced supervisor. This finding is consistent with Borders (1994) who states that comparison studies have yielded few differences between novice and experienced supervisors; more experienced supervisors seem to use more teaching and sharing behaviors, and they and their supervisees are more active. However, novice supervisors have been found to be as effective as experienced supervisors.

Table 14. The novice supervisor's distribution of behaviors and styles in all pre-observation conferences

| Behaviors              | CONFERENCES AT THE BEGINNING |     |     |       |      | CONFERENCES AT THE END |     |     |       |      |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|
|                        | Style                        | C1  | C2  | Total | %    | Style                  | C3  | C4  | Total | %    |
| Listening              | DI                           | 0   | 5   | 5     | 0%   | DI                     | 3   | 4   | 7     | 1%   |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Clarifying             | DI                           | 55  | 45  | 100   | 10%  | DI                     | 35  | 32  | 67    | 8%   |
|                        | DC                           | 52  | 40  | 85    | 8%   | DC                     | 44  | 45  | 89    | 11%  |
|                        | C                            | 40  | 47  | 94    | 9%   | C                      | 42  | 41  | 83    | 10%  |
| Encouraging            | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 1   | 4   | 5     | 0%   | C                      | 3   | 1   | 4     | 0%   |
| Reflecting             | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 165 | 103 | 268   | 26%  | C                      | 93  | 112 | 205   | 25%  |
| Negotiating            | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 41  | 39  | 80    | 8%   | C                      | 25  | 34  | 59    | 7%   |
| Problem solving        | DI                           | 6   | 8   | 14    | 1%   | DI                     | 2   | 2   | 4     | 0%   |
|                        | DC                           | 7   | 7   | 14    | 1%   | DC                     | 2   | 1   | 3     | 0%   |
|                        | C                            | 3   | 3   | 6     | 1%   | C                      |     |     |       | 0%   |
| Presenting             | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           | 21  | 20  | 41    | 4%   | DC                     | 15  | 16  | 31    | 4%   |
|                        | C                            | 15  | 10  | 25    | 2%   | C                      | 8   | 15  | 23    | 3%   |
| Directing              | DI                           | 39  | 27  | 66    | 6%   | DI                     | 30  | 40  | 70    | 8%   |
|                        | DC                           | 60  | 80  | 140   | 14%  | DC                     | 34  | 44  | 78    | 9%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Standardizing          | DI                           | 1   | 0   | 1     | 0%   | DI                     |     |     |       | 0%   |
|                        | DC                           | 3   | 1   | 4     | 0%   | DC                     |     |     |       | 0%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Reinforcing            | DI                           | 11  | 9   | 20    | 2%   | DI                     | 13  | 11  | 24    | 3%   |
|                        | DC                           | 13  | 10  | 13    | 1%   | DC                     | 14  | 9   | 23    | 3%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Checking understanding |                              | 12  | 11  | 23    | 2%   |                        | 9   | 8   | 17    | 2%   |
| Reminding              |                              | 9   | 6   | 15    | 1%   |                        | 11  | 11  | 22    | 3%   |
| Humour                 |                              | 1   | 3   | 4     | 0%   |                        | 6   | 11  | 17    | 2%   |
| Giving examples        |                              | 3   | 2   | 5     | 0%   |                        | 1   | 5   | 6     | 1%   |
| <b>Total</b>           |                              | 558 | 480 | 1038  | 100% |                        | 390 | 442 | 832   | 100% |

Table 15. The experienced supervisor's distribution of behaviors and styles in all pre-observation conferences

| Behaviors              | CONFERENCES AT THE BEGINNING |     |     |       |      | CONFERENCES AT THE END |     |     |       |      |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|------------------------|-----|-----|-------|------|
|                        | Style                        | C1  | C2  | Total | %    | Style                  | C3  | C4  | Total | %    |
| Listening              | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Clarifying             | DI                           | 30  | 40  | 70    | 13%  | DI                     | 35  | 32  | 67    | 12%  |
|                        | DC                           | 35  | 36  | 71    | 13%  | DC                     | 40  | 38  | 78    | 14%  |
|                        | C                            | 20  | 15  | 35    | 6%   | C                      | 21  | 13  | 34    | 6%   |
| Encouraging            | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 5   | 3   | 8     | 1%   | C                      | 2   | 4   | 6     | 1%   |
| Reflecting             | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 76  | 78  | 154   | 28%  | C                      | 82  | 80  | 162   | 28%  |
| Negotiating            | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           |     |     |       |      | DC                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | C                            | 17  | 19  | 36    | 7%   | C                      | 18  | 15  | 33    | 6%   |
| Problem solving        | DI                           | 3   | 2   | 5     | 1%   | DI                     |     |     |       | 0%   |
|                        | DC                           | 2   | 2   | 4     | 1%   | DC                     | 4   | 5   | 9     | 2%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      | 3   | 2   | 5     |      |
| Presenting             | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           | 7   | 17  | 24    | 4%   | DC                     | 20  | 19  | 39    | 7%   |
|                        | C                            | 4   | 10  | 14    | 3%   | C                      | 5   | 11  | 16    | 3%   |
| Directing              | DI                           | 21  | 19  | 40    | 7%   | DI                     | 21  | 15  | 36    | 6%   |
|                        | DC                           | 28  | 23  | 51    | 9%   | DC                     | 25  | 24  | 49    | 8%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Standardizing          | DI                           |     |     |       |      | DI                     |     |     |       |      |
|                        | DC                           | 4   | 2   | 6     | 1%   | DC                     | 2   | 3   | 5     | 1%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Reinforcing            | DI                           | 1   | 6   | 7     | 1%   | DI                     | 4   | 1   | 5     | 1%   |
|                        | DC                           | 2   | 5   | 7     | 1%   | DC                     | 4   | 3   | 7     | 1%   |
|                        | C                            |     |     |       |      | C                      |     |     |       |      |
| Checking understanding |                              | 4   | 1   | 5     | 1%   |                        | 0   | 4   | 4     | 1%   |
| Reminding              |                              | 1   | 4   | 5     | 1%   |                        | 5   | 5   | 10    | 2%   |
| Humour                 |                              | 3   | 1   | 4     | 1%   |                        | 3   | 7   | 10    | 2%   |
| Giving examples        |                              |     |     |       |      |                        |     |     |       |      |
| Reproaching            |                              | 0   | 1   | 1     | 0%   |                        | 3   | 0   | 3     | 1%   |
| Total                  |                              | 263 | 284 | 547   | 100% |                        | 297 | 281 | 578   | 100% |

#### **4.4. The changes in the lesson plan**

In order to find if there were any changes in the lesson plans according to the feedback in the conferences, the first and the second drafts of lesson plans of 6 student teachers were collected. The lesson plans that were brought to conferences were called as first drafts since the supervisors commented on the plans and then the student teachers made necessary changes and prepared another draft (second drafts) of the lesson plans.

In checking the lesson plans, the transcripts of conferences were also looked at. When the first and second drafts of the lesson plans of 6 student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor were checked, it was seen that the changes included the changes in the activities, the time of activities, the wording of behavioral or overall objectives. In the second drafts of the lesson plans, there were various activities designed according to the supervisor's feedback in the pre-observation conferences. It was seen that every feedback given by the supervisor resulted in changes in the lesson plans. As a result, the second drafts of the lesson plans were more detailed and better than the first drafts. The student teachers appeared to add activities, change the order of activities in students' books, add pictures or photographs, change the number of items in an exercise, add handouts for students and change the wording of instructions that were difficult to understand.

When the lesson plans of 6 student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor were checked, it was found out that the changes were applied in the activities, in the order of the activities and in the wording of instructions. The second drafts of the lesson plans seemed to include more and varied activities, pictures or handouts. However, the supervisor did not like the fifth student teacher's third plan so he did his plan again and made changes. The supervisor found the activities very boring and not communicative. Thus, student teacher 5 tried to add more communicative and enjoyable activities in his plan.

#### **4.5. Supervisory styles/behaviors leading to changes**

In order to answer the fifth research question, the first and second drafts of the lesson plans were checked for each student teacher for each conference. The transcripts



of lesson plans and the actual plans were compared to find the behaviors or styles that led to changes.

#### **4.5.1. The lesson plans of student teachers who were supervised by the novice supervisor**

Considering the 6 student teachers' lesson plans, the overwhelming category was directing but its frequency changed according to the student teachers. It was found that most changes took place when the supervisor directly told student teachers what to do and how to do. Although directing was not the mostly used category in pre-observation conferences, the lesson plans revealed that it was directing category that led to changes. In terms of sub-categories of directing, direct style was the mostly preferred one, and indirect style and confirmation were used very little compared to direct style. However, the categories such as reflecting, presenting, clarifying (in the form of explaining supervisor's own point), reminding, problem solving and standardizing were used slightly. Confirmations and clarifications generally came after directing; when the novice supervisor told a student teacher what to do, he tried to get a confirmation from the student teacher or he explained why he wanted student teacher to do changes in the plan. Thus, he clarified his directing behavior. Sometimes the novice supervisor used indirect statements to direct student teachers when he wanted student teachers realize what they were going to do and these statements led changes in the plans. Some of the plans were well designed and there were not many changes to apply so the novice supervisor used reinforcing statements a lot in giving feedback to those plans. The following table shows the novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in the lesson plans:

**Table 16. The novice supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in lesson plans.**

| Conferences                          | Student teacher 1. |        | Student teacher 2. |        | Student teacher 3. |              | Student teacher 4. |              | Student teacher 5. |               | Student teacher 6. |        |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------|
|                                      | Behaviors          | Number | Behaviors          | Number | Behaviors          | Number       | Behaviors          | Number       | Behaviors          | Number        | Behaviors          | Number |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 1.</b> | Direct s.          | 5      | Direct s.          | 7      | Direct s.          | 8            | Direct s.          | 7            | Presenting         | 7             | Direct s.          | 7      |
|                                      | Indirect s.        | 3      | Presenting         | 7      | Reflecting         | 1            | Presenting         | 2            | Direct s.          | 6             | Presenting         | 3      |
|                                      | Reflecting         | 2      | Confirmation       | 2      |                    |              | Problem s.         | 1            | Standardizing      | 3             | Indirect s.        | 1      |
|                                      | Clarifying         | 2      | Problem s.         | 1      |                    |              | Indirect s.        | 1            | Problem s.         | 3             | Problem s.         | 1      |
|                                      | Presenting         | 1      | Standardizing      | 1      |                    |              |                    |              | Confirmation       | 1             | Clarifying         | 1      |
|                                      |                    |        |                    |        |                    |              |                    | Reminding    | 1                  |               |                    |        |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 2.</b> | Direct s.          | 6      | Presenting         | 3      | Direct s.          | 4            | Direct s.          | 5            | Direct s.          | 13            | Direct s.          | 6      |
|                                      | Indirect s.        | 3      | Direct s.          | 1      | Presenting         | 2            | Presenting         | 3            | Presenting         | 2             | Presenting         | 3      |
|                                      | Reminding          | 1      | Clarifying         | 1      |                    |              | Reflecting         | 1            | Clarifying         | 1             | Indirect s.        | 1      |
|                                      | Clarifying         | 1      |                    |        |                    |              | Problem s.         | 1            | Problem s.         | 1             | Problem s.         | 1      |
|                                      |                    |        |                    |        |                    | Confirmation | 1                  | Confirmation | 1                  | Standardizing | 1                  |        |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 3.</b> | Direct s.          | 8      | Direct s.          | 6      | Direct s.          | 5            | Direct s.          | 8            | Direct s.          | 7             | Direct s.          | 8      |
|                                      | Presenting         | 2      | Presenting         | 1      |                    |              | Presenting         | 5            | Presenting         | 5             | Presenting         | 4      |
|                                      | Indirect s.        | 2      | Clarifying         | 1      |                    |              | Reflecting         | 2            | Clarifying         | 2             | Indirect s.        | 1      |
|                                      | Clarifying         | 2      |                    |        |                    |              | Clarifying         | 2            | Indirect s.        | 1             | Negotiating        | 1      |
|                                      | Confirmation       | 1      |                    |        |                    |              | Indirect s.        | 1            |                    |               | Encouraging        | 1      |
|                                      |                    |        |                    |        |                    | Reminding    | 1                  |              |                    |               |                    |        |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 4.</b> | Direct s.          | 8      | Direct s.          | 5      | Direct s.          | 5            | Direct s.          | 14           | Presenting         | 6             | Direct s.          | 22     |
|                                      | Clarifying         | 2      | Presenting         | 3      | Presenting         | 3            | Confirmation       | 3            | Direct s.          | 1             | Presenting         | 8      |
|                                      | Indirect s.        | 1      |                    |        | Reflecting         | 1            | Reflecting         | 2            |                    |               | Confirmation       | 5      |
|                                      | Reflecting         | 1      |                    |        |                    |              | Presenting         | 2            |                    |               | Reminding          | 1      |
|                                      | Problem s.         | 1      |                    |        |                    |              | Clarifying         | 1            |                    |               | Negotiating        | 1      |
|                                      | Presenting         | 1      |                    |        |                    |              |                    |              |                    |               | Clarifying         | 1      |

#### **4.5.2. The lesson plans of student teachers who were supervised by the experienced supervisor**

When the lesson plans were checked, it was seen that the behavior that led to changes mostly was directing. Like the novice supervisor, the experienced supervisor also told student teachers what to do directly. Directing was carried on as direct style and there were few indirect style behaviors. Presenting also led changes in the lesson plans. The supervisor gave suggestions or ideas to student teachers and her suggestions caused changes in the lesson plans. Other categories such as standardizing, reflecting, reinforcing, clarifying and reproaching were used but their number was low compared to directing. As mentioned before, the experienced supervisor's intonation was clear even when she was using reflecting and clarifying type of behaviors (see Table 17 for the experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in lesson plans).

#### **4.5.3. Comparison of the lesson plans of the student teachers who were supervised by the novice and the experienced supervisor**

The use of directing type of behaviors by the novice and experienced supervisor to direct student teachers to make changes in the lesson plans has some support in literature. The use of directing behaviors is typical to teachers or groups of low developmental levels, expertise and commitment. As Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) state, the above mentioned type of teachers have difficulty defining problems, have few ways of responding to problem and are unlikely to accept decision making responsibility. They clearly are in need of the structure and intensive assistance provided by directive supervision.

**Table 17. The experienced supervisor's frequency of behaviors that led to changes in lesson plans.**

| Conferences                          | Student teacher 1.                                       |                    | Student teacher 2.   |                        | Student teacher 3.   |                       | Student teacher 4.  |                            | Student teacher 5.                                   |                   | Student teacher 6.   |                        |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|------------------------|--|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------|--|------------------------|
|                                      | Behaviors  | Number             | Behaviors  | Number                 | Behaviors  | Number                | Behaviors   | Number                     | Behaviors  | Number            | Behaviors  | Number                 |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 1.</b> | Direct s.<br>Presenting                                  | 13<br>4            | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Clarifying<br>Indirect s.<br>Reflecting | 6<br>3<br>3<br>1<br>1  | Direct s.<br>Indirect s.<br>Presenting<br>Clarifying             | 7<br>2<br>2<br>1      | Direct s.<br>Problem s.<br>Reflecting<br>Standardizing<br>Confirmation          | 4<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1      | Direct s.<br>Standardizing                           | 4<br>1            | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Clarifying<br>Reflecting                  | 6<br>2<br>1<br>1       |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 2.</b> | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting<br>Standardizing   | 12<br>10<br>2<br>1 | Direct s.<br>Reflecting<br>Presenting                              | 4<br>3<br>1            | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Indirect s.<br>Standardizing          | <4<br>2<br>1<br>1     | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Clarifying   | 6<br>1<br>1                | Presenting<br>Direct s.<br>Reflecting<br>Clarifying  | 10<br>2<br>2<br>1 | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting<br>Clarifying<br>Reproaching   | 7<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1  |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 3.</b> | Direct s.<br>Reflecting<br>Standardizing                 | 1<br>1<br>1        | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Clarifying<br>Reflecting<br>Problem s.  | 11<br>5<br>1<br>1<br>1 | Reminding<br>Reflecting<br>Reinforcing                           | 1<br>1<br>1           | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting<br>Clarifying<br>Indirect s.<br>Reminding | 8<br>5<br>2<br>2<br>1<br>1 | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting                | 5<br>2<br>2       | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting<br>Clarifying                  | 10<br>5<br>1<br>1      |
| <b>Pre-observation conference 4.</b> | Direct s.<br>Indirect s.<br>Reinforcing<br>Standardizing | 2<br>1<br>1<br>1   | Presenting<br>Direct s.<br>Reflecting<br>Reminding<br>Clarifying   | 6<br>4<br>2<br>1<br>1  | Presenting<br>Clarifying<br>Direct s.<br>Problem s.<br>Reminding | 9<br>3<br>2<br>2<br>1 | Direct s.<br>Presenting   | 8<br>6                     | Presenting<br>Direct s.<br>Indirect s.<br>Reflecting | 3<br>2<br>1<br>1  | Direct s.<br>Presenting<br>Reflecting<br>Clarifying<br>Standardizing | 13<br>4<br>1<br>1<br>1 |

#### 4.6. Interviews

As stated in chapter 3, carrying out interviews with the two supervisors was the final step in data collection. The structured interviews, in which there were 6 questions, were carried out first with novice supervisor and then with the experienced supervisor. The interviews lasted for about half an hour and they were tape recorded. The researcher carried out the interviews and mentioned about the research briefly. She also brought the categorization of Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) and let the supervisors read the list of behaviors and, when needed, she explained the behaviors. She also mentioned about emerging behaviors and explained them. Although the prepared questions were asked, some other questions were asked during the course of the interviews. The following questions were asked in the interviews:

7. What kind of behaviors do you think you applied most in the pre-observation conferences?
8. What do you think about the results?
9. Would there be a change if you carried out post-observation conferences?
10. What kind of behaviors do you think caused changes in the lesson plans?
11. What kind of changes do student teachers apply in their second drafts of lesson plans?
12. Did you have training before you start supervising? If yes, tell about the process.

##### 4.6.1. The novice supervisor's interview

For the first question, the novice supervisor stated that he may have applied listening, encouraging and negotiating most. He stated that:

**I apply listening most because I let student teachers tell what they did in the plan and without listening to them I cannot give feedback. I apply encouraging type of behaviors because student teachers do not trust themselves and they think they cannot write lesson plans effectively. Therefore, I try to encourage them. I employ negotiating most since practice teaching is a long-term**

**process and there are not certain rights or wrongs in this process. I try to get the student teachers' ideas and opinions first and then I combine them with my ideas and opinions.**

The researcher then asked if the behaviors were same or different at the beginning and at the end of the practicum. The supervisor commented on every behavior in detail:

**I apply encouraging every time, its frequency does not change. Negotiating may change near the end of the practicum because I and student teachers get to know each other near the end of the practicum and negotiate more. Problem solving may change since we know each other more closely and problems decrease as the time passes. I employ directing less because I do not want to tell them directly what to do, instead I try to negotiate with them. I use presenting in giving my ideas and use humor every time. I want student teachers to understand everything clearly so I check if they understood or not. When the conference finishes and they go home, I do not want them to have questions in their minds. I try to remind them their mistakes or their successes in the past. I give examples when I explain something and I think the frequency of this behavior decreases near the end of the practicum.**

Before answering question 2, the frequency of the behaviors in pre-observation conferences was shown to the supervisor and he was a bit surprised at the results and commented:

**Reflecting and clarifying seem the most employed categories. I thought I had used encouraging a lot but the results reveal that I did not use encouraging a lot. I may not have used verbal statements expressing encouraging but I may have used nonverbal behaviors such as eye contact, mimics to encourage them or my intonation may have carried out the signs of encouragement. I also tried to create a supportive environment in giving feedback. I get feedback from my student teachers continuously and they state that they were feeling bad at the beginning of the practicum but I**

**encouraged them. This may be because I did not use phrases or statements that express encouragement.**

When answering the third question, the novice supervisor said that the behaviors in pre-observation and post-observation conferences differ and the results would have been different if the behaviors in post-observation conferences had been recorded. He added that in post-observation conferences he always asks student teachers about their reflections of the lesson the student teacher teaches and student teachers are more active and the conferences are more student teacher centered. In terms of the pre-observation conferences, the novice supervisor said that the number of feedback decreases and student teachers improve as future teachers.

As an answer to the fourth question, the novice supervisor stated that clarifying, directing and reflecting type of behaviors may have caused changes because he may have explained something and the student teachers may have realized that they should correct or change it. When the researcher explained the results and said that directing type of behaviors caused changes mostly in the plans, the novice supervisor stated:

**In fact, when we think about the student psychology, directing type of behaviors may have caused changes because they are anxious about their grades and they want to get good grades. Thus, they change the parts that I directly tell them to change. Sometimes I advise them to think about the plan again and tell that if they want, they can change the plan. However, my point of view and theirs may differ; they want to get good grades and I want them to improve.**

For the fifth question, the novice supervisor stated that changes in the plans vary according to the activity and the topic. The changes occur in the order of the activities, in the questions about the reading passages, in the wording of the objectives and in the activities.

As an answer to the sixth question, the novice supervisor said he did not have any formal training but had some sort of apprenticeship in which he was

guided and led towards the criteria for the evaluation of lesson plans. He stated that he observed an experienced supervisor while giving feedback, checked the lesson plans of student teachers alone and then with the supervisor. First he gave feedback and then the experienced supervisor gave feedback to the same plans and then they compared their feedback.

#### **4.6.2. The experienced supervisor's interview**

For the first question, the experienced supervisor stated that she may have applied listening, problem solving and clarifying most. She stated that:

**I do not use negotiating a lot. I use presenting when I want to explain and I do not use directing a lot. I only use it when the student teachers seem to get lost. I employ standardizing. I do not know if I use reinforcing explicitly but I am not sure, may be I use it nonverbally. However, I know I have to use reinforcing.**

Before answering question 2, the frequency of the behaviors in pre-observation conferences was shown to the supervisor and she was a bit surprised at the results and commented:

**I thought I had used listening a lot but it seems that I did not listen to student teachers. Maybe I applied it nonverbally. I used reflecting a lot and I did not apply encouraging and problem solving type of behaviors. I think I encourage the student teachers nonverbally using eye contact but these types of behaviors cannot be analyzed by tape recording. I encountered these student teachers a lot of times because I was their teacher in most of their lessons. Thus, I know them and I give feedback according to their developments as student teachers and they can understand if I am angry with them or I like their plan or not. I thought I see that I used reproaching because sometimes I got angry with them because I thought they did not listen to me. While I was giving feedback to them, there were other students in their groups whom they prepared the lesson plans together.**

The researcher then asked if the behaviors were same or different at the beginning and at the end of the practicum. The supervisor commented:



**There seems to be a decrease in the number of behaviors near the end of the practicum because the student teachers understand what I want to say by looking at my face. They become more autonomous near the end of the practicum. They prepare plans according to the feedback we give before so the feedback sessions seem to achieve their purpose.**

When answering the third question, the experienced supervisor said that the behaviors in pre-observation and post-observation conferences differ and the results would have been different if the behaviors in post-observation conferences were recorded. Clarifying type of behaviors would decrease whereas reflecting type of behaviors would increase in post-observation conferences. The student teachers would be more dominant in giving feedback to their own lessons.

As an answer to the fourth question, the experienced supervisor stated that clarifying, directing and standardizing type of behaviors, especially directing type of behaviors may have caused changes in the plans. According to her, the student teachers may be anxious about their grades or they may have accepted the supervisor as an authority figure so they may have changed the parts that the supervisor directly told them to change.

For the fifth question, the experienced supervisor stated that changes in the plans vary according to the activity and the topic.

As an answer to the sixth question, the experienced supervisor said that she did not have formal training but had some sort of apprenticeship. She stated that she was guided by an experienced supervisor and she modeled the experienced supervisor in supervising student teachers.

#### **4.6.3. Interpretation of novice supervisor's interview**

When asked the kind of behaviors in the conferences, the novice supervisor stated that he may have used listening, encouraging and negotiating. However, the analysis of the data revealed that the novice supervisor employed reflecting, clarifying and directing type of behaviors. Thus, it can be said that the perceptions of the novice supervisor on his behaviors were very different from what he actually did in the conferences.

When the novice supervisor learnt the results, he was surprised but he claimed that he may have encouraged student teachers nonverbally. The novice supervisor accepted that he was dominant in pre-observation conferences but he asserted that post-observation conferences were more student-teacher centered.

In terms of the behaviors that caused changes in the lesson plans, the novice supervisor learnt that directing type of behaviors mostly caused changes in lesson plans. He explained this change in terms of student teachers' concern about their grades. For the novice supervisor, the student teachers were anxious of getting good grades so they changed the parts that the supervisor directly told them to change.

#### **4.6.4. Interpretation of experienced supervisor's interview**

As an answer to the first question, the experienced supervisor stated that she may have used listening, problem solving and clarifying mostly in the conferences. However, the analysis revealed that she employed directing and reflecting mostly. Her perception of using clarifying was the same with the actual data but her perception of using listening and problem solving were not same with what she actually employed in the conferences. After she learnt the results, she claimed that she listened to student teachers but maybe her behaviors were nonverbal.

In terms of the changes in the lesson plans, her comments were similar with the novice supervisor's comments. She also claimed student teachers' concern about their grades.

#### **4.6.5. Overall interpretation of the results**

To sum up, clarifying, reflecting and directing were the behaviors that outweighed the others. Both the novice and the experienced supervisor used these three behaviors mostly in the conferences. These behaviors they used were the typical behaviors in directive control, directive informational and collaborative styles. They were eclectic in this sense. The analysis of the data revealed that there was a decrease in the use of behaviors by both the novice and the experienced supervisor near the end of the practicum. However, the two supervisors differed in terms of the length of the conferences and the variety of behaviors. Almost all the behaviors in Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization were employed by the novice supervisor

whereas some of them were used by the experienced supervisor. The emerging categories such as checking understanding, reminding and humor were used by the novice and the experienced supervisor. Giving examples was employed by only the novice supervisor while reproaching was used by only the experienced supervisor.

In terms of the behaviors that caused changes in the lesson plans, directing was the mostly used behavior. It can be said that directive control style outweighed the other styles in affecting the changes in the lesson plans.

The structured interviews showed that there were differences between the perceptions of the supervisors and their actual behaviors in the conferences.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION

#### 5.1 Summary of the study

This study attempted to answer the following research questions based on the previous research conducted on practice teaching, pre-service teacher education, the role of supervisors, the interaction between supervisors and student teachers and the supervisory styles/behaviors:

13. What are the supervisory styles/behaviors employed by the novice and experienced supervisor in pre-observation conferences?
14. Are there any differences or similarities between the pre-observation conferences carried out at the beginning and at the end of the practicum in terms of styles?
15. What are the differences between the novice and the experienced supervisor in terms of supervisory styles?
16. What kind of changes did the student teachers do in their revised lesson plans?
17. Which supervisory style caused the changes in the lesson plans?
18. What are the novice and the experienced supervisor's perceptions of their styles? Are there differences between their perceptions and the styles they actually employed in pre-observation conferences?

According to the analysis of the data, the novice and the experienced supervisor were found to have used a wide variety of behaviors such as listening, clarifying, encouraging, reflecting, presenting, problem solving, negotiating, directing, standardizing and reinforcing as suggested by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004). The data also revealed other categories such as checking understanding, reminding, humour, giving examples and reproaching, and some sub-categories in directing type of behaviors such as direct style, indirect style and confirmation. Having detected the behaviors of supervisors, each supervisor's behaviors in pre-observation conferences that were held at the beginning and the ones that were held at the end of the

practicum were compared in order to find similarities or differences. Furthermore, the behaviors or styles of the novice and the experienced supervisor were compared.

Next, the student teachers' the first and second drafts of lesson plans were examined and the changes were found. The next step was to compare lesson plans and the transcripts of the conferences to find the supervisory styles that caused changes in lesson plans.

The final step was to carry out interviews with the supervisors individually to learn their perceptions about their supervisory behaviors and inform them about their actual behaviors in the conferences. This study aimed to raise consciousness of supervisors since what they do in the conferences can be different from what they think they do in the conferences.

The results of the study revealed that both supervisors used less behaviors in the pre-observation conferences that were held at the end of the practicum more than the ones that were held at the beginning of the practicum. The results also revealed some similarities and differences between the novice and the experienced supervisor's use of behaviors. Similarities include the use of certain behaviors more than the others such as clarifying, reflecting and directing behaviors. Although their percentages differ between the novice and experienced supervisor, these categories outweigh the other categories. The differences included the length of the conferences, the variety of behaviors applied, the number of behaviors and the use of certain behaviors more than the other categories.

The lesson plans of student teachers revealed that the student teachers applied changes in their lesson plans after pre-observation conferences and the behavior that caused the change was directing. The interview session showed that the perceptions of the supervisors on their supervisory behaviors were different from their actual behaviors in the conferences.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

This study tried to reveal the styles of the supervisors in pre-observation conferences, the effect of these styles on the lesson plans and the perceptions of supervisors on their styles. The study showed that the student teachers apply changes in their lesson plans according to the feedback given by the supervisors in the pre-observation conferences.

When the novice and the experienced supervisor's behaviors were taken into account, it was seen that there were some similarities and differences in the use of supervisory behaviors and styles. The novice and the experienced supervisor used most of the behaviors in Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon's (2004) categorization. The mostly employed behaviors were directing, clarifying and reflecting. Thus, the styles they used were Directive Informational, Directive Control and Collaborative. They seemed flexible and eclectic because they changed their behaviors according to student teachers' needs. According to Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004), the supervisor must choose his or her approach on a case-by-case basis, relying on the knowledge base on teacher characteristics, recent observations of and interactions with the teacher or group, and analysis of the current situation. They further claim that the ultimate supervisor flexibility is the ability to "shift supervisory gears" and effectively use an approach not originally planned because of new discoveries about teachers or the situation at hand; successful supervisors must be able to think on their feet and flex accordingly (Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:150).

On the other hand, there were differences in the frequency and variety of the behaviors; the novice supervisor seemed to apply all the categories suggested by Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) and he used more behaviors compared to the experienced supervisor while the experienced supervisor did not apply all the categories and the behaviors that she used were fewer than the behaviors that the novice supervisor used. The differences were slight compared to the similarities. Although the two supervisors were labeled as novice and experienced, and they differ in terms of the years of teaching, there were not many differences between them. It can be inferred that the two supervisors were the graduates of Education Faculty, English Language Teaching Department of Anadolu University and they had undergone the same training before they became teachers. Therefore, there were not many differences between them.

The categories used in this study were the categories that take place in post-observation conferences but these categories were applied to pre-observation conferences in this study. Thus, it is evident that the pre-observation conferences were supervisor-dominant and some categories such as listening and encouraging were not used a lot by both supervisors.

In terms of the behaviors used in the pre-observation conferences that were held at the beginning and the pre-observation conferences that were held at the end of the practicum, both the novice and the experienced supervisor seemed to apply the same behaviors throughout the practicum process and their behaviors in the first two pre-observation conferences and in the last two pre-observation conferences did not change. Their styles were Directive Informational, Directive Control and Collaborative. However, there was a decrease in the number of behaviors towards the end of the practicum. This decrease may be due to the development of student teachers and their perceptions. Gebhard (1990) states that student teachers change in the positive direction throughout the practicum in setting up and carrying out lessons. He also points out that student teachers are more successful in selecting the content of their lessons as time passes. When they focus on language itself at the beginning of the practicum, they tend to focus on more 'real life' concepts which is the consequence of student teachers' interactions with students, their teaching partners, mentors and supervisors. It can be inferred from this study that student teachers change as the time passes. Supervisors tend to give less feedback towards the end of the practicum so the number of behaviors supervisors use decreases near the end of the practicum. This change may be in teaching and planning skills of student teachers or in their perceptions of the practicum (Gebhard, *ibid.*).

In terms of the perceptions of student teachers, Merç (2004) states that perceptions of student teachers are more positive towards the end of the practicum. They reflect that they are feeling more like teachers as the time progresses. This might be because of the fact that they are feeling more comfortable about their teaching, and are able to create the necessary positive atmosphere in the classrooms they are teaching.

It can also be inferred that supervisors may have trained the student teachers just like themselves. They reduced their criticism because the student teachers kept up with them and tried to imitate their supervisors since they see the supervisors as role models. Halbach (2000) states that it is quite important to find an appropriate teaching methodology in teacher education courses since student teachers are likely to take teacher trainers' teaching behaviors as models for their own teaching.

As stated before, this study also aimed to find the changes in the lesson plans after the pre-observation conferences. Investigating the first and the second drafts of

lesson plans, it was found that the changes in the lesson plans were in the order of the activities, the wording of overall and behavioral objectives, variety of activities and the time of the activities. The style that caused the changes in the lesson plans was Directive Control and the mostly used behavior was directing. It can be inferred that student teachers tried to do what their supervisors told them to do since incorporating changes from the Directive Control style was more straightforward and easier to incorporate.

This finding is consistent with the studies that have been conducted in terms of pre-service teachers' preferences of supervisory approaches (Zonca, 1973; Vudovich, 1976; Copeland & Atkinson, 1978; Copeland, 1980; Lorch, 1981; cited in Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon, 2004:205). Findings of these studies reveal that most pre-service teachers wanted a supervisor to tell them precisely what changes they could be expected to make to improve instruction. Glickman, Gordon and Ross-Gordon (2004) claim that neophyte teachers (student and beginning teachers) initially prefer their supervisors to apply a directive informational approach or collaborative approach.

Finding the perceptions of the supervisors on their supervisory styles was another aim of the study. Having carried out interviews with the novice and the experienced supervisor, it was found that their perceptions of their styles and their actual styles differed. The supervisors were also shown the results of the study and they were a bit surprised at the results. Thus, this study tried to reflect the supervisors' actual styles and tried to make them aware of the styles they use in the conferences.

This study also implies the importance of reflection although student teachers did not have a lot of chances to reflect in pre-observation conferences except reflecting about their lesson plans. The supervisors in this study tried to be reflective as much as possible to be good role models for the student teachers. The results of the study indicate that reflecting type of behaviors were the most frequently used behaviors and by being reflective, the supervisors displayed exemplary behaviors to the student teachers. For Gebhard (1990), when student teachers are given the opportunity to reflect on their teaching behavior, they are also given the chance to evaluate their teaching and develop their decision making skills.



### 5.3. Suggestions for Pre-Service Teacher Education

Barone and his colleagues (1996) emphasize that new programs which will be effective in educating reflective practitioners will focus not only on structures, the sites or the proportion of time spent in theory courses or in practical settings, they will also focus on having a strong, coherent underlying conceptual basis which is grounded in what we know about how teachers learn to teach. Programs which purport to educate reflective practitioners will need to provide multiple opportunities for prospective teachers to articulate their philosophies of teaching and learning, to connect theory and practice, and to describe and analyze the social and cultural context of teaching (Barone et al, 1996:50).

According to Beattie (1997), as teacher educators we have to try out new ways to foster reflective practice, and we have to accept the uncertainties and ambiguities of real learning in our professional lives. The experience of doing so provides us with a setting for inquiry and continuous learning, and for modeling the process of inquiry of prospective teachers who must learn to create settings for shared inquiry and collaborative meaning making in their own classrooms. In order to do this, they first have to experience learning situations of their own, where collaboration replaces competition, where understanding replaces judgment and where connectedness replaces separation. She further states that:

The teachers of today will teach the citizens of tomorrow the habits of mind and the capacities to be active members of a democratic society, able to learn what they need to know and capable of the adaptation and flexibility necessary to survive and thrive in the culture and society in which they live. They must be able to create the kinds of classroom and school experiences through which these future citizens will learn about the principles of democracy by experiencing them in their own lives, and will have multiple opportunities to practice the reflective, analytical, literate behavior required of them. Today's teachers must be creative, imaginative, knowledgeable and sensitive to the diverse needs and interests of the students who populate today's classrooms and who will work and live in tomorrow's society (Beattie, 1997:121).

Bourke's (2001) 'developmental model' includes giving student teachers opportunities to learn by observing, doing and reflecting in which there is less emphasis for prescribed practices, but more emphasis on what student teachers do for the learning to happen. Following Bourke's (2001) model, Hertzog (2002) offers support programs for novice teachers which include themes such as emotional, pedagogical, administrative assistance to first-year teachers. According to Beattie (1997), many

prospective teachers expect their students to learn as they do, and they expect that their teacher education programs will provide them with the concepts, strategies, techniques and skills that will guarantee them success in classrooms with diverse groups of students.

Merç (2004) suggests that a similar program might be added to teaching practicum components of teacher education programs in which student teachers might be provided with teacher education seminars. Student teachers can be informed about what they are supposed to do in the practicum and how they can cope with certain problems they face during their student teaching experiences. Many prospective teachers expect their students to learn as they do, and they expect that their teacher education programs will provide them with the concepts, strategies, techniques and skills that will guarantee them success in classrooms with diverse groups of students (Beattie, 1997).

Supervisor training is also an important issue and researchers (Boydell, 1986; Chamberlain, 2000; Gale & Jackson, 1997; John & Gilchrist, 1999; and Wiles & Bondi, 2000) suggest that supervisors should be trained for their role before they act as supervisors.

As Boydell (1986) states, setting up a supervisor training program which makes use of a collaborative inquiry-based approach will be beneficial for supervisors, students and teachers. According to John and Gilchrist (1999), during training, supervisors need to have their perceptions heightened to be able to identify the student's state of mind so that they can adopt appropriate strategies to enable the conference to remain truly participative. Their study has demonstrated that the effective supervisor is one who recognizes and reacts in an appropriate way to the student's state of mind. In a conference it is just as important to listen as it is to talk. It is vital, when presented with a student in an anxious state, to elicit their perceptions and bolster their confidence with supportive remarks.

Wiles and Bondi (2000) also state the importance of some basic training and experience criteria for persons becoming supervisors and the most important college courses recommended are: supervision of instruction, group processes and human relations, curriculum theory and development, educational measurement and evaluation, educational psychology, organization and administration of schools, educational

research, philosophy of education, media and technology, sociology of education, history of education and anthropology of education. They further claim that there should be selection criteria for supervisors based on their training and experience.

As Chamberlain (2000) points out, supervisors' good intentions may be influenced by time constraints or an overwhelming urge to give explicit directions. Even if verbal discourse is supportive, nonverbal behaviors could be sending another message. Supervisors need to be informed about their responsibilities in TESL programs where they teach a methodology course or supervise student teachers in practicum. As a profession, teacher educators must recognize the complexities of the teacher-supervisor relationship and take a close look at the current levels of preparation required of those assuming the duties of a supervisor. Recognizing the potential effects of communication styles in the teacher-supervisor relationship in relation to the goals of reflective practice offers a starting point for training and preparation.

There is no guarantee that a supervisor with unlimited time, great sensitivity to students' concerns and immense pedagogical expertise would be able to raise the intellectual level of supervision appreciably. It is too easy to blame for the apparent lack of critical reflection within supervisory relationships at the feet of student teachers and supervising teachers themselves. We would suggest that the supervision of student teachers and their development as professionals rests as much on the systems that are set in place and within such supervision occurs. Changes in the structural context of student teaching may be needed to alter the character and quality of discourse in supervisory conferences (Gale & Jackson, 1997:180).

In terms of the benefits of training, Sinclair's (1997) study which was carried out with 54 teachers who were responsible for the school-based initial teacher education revealed that training was beneficial for them. The participants in the study reported that training resulted in positive change on an individual level as it raised the teachers' awareness of and interest in the ideas presented, enhanced self-esteem through a reinforcement of the suitability of their current practice and led to change or an expressed willingness to change teaching or supervision practice.

Not only pre-service but also in-service training is important and beneficial for supervisors. As Rust (1988) states, the use of supervisory journals and frequent conferences among supervisors to enable new supervisors to develop a reflective

capacity is useful. New supervisors in her study have the need for guidance, even mentoring, and for modeling of supervisory practice since they appear to go through stages similar to those of teachers, new supervisors should begin their practice with clearly defined guidelines and ready access to help. Thus, collaboration among supervisors is inevitable.

#### **5.4. Suggestions for further research**

This study was conducted with two supervisors, a novice and an experienced one and 6 student teachers for each supervisor. Further studies may be carried out with more supervisors and student teachers in AUELТ.

This research is limited to AUELТ context. Other studies may be carried out in different teacher education programs in order to generalize the findings of the study.

The data of the study consisted of recordings of the pre-observation conferences, collection of the lesson plans on which supervisors gave feedback to student teachers and carrying out interviews. Other data collection techniques such as observation, questionnaires, reflection reports, etc. may be used in other studies.

The transcribed data were analyzed by using a pre-determined category and only the supervisors' speech was analyzed. Further studies may be carried out by analyzing both the supervisors' and student teachers' speech. Discourse features (e.g. turn-taking, requests, etc.) of the conferences may also be studied.

This study was carried out during the second term for 3 months. More longitudinal studies can be carried out using more student teachers and supervisors.

This study only dealt with pre-observation conferences. Further studies can be conducted related to post-observation conferences and actual teaching of student teachers can be observed or recorded.

## REFERENCES

- Acheson, K. A. & M. D. Gall (1997). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.
- Adler, N. J. (1991). International dimensions of organizational behavior. Boston, Mass. : PWS-KENT Pub. Co.
- Aydın, B. (2003). Pre-service teachers' and their supervisors' perceptions of classroom events. Paper presented at the "Common European Framework and Foreign Language Education in Turkey Conference" Uludağ University: Bursa.
- Barone, T., D. Berlinder, T. Blachard, U. Casanova & T. McGowan (1996). A future for teacher education: developing a strong sense of professionalism, in The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. New York: Macmillan.
- Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Beattie, M. (1997). Fostering reflective practice in teacher education: inquiry as a framework for the construction of a professional knowledge in teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, V. 25 (2).
- Beck, C. & C. Kosnik (2002). Professors and the practicum. Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 53, No. 1, 6-19.
- Beck, C. & C. Kosnik (2002). Components of a good practicum placement: student teacher perceptions. Teacher Education Quarterly. Spring 2002.
- Blase, J. (1998). Handbook of Instructional Leadership. California: Corwin Press.
- Block, M., S. Korth & M. Lefebvre (2003) Examining instructional supervision.  
Retrieved October 15, 2003, from <http://www.Msu.edu/user/lefebvre/synthesis1.html>
- Borders, L. D. (1994). The good supervisor. (Eric Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 372 350).
- Bourke, J. M. (2001). The role of the TP TESL supervisor. Journal of Education for Teaching, V. 27(1).
- Boydell, D. (1986). Issues in teaching practice supervision research: A review of the Literature. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(2), 115-25.

- Brown, D. (2001) Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Addison Wesley.
- Bunton, D., P. Stimpson & F. Lopez-Real (2002). University tutor's practicum observation notes: format and content. Mentoring & Tutoring, V. 10 (3), 233-251.
- Chamberlain, C. R. (2000). TESL degree candidates' perceptions of trust in supervisors. TESOL Quarterly, 34 (4), 653-673.
- Chapman, B. S. (1999). Praxis: An adult education program. Adult Learning, 11 (1), 14-17.
- Day, R. R. (1990). Teacher observation in second language teacher education. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Denmark, V. M. & I. J. Podsen (2000). The mettle of a mentor. Journal of Staff Development, V.21 (4).
- Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 16, 195-222.
- Drafall, L. E. & W. Joe (1994). Improving communication with student teachers. Music Educators Journal, V.81 (1).
- Dobbins, R. (1996). The challenge of developing a 'reflective practicum'. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 24 (3), 269-280.
- Dye, Allan (1994). The supervisory relationship. (Eric Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 372 343).
- Edwards, A. & J. Collison (1996). Mentoring and Developing Practice in Primary Schools. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1990). Activities and procedures for teacher preparation. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (3), 14-18.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). Reflective practice in an EFL teacher development group. System, 27, 157-172.

- Ferraro, J. (1999). "Reflective practice and Professional development".  
Available at: <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigest/ed449120.html>
- Freidus, H. (2002). Teacher education faculty as supervisors/advisors/facilitators: playing multiple roles in the construction of field work experiences. Teacher Education Quarterly, Spring 2002, 65-76.
- Fosnot, C. T. (1989). Inquiring teachers, Inquiring learners: A Constructivist approach for teaching. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Freeman, D. (1990). Intervening in practice teaching, in J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Freeman, D. & Richards, J. C. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. TESOL Quarterly, 27 (2), 193-216.
- Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. TESOL Quarterly, 32, 397-417.
- Frost, D. (1994). Reflective Mentoring and the New Partnership in D. McIntyre, H. Hagger & M Wilkin (Eds.) Mentoring: Perspectives on School Based Teacher Education. London: Kogan Page.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992). Teacher development and educational change. In M. Fullan & A. Hargreaves (eds.), Teacher Development and Educational Change. London: Falmer Press. pp.1-21.
- Gaies, S. & Bowers, R. (1990) Clinical supervision of language teaching: The supervisor as trainer and educator. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), Second language teacher education (pp.167-181). Cambridge: CUP.
- Gale, T. & C. Jackson (1997). Preparing professionals: student teachers and their supervisors at work. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, V. 25 (2).
- Gebhard, J. G. & Oprandy, R. (Eds.). (1999). Language teaching awareness: A guide to exploring beliefs and practices. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gebhard, J. G. (1990). Interaction in teaching practicum, in J. C. Richards, & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Glenwright, P. (1999). The discourse of written teaching practice supervision reports: linking language and methodology. Asia Pacific Journal of Language in Education. V. 25 (2), 189-199.

- Glickman, C. (1990) Supervision of instruction (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glickman, C. D. (2002). The courage to lead. Educational Leadership, 59 (8), 41-44.
- Glickman, C. D. , S. Gordon & J. M. Ross-Gordon (2004). Supervision and Instructional Development: A Developmental Approach. Boston: Pearson.
- Goodwyn, A. (1997). Developing English Teachers: The Role of Mentorship in a Reflective Profession. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Golland, J. H. (1998). A lesson plan model for the supervision of student teachers. Education, V. 118 (3).
- Gower, R., D. Phillips & S. Walters (1995). Teaching Practice Handbook. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Graham, M. A. (1993). Curious Positions: Exploring tensions and reciprocal influences in student teachers' relationships with their cooperating teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.
- Halbach, A. (2000). Trainee change through teacher training: a case study in training English language teachers in Spain. Journal of Education for Teaching, 26 (2), 139-146.
- Harmer, J. (2001). The Practice of English Language Teaching. England: Pearson Education.
- Hart, G. M. (1994). Strategies and methods of effective supervision. Retrieved February 25, 2003. (Eric Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 372341).
- Hertzog, H. S. (2002). "When, how, and who do I ask for help? "Novices' perceptions of problems and assistance. Teacher Education Quarterly, 11(2), 33-49.
- Hockly, N. (2000). Modelling and cognitive apprenticeship in teacher education. ELT Journal. V. 54 (2), 118-125.
- Hoover, N. L., L. O'Shea & R. G. Carroll (1988). The supervisor-intern relationship and effective communication skills. Journal of Teacher Education. V.39, (2), 22-27.
- Huling, L. R. (2001). Teacher mentoring as professional development. (Eric Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 460 125).



- John, P. T. & I. Gilchrist (1999). Flying solo: understanding the post-lesson dialogue between student teacher and mentor. Mentoring & Tutoring, V. 7(2), 101-111.
- John, P. T. (2001). Winning and losing: a case study of university tutor-student teacher Interaction during a school-based practicum. Mentoring & Tutoring, Vol.9, No.2, 153-168.
- Kauffman, D. (1992). *Supervision of student teachers*. Retrieved February 25, 2003. (Eric Document Reproduction in Service No. ED 344 873).
- Kızıltan, N. (1997). A comparative study of pre-service foreign language teacher education in the United States and Turkey. YOK/NEDP Project.
- Klapper (2001). Teaching Languages in Higher Education: Issues in Training and Continuing Professional Development. London: CILT.
- Kocaman, A. (1992). Beyond the Surface: Training the Teacher Trainers. In A. Daventry, A. J. Mountford & H. Umunç (Eds.), Tradition and Innovation: ELT and Teacher Training in the 1990s, V.2. Ankara: British Council.
- Koerner, M. & F. O. Rust (2002). Exploring roles in student teaching placements. Teacher Education Quarterly, Spring 2002, 35-58.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). Training teachers or educating a teacher. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, and P. Strevens (eds.), Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Lopez-Real, F. , P. Stimpson & D. Bunton (2001). Supervisory conferences: an exploration of some difficult topics. Journal of Education for Teaching, V. 27(2).
- Luitel, B. C.(2002). History and reform. Available at: <http://www.au.geocities.com/bcluitel/h-rcurriculum.htm>
- Lunenberg, M. (1999). New qualifying requirements for the mentoring of student teachers in Netherlands. European Journal of Teacher Education, 22 (2/3), 159-171.
- MacDonald, C. J. (1992). The multiplicity of factors creating stress during the teaching practicum: the student teachers' perspective. *Education*, 113 (1), 48-58.
- Malderez, A. (2001). New ELT professionals, English Teaching Professional, 19, 57-58.

- Maynard, T. & J. Furlong (1994). Learning to teach and models of supervision, in D. McIntyre, H. Hagger & M. Wilkin (Eds.) Mentoring: Perspectives on School Based Teacher Education. London: Kogan Page.
- Merç, A. (2004). Reflections of pre-service EFL teachers throughout their teaching practicum: What has been good? What has gone wrong? What has changed? Unpublished Master's Thesis, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.
- Millwater, J. & Yarrow, A. (1997). Practernship: a theoretical construct for developing professionalism in preservice teachers. Teacher Education Quarterly, 24 (1), 23-35.
- Murray-Harvey, R., P. T. Slee, M. J. Lawson, H. Silins, G. Banfield, A. Russell (2000). Under Stress: the concerns and coping strategies of teacher education students. European Journal of Teacher Education, 23 (1), 19-35.
- Pennington, M. C. (1990). A professional development focus for the language teaching practicum. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pickett, A. (1999). Reflective teaching practices and academic skills instruction. Available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~506/mod02/pickett.html>
- Rettig, P. R., S. Lampe & P. Garcia (2000). Supervising your faculty with a differentiated model. The Department Chair, V. 11(2).
- Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-34.
- Richards, J. C. (1987). The dilemma of teacher education in TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, 21 (2), 209-226.
- Richards, J. C. & G. Crookes (1988). The practicum in TESOL. TESOL Quarterly, 22(1), 9-27.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). The dilemma of teacher education in second language teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: CUP.
- Richards, J. C. & Nunan, D. (eds.) (1990). Second Language Teacher Education. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1998) Beyond Training. Cambridge: CUP.

- Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1996). Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. Cambridge: CUP.
- Roe, P. J. (1992). Career Pathways for Teachers: the Way Ahead. In A. Daventry, A. J. Mountford & H. Umunç (Eds.), Tradition and Innovation: ELT and Teacher Training in the 1990s, V.2. Ankara: British Council.
- Roberts, J. (1994). Discourse analysis of supervisory conferences: an exploration. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 9(2), 136-154.
- Rust, F. (1988) How supervisors think about teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 56-63.
- Shantz, D. & M. Brown (1999) Developing a Positive Relationship: The Most Significant Role of the Supervising Teacher. Education, V. 119 (4).
- Schön, D. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Siens, C. M. & H. Ebmeier (1996). Developmental supervision and the reflective thinking of teachers. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 11 (4), 299-319.
- Sinclair, C. (1997). Redefining the role of the university lecturer in school-based teacher education. Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education. V. 25(3).
- Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: a disenfranchised outsider. Teaching and Teacher Education. V. 14 (8), 821-834.
- Slick, S. K. (1997). Assessing versus assisting: the supervisor's roles in the complex dynamics of the student teaching triad. Teaching and Teacher Education. V.13 (7), 713-726.
- Sloboda, J. (1986). Acquiring skill, in: A. Gellatly (Ed.) The Skillful Mind: an introduction to cognitive psychology. Milton Keynes: Oxford University Press.
- Spear, M., Lock, N. D. & McCulloch, M. (1997). The written feedback mentors give to student teachers. Teacher Development, 1(2), 269-280.
- Timperley, H. (2001). Mentoring conversations designed to promote student teacher learning. Asia-Pacific Journal of teacher Education, Vol.29, No.2, 111-123.
- Taggart, G. L. And Wilson, A. P. (1998). Promoting Reflective Thinking in Teachers: 44 Action Strategies. California: Corwin Press.
- Tardif, M. (2001). Pre-service teacher training programs: outcomes of recent reforms and new trends towards effective Professional training. Paper presented at Pan-Canadian Education Research Program Symposium Teacher and Educator

- Training 2001 on “Current Trends and Future Orientations” May 22-23, 2001.  
Université Laval, Quebec City.
- Toney, M. R. (1991). Lesson plans-strategies for learning. Training & Development, June 1991.
- Tsui, F. L., Y. K. Law, R. Tang & M. S. K. Shum (2001) Roles and Relationships in Tripartite Supervisory Conferencing Processes. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 16(4), 322-44.
- Ur, P. (1997). The English teacher as professional. English Teaching Professional, 1 (2),3-5.
- Waite, D. (1992). Supervisors’ talk: making sense of conferences from an anthropological linguistic perspective. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision. 7(4), 349-371.
- Waite, D. (1995). Rethinking instructional supervision: notes on its language and culture. London: The Falmer Press.
- Waite, D. 2000. Identity, Authority, and the Heart of Supervision. International Journal of Educational Reform, 9(4), 282-291.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weller, L. D. (2001). Essential Competencies for effective supervision of the student teacher. Education, V.24, (2), 213-218.
- Wiles, J. & J. Bondi (2000). Supervision : a guide to practice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Zachary, L. J. (2002). The Role of Teacher as Mentor. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, No.93, 27-38.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education. V. 34 (3), 3-9.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1986). The practicum as an occasion for learning to teach. South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 14, 11-27.
- Zeichner, K. M. & D. P. Liston (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. Teaching and Teacher Education. V. 1.

Zeichner, K. M., D. P. Liston, M. Mahlios & M. Gomez (1988). The structure and goals of a student teaching program and the character and quality of supervisory discourse. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, V.4 (4).

Zimpher, N. L., deVoss, G., & D. Nott (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(4), 11-15.

**APPENDICES**

## APPENDIX A

### Sample of a pre-observation conference carried out by the novice supervisor

#### Pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 1.

- Ö: Simple Present Tense yapıyorsun, biliyorlar öğrendiler.
- C: Geçen hafta öğrettik, o çok iyi olmadı oturmadı onlarda. Negatife hemen geçmeyelim biraz practice yaptıralım dedik.
- Ö: **Nasıl farkettiler anlamadıklarını?**
- C: Zaten yüzlerinden belli oluyor, çok iyi değiller.
- Ö: **Üçünüzde practice mi yapıyorsunuz?**
- C: Evet.
- Ö: **Üçünüzde practice yaptığınıza göre aranızda anlaşip aktivitelerinizi ona göre ayarladınız mı?**
- C: .....
- Ö: **Neden?**
- C: Benden öncekilerin ne yaptığını bilmiyorum, ben 6. sınıfa giriyorum.
- Ö: **Senin için farketmiyor sen sadece bir ders practice yaptırıyorsun o zaman.**
- 
- Ö: **Behaviorallara bakalım. Sen bana önceden anlatır mısın aktivitelerini?**
- C: Birinde resimler var, altında karışık cümleler var, onları sıraya koyacaklar. Diğerinde de resimleri cümlelerle eşleştirecekler. Anlayabilecekleri resimleri şuraya koydum.
- Ö: **Burada 10 tane cümle var hemen yapabilirler. Social chat yapıyorsun. Bunlara katılıyorlar mı?**
- C: Katılıyorlar.
- Ö: **Şimdi buraya kadar introduction. Sonra diyorsun ki “I have some enjoyable exercises for you” Başka bir transition düşünebilir miyiz oraya?**
- C: O soruyla daldan dala atlamış olmuştum.
- Ö: **Gibi görünüyor. Şuraya biraz daha farklı bir şey düşünebilirsin. Social chatten sonra ne düşünebilirsin?**
- C: Kişilerle ilgili bir şey mi söylesem?

- Ö: **Exerciselerini bir contexte oturtursan o contexte geçiş yapabilirsin. Şöyle desen “We have 5 incomplete sentences and 5 pictures. Complete the sentences by looking at the pictures” desen daha açık olmaz mı?**
- C: Evet.
- Ö: **Biraz daha simplify edebilirsin. Hele context yarattıysan daha da başarılı olacaktır.**
- C: Hı, hı.
- Ö: **Always’i burada nereye koyacaklar öğrettin mi?**
- C: Öğretmedim, düşünmedim açıkçası.
- Ö: **O zaman kafaları karışmayacak mı bu always’i nereye koyalım diye, sorarlarsa?**
- C: Yaparım diye düşündüm de.
- Ö: **Belki örnek cümlelerle anlatabilirsin.**
- C: Şurada drinks demek çok basit gibi geldi.
- Ö: **Tamam, canım onlarında konulduğu yerler var. Her yere koyamıyorsun. Çocuk always my cat drinks milk derse?**
- C: Always’i bilmiyorlar.
- Ö: **Bilmiyorlarsa o zaman burada kullanma, every gibi bir şeye çevir.**
- C: Yaparken öğrenirler
- Ö: **Olur mu yaparken?**
- C: Koyarlar oraya koymazlarsa ben koydurturum.
- Ö: **Biraz zor olacak gibi. Hem diyorsun pek anlamıyorlar hem de hiç bilmedikleri bir şeyi işin içine katmışsın.**
- C: Duydukça daha çok merak edip motive olurlar.
- Ö: **Tamam olabilir eğer işleyeceğini düşünüyorsan bir bak gör bakalım nasıl olacak. Sonra gelme ama hocam çok kötü geçti diye. Birde şu cümlede drinks demişsin, bu ‘s’ takısını koymasın da çocuklar mı koysa acaba?**
- C: Koymazsam çocuklar koymayacaktır.
- Ö: Niye?
- C: Instructionda sadece sıraya koyma var, gramer hatalarını düzeltme yok. Çocuklar büyük ihtimalle ‘s’ takısını koymayacaklar karışıklık olacak. Birazda öğretme amaçlı olsun diye böyle yaptım.



- Ö: **Söz dizimine önem veriyorsun yani.**
- C: Present Tensedde cümle yapısını görmelerini amaçlıyorum.
- Ö: **Tamam. Madem cümle yapısını görmelerini istiyorsun o zaman şu zaman zarflarını karıştırma istersen yada every Sunday gibi bir şey kullan. Ben sana yapma demiyorum nasıl öğreneceklerine inanıyorsan öyle yap. Peki bu resimler olmasaydı bu aktivite olur muydu gene?**
- C: Resimleri görsel olsun diye kullandım. Eğlenceli olsun diye ilgilerini çeksın diye.
- Ö: **1. aktiviteyle ilgili o zaman zarflarını bir düşün. Herşeyi çok güzel yapıyorlar, ya hata yaparlarsa?**
- C: O zamanda fantastic.
- Ö: **Hata yaparlarsa nasıl düzeltirsin? Yazmamış olsan bile bir düşünsen iyi olur. Diyelim çocuk ‘We every evening TV watch ‘ dedi. Ne yaparsın?**
- C: Fantastic derim orada.
- Ö: **Öyle dersen ben öğrenci olarak tamam doğru yaptım der otururum.**
- C: Diğer öğrencilere sorarım doğru olup olmadığını.
- Ö: **Diğerleri dinlemiyorlarsa?**
- C: Hocam sıkıştırmayın beni.
- Ö: **Sıkıştırmıyorum. Derlerseki hoca öğrencinin biriyle konuşuyor, dinlemeye gerek yok, o zaman ne yapacaksınız?**
- C: O zaman çok sinirlenirim.
- Ö: **Aa, olur mu? O zaman diğer öğrenciler bir purpose vermen lazım arkadaşlarını dinlemeleri için. 2. olarak ‘think about how to correct the wrong answers’ yazarsın. Yanlış cevap verirlerse ne yaparım diye düşün. Planın süper inşallah sınıfta da böyle gider ama her zaman işler böyle gitmiyor.**
- C: Çok planladığım şeyleri sınıfta yapamadığım da oluyor, öğrencilerden soru çok fazla olduğu zaman kopukluk oluyor.

---

Ö: Ee, 2.ye geçtik o zaman. Burada tamam. (Teacher reads the sentences) **Bu aktivitelerin sırası var mı?**

C: Birbirine yakın aktiviteler zaten, sırasını düşünmedim.

- Ö: **Daha önce ne demiştik simple'den karışık olana doğru gitmek lazım. Hangisi more complicated bunların? Hangisi daha fazla demanding?**
- C: 1.si
- Ö: **Birincisi değil mi? 2. aktivite biraz daha kolayı yapmaları gereken iş daha az. Onun için 2. aktivite ile başlamak daha mantıklı. O zaman aktivitelerimizi düzenlerken sıralamaya dikkat ediyoruz. Daha sonra checking yapıyorsun. Yine aynı şeyleri yapacaksın. Çocuk yanlış yaptıysa doğrusunu söylemek yerine onu guide edebilirsin. Niye onu düşündün, resimlere bak bakalım diyerek guide edebilirsin. Evet, böylece ders bitiyor. Yetecek mi peki bunlar?**
- C: Yeter diyorum. Geçen hafta hazırladığımız birçok aktivite kaldı.
- Ö: **İlla her hazırladığım şeyi yetiştirmek zorunda değilsin yine de extra aktiviten olsun yanında. Bazen öyle bir zaman kalıyor ki -5 dakika- gibi oyun tarzı gibi bir şey bile olsa yeter. Var mı eklemek istediğin bir şey?**
- C: Yok.
- Ö: Kolay gelsin.

## APPENDIX B

**Sample of a pre-observation conference carried out by the experienced supervisor**

**Pre-observation conference 2 of student teacher 2**

**Ö: Bunlar repeat after me bölümü.**

M: Yapılan kısımdan devam ediyoruz, sadece şu iki sayfayı verdi hoca. Burada may ve haven't you var.

**Ö: May ve haven't you, ne kadar alakasız.**

M: Aslında öyle.

**Ö: Hoca sadece konuyu alın yapın mı dedi?**

M: Evet.

**Ö: Şöyle yapın böyle yapın demedi.**

M: Demedi. Tam speaking olmuyor, grammarde var, may not'ı öğrenmemişler dolayısıyla haven't you da var.

**Ö: Bu mu cue card?**

M: Evet, may in tekrarı gibi bir şey. Olumsuz şeklini öğrenmediler.

**Ö: "May I use it?" derse "Yes, of course" diyemez mi.**

M: Diyebilir, olumsuz cevap yok daha ziyade olumlu cevap var. Olumsuz derken....

**Ö: Negatif cümleyse positif, positif cümleyse negatif anlamlı**

M: Ama sonuçta may not geçmiyor.

**Ö: Ben şunu demek istiyorum. "May I use it?" in cevabı illa "sorry" mi olmak zorunda?**

M: O şekilde düşünmemiştim ben kitaba bağlı kaldığım için.

**Ö: Kitapta öyle mi diyor?**

M: Genelde egzersizler o şekilde ilerliyor, kafalarını karıştırmayım diye başka türlü vermedim. Çünkü bu kalıplar önceden verilmiş paket halinde.

**Ö: Şimdi bak, "sorry I need it myself" dedi, sonra "of course, you can" mi diyecek?**

M: Evet, bu kalıp var çünkü

**Ö: Outline şöyle herhalde. A B'den bir şey istiyor, o da hayır veremem diyor, A'da tamam olsun diyor, sonra B A'dan bir şey istiyor, o da tamam olabilir diyor. Böyle mi geliyor?**

M: Evet.

**Ö: Bunu anlamadım ben işte.**

M: Bunlar ayrı ayrı öğretilmişti zaten ben de bunları tek bir şekilde bir kural olarak hatırlasınlar istedim. Ondan sonra why not'ı öğretyim dedim. Sonra öteki kalıbı.

**Ö: Sen benim ne demek istediğimi anladın mı? Hala ondan emin değilim.**

M: Anladım, kafaları karışmasın iye kitaba bağlı kalmak istemiştım. O zaman positiflerii de içeren birşeyler yapayım.

**Ö: Diğerine bakalım. Cinderella ile ilgili bir şey var. Tamam güzel. “of course, you may” der herhalde may’le sorarsa ne yapacaklar sonra?**

M: Tahtaya yazdığım diyalogu tekrar edecekler.

**Ö: Resim vermişsin, görürlerse cevap verir çocuklar.**

M: En fazla bu kadar büyütebildim hocam, sınıf küçük zaten

**Ö: Boyasaydın keşke daha silik çektirip.**

M: Olmadı fotokopi çok koyu

**Ö: Burada role play yapmışsın güzel. 24 yok onlarda 12pm tamam, güzel. Genellikle excuse belirtmiyorlar mı, no you may not yeterli oluyor mu?**

M: Oluyor.

**Ö: Sonra “have” e mi geçtin? Bu perfect tense’deki have mi?**

M: Evet, konunun gidişatı böyle. Reddediyor ama bu şekilde olumsuz cümle kurarak değil de. Refuse çeşitleri öğretiliyor aslında burada.

**Ö: May’dan can’e mi geçtik şimdi?**

M: Evet. Orada bir diyalog var karmaşık, onları düzenleyecekler.

**Ö: Şu CD’yi anlamadım ben.**

M: Bir CD ödünç almış. Sözlü olarak bir diyalog yapmalarını istiyorum.

Ö: Çocukların ne yapacağını anlamadım, ya cue card vermen gerekiyor.

M: İkisini birleştireyim olmazsa vakitten de kazanırım.

**Ö: Birleştir. Zaten yetişmeyebilir de belki bu.**

M: Tahtaya birer örnek yazsam ya da direk resimleri asıp sözlü söylesem daha verimli olabilir. Görerek yaptıklarında kendilerine güvenleri daha çok oluyor.

**Ö: O zaman gidişata bakarsın, 2 tane falan örnek gerekebilir.**

M: Tamam.

APPENDIX C

Sample of a first and second drafts of a lesson plan of a student teacher

1st draft

DAILY LESSON PLAN

I. INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION

Student Teacher;

Instructor;

Level of the Class; Beginner

Number of the Students;

Date/ Hour: 10.03.2004 / 13<sup>30</sup> - 14<sup>10</sup>

Class Period: 40

Materials: flashcards, board

Overall Objectives of the Lesson:

to teach how to use positive and interrogative forms in S. Present Tense.

Behavioral Objectives of the Lesson:

At the end of the lesson, Ss. will be able to get the meaning from the context in the Simple Present Tense.

to make positive sentences in The S. Present Tense, to answer the questions that are asked with "what" in The S. Present Tense.

add some more examples for different pronouns

I. PRESENTATION:

Note: There can be words that the Ss. don't know because of their level while I am presenting the topic in the context, therefore I have given place to teaching vocabulary briefly during the plan.

T: Good afternoon everybody!

Ss: Good afternoon!

T: How are you today?

Ss: Thanks, and you?

T: I'm fine, thanks. Today, we'll have a new topic. I have some pictures of a boy. First, I'll introduce this boy to you. (show the picture of the boy to the class)

T: Yes, This is Tony. Tony is a student.

Well, look at Tony's Mornings (write

Every morning kullu bolu



T: Repeat. Tony has breakfast in the mornings.

Ss: Tony...

T: Now, look at the other picture.

Ss: His wardrobe ... his uniform.

T: Yes, Tony puts on his uniform in the mornings. Puts on? Do you know "puts on"?

Ss: ...

T: (If they don't know "puts on" - they most probably don't know "puts on" - I try to give the meaning by putting on my jacket) ...

T: Ok, Tony puts on his school uniform in the mornings. Repeat! (Tony, I read write on the board)

Ss: Tony...

T: Now, the last picture is here. Where is Tony?

Ss: ... school.

T: Yes, then, Tony goes to school in the mornings. (hang-write) Repeat!

Ss: Tony...

T: Very good! (I point out the first picture and ~~ask~~ with "what")

What does Tony do in the mornings?

(I write the sentence on the board and highlight)

Ss: ...

T: Tony wakes up in the mornings. (I point out the second picture and ask the same question again)

What does Tony do in the mornings? check

Ss: Tony washes his hands in the mornings.

T: Wonderful! (I ask for all the pictures)

I point out the whole class and say: You go to school in the mornings. (write and highlight) *diper resemble de soulor sor... grade*

C.I. point out myself.

I go to school every morning.

T: I point out the class and me:

We go to school in the mornings. (write, highlight)

I point out a boy in the class:

He goes to school in the mornings.

I point out a girl in the class:

She goes to school in the mornings

(I write all the sentences on the board by highlighting and then pass the question form with "what")

(I ask the question by pointing out the answer on the board!)

What do you do in the mornings? (write)

Ss: You go...

T: You answer the question. We...

Ss: We go to school...

T: wonderful! (I write all the questions that

I ask the Ss. on the board)

I point out a girl in the class:

What does she do in the mornings?

Ss: She goes to school in the mornings.

T: Wonderful, thanks! (Point out a boy) What does he do in the mornings?

Ss: He goes to school in...

T: Thanks! (I draw a chart on the board because the Ss. can see the form clearly.) Write these examples in your notebooks!

Ss: (Write)

T: finish?

Ss: Yes.

T: Good. We'll do exercises in the next lesson.

### Checking Understanding!

Diğer pronoun lar col gəlgedə təkrar?  
Onlar-ə? 7 fəzil rəsulər bələbəlməyə bə  
məsələ. Cəmbəli tələmə bələmə dəyərdə  
məsələ. T



BOARD USE

1

Tony wakes up early every morning.

2

Tony washes his hands every morning.

3

Tony has breakfast every morning.

4

Tony puts on his school uniform every morning.

What does Tony do every morning?

What do you do every morning?

I have my breakfast every morning.

You go to school every morning.

We go to school every morning.

I go to school every morning.

They wash their breakfast every morning.

She goes to school every morning.

|                        |      |                            |
|------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| I<br>you<br>we<br>they | go   | to school<br>every morning |
| he<br>she<br>it        | goes |                            |

16.03.2004 - 13<sup>30</sup> 14<sup>10</sup>

## SIMPLE PRESENT TENSE

|                        |      |                            |
|------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| I<br>you<br>we<br>They | go   | to school in the mornings. |
| he/she/it              | goes |                            |

DAILY LESSON PLAN <sup>Second</sup>  
I. INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION <sup>Draft</sup>

Student Teacher:

Instructor:

Level of the Ss: Beginner

Number of the Ss:

Date/ Hour: 16.03.2004 / 13<sup>30</sup> - 14<sup>10</sup>

Class Period: 40'

Materials: flashcards, handouts, board

Overall Objective of the Lesson:

to teach Ss. how to use positive and interrogative forms in S. Present Tense.

Behavioral Objectives of the Lesson:

At the end of the lesson, Ss. will be able to match the picture with the right sentence.

to make positive sentences in The S. Present

Tense, to answer the questions that are

asked with "what" in The S. Present Tense.

I. PRESENTATION

T: Good afternoon everybody!

Ss: Good afternoon!

T: How are you today?

Ss: Thanks and you?

T: I'm fine, thanks. Today, we'll have a new topic. I have some pictures of a boy. First, I'll introduce this boy to you. (show the picture of the boy to the class)

T: Yes, this is Tony. Tony is a student. We'll look at Tony's Mornings (write the title and hang the picture on the board) what do you understand from this title?

Ss: breakfast

T: Good! what else?

Ss: School...

T: Yes! we can understand Tony's activities in the mornings. OK, then we'll look at ~~at~~ (I hold the picture and ask) what do you

see?

Ss: Tony is in bed...

T: Yes! Very good. Tony is in his bed. Then, Tony wakes up early every morning (hang picture and write the sentence) OK, Tony wakes up every morning. Repeat, every morning!

Ss: Every morning!

T: Tony wakes up early every morning.

Ss: Tony . . . . .

T: Let's look at the second picture!

What do you see?

Ss: . . . . .

T: Tony washes his hands every morning. (hang the picture and write the sentence on the board - highlight)

T: ~~Oh, they don't know.~~ ~~put on!~~ ~~they~~ ~~most-~~  
probably don't know - I try to give the  
meaning by putting on my jacket) ...

T: Oh, Tony puts on his school uniform  
every morning. Repeat! (hang-write)

Ss: Tony ...

T: Now, the last picture is here. Where  
is Tony?

Ss: ... school ...

T: Yes, then, Tony goes to school every  
morning. (hang-write) Repeat!

Ss: Tony ...

T: Very good! (I take the pictures and  
hang them on the other side of the board  
and: ~~They want~~ ~~they~~, to put the pictures on  
the right sentence. The Ss: come to the  
board and hang the pictures on the  
write sentence.)

T: Oh, repeat! Every morning!

Ss: Every morning!

T: Tony washes his hands every morning.

Ss: Tony ...

T: Wonderful! Let's pass the other picture.  
What do you see?

Ss: breakfast ...

T: Very good! Tony has breakfast  
every morning. (hang-write) Repeat.  
Tony ...

Ss: Tony ...

T: Now, look at the other picture.

Ss: His wardrobe ... his uniform ...

T: Yes, Tony puts on his uniform every  
morning. Puts on? Do you know 'puts on'?

Ss: No ...

T:

T: very good! (I point out the first picture, ask with 'what')

What does Tony do every morning?  
(write and highlight)

Ss: ...

T: Tony wakes up every morning - (point out the second picture and ask (like some question))

What does Tony do every morning?

Ss: Tony washes his hands every morning.

T: wonderful! (I ask for all the pictures)

I point out the whole class and say:

You go to school every morning.

Write - highlight

I point out myself.

I have my breakfast every morning.

127

T: I point out the class and me:

we go to school every morning.

I approach a boy:

T: What do you do every morning?

S: I go to school every morning.

T: Very good. (point out the boy)

He goes to school every morning.

I approach a girl:

T: What do you do every morning?

S: I have my breakfast.

T: Is she right (to the class)

Class: No..

T: Then? Ali?

A: I have my breakfast.

T: Yes, wonderful. (write the question and the answer on the board) Now, there are hand-outs for you. Look the pictures on the hand-outs. Carefully, and match the pictures with the sentence. Did?

T: Understand?

Ss: Yes.

T: Good. Look at it in three minutes, then we'll look together.

Ss: -- --

T: Let's look at it together. The first one... You listen to music every evening.

Ss: C

T: Very good. (I make these do the other ones)

T: Now, I'll draw a simple chart on the board (draw the chart on the board) write these examples and the chart in your notebooks!

Ss: (write)

T: finish?

Ss: Yes.

T: Good. We'll do exercises in the next lesson.

BOARD USE

- 1 Tony wakes up early every morning.
- 2 Tony washes his hands every morning.
- 3 Tony has breakfast every morning.
- 4 Tony puts on his school uniform every morning.

- What does Tony do every morning?
- What do you do every morning?
- I have my breakfast every morning.
- You go to school every morning.
- We go to school every morning.
- I go to school every morning.
- They wash their breakfast every morning.
- She goes to school every morning.

|                        |      |                            |
|------------------------|------|----------------------------|
| I<br>you<br>we<br>they | go   | to school<br>every morning |
| he<br>she<br>it        | goes |                            |