INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600



Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/286

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

SUPERVISION OF ITINERANT TEACHERS: PERSPECTIVES FROM ITINERANT TEACHERS AND THOSE WHO SUPERVISE THEM

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Bradley Niles Benson
Norman, Oklahoma
2001

UMI Number: 3004879



UMI Microform 3004879

Copyright 2001 by Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© Copyright by BRADLEY NILES BENSON 2001
All Rights Reserved

SUPERVISION OF ITINERANT TEACHERS:
PERSPECTIVES FROM ITINERANT TEACHERS
AND THOSE WHO SUPERVISE THEM

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
AND POLICY STUDIES

BY

Sally J. Zepeda, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Michael Langenbach, Ph.D.
Committee Chair

Pamela G. Fry, Ed.D

Jeffrey A. Maiden, Ph.D.

Mary John O'Hair, Ed.D

Christine Ormsbee, Ph.D.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest thanks go to my chairs, without whom this dissertation could not have been written. From the first meeting of the first class, Dr. Sally J. Zepeda continuously shared with me her vast knowledge and expertise in the field of supervision. I will always be indebted to her for her tireless effort and unwavering dedication to this project, and especially her commitment to see me through. She is a shining example of the teacher-scholar. I will be forever grateful to Dr. Michael Langenbach for his immense wisdom and unerring insight. He has challenged and broadened my thinking, improved my skills, and deftly opened windows of self-discovery. It has been a privilege to work with these two people, both personally and professionally.

Thanks go to the other members of my committee: Dr. Pamela Fry, Dr. Jeffrey Maiden, Dr. Mary John O'Hair, and Dr. Christine Ormsbee all of whose advice and guidance helped my research and my writing move forward. I am also thankful for their informed suggestions.

Thanks to the superb teachers and professors that I have had through the years. They have given me a strong foundation on which to build. Thanks also to the wonderful students, teachers, administrators, and staff throughout the district with whom I have had the pleasure to work. A very special thanks goes to my colleagues David Davisson and Brenda Wagner for their monumental patience, unselfish cooperation, and invaluable help throughout this endeavor.

I am thankful to my current principal, Dan Quinn for his interest and for his example of what a caring administrator can accomplish; Dr. John Clinton for his

sage advice and calming influence; Dr. Richard Schiller and Dr. Ruth Ann Carr for helping to pave the way; and especially to Sally Riley, whose unfailing belief and encouragement kept me going.

Thank you to Dr. George Moore and Dr. Jennifer Watson for opening doors and guiding me along the path; and especially to Dr. Stewart Mayers who so many times has gone out of his way to assist and encourage me in this process. Thanks also to Trudy Rhodes, Julie Comer, and Barbi DeLong for their patience and humor, and for keeping me on the right track.

I thank the participants in this study for the quality of their thought and conversation. It was a pleasure to learn from each of you.

To my family, I can only say that there are not enough words to express my gratitude for what you have done for me. I appreciate the sacrifices, help, and love of my children, Blythe and Joshua. Thank you for understanding that this was something important.

I am eternally indebted to my wife, Liz, for her consistent support, her numerous sacrifices, and the infinite number of little things that helped in such big ways. You have been a compass on a journey that often had no map. Thank you for pointing me in a new direction, and for believing that I could and should go down a road that, for me, was less traveled.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated with the deepest love and respect to my father, Dr. Ben H. Benson, for instilling in me the confidence to go the distance; and to my mother, Nita M. Benson, for giving me the wings to fly. They have always been there for me – and always will be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES xi

ABSTRACT xii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background 3

Problem Statement 7

Purpose of the Study 9

Research Questions 10

Definitions of Terms 12

Assumptions 14

Limitations of the Research 14

Significance of the Research 15

Importance to the Researcher 15

Organization of the Dissertation 17

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Background 19

Complexities of the Itinerant Teacher 25

The Itinerant Teacher: Definitions and Qualities 28

The Itinerant Teacher: Workforce and Environment 30

Issues Surrounding the Itinerant Teacher 31

Quality of Service 33

Issues Regarding Travel 34

Communication Issues....35
Preparation for Itinerant Teaching.... 36
Control Factors for Itinerant Teachers.... 37
Role Confusion of the Itinerant Teacher.... 38
Relationships Between Itinerant Teachers and Administrators.... 38
Perennial Issues in Supervision.... 39
Differentiated Supervision.... 43
Developmental Supervision.... 45
Supervision and the Itinerant Teacher.... 49
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLODY
Pilot Study.... 54
Findings of the Pilot Study.... 55
Rationale for the Study.... 56
Rationale for Qualitative Methodology.... 57
Data Source.... 62
Data Collection Procedures.... 64
Confidentiality....65
Protocol....65
Data Analysis.... 67
Credibility and Trustworthiness.... 68
Limitations of the Study.... 70

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Participant Profiles 73

Findings and Analysis 81

Conditions Surrounding the Itinerant Teacher and Related Effects on Supervision 81

Workplace and Job Related Conditions 90

Issues Regarding Communication for the Itinerant Teacher 96

Supervisors' Perspectives on Communication 98

Feelings of Alienation on the Part of the Itinerant Teacher..... 100

Confusion Over Multiple Supervisors..... 107

Administrative Understanding of the Conditions of the Itinerant Teacher..... 112

Supervisory Issues for the Itinerant Teachers and Their Supervisors..... 117

Type and Frequency of Supervision Events..... 119

Perceived Satisfaction with Supervision Processes..... 121

The Perceived Importance of Supervision..... 125

Desired Improvements for More Effective Supervision..... 127

CHAPTER FIVE: INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Review of the Study 132

Procedures..... 133

Demographics..... 133

Interpretation of Findings 134

The Conditions of Itinerant Teaching 136

The Effects of Itinerant Teaching on the Supervision Process.....137

Confusion Surrounding the Supervision Process with Respect to the Lexicon Used to Describe Supervision and Evaluation.....139

The Type of Supervision and Supervisor Desired by the Itinerant Teachers.....143

Implications and Recommendations 152

Implications for School Systems Employing Itinerant Teachers.....152

Implications for Colleges of Education that Prepare Teachers and Prospective Administrators.....156

Recommendations for Future Research 157

Concluding Commentary..... 158

REFERENCES 160

APPENDIX A 179

APPENDIX B 180

APPENDIX C 182

APPENDIX D 187

APPENDIX E 191

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Various Names for Itinerant Teachers Derived from the Models of Delivery They Provide 26

TABLE 2: Various Names for Itinerant Teachers that Illustrate Mobility 27

TABLE 3: Names Given by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Their Workplace Conditions 27

TABLE 4: Challenges Faced by Itinerant Teachers 31

TABLE 5: Teacher Participant Information 74

TABLE 6: Supervisor Participant Information 79

TABLE 7: Base-line Data Regarding Supervisory Experiences Per Year as Self-Reported by the Itinerant Teachers 83

TABLE 8: Terms Used by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Evaluation 85

TABLE 9: Terms Used by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Supervision 87

TABLE 10: Assigned Supervisors for Itinerant Teachers 108

ABSTRACT

SUPERVISION OF ITINERANT TEACHERS: PERSPECTIVES FROM ITINERANT TEACHERS AND THOSE WHO SUPERVISE THEM

By: Brad N. Benson

Major Professors:

Sally J. Zepeda, Ph. D.

Michael Langenbach, Ph. D.

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the supervision of itinerant teachers as reported by nine itinerant teachers and four administrators who were responsible for supervising this narrow population of teachers. The participants were purposefully selected from across three suburban school districts in Oklahoma that had itinerant teacher populations of between 12 and 15%.

Both the itinerant teachers and their supervisors were interviewed to examine their experiences with supervision as it related to itinerancy. Utilizing a phenomenological lens, the researcher sought first to understand the conditions in which itinerant teachers worked and then to understand the perceptions about supervision from both the teachers' and supervisors' points-of-view.

In relation to the conditions in which traveling teachers worked, participants reported the conditions that most often got in the way of their ability to effectively do their jobs were difficulties with travel, adapting to each site, lack of communication, feelings of alienation, confusion over multiple supervisors, and a lack of administrative understanding of itinerancy.

The two major elements that itinerant teachers believed would improve their instructional practices and effectiveness were supervisor understanding of the complexities of the itinerant experience, and supervisors who were knowledgeable about the content areas taught by itinerant teachers. The teachers all reported that more informal types of supervision, from qualified and competent supervisors and colleagues, could increase their effectiveness. The participants in this study, both the teachers and those who supervised them, developed their own lexicon that represented various forms of supervision and evaluation. For example, it was noted that the itinerant teachers utilized such terms as "forced supervision" and "legal supervision" to describe teacher evaluation. For the participants in this study, the words supervision and evaluation were often used interchangeably.

The administrators reported that a better understanding of itinerancy would help them to make adjustments needed for more effective supervision for the traveling teachers, and that supervisors should attempt to learn as much as possible about the content area of those they supervised in order to increase administrator credibility. The administrators in this study cited opening lines of communication, supervising itinerants across sites, and increasing the frequency of supervision to be important.

Although the itinerant teachers and supervisors indicated a level of dissatisfaction with the state of itinerant teacher supervision, both agreed that supervision was important to the development of teachers. The participants believed that changes in supervisory practice such as peer coaching should be

made to ensure more meaningful experiences that could result in further growth and development for the itinerant teacher.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The quality and frequency of instructional supervision in K-12 schools continues to be a matter for concern and study. Throughout its history, there has been a persistent conflict surrounding the supervision of teachers. The dichotomy between the purposes and intents of supervision and its actual practice have served to fragment the perceived nature and goals of supervision, if not its fundamental definition. Bolin and Panaritis (1992) believed that through all of the various viewpoints on supervision, there have only been two areas around which a loose consensus had coalesced. The first was that, "[T]he function of supervision is an important one whether it is carried out by a superintendent, a supervisor, curriculum worker, or peer" (p. 31). The second was, "Supervision is primarily concerned with the improvement of classroom practice for the benefit of students, regardless of what else may be entailed (e.g., curriculum development or staff development)" (p. 31).

Conceding the point that the function of supervision is an important one, and that it is primarily concerned with improvement of classroom practice, it follows that a lack of supervisory experiences would result in an important loss of development for the individual teacher. Although there have been only a limited number of studies that directly assessed the effectiveness of supervision on student achievement and improved changes in teaching behaviors, there appears to be enough positive evidence to make the case that supervision is, at

the least, an important function in those areas (Elgarten, 1991; Fitzpatrick & Charter, 1986; Holifield & Cline, 1997).

Most, if not all, supervision texts deal with models of supervision (and the delivery of those models) as being appropriate for all teachers regardless of content area or school level (e.g., elementary, middle, high school). Practical knowledge informs us that supervision is site as well as context specific, even if there is more than one site or context involved within a teacher's assignment. Cook (1998) stated that supervision texts do not differentiate in relation to content, "However, supervisors work with teachers whose focus is upon the content, concepts, knowledge and skills in and across specific disciplines such as English language arts, mathematics, social studies and science" (p. 493). Therefore, even with the best model and the best delivery system, under optimal educational conditions, there is still the possibility that supervisory experiences might be lacking through a supervisor's less than adequate working knowledge of a teacher's targeted content area, specific student population, or site(s).

The emphasis in the study of supervision has remained on the "regular classroom teacher." Within this standard environment, where supervision was deemed important, the significance and variation of site, context, and the supervisor's knowledge of content created a situation where the quality of supervision could easily be compromised. How much more could supervision be compromised if the teacher were an itinerant who was at more than one site, taught more than one level of student (elementary, middle, or high school), and in

all likelihood, had a content area that in great part was very unfamiliar to the supervisor?

Since the inception of schools, staffing patterns have included itinerant teachers who travel to more than one site, to more than one district, or even to more than one town. The itinerant teacher's very movement, and therefore, limited involvement in any one single school site, places her or him in a significantly different position than the regular classroom teacher. The unique status of the itinerant teacher in the educational system has created a much different environment within which supervision was to be encouraged, administered, and received. This study was a descriptive one that investigated the scope and depth of the supervision of itinerant teachers.

Background

There have been numerous definitions and explanations of educational supervision since its inception. In its broadest sense, supervision could be defined as action toward improvement of instruction (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1995). Another admittedly broad definition of supervision was offered by Harris (1985), "What school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change the school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to promote pupil learning" (p. 10). Nolan (1997) claimed that the purpose of supervision was "to promote individual teacher growth beyond the current level of performance" (p.101). Of course, such wide-band definitions and explanations do little to enhance the implementation of practical applications of supervisory

skills, but they do serve to frame the general intents and purposes of a field that is certainly broad in nature and growing in depth.

Other definitions of supervision encompass the point of view of the supervisory model itself, (e.g., clinical, action research, reflective), or the view from which the function of supervision is seen (e.g., organizational emphasis, central office, community-building, etc.). Alfonso, Firth, and Neville (1981) provided an organizational slant, "Supervision is a combination or integration of processes, procedures, and conditions that are consciously designed to advance the work effectiveness of individuals and groups" (p. 3). They clarified their view by stating that the purpose of supervision was, " . . . to provide the conditions and promote the behavior necessary for the achievement of organizational goals" (p. 4). This broad view seemed to de-emphasize supervision of instruction in classrooms; however, the intent was to create the conditions at the organizational level necessary to build a culture for supervision in classrooms.

Throughout its history, supervision has also been defined by the perceived needs of the time. Educational and societal changes have posed problems and situations that spawned new attempts at supervisory solutions, as evidenced by Neville and Garman (1998) through their discussion of supervisory belief systems based on the concepts of inspection, efficiency, democracy, science, the clinical approach, and leadership. Looking back over the history of supervision with an eye toward finding a unifying definition for the field, Badiali (1998) indicated:

> One common thread running through the definition of supervision from age to age has been the idea that it is an "enabling activity." Supervisors

> aim to enable teachers to do a better job in helping students learn. They aim to enable schools to fulfill their purposes as organizations or as communities. While not much is written on this topic, supervisors have attempted to enable administrators to keep their very busy eyes on the quality and equity of education for all students. (p. 961)

In light of the above, a broad definition of supervision might now become: enabling actions toward schools, administrators, and teachers in service of organizational goals and improved instruction. The best possible scenario for the achievement of the intents and purposes of supervision might be the improvement of instruction, educator professionalism, and the school environment, through all supervisory change agents in the system, utilizing supervision that is appropriate to each and every individual, group, or situation.

Itinerant teachers, through the nature of their teaching assignment, continue to challenge the supervisory process and even the supervisory structure of the districts in which they teach. Zepeda and Langenbach (1999) noted that there were several difficulties surrounding a district's use of itinerant teachers, e.g., communication between principals and the teacher, coordination among principals for supervision and evaluation, and the development of a realistic schedule which includes travel time. These are some of the obstacles that face both the itinerant teacher and their supervisors. School districts have found that the use of itinerant teachers meets valuable goals and needs of the overall curricular offerings. Yet, according to Luckner and Miller (1994), " . . . there is a paucity both of information about itinerant teaching and . . . research" (p. 111) to

inform practices that can support and nurture the unique needs of the itinerant teacher.

Itinerant teachers, being typically special programs teachers (e.g., fine arts, physical education, special education), have served a vital function in the total curriculum of schools. Without the use of itinerant teachers, many elementary and secondary level programs would be in jeopardy. Elementary music programs and physical education programs rely heavily on the use of itinerant teachers. Secondary level music programs support performance group teachers (orchestra, choir, band) who, without teaching in other buildings, might lose their assignment and program to cost efficiency issues. Coaches also frequently teach physical education or other classes at different sites and grade levels in addition to their coaching assignment.

The value of special programs to a district has been documented from both a historical and current practice perspective (Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). The call for schools to broaden their content, to serve more of the needs of the student, and to promote positive personal and social goals, has, in large part, been answered through the development and sustainment of special programs. In order for these programs to survive and even flourish, the itinerant teacher has become an integral part of the process.

The large numbers of students served by itinerant teachers through the areas in which they teach also have contributed to their value. In addition to this, many performance oriented special programs (e.g., fine arts, athletics) connect students, teachers, and the school's image directly with the public in a very

positive fashion. Realizing the value of the itinerant teacher to many school districts, it would seem advisable to help these teachers succeed in every way possible, or at least to the same degree as the regular classroom teacher. In order to begin the process of improvement, a better understanding of the conditions, relationships, and desires of the itinerant teacher and his or her supervision is needed. This study sought to explore the conditions under which itinerant teachers work and the supervision they receive.

Problem Statement

Itinerant teachers travel to two or more sites within a school district or sometimes between school districts. They are educators who are responsible for one or more programs at each site, often requiring a new preparation for each class they teach. Frequently they feel homeless, do not have a room of their own, and keep their office in the back seat of their cars. When meetings are required at a site, they must decide to which site they temporarily belong. Special events during a school day that involve their students are frequently a surprise to the itinerant teacher and can undo the preparation and planning for the students on that day.

Many itinerant teachers are educational specialists (e.g., music, physical education, special education, or other special programs teachers). With the emphasis on site based autonomy present in many of today's schools, most large schools now have their own special programs classes at every level, instead of hub programs spread throughout the district. In addition to their responsibility to each school site at which the itinerant teacher works, there

typically is also a vertically aligned department to which they are also responsible (e.g., music, physical education), usually staffed by an administrative specialist in that area. There are numerous decisions to be made, many on a daily basis, that must be weighed carefully on the balancing scales of the needs and goals of both the site school and the vertically aligned department.

Itinerant teachers are faced with teaching at two or more school sites and working with the faculty, administration, and staff at each site. Itinerants are also typically teaching in a special program with a relationship to other faculty in that field across the district, as well as to the faculty at each site. Additionally, itinerant teachers are held responsible to two or more building administrators, and in all likelihood, an administrator in the specialty area. It is within these conditions that the itinerant teacher receives supervision, from whatever source(s), in whatever quantity, and with whatever quality.

The typical situation in which itinerant teachers find themselves places them at risk to receive inadequate supervision. Many administrators are not properly equipped to evaluate the special educational circumstances and needs of these teachers, and the field of supervision has offered no specific solutions for transient teachers. The little research done in this area has revealed that the affected teachers greatly value supervision and have asked their district for help or have even looked to their peers to fulfill their needs (Ellis & Matthews, 1982).

Texts on the supervision of instruction have not dealt specifically with the itinerant teacher's plight. The many models and processes of supervision offered through current texts on the subject have not addressed the particular problems

of the itinerant teacher, nor have they offered any categorical solutions (Acheson & Gall, 1997; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1999; Garubo & Rothstein, 1998; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998; Pajak, 1993; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998). All of these texts, while addressing in detail a delivery system (or systems) to the regular classroom teacher, had nothing to offer regarding the unique situation within which the itinerant teacher practices.

While there has been a modicum of research examining the day-to-day routine of itinerant teachers, there is a dearth of knowledge concerning supervision as related specifically to the itinerant teacher. In fact, there were no research studies found that specifically targeted the supervision of itinerant teachers. Studies pertaining to itinerant teachers available in the literature included ancillary findings that could be loosely transferred to the supervision of itinerant teachers. Even in the area of special education, from which the bulk of the scant research largely emanated, there were no studies that focused on the supervision of itinerant teachers. The position of the itinerant teacher is an area that has received little attention by researchers. The supervision of itinerant teachers has not been directly investigated at all; therefore, a study of this phenomenon is needed to contribute to the knowledge base regarding itinerant teachers and supervision.

Purpose of the Study

Previous research on the supervision of itinerant teachers has emerged largely as a by-product of studies targeted at some other aspect of the itinerant teaching experience. While there is research and data available on the itinerant

teacher, there is a limited knowledge base regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers. The literature has revealed nothing about guidelines or suggested strategies or methods for the supervisor of itinerant teachers. It was the purpose of this study to contribute to the knowledge base on the supervision of itinerant teachers with a corollary contribution regarding the supervisors of itinerant teachers.

Research Questions

The following questions will serve to guide and to direct the research:

1. What specific data can be generated regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers?
2. How do itinerant teachers perceive the itinerant experience and the supervision they receive?
3. How do supervisors of itinerant teachers describe their role and extent of involvement with itinerant teachers throughout the supervisory process?
4. How satisfied, if at all, are itinerant teachers in regard to the supervision they receive?
5. How satisfied, if at all, are the supervisors of itinerant teachers with the process of supervising itinerant teachers?
6. To what extent, if any, do itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers believe that supervision is a necessary

component in the development and improvement of the itinerant teacher?

7. If supervision is seen as necessary, what supervisory processes and procedures do itinerant teachers want and need to improve their instructional practices and effectiveness?

8. If supervision is deemed important, what conditions, processes, and/or procedures do supervisors of itinerant teachers want and need in order to deliver effective supervision to itinerant teachers?

In order to develop baseline data regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers, a qualitative, descriptive study was formulated. The focus of the investigation was on the world of the participants, and therefore was rooted philosophically in the phenomenological realm and was ontologically of a perspective-seeking nature (Langenbach, Vaughn, & Aagaard, 1994). Due to the scarcity of literature relating directly to the study of itinerant teachers and their supervision, a hermeneutical approach based in the tradition of phenomenology was deemed most appropriate for this investigation. As in most instances of phenomenological research, the primary instrument of data collection for the study was the investigator, and the mode of investigation was inductive (Langenbach et al., 1994).

The participants in the study consisted of nine itinerant teachers who were special programs teachers, and four supervisors of itinerant teachers who were building level, district level, or central office administrators. Three public school districts were chosen for this study from among the thirty-two largest school

districts in the state of Oklahoma. The population of the communities involved ranged from seventy thousand to one hundred thousand. In addition, these districts were classified as suburban, and were within a few miles of a college or a university. Interviews were the main source of data. The data were analyzed and codified toward the development of a baseline of knowledge in order to provide a deeper sense of the supervision of itinerant teachers.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms and definitions were used to frame this study.

Itinerant Teachers were those teachers who had taught simultaneously at two or more sites, in one or more school districts, and across one or more school levels (elementary, middle, or high school).

Regular Classroom Teachers were those teachers who taught in one school and within one school level (elementary, middle, or high school).

Supervision was the act of assisting teachers to improve instructional practices in order to enhance the school environment and to promote student achievement.

Supervisors were those persons or agents in a position of line or staff authority (or possibly curricular authority) who were charged with delivering supervision to teachers. The typical supervisor would include assistant principals, principals, central office administrators and positions designated as supervisor, coordinator, department chair or curriculum specialist.

High School was the level of schooling which included grades nine through twelve.

Middle School was the level of schooling which included grades six through eight.

Elementary School was the level of schooling which spanned grade levels pre-kindergarten through five.

Evaluation was a process to safeguard and improve the quality of instruction received by students (McGreal, 1983). The three districts in this study were required by Oklahoma law to evaluate teachers in their district.

Formal Observations were scheduled visitations to observe the teacher in a classroom or learning situation. Formal observation would normally include at least a pre-observation conference between the supervisor and the teacher or a post-observation conference, in addition to the observation itself.

Informal Observations were unannounced "drop in" visits from the supervisor (Zepeda & Mayers, 2000).

Informal Supervision consisted of unplanned classroom visits with limited documentation, or short conversations, given by supervisors, colleagues, content specialists, or other personnel (Blase & Blase, 1998; Calabrese & Zepeda, 1997).

Peer Supervision was a type of supervision that included elements of peer-level interaction, and teachers observing and reacting to each others' work (Anderson & Snyder, 1993).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made by the researcher in conducting this study.

1. Itinerant teachers have perceptions about the supervision they receive and about those who supervise them.
2. Itinerant teachers openly and truthfully described those perceptions.
3. Supervisors of itinerant teachers have perceptions about their role in the supervision of itinerant teachers.
4. Supervisors of itinerant teachers openly and truthfully described those perceptions.
5. Itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers accurately and with specificity reported factual information regarding their respective supervisory environments and supervisory experiences.

Limitations of the Research

1. The research was conducted in only three of the 10 largest suburban districts in the central region of the state of Oklahoma.
2. The research was limited to a purposeful sample of teachers who were itinerant special programs teachers.

3. The supervisors of itinerant teachers were necessarily limited to those who had at least formally or informally observed itinerant special programs teachers.

Significance of the Research

Research into the supervision of itinerant teachers can increase the knowledge base in this area that has received only limited study. An increased awareness of the problems of the itinerant teacher (with specific reference to supervision), as well as the conditions and viewpoints of the supervisors of itinerant teachers, will result in a deeper understanding in both areas of concern. Through the responses of the participants, insights into various problems surrounding itinerant supervision should be brought to light.

The findings from this study could be used by similar districts to better understand the supervisory needs of itinerant teachers. Itinerant teachers themselves may gain knowledge from the study, and possibly of equal importance, the realization that they are not isolated with no recourse for change. Supervisors of itinerant teachers could develop a more empathetic view of their itinerant teachers, and gain insight into more effective supervisory practices. Finally, the deep insights revealed by the participants into the entirety of the itinerant teacher experience could lead other researchers to further study.

Importance to the Researcher

From the first day of public school teaching experience spanning 20 years, this researcher has been an itinerant teacher. Knowing first-hand what problems and difficulties accompanied being a teacher without a home base, there has

been an ever present interest in studying the supervision of the itinerant teacher. In the world of business, and in most other professions, the beginner is rarely put in a situation where he or she is expected to perform at the same level as their most experienced colleagues. In fact, apprenticeships, internships, mentors, and many other means of assistance are customarily available to the new recruits in business or other professions.

More often than not, the itinerant teacher does not even have the limited help that is available to those teachers who remain at one site. The sense of nomadic isolation and constant disorganization that accompanies the beginning stages of itinerancy can certainly stunt the development of even the best of teachers. Without assistance, this researcher believes that itinerant teachers do not easily realize their full potential.

While participating in a course centered on the supervision of teachers, the researcher developed a strong interest in supervision, and subsequently the power of supervision to help, change, improve, and promote self growth among teachers. Supervision then, could be seen as the assistance that itinerant teachers need for personal and professional growth. In the researcher's case, luck, proximity to a university, and accidental yet valuable encounters fulfilled this need for supervision over a lengthy time period. Understanding the precarious position in which most itinerant teachers practice, developing a study to clarify states of being, codifying needs and wants and perhaps instigating further study, have become significant goals in the service of both itinerant teachers and their supervisors.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter one included the basic rationale for this study through the background, problem, and purpose for an investigation of the supervision of itinerant teachers utilizing itinerant teachers and their supervisors. Chapter two will present the theory and literature related to the itinerant teacher and the supervision of itinerant teachers, although much of the theory related to the supervision of itinerant teachers is merely a by-product of itinerant teacher studies. Chapter three will include the methods employed for this research. Chapter four will report the findings from the participants and an analysis of the data. Chapter five will provide a discussion of the findings and implications for itinerant teachers and those who supervise them, and suggestions for further investigation.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The use of itinerant teachers in the delivery system of education has become widespread. Itinerant teachers serve populations that otherwise would be left unserved for a variety of reasons. Itinerant teachers can be found at all grade levels of public school education as well as in urban, suburban, and rural schools. The importance of itinerant teachers to the field of education has been viewed in terms of cost effectiveness (McFadden, 1990), overcoming geographical and distance hindrances, (Hockley, 1983) and reaching special populations (Wilde & Sillito, 1986). It must also be noted that some programs would simply not exist without the inclusion of the itinerant teacher (Monk, 1988). Although the ratio of itinerant teachers to regular classroom teachers is not particularly high, the itinerant teacher position still assumes great importance. The significance of the position is magnified when it is removed from the educational setting. With the removal of the itinerant teacher position, the typical functions of the regular classroom teacher would, in many instances, increase exponentially, and in many cases, programs that serve a unique student population would be discontinued.

The growth and development of itinerant teachers should become a priority to those districts and administrators who employ them. In all likelihood, supervision of itinerant teachers could be enhanced, from the view of the teachers themselves, as well as those who supervise them, through a greater understanding of the supervisory situation within which the teachers and

administrators find themselves. It was the purpose of this study to contribute to the knowledge base on the supervision of itinerant teachers with a corollary contribution to those who supervise itinerant teachers.

Historical Background

The literature on the itinerant teacher is sparse (Schmidt & Stipe, 1991) and is scattered throughout disciplines and even countries. Itinerant teachers have been practicing for centuries. In ancient China, itinerant teachers were said to travel from camp to camp teaching survival skills, battle skills, and providing forms of entertainment. The Bible contains a record of perhaps the most famous itinerant teacher in history, Jesus. It seems, then, throughout the ages, that people have traveled and taught. In recent history, itinerant teachers have become an important part of the educational delivery system in response to educational, financial, geographical, social, health, and population needs.

The written record, as limited as it is, of itinerant teachers coupled with public education, began around the turn of the last century. In Queensland, Australia, the Itinerant Teacher Service (ITS) was introduced in 1901, in answer to the "education for all" mandate made by the Australian government. The Service was begun to educate children who lived great distances from schools and who were unable to attend even the provisional schools the government had established. During its first year, the ITS consisted of one itinerant teacher who served children at 103 homesteads in rural Queensland. In 1905, the replacement itinerant teacher (the first teacher had taken a "stationary" job) recorded 3,274 miles traveled that year (Fogarty, 1983).

In 1907, more teachers were added to the program, but the itinerant teachers still averaged only one visit per year with each student. Modes of transportation from 1901 through 1934 included horse and buggy, train, bicycle, motor bike, motor cars, and even a camel. In 1909, the success of the program allowed it to be standardized by the government, and in 1921, the ITS peaked with 18 teachers serving 1,889 students (Fogarty, 1980).

Around 1930, the Itinerant Teacher Service began to decline and was completely phased out (for the first half of the twentieth century) by 1934. Australia experienced a major economic depression during the 1920s resulting in cutbacks and shortfalls for all educational enterprises. Another contributing factor to the decline was the growing emphasis on the centralized model of education. State and national education officers found it too difficult to control the itinerant system when compared to the rest of the educational settings. Moreover, with improvements in transportation, more students had access to the established provisional schools (Higgins, 1980), and as a result, they were able to attend school more easily.

In the United States, the use of itinerant teachers in education paralleled the timeline in Australia. New York City's Public Education Association financed the first full-time "visiting teacher" in the early 1900s. By 1911, there were seven visiting teachers employed, and through a grant, ten teachers were hired by 1913. Other cities around the country followed New York City's example: Philadelphia in 1909; Kansas City in 1915; Minneapolis in 1916; and Chicago in

1919. By 1923, 140 visiting teachers worked in 50 cities in 26 states (Knupfer, 1999).

The founding of the National Association of Visiting Teachers in 1919 solidified the position of these teachers and also served to focus the debate on the training and purpose of the visiting teacher position. Visiting teachers provided educational services, but they also frequently functioned as truancy officers, social workers, health workers, and even probation officers. The itinerant teachers were seen often as liaisons between the schools and the families of needy students. Eventually, many visiting teachers were required to earn two degrees, one in education and one in social work. Even with two degrees, however, itinerant teachers were still extremely low in status and received far less pay than the lowest paid regular teachers.

The economic depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s was a major impediment to the visiting teacher movement. By 1932, much of the outside funding for visiting teachers was rescinded, and most local school boards were unwilling or unable to support the teachers on their own. During the mid-1930s, only the wealthier school districts could afford to hire visiting teachers, and as a result, the clientele served were the middle, rather than the lower class students. In this new role, the visiting teachers who remained began to concentrate more on the psychological aspects of students as well as working with physically challenged students (Knupfer, 1999).

The connection of health issues to public schools can also be seen in the work of Goldie Allen who was a nurse by profession. In 1928, as a result of a

grant, Goldie Allen became the first public nurse in Appalachia. In 1929, Allen read a study that linked poor health with student academic difficulties. Allen immediately decided to become an itinerant nurse/teacher for the surrounding schools in Appalachia. Allen's work created a model for the area that several counties adopted and which continued for years (Pollitt, 1994).

There were two examples of itinerant programs that thrived in the 1930s, one involved minority populations and another a philanthropic venture in Canada. Very few of the itinerant teachers hired in the United States from 1901 to 1940 were minorities (Knupfer, 1999). Encountering a lack of vocational training at African American colleges, 12 such colleges began the training of itinerant vocational teachers in 1934 (Florence, 1938). In all, 25 teachers were trained in the program, eight of which were itinerant in status.

In Newfoundland, Canada, in the mid-1930s, railway workers and their families lived along the rail line in small isolated settlements. In order to bring education to the children of these families, the Canadian Department of Education and the railway company devised an imaginative solution. The owner's luxury railroad car was converted into a school classroom and living quarters for an itinerant teacher. The program, which lasted for six years, eventually hired more itinerant teachers and even developed itinerant schools for itinerant students at settlements that were off the railway (Noseworthy, 1997).

The latter half of the twentieth century was peppered with unique itinerant solutions to educational problems. Predating Sputnik in 1956, the Oakridge Institute of Nuclear Studies trained 20 teachers to become traveling science

teachers in the public schools. This program reached 572 schools across seven states (Ratner, 1961). In 1959, the state of New York began employing "shared teachers" to serve both rural and city schools. The New York program was an outgrowth of the visiting teacher movement in that truancy, gifted education, vocational education, and special education became the focus of the program (De La Fleur, 1961).

The concept of itinerant teachers traveling in "mobile" private schools originated in Florida in 1960 (Miller, 1995), but did not come to fruition until 33 years later when itinerant teachers were finally used to reach the children of immigrant farm workers. Also in 1960, the North Carolina schools obtained funds for a pilot program to train itinerant gifted education teachers. The program was viewed as such a success that the North Carolina State Board of Education agreed to an allotment of itinerant teachers in gifted education for the entire state (Stoval & Tongue, 1970).

During the 1970s, there was an increase in the numbers of itinerant teachers as well as an expansion of models for itinerant teaching. Thirteen Appalachian counties in Tennessee began a "teacher exchange" program in 1971 to improve reading skills (Norman & Balyeat, 1974). In the early 1970s, the Texas Legislature mandated service to the hearing impaired. As a solution, they divided the state into five regions and employed itinerant teachers in each region (primarily speech pathologists). Itinerant teachers were seen as a vital component to the comprehensive education of hearing impaired students (Sallop & Butler, 1977).

The issue of transportation was still a problem for itinerant teachers in the 1970s. In Southwest Queensland, Australia, an itinerant teacher program was initiated that settled a small group of teachers in a location from which they would fly to remote areas. This became known as the "School of the Air" (Fowler, 1979a). ("School of the Air" was also referred to as a radio broadcast correspondence program.) Still, even in the late 1970s, other itinerant teachers were traveling thousands of miles per year, and were 'spread very thin' (Fowler, 1979b).

In a 1983 assessment of education in Queensland, Australia, forms of itinerant education delivery were evaluated. The "School of the Air," communications' satellite systems, and several forms of telecommunications were all found effective in reaching isolated students, but the report concluded that the itinerant teacher, in addition to being effective, also provided an essential human factor in the evolving age of technology (Kitt, 1983). And, perhaps somewhat ironically, in 1989, a program enlisted itinerant teachers to educate the itinerant students of families who traveled with the Australian Showmen's Guild (traveling entertainers). Here, the theme was consistency in curriculum that the children could not obtain by enrolling in a new school each week (Danaher, 1993).

The brief historical survey of the literature on itinerant teachers has revealed the strengths of the position and also posits that the itinerant teacher is vulnerable. Even with programs that have been phased out throughout the years, the literature revealed that increasing numbers of itinerant teachers were

finding their way into both special programs and also into the mainstream of the educational environment. Although itinerant teachers served numerous school-age populations, they faced complexities within the contexts of the districts they served. These complexities included, for example, the obvious (traveling to more than one site, and dealing with the expectations of more than one site) to the not-so-obvious (role confusion due to the names bestowed on the itinerant). Itinerant teachers also experienced such issues as a lack of support vis-à-vis supervision and staff development.

Complexities of the Itinerant Teacher

The names itinerant teachers have been labeled with are indicative of the confusing and transient nature of their positions. Some of the monikers bestowed upon itinerant teachers denote a particular model of delivery, others relate to their mobility, and still others (given by itinerant teachers themselves), include a creative twist of self-irony. Table 1 lists the names itinerant teachers have been referred to in the literature in relation to the model of delivery they have provided within schools. Table 2 provides an overview of the names given to itinerant teachers to describe travel and the mobility associated with their duties. Table 3 provides the names itinerant teachers have used themselves to describe their working conditions.

The names utilized to describe the itinerant teacher provide images of the position and the work of the itinerant. These names also reveal the fact that one of the difficulties in centralizing information about and for itinerant teachers is the plethora of terms used to describe the position. However, the majority of the

literature uses the word "itinerant", and in the last 15 years, the term "itinerant" has been the dominant term used to describe the position and all that it entails.

Table 1

Various Names for Itinerant Teachers Derived From the Models of Delivery They Provide

Name	Researcher/Theorist	Date
Adjunct Faculty System Teacher	Mckenzie, Egner, Knight, Perelman, Schneider, & Gavin	1970
Consultant Teacher	McKenzie, Egner, Knight, Perelman, Schneider, & Garvin	1970
Distance Education Supervisor	Higgins	1981
Home Teacher	Young, Dickerson, & Jacobson	1980
Itinerant Resident	Brown	1976
Non-traditional Teacher	Swenson	1995
Rehabilitation Teacher	Young, Dickerson, & Jacobson	1980
Resource Teacher	McBurney & O'Reilly	1985
	Olson	1978
	Stovall & Tongue	1970
Semi-departmental Teacher	Johnson	1952
Shared Teacher	De La Fleur	1961
Team Teacher	Rosenberg	1973
Visiting Teacher	Knupfer	1999

Table 2

Various Names for Itinerant Teachers that Illustrate Mobility

Name	Researcher/Theorist	Date
Circuit Rider	Shoemaker	1970
Circuit Teacher	Wyer, Thompson, & Danaher	1993
Mobile Teacher	Miller	1995
Peripatetic Teacher	Jeffs	1986
Roving Teacher	Fogarty	1983
Traveling Teacher	Smith	1998
	Spicer	1975
	Ratner	1961

Table 3

Names Given by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Their Workplace Conditions

Name	Researcher/Theorist	Date
Gypsies	Bina	1987
Journeying Joannas	Collins	1972
Nomads	Danaher	1993
Robinson Crusoes	Knupfer	1999
Superteachers	Rozik-Rosen & Atlas	1994
Vagabonds	Bina	1987

The Itinerant Teacher: Definitions and Qualities

Itinerant teachers may be broadly defined as those teachers who travel between educational destinations. The terms, "educational" and "travel," have assumed great importance to itinerant teaching as well as illustrating the Yin/Yang relationship when itinerant teachers attempt to define themselves. Luckner and Miller (1993) noted that itinerant teachers have defined themselves as those teachers who:

- Stay in the car for such long periods that when they arrive, they may have forgotten why they came.
- Discover that it may take more time to unload boxes and teaching materials from the trunk than it does to change a flat tire.
- Acquire interesting stains on their clothes from driving with one hand while eating with the other.
- Know the names of more school secretaries and custodians than the local personnel director. (pp. 16-17)

Bina (1987), in a study concerning the job realities and shortcomings of itinerant teaching, discovered that the adjustment to change, the ability to modify expectations, and the exercising of a healthy sense of humor were qualities seen as integral to the itinerant teacher. Bina's study also produced a list of definitions for the itinerant teacher. Based on responses in the study from the teachers themselves, being an itinerant teacher meant:

- Attempting to do all that you're expected to do and then being expected to keep a positive attitude.

- Being very familiar with landmarks such as McDonald's and Texaco, and wishing you had stock in both.
- Driving 500 miles a week solo, which causes brain death and gluteus maximus moribundus.
- Realizing that your occupation is almost a John the Baptist job, since you spend a lot of time crying in the wilderness.
- Not benefiting from contact with other professionals.
- Learning to dance and jump by having different forms, textbooks, school holidays, and procedures in each of the three districts in which you work.
- Having too many students, scheduling woes, a supervisor who doesn't know beans, and regular educators who act like they are being punished by your presence.
- Never meeting the expectations of the regular educators who have no idea what you do, who you are, or where you came from – even after working with them for at least a year.
- Being a one-man band.
- Getting no respect or support, and being viewed as an invader. (pp. 20-21)

Yarger and Luckner (1999), in a study involving itinerant teachers of the deaf, discovered four major qualities that effective itinerant teachers had. "[W]e identified four recurring themes: flexibility, communication, collaboration, and a broad base of knowledge" (p. 311). Having underscored the realities and qualities that help to define the itinerant teacher, some questions remain as to

who makes up this workforce, and what is known about the environments in which they work?

The Itinerant Teacher: Workforce and Environment

Historically, itinerant teachers have worked primarily in inner city and rural schools. Middle class, suburban schools seemed to inherit or adapt the itinerant model at a later date than urban or rural schools. Although the model of itinerant delivery may differ somewhat from setting to setting, a recent study (Olmstead, 1995) found that itinerant teachers are present in schools encompassing all three social strata (urban, rural, and suburban). Of the 72 itinerant teachers Olmstead studied, "21 worked in urban areas, 24 worked in rural areas, and 17 worked in suburban areas. There were ten teachers who traveled to two or more of the areas on a regular basis" (p. 546). Olmstead's study showed that suburban schools had fewer itinerant teachers than urban or rural schools, and this trend was found in the other literature reviewed (Bina, 1987; Collins, 1972; Davis, 1983).

In an attempt to study motivational factors within a group of itinerant teachers, Jeffs (1986) developed an overview of the types of teachers and types of preferences that fit the description of the itinerant teacher. He found that there was a significant number of new recruits in the itinerant workforce, as well as many teachers with considerable classroom experience. The study also indicated that itinerant teachers were distinctly child and task oriented. Data indicated that becoming an itinerant teacher was a conscious choice for all of these teachers, and that they also valued their role as an itinerant teacher.

Issues Surrounding the Itinerant Teacher

The daily work routine of the itinerant teacher is filled with uncertainty. Because of their mobility, itinerant teachers spend their time torn between two or more buildings (Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999) and in some instances, traveling between two or more districts (Rosenberg, 1973; Weber, 1987). Because itinerant teachers typically do not have a "home school" or permanent place, they grapple with a variety of challenges. Table 4 highlights the most often reported challenges of the itinerant teacher.

Table 4.

Challenges Faced by Itinerant Teachers

Problem/Issue	Theorist	Date
Assuming supervisory duties for instructional aids and volunteers	Rozik-Rosen & Atlas	1994
Establishing credibility as a 'legitimate' professional	Ferguson & Ralph	1996
	Flynn	1991
Keeping more than one site's schedule straight	Davidson	1981
Establishing relationships with students, faculty, and community members	Yarger & Luckner	1999
	Ferguson & Ralph	1996
	Rozik-Rosen & Atlas	1994
	Wyer, Thompson, & Danaher	1993
	Davis	1983

Table 4 (cont.)

Grappling with burnout	Bina	1987
	French, Lavay, & Montelione	1986
Not having a duty-free lunch	Olmstead	1995
Operating without a	Roberts	1975
preparation period	Collins	1972
Preparing for multiple	Webster	1989
classes		
Spending countless hours	Swenson	1995
locating materials	Rogow	1978
	Collins	1972
Using a car as an office	Yarger & Luckner	1999
	Luckner & Miller	1993

The work life of the itinerant teacher is complex and filled with uncertainties. The itinerant teacher is rarely in control of his or her professional day and itinerant teachers find it difficult to adapt to the ever-changing circumstances of working in several school sites simultaneously (Davidson, 1981; Dawson, 1986; Hoover, 1984; Rozik-Rosen & Atlas, 1994; Swenson, 1995). For example, Swenson (1995) reported that the average itinerant teacher visits from between three and five schools per day. The teachers in Swenson's study reported with frequency that they could not be where they believed they should be or stay with students long enough to develop rapport or to provide

assistance. Although itinerant teachers were utilized to enhance academic opportunities for students by providing services that would not ordinarily be available to them, the short amount of time that an itinerant teacher could provide to a single school often prevented him or her from being able to make connections with students with any regularity (Hoover, 1984; Rozik-Rosen & Atlas, 1994).

Quality of Service

Research has indicated that itinerant teachers who serve more classes across sites are actually able to provide fewer services (Luckner & Miller, 1993; McBurney & O'Reilly, 1985; Yarger & Luckner, 1999). Luckner and Miller's (1994) data suggested that less than half of a typical week is spent teaching. Similarly, Ferguson and Ralph (1996) reported, "At best, these traveling teachers are able to deliver effective teaching some of the time" (p. 50). Trusdell's (1985) research findings indicated that "the actual time spent by itinerant teachers at one site ranged from no more than one hour per school to no less than three hours per week" (p. 180).

Yarger and Luckner (1999) found that only 60 percent of an itinerant teacher's time was spent providing direct instruction and the rest of the itinerant teacher's time was spent with trivialized tasks such as trying to locate a "quiet" workplace, securing supplies and materials, and trying to catch up with the activities occurring at each one of the teaching assignments. The itinerant teachers involved in Yarger and Luckner's (1999) study also indicated that the 60 percent of the time they spent attempting to provide direct instructional activities

was quickly diminished due to the added burdens of being an itinerant teacher. Olmstead's (1995) study reported that less than half of the itinerant teachers, in comparison to regular teachers in his study, had daily scheduled preparation time; only half had a duty-free lunch period; and only a third had provisions for extended travel time to more remote sites.

Issues Regarding Travel

Instructional time is lost to travel between sites (Luckner & Miller, 1994; Yarger & Luckner, 1999). Luckner and Miller (1993) reported that up to one full day of teaching per week is lost to traveling between sites, and that the time needed by the itinerant teacher to unload and set up materials at more than one site further reduces the amount of time the itinerant teacher had to work with students or on instructional tasks (e.g., planning and preparing to teach). But spending 'time on the road' has more deleterious effects than just lost instructional time.

Webster (1989) reported that, "Without a home base, itinerant teachers may not feel they are a part of the regular faculty team" (p. 6). Yarger and Luckner's (1999) research indicated that itinerant teachers experienced significant frustration due to isolation from other school personnel. They indicated that itinerant teachers believed they were constantly challenged by the amount of political maneuvering that they had to wade through in order to survive working in more than one site. The itinerant teachers held that they were disconnected from school faculty, did not have a 'home base', and were "out there on their own" (p. 311). The itinerant teachers in Yarger and Luckner's

study also experienced a lack of socialization at each of their assigned sites and that, "Navigating the politics in so many settings was like walking on egg shells" (p. 311).

Communication Issues

Itinerant teachers have difficulties connecting with teachers and other professionals within the schools they serve. Swenson (1995) reported that it was difficult for itinerant teachers to coordinate with others and that the amount of 'extra' effort needed to interact with others prevented the itinerant teachers from establishing ties with any of the school communities that they served. Similarly, Hass (1994) and Davis (1983) found that the itinerant teachers they studied reported difficulty in adjusting to the routine involved in being effective as well as difficulties in developing time management strategies.

Complications in developing communication channels needed to work with permanent teaching staffs was also problematic for itinerant teachers (Davis, 1983; Hass, 1994; Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). Difficulties in developing communication between itinerant teachers and their permanent counterparts was caused, primarily, because itinerant teachers typically did not have time built into their schedules to:

- attend before or after school team meetings (Hoover, 1984);
- consult with teachers and/or other school personnel, including administrators (Hoover, 1984; Rosenberg, 1973);
- read and respond to memos and other forms of communication in a timely manner (Weber, 1987);

- meet informally with teachers and others (French, Lavay, & Montelione, 1986); and,
- observe others teach and have follow-up discussions with one another (Collins, 1972).

Yarger and Luckner (1999) stated that, "Being able to communicate effectively is important for many types of work, but for itinerant teachers, it is critical" (p. 312). Because so much of the itinerant teacher's time is spent commuting between sites, working harmoniously with others may be the hardest obstacle an itinerant teacher encounters (Luckner & Miller, 1993).

Communication may also be inhibited by a lack of understanding by regular classroom teachers of what itinerants do (Collins, 1972). For itinerant personnel who travel less frequently (e.g., once or twice a month) to several locations, as in the case of some special education personnel, it becomes even more difficult for the itinerant to "break into the system" of each school they serve.

Preparation for Itinerant Teaching

Itinerant teachers often find themselves unprepared for teaching in multiple environments for which little of their prior training in university courses prepared them (Brown, 1976; Rozik-Rosen & Atlas, 1994). This situation is exacerbated because, "Hours of travel also decrease time needed to prepare instructional materials" (Mullen, 1990, p. 168). Frustration for the itinerant teacher increases, according to Spicer (1975) because, "the educational environment is often less than ideal according to traditional standards" (p. 18) in

which teachers were prepared to teach. Being an itinerant teacher for an extended period of time can have a profound negative effect on professional development as an educator and according to French et al. (1986), "[T]hese problems are multiplied" (p. 84) because they must exist, or perhaps coexist, in a multitude of environments, not really belonging in any one of the buildings in which they provide services. "Nothing takes the place of a permanent room in which to teach" (Handley, 1985, p. 40) or having a permanent quiet place to prepare to teach (Smith, 1998).

Control Factors for Itinerant Teachers

The fact that itinerant teachers do not really belong to any of the schools in which they work serves to disenfranchise the itinerant even further. Flynn (1991) reported that the multifaceted nature of the work itinerant teachers are required to do often leaves the itinerant teacher feeling out-of-control because life for the itinerant teacher is "controlled by external factors" (p. 5). External factors that lead to an out-of-control feeling for itinerant teachers include time, space, and unpredictability of travel time from one destination to another (Flynn, 1991; Isely & Sanwogou, 1983; Mullen , 1990; Olmstead, 1995; Rex, 1995; Ringo, 1986; Spicer, 1975; Trusdell, 1985). Hanlon (1979) concluded, after studying the problems associated with itinerant art teachers, that they had "too many students, too many miles, too many school responsibilities" and that "there are too many kids and not enough time" in the day to work effectively at any of their assigned sites (p. 4).

Itinerant teachers experience frustration while even trying to manage what would appear to be the most simplistic tasks such as securing supplies. Swenson (1995) noted that itinerant teachers, "spend countless hours locating . . . and securing the most basic of materials" (p. 115). The itinerant teacher frequently has difficulty obtaining materials and equipment (Rogow, 1978) and often gets caught up in 'resource wars' where schools that share an itinerant want to ensure that the itinerant does not use supplies provided from one site at another (Rogow, 1978).

Role Confusion of the Itinerant Teacher

Itinerant teachers often experience role confusion (Bina, 1987; Collins, 1972; French et al., 1986; Hass, 1994; Luckner & Miller, 1994; Swenson, 1995; Yarger & Luckner, 1999). A variety of factors contribute to this role confusion. Hass (1994) reported that itinerant teachers experienced an uncertainty about the parameters of their work, but so too did the principals who were responsible for overseeing the work of the itinerant teachers. One itinerant teacher in a study conducted by Bina (1987) explained role confusion, "No one knows who you are or what you are supposed to be doing" (p. 25). Role confusion, according to Collins (1972), has a negative impact on morale and job performance due to the fragmentation of "trying to serve more than one master" (p. 376).

Relationships Between Itinerant Teachers and Administrators

Relationships between itinerant teachers and administrators were often cited as being problematic. Itinerant teachers, by the very nature of their multiple assignments, find themselves having to serve many masters simultaneously

(Collins, 1972; Davis, 1983; Hass, 1994; Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). The role of the principal as a support to the itinerant teacher has not previously been researched in relation to supervision. Nor has supervision per se been studied in relation to the perspectives of itinerant teachers and the principals and other personnel (e.g., district-wide administrators) who, often by contract, are held legally responsible for evaluating the itinerant teacher.

The scant literature touching on supervision and itinerancy has focused primarily on itinerant special education personnel (e.g., speech pathology, deaf educators, and English as Second Language teachers), itinerant nurses in hospital settings, and itinerant paraprofessionals. The focus of prior research has not, however, been supervision, per se, but rather, on aspects such as workplace conditions, communication patterns, and other related areas. The references to supervision throughout the studies in the literature have been offered as loosely-connected recommendations for practice, pleas for more effective supervision, or calls for supervision to be initiated.

Perennial Issues in Supervision

Supervision has suffered from what Zepeda and Ponticell (1998) noted as "cross purposes," where both teachers and supervisors are unsure of what to expect from each other. The original and even current models of supervision have as their intents the promotion of growth and development, irrespective of the processes entailed by the model.

Modern supervision (clinical supervision) evolved in the 1960s. The 1960s ushered in a nation-wide emphasis on science, and the social climate

shifted from a group orientation to a focus on the individual. These were the conditions that provided the groundwork for the clinical model to originate at Harvard University where Cogan and his associates were charged with developing a system of rendering assistance to graduate students in the master of arts teaching program.

Clinical supervision was developed by Cogan (1973) to address two major shortcomings that he had noted: 1) to effect a system of in-class supervision that would result in "significant improvements in the teacher's classroom instruction" (p. xi), and, 2) to redress the lack of change toward instructional innovations by teachers because of an absence of in-class support and assistance. On this second point, Cogan stated that, "[T]he lack of clinical supervision is conceived to be one of the major factors in the failure of many useful instructional innovations to secure a foothold in our schools and universities" (Cogan, 1973, p. xi).

Goldhammer (1969), and subsequently Goldhammer, Anderson, and Krajewski (1980) along with Cogan (1973), are believed to be the seminal architects for all of the variations of the clinical model of supervision which have followed. The clinical model of supervision received widespread application during the 1960s and 1970s. As Valverde (1998) pointed out, clinical supervision was a perfect fit for the times:

> Supervision was now clinically a formal and systematic way of observing the actions of the teachers and helping the teachers 'see' and understand the consequences of their classroom behavior. Clinical supervision fit the time of assessment and diagnosis.

> Clinical supervision was a one-on-one affair, again fitting into the societal norms of the time: individualization and science. (p. 1158)
>
> The model itself was so attractive that it has remained influential through the 1990s, and "Every secondary school we know about attempts to use some version of the clinical supervision model . . ." (Holifield & Cline, 1997, p. 109).

One of the major tenets of clinical supervision is the collection of data in the teacher's classroom by a supervisor who is present to observe instruction. In fact, the importance of in-class observation is repeatedly highlighted as the key element in distinguishing clinical supervision from other forms of supervision (Acheson & Gall, 1992; Glatthorn, 1990; Goldhammer et al., 1980). In addition, Acheson and Gall (1992, p. 9) argued that the focus of clinical supervision was the "face-to-face" relationship between the supervisor and the teacher and in their 1997 revised text, they added that this relationship could also be seen as "side-by- side" (Acheson & Gall, 1997, p. 9).

Another important facet to the clinical model is its inherently cyclical nature. Although Cogan originally outlined eight stages or phases of the clinical supervision process and Goldhammer's original version consisted of five sequenced events, almost all clinical supervision models currently consist of three basic elements: 1) the pre-observation conference, 2) the classroom observation, and 3) the post-observation conference. These major areas can be broken down into their component parts.

The pre-observation conference serves as a planning period for the teacher and supervisor to engage in goal setting, identifying teacher concerns, selecting an observation instrument(s), and identifying behaviors to be recorded by the supervisor. The classroom observation consists of the supervisor gathering data using one or more methods of observation. Examples of such methods would include: selective verbatim (questioning and response patterns), observational records based on seating charts (verbal flow and movement patterns), wide-lens techniques (video and audio recordings), and checklists and timeline coding (pupil surveys and checklists) (Acheson & Gall, 1997). The function of the post-observation conference is to provide feedback and to interact with the teacher. During this segment of the cycle, the supervisor provides the data gathered from the observation, elicits the teacher's opinions and feelings, and encourages the development of alternatives for instruction. Changes and alternatives discovered by the supervisor and/or the teacher would ideally lead back to another pre-observation conference at a future date, thus continuing the clinical cycle.

The aptness and attractiveness of clinical supervision did not prevent others from noting inherent shortcomings in the model itself, or in the use or misuse of the model. Some administrators and supervisors lacked sufficient training to properly utilize the clinical model, and thus applied it in a purely judgmental and evaluative manner (Holland, Clift, Veal, Johnson, & McCarthy, 1992). The original well-conceived collaborative processes of the clinical model of supervision had become a highly mechanical and systematized method of

teacher inspection and instructional surveillance by the 1980s (Garman, 1990). Clinical supervision also suffered from its widespread use for any teacher, regardless of age, experience, or setting. The clinical model became for many administrators and supervisors the only supervisory approach to be used.

The perceived need for a more developmentally appropriate supervision arose from the realization that the dominant, clinical model of supervision was not always functioning in the best interests of teachers, schools or supervision itself; and that clinical supervision was thought to be too narrow to address all of the needs of every teacher (Aiken & Tanner, 1998). The demand for a new approach to supervision was two-fold. First, the perception that clinical supervision was overtly technical and bureaucratic, often linked with evaluation and that it allowed little teacher creativity or choice created a negative image that was hard for the model to combat. Second, new settings, new situations and new perceptions regarding the human element in supervision left a void to be addressed by a supervisory model that was flexible enough to meet individual needs, while retaining the structure to reach organizational goals. Differentiated and developmental supervision offered some solutions to the problems with the clinical model while retaining variations of the original clinical supervision model and its use of the pre-observation and post-observation conferences.

Differentiated Supervision

New problems and new settings called for a supervisory shift away from the 'one size fits all' solution. Many writers and researchers came to a similar conclusion: traditional supervision, for the regular classroom teacher, was

becoming less and less effective in today's schools (Gordon, 1992) while in relation to the itinerant teacher, there has been a call for a supportive type of supervision. As early as 1987, Bina concluded that there was a need for "better" supervision and that administrators had a responsibility to provide supervision and support for the itinerant. Yarger and Luckner (1999) reached similar conclusions about the need for supervision for the itinerant, but also called for itinerant teachers to be supported through such means as an assigned mentor at each site. Although the call for supervision for itinerant teachers has been made (e.g., Isely & Sanwogou, 1983; McBurney & O'Reilly, 1985; Yarger & Luckner, 1999), no research exists that studies the type and needs of the itinerant in relation to supervision.

New settings for supervision (or existing settings that had been ignored) became the target for perceived supervisory need. Cook (1998) spoke of the need for a type of supervision with enough flexibility to be situation-specific, particularly in the academic arena, "Textbooks in supervision consistently treat supervision as equally applicable to all subject areas and all grade levels" (p. 493). New supervisory practices for new settings has been addressed by Toepfer (1998) as follows:

> Development of collaborative instructional approaches and teaching strategies in the middle level schools created needs for supervisory support that varied from elementary and high school practices. Middle level educational curriculum and program

practices continue to create needs for differentiated modes of supervisory support. (p. 604)

Yet, to date, there is a lack of research or extended inquiry into the supervision of itinerant teachers who face daily, multiple contexts, as they travel from building-to-building.

Glatthorn (1984) made the case for a differentiated approach to supervision, "Teachers should have some choice about the kind of supervision they receive – in contrast to the situation that prevails in most schools. All are treated the same, even though they have very different needs" (p. 1). Certainly, itinerant teachers and other itinerant personnel could be considered 'different enough' from teachers who do not travel from one site to the next in order to fulfill their teaching assignments and thus warrant a type of differentiated supervision. This study sought to explore, what would supervision need to look like in order to be considered differentiated? The only way to begin answering this question is to ask itinerant teachers and their supervisors about their experiences and to seek their perspectives.

Developmental Supervision

Closely aligned with the call for differentiated supervision was the call for a model of supervision that was more developmental. The developmentalists (e.g., Fuller, 1969; Glickman, 1985) were concerned with a more responsive and holistic supervision that could attend more closely to the needs of teachers based on 1) levels of experience, 2) levels of education, and 3) career stages (beginning teacher, veteran teacher).

Developmental supervision is a supervisory model that evolved to address the limited area of influence being exercised through the practice of clinical supervision. A model of supervision was needed that served the needs of teachers across the developmental continuum, involved teacher choice and participation in the supervisory process, and resulted in teacher self-supervision. The intents and purposes of developmental models of supervision were to assess the conceptual level of the teacher, to apply the appropriate approach of supervision (with teacher choice considered), and to utilize one or more tools in a more developmental fashion. 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" (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1998, p. 199).

In order for developmental supervision to work, the conceptual level of teachers must be approximated with the teacher and the supervisor jointly assessing needs for ongoing growth and development. Waite (1998) reported the research results of Ham's (1986) study which concluded, "The most effective . . . supervisors were those able to match appropriate models or strategies to the specific needs and developmental levels of their teachers" (p. 300). Ham, in Waite (1998) reported that there was not one best model for supervision, and that the work of Glatthorn (1984, differentiated supervision) and the developmentalists (Fuller, 1969) was valid.

Gordon (1990), in his research on tactically matching supervisory behaviors, found that there was a need for alternative and developmental .

approaches to supervision. Alternative supervisory approaches are critical elements of developmental supervision, but the correct assessment and identification of the cognitive (conceptual) level of the teacher is a prerequisite for a more informed supervisory match.

In the developmental model, a teacher with a low conceptual level (difficulty in defining problems, use of concrete thinking) would be paired with a directive supervisory approach. The directive approach leaves little choice for the teacher and is used to impose expectations while giving exact prescriptions to be followed. It is believed that teachers at a moderate conceptual level can think more abstractly, define problems and generate limited solutions, but they still have difficulty formulating comprehensive plans to achieve solutions to their problems of practice.

The collaborative approach allows the supervisor and the teacher to reach solutions together. The decision-making process is a joint venture and operates on the premise that the participants are on more equal footing with each other. Teachers operating at a high conceptual level are abstract thinkers, independent, flexible, empathic, and often want to work on their own. At this level, the non-directive approach would be utilized with the assumption that the teacher knows best what supervisory process and assistance he or she needs. The supervisor in this case acts more as a facilitator for the goals of the individual teacher (Glickman et al., 1998).

Teacher choice in the supervisory approach to be utilized is a major element of developmental supervision. Nolan and Francis (1992) cautioned the

supervisor to respect the autonomy of teachers, "Teachers who choose to adopt new practices are not empty vessels to be filled with someone else's ideas. They are learners who are re-educating themselves to become experts in another mode of teaching" (p. 51). Glickman et al. (1998) made a forceful case for the inclusion of teachers in deciding which supervisory approach to utilize:

> . . . observations and discussions between supervisor and supervisee are the main source of information when determining approach. A supervisee has as much right to be involved in the choice about the present and future approach as does the supervisor. This is not a unilateral decision. The supervisor, simply due to position of authority, does not automatically know what is best for someone else. (p. 142)

Once the choice has been made, it is then time to apply supervisory tools (often other models of supervision such as reflection) to extend the development of learning opportunities.

The directive supervisory approach, dealing with a low conceptual level, usually calls for technique-based approaches with tight observation and tools. The clinical model of supervision as proposed by Acheson and Gall (1997), or as modified by others, is seen by developmentalists to serve the directive needs of the teachers involved at this level, as long as the goal or the end result is movement toward a more collaborative supervisory relationship.

The collaborative supervisory approach (moderate conceptual level) can be served through cognitive or "peer" coaching (Costa & Garmston, 1994; Joyce

& Showers, 1982), with the supervisor structuring the sessions and guiding information exchanges as needed. Again, the goal must be progressively developmental in nature as cognitive structures are expanded to reach the next level of growth and development.

The non-directive approach to developmental supervision is the most teacher-centered of all the approaches and promotes teacher autonomy. Teachers at this conceptual level are capable of creating and carrying out their own developmental plans with minimal supervisor involvement. A tool that could be applicable at the moderate conceptual level, but that is ideally suited for the high conceptual level, is action research. Individual teachers or groups of like-minded teachers can design, carry out, and evaluate their own studies through a plan for action research (Glanz, 1998; McKay, 1992; Zepeda, 1999; Zepeda & Mayers, 2000).

Supervision and the Itinerant Teacher

Given the sparseness of literature on the supervision of itinerant teachers, it is worth noting the research studies that have addressed the issue as a portion of their investigation. One report from Australia (Briody, 1982) outlined the role of the supervisor for six music teachers who traveled to isolated schools in Queensland. Although a "Supervisor of Music" was responsible for developing and explaining the program, "one of the six itinerant teachers was named teacher-in-charge of the program" (p.18). The "Supervisor of Music" was a state level position with state-wide and national administrative duties.

The itinerant teacher who was named the "Program Supervisor" was to meet weekly with the other five teachers to evaluate, plan, and prepare. Due to the state-wide program effort as well as the weekly meeting schedule, it appeared there was very little here that could be directly applied to the American system of education. However, it is interesting to note that one of the itinerant teachers was chosen as the best fit to supervise the other music teachers.

Another study targeted 23 first-year itinerant teachers in the area of special education (Ellis & Matthews, 1982). Recommendations from this study included the need for "master teachers as supervisors" and that, "Master teachers should be periodically provided with inservice training" (p. 14). The itinerant special education teachers in this study experienced such a need for supervision that they recommended the creation of a supervisor position where none existed. The study also enumerated many areas and specific instances where the first-year itinerant teachers needed professional and developmental assistance.

The nursing profession provided an example of supervisory confusion in relation to more than one work site and more than one perceived supervisor (Elder & Bullough, 1990). In this study, when nurses were asked who their immediate supervisor was, 50% selected higher level nurses, while the other 50% chose physicians as their immediate supervisor. Participants also indicated that between 9% and 36% of the time they were monitored by either a head nurse or a physician.

As seen through this example, the scope and depth of supervision not only varied, but also the perception of the identity of the immediate supervisor was ambiguous. The difficulties caused by this confusion resulted in daily delays and communication problems. There were also cases of decision paralysis and instances where careers and career advancement were negatively affected. The importance of having a clearly identified and competent supervisor was evident from this study. In addition to these studies there were other instances within the literature where the need for supervisory assistance was noted (Abrams, 1991; Isely, 1983; Johnson, 1952; Krome, 1986; Workinger, 1994).

Although the literature on developmental and differentiated supervision makes a compelling case to examine the teacher and to determine her or his developmental and conceptual level as a precursor to deciding what supervision model to use to assist teacher growth, there is a limitation, not readily studied in the supervision literature. A gap in the literature exists concerning how to supervise individuals who perform necessary instructional activities that are not part of the mainstream of any given school – the itinerant teacher.

In regard to the supervision of itinerant teachers, no studies were found that specifically related to the supervision of the itinerant or examined the experience of supervising an itinerant from the point-of-view of personnel at the site level (principal, assistant principal) or the point-of-view of district personnel who might be responsible for supervision (e.g., curriculum coordinator, personnel director, assistant superintendent). Given the complexity of the work itinerant teachers do within districts, a more thorough understanding of the supervisory

needs of itinerant teachers and their beliefs, examined against the perceptions of site and district-level supervisors can help to shed light on a phenomenon not studied to date in any great detail.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The phenomenon of itinerant teaching has received some attention from researchers, but to date there has been no research conducted that specifically targeted studying the supervision of itinerant teachers. The purpose of this study was to contribute to the knowledge base on the supervision of itinerant teachers, through the perceptions of itinerant teachers and those who supervise them. The research questions that guided the study included:

1. What specific data can be generated regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers?
2. How do itinerant teachers perceive the itinerant experience and the supervision they receive?
3. How do supervisors of itinerant teachers describe their role and extent of involvement with itinerant teachers throughout the supervisory process?
4. How satisfied, if at all, are itinerant teachers in regard to the supervision they receive?
5. How satisfied, if at all, are the supervisors of itinerant teachers with the process of supervising itinerant teachers?
6. To what extent, if any, do itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers believe that supervision is a necessary

component in the development and improvement of the itinerant teacher?

7. If supervision is seen as necessary, what supervisory processes and procedures do itinerant teachers want and need to improve their instructional practices and effectiveness?

8. If supervision is deemed important, what conditions, processes, and/or procedures do supervisors of itinerant teachers want and need in order to deliver effective supervision to itinerant teachers?

Chapter three includes descriptions of (a) the pilot study, (b) the design, (c) the data source, (d) data collection procedures, (e) analysis of the data, and (f) limitations of the study.

Pilot Study

In 1998, an exploratory pilot study was undertaken to investigate the scope and depth of the supervisory experience for itinerant teachers (Benson, 1999). This study helped to codify the research questions and to clarify the protocol for use in the full study. Interviews were taken from teachers with itinerant experience as well as with one administrator experienced in the supervision of itinerant teachers. The community they represented was considered suburban, had a student population of 9,000, and had a university within its boundaries.

The five teachers in this study had between eight and thirteen years of experience as itinerant teachers. They taught at a minimum of two sites per week in nine different (elementary, middle, and high) schools, with different daily

class preparations ranging from three to seven. The supervisor interviewed in the pilot study was responsible for 60 to70 teachers, 12 of whom were itinerant teachers.

Interviews were recorded and then transcribed to notecards. Coding began on the second read through of the data, with significant topics identified and coded. Four major areas emerged from the data: 1) role confusion, 2) appropriateness of the supervisory environment, 3) importance of supervisory support, and 4) the effects of supervision.

Findings of the Pilot Study

The findings of the pilot study helped to shape the research questions for this study as well as to guide the construction of the interview and data collection protocols. The pilot study also allowed the researcher to develop data collection plans and the procedures for the full study. Yin (1994) designated this function of the pilot study as a "dress rehearsal," and as such, it was used to test the intended data collection plan. In addition, the use of the tape recorder and the process of transcribing interviews for the pilot study gave the researcher invaluable experience.

The data gathered from the pilot study indicated a valuing of supervision by the participants, but illuminated a decided lack of supervisory experiences. The perception of the quality of the supervision received by the teachers in the study was frequently deemed inadequate by the itinerant teachers. There was an expressed need and desire for more and better supervision from the viewpoint

of the teachers. The supervisor of the itinerant teachers also affirmed the need for more appropriate forms of supervision.

The study revealed that the uniqueness of the itinerant role in education had an effect on the supervisory process. It became clear that a more in-depth investigation was needed in order to better understand the process of supervision related to itinerant teachers. The pilot study pointed the way toward a fuller study that potentially would increase the knowledge base regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers from both the itinerant teachers' and supervisors' point-of-view.

Rationale for the Study

There has been very little research undertaken with reference to the supervision of itinerant teachers and what little there was occurred peripherally within those specific studies. For the itinerant teacher there are many difficulties associated with teaching coupled with traveling, be it across a region (e.g., Australia), across a city (e.g., Norman, Oklahoma), or even among departments in an institution (e.g., hospitals). Most of the teachers or professionals in an itinerant role had some problem determining who their supervisor was, and some even requested a supervisor position (Ellis & Matthews, 1982) where there was none. There was, at times, ambiguity as to which supervisor was in authority (Elder & Bulloughs, 1990) in various situations. Itinerant teachers often sensed animosity from the regular classroom teachers, because they had not become an integral member of the site environment. In the case of itinerant special programs teachers, it was often a formidable task to find a supervisor with the

requisite content knowledge necessary to offer appropriate professional development. The difficulties and inadequacies noted in the pilot study coupled with the dearth of research in the area of supervision of itinerant teachers, warrants further study.

Rationale for Qualitative Methodology

The purpose of qualitative methodology is to determine the subjective aspects of the participants' behaviors and beliefs. Stainback and Stainback (1988) postulated that, "The nondirective, open-ended nature of qualitative methodology enables the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people, without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories or rating scale items" (p. 13). According to Bogdan and Biklen (1998), qualitative research contains five basic features, each of which applies directly to this study:

1. Qualitative research has actual settings as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument.
2. Qualitative research is descriptive.
3. Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products.
4. Qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively.
5. "Meaning" is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. (pp. 4-7)

Each of these features of qualitative research guided the researcher in developing a qualitative, phenomenological approach.

The complexities of the itinerant teachers' supervisory experience also required that a qualitatively based epistemology be employed. The standardized measures used in quantitative studies could not fully explore nor interpret the quality, depth and dynamics of the relationships targeted by the research problem (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). This qualitative, descriptive study was phenomenological and perspective-seeking (rather than truth-seeking). Therefore, the focus of the study was on the world of the participants (Langenbach, Vaughn, & Aagaard, 1994), and the richest data will come from the self-reported information provided by the participants (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Phenomenology is the search for understanding of how participants experience and give meaning to an event, a series of events, a concept or phenomenon (Langenbach et al., 1994). Phenomenology has also been characterized as "both a way of seeing and an attitude that suggests appropriate methods for investigating what is seen" (Eyring, 1998, p. 141). Supervision of itinerant teachers is an area of research that lends itself to the phenomenological approach. The purpose of this study is to add to the knowledge base of the supervision of itinerant teachers, and a phenomenological approach could yield a better understanding of the meaning an experience has for others (and also for ourselves).

An important aspect of any research is the posture of the researcher, both methodologically and subjectively. Eyring (1998) commented on the process of the researcher seeing the world of the participants:

> A phenomenological approach is one characterized by multiple perspectives. Instead of the researcher choosing one angle of vision from which to view a phenomenon, there is an attempt to understand experience through the lenses of those describing the experience – while recognizing one's own perspective and the influence of that perspective. (p. 141)

The concept of "bracketing", also known as "epoche" and "memoing" (Holstein & Gubrium, 1998) is the act of suspending the judgment(s) of the researcher in order to clarify the research method.

"Phenomenology is a school of philosophical thought that underpins all of qualitative research . . ." (Merriam, 1998, p. 15). When conducting a phenomenological study, the focus would be on the structure or essence of a particular experience. Patton (1990) related that phenomenological research was based upon:

> the assumption that *there is an essence or essences to shared experience*. These essences are the core meanings mutually understood through a phenomenon commonly experienced. The experiences of different people are bracketed, analyzed, and compared to identify the essences of the phenomenon. . . . (p. 70, emphasis in the original)

The task of the researcher employing the phenomenological methodology is to adequately describe and depict the essence or essences of an experience. In order to have description which is as accurate as possible, phenomenologists

do not assume that they know what things mean to the people they are studying (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). To further the point, Merriam (1998) stated that:

> Prior beliefs about a phenomenon of interest are temporarily put aside, or bracketed, so as not to interfere with seeing or intuiting the elements or structure of the phenomenon. When belief is temporarily suspended, consciousness itself becomes heightened . . . (p. 16)

Spiegelberg (1965), cited in Merriam (1998), outlined the basic process of conducting a phenomenological study. First, the investigator must have an intuitive grasp of the phenomenon. The researcher, as related in Chapter One, began his career in education as an itinerant teacher, and continues in that role; therefore, this investigator has a firm intuitive grasp of the itinerant teacher phenomenon. Spiegelberg then advised that one should investigate, "several instances or examples of the phenomenon to gain a sense of its general essence" (p. 16). The impetus for this study began formally two years ago when the researcher conducted an exploratory investigation of the itinerant teacher and supervision (Benson, 1999). In the pilot study, five itinerant teachers were engaged in discussion about their workplace conditions and support provided through supervision. Additionally, one administrator was involved in the pilot study.

Throughout the pilot study, the researcher looked for relationships among the several essences and then began to systematically explore the phenomenon with a clearer focus. This exploration of the phenomenon, according to

Spiegelberg, should definitely be two pronged: "1) discovering exactly what appears (whether particulars or general essences), and also 2) the way in which things appear" (p. 16). The writer's research questions addressed factual data about the phenomenon of supervision of itinerant teachers as well as the way things felt and appeared to the participants. For the teachers – how they viewed, and what they felt and believed, about supervision. For the principals – what they believed, from their point-of-view, and what supervision meant for them and the itinerant teachers.

Next, the researcher purposefully reflected, according to Merriam (1998), "how the phenomenon came into consciousness" (p. 16). The researcher removed his own thought process in order to allow the meaning of the participants' words to make sense. In order to capture meaning, the researcher "bracketed the meanings about the phenomenon" (p. 16). From these bracketed notes, the researcher developed meanings which could be more readily interpreted (Merriam, 1998). Once these meanings are interpreted, phenomenologists hold that shared meanings not only become reality through symbolic interactionism, but may be communicated and understood by others (Charon, 1979; Morse, 1998; Patton, 1990).

A phenomenological qualitative study is divergent rather than convergent in nature due to the perspective-seeking philosophical tradition. Rather than seeking a "truth," phenomenology seeks an individual's perceptual beliefs about, and meanings derived from, a phenomenon or an experience. Because a person cannot be separated from her or his perceptions of the environment,

phenomenologists do not investigate external truths, but rather, their participants' interpretations of emotions and events (Langenbach et al., 1994).

Data Source

The following criteria, suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), were applied in developing the sampling plan for this study:

> 1) Is the sampling relevant to your conceptual frame and research questions?
>
> 2) Will the phenomenon you are interested in appear?
>
> 3) Does your plan enhance the generalizability of your findings?
>
> 4) Can believable descriptions and explanations be produced, ones that are true to real life?
>
> 5) Is the sampling plan feasible, in terms of time, money, and access?
>
> 6) Is the sampling plan ethical, in terms of consent, and benefits and risks? (p. 34)

With the above criteria in mind, the first step in answering the research questions was the identification of an appropriate group of participants. Purposeful sampling was used to select the participants in order to obtain rich descriptions as well as breadth and depth in the quality of information. More specifically the "typical" form of purposeful sampling was employed. According to Merriam (1998), "A *typical* sample would be one that is selected because it reflects the average person, situation, or instance of the phenomenon of interest" (p. 62 emphasis in the original). Every effort was made to secure participants representative of these sampling guidelines.

The participants were chosen for this study because of their unique status as itinerant teachers or as supervisors of itinerant teachers. The following criteria were used in the specific selection of qualified participants:

1. The teacher participants were teachers who had a minimum of two years teaching experience who traveled to two or more sites, at least two days per week, in one or more school districts, and across one or more school levels (elementary, middle, or high school).
2. The supervisor participants were site or central office level administrators, or district level coordinators, who had at least three years of experience in the supervision of one or more itinerant teachers.

Accessibility to the districts was also an issue in the choice of participants. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) pointed out that districts needed to be accessible to researchers for optimum results in interviewing. Another factor considered in the selection process was the use of 'applications to conduct research' that were employed by some districts.

All of the districts from which the administrators and itinerant teachers were selected were suburban, were within 20 miles of state and/or private universities, and maintained a mutually beneficial relationship with at least one of those universities. The communities in which the districts resided ranged in population from 70 to 100 thousand, and community support for education in each of the cities was considered to be good (based on their record of successful bond elections). Each of the districts averaged a middle class socio-economic

level, but district representatives were quick to point out that all socio-economic levels were represented in their student populations.

The school districts in which the participants worked were among the 32 largest districts, per student population, in the state (Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association, 2000). The three districts ranged from approximately 14,500 students to 19,050 students per district, with certified personnel ranging from 1,050 to approximately 1,400. Two of the districts had three high schools and one had two high schools. The rate of itinerant teachers changed yearly (due to curricular needs and budgetary limits), but the estimate from the three districts ranged from 12.5% itinerant teachers to at least 15% for a recent average yearly figure. Although there were a few instances to the contrary, the bulk of the itinerant teachers found in each district were special programs teachers. Three teachers and one supervisor (two supervisors from one district) were targeted for interviews from each of the districts. Content areas represented by these teachers were music, general music/visual arts, gifted education, physical education, and foreign language. Relevant demographics for the participants and the districts were verified through documentation and checking with the appropriate district personnel.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission was sought from each of the districts to conduct this research. Appropriate school officials were contacted at the relevant site(s) (often more than one as a result of the itinerant status of the participants) and written permission was secured to interview the subjects (See Appendix A). School

officials were assured that the anonymity of their district would be secure. Also, a short statement relating the purpose of the study and the use to be made of the information gained was communicated to each interviewee (See Appendix B) as well as formal statements regarding confidentiality and risks/benefits (Patton, 1990).

Confidentiality

Subjects were assured that at no time would their names be used in this study, or any data or information that clearly identifies them be revealed. All data and information pertaining to this study were secured and not revealed to non-project personnel in any way that would identify participants. Participants were also assured that presentation of the results of the study, or future writings based on the study, would not be used in any manner that could identify a subject.

Protocol

Seidman (1998), referring to effective qualitative interviewing, pointed out that:

> The purpose of the in-depth interview is not to get answers to questions, nor to test hypotheses, and not to "evaluate" as the term is normally used. At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience. (p. 3)

The interview process, from the phenomenological and perspective-seeking research posture, contains an important aspect – reflection on the part of the researcher (Creswell, 1998). In fact, Langenbach et al. (1994) addressed the

issue directly, stating that, "The phenomenological interview is not a series of questions and answers. It could more aptly be described as dialogical reflection" (p. 147).

Following the tenets set forth by Rubin and Rubin (1995), "Main questions" were developed to guide the conversation which were "open enough to encourage . . . opinions and experiences" (p. 145). Appendix C details the questions asked of the itinerant teachers, and Appendix D details the questions asked of the administrators who supervise itinerant teachers.

Probing questions were both planned and improvised, serving their stated purpose (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) of prompting the interviewee and indicating that the interviewer was listening. Follow-up questions were employed to elicit richer data whenever appropriate. As Rubin and Rubin (1995) noted, "Follow-ups can cascade, because the answers to one follow-up can suggest new lines of inquiry that you want to follow up in turn" (p. 151).

Data were collected through open-ended, semi-structured interviews with the itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers in the selected districts. Interviewees were asked to sign a Participant Consent Form (See Appendix E), one copy of which was returned to the participant, with the researcher retaining the other copy. Upon completion of the signed forms, interviews were scheduled with the participants.

Interviews were tape recorded to ensure accuracy of the data obtained. Each interview was kept on a separate tape and the tapes were labeled and coded for accuracy and security. Aliases were used to assure the anonymity of

the participants. Data were obtained through the use of audiotapes, the researcher's field notes and reflective journal, and transcripts of the interviews. The transcript of each interview was compared to the audiotape and to the field notes to verify the accuracy of the data. Only the researcher and the researcher's major professors had access to the tapes, transcripts, and field notes generated through this study.

Data Analysis

Data analysis in a phenomenological study identifies the basic elements of the experiences common to members of a specific group (Patton, 1990). In this case, the itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers were the group and the supervision of itinerant teachers was the experience. Merriam (1998) added that the goal of data analysis was "ferreting out the essence or basic structure of a phenomenon" (p. 158). Merriam also asserted that a function of such analysis was to find "the underlying and precipitating factors that account for what is being experienced (p. 158). Langenbach et al. (1994) cautioned that phenomenological data analysis is open, tentative, and intuitive.

Data gathered from tapes, field notes, and the reflective journal were coded in congruence with the identification of "meaning units" (the smallest segments of text that are understandable by themselves). The resulting meaning units were then grouped, not in the usual categorical manner, but rather in a way which reveals "themes." The themes should result in a narrative that ultimately delineates patterns from the analyzed data (Langenbach et al., 1994). Color

coding as well as short hand abbreviations developed by the researcher were used to code, organize, and develop the data.

The constant comparative method was utilized as a means of continual analysis. The constant comparative method is particularly suited to the generation of data from several sites and is also conducive to the inductive method of theory development found in qualitative studies (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In its final form, data analysis is the organization of what the researcher has seen, heard, and read so that sense and meaning can emerge from what is learned (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992).

Credibility and Trustworthiness

In the qualitative arena, the primary focus for authentic research lies with the researcher. In qualitative research, credibility is a term often used to address validity, and trustworthiness applies to the concept of reliability. The validity and reliability of qualitative data depend to a great extent on the researcher's methodological skill, sensitivity and integrity (Patton, 1990). As a result of the subjectivity of the research and the key role played by the researcher, the possibility of bias exists in a qualitatively based investigation. With an awareness of such bias, the researcher was able to check more readily for biases throughout the processes of collecting, analyzing and reporting data. In order to collect data in a more unbiased manner and in order to achieve validity, Wolcott (1990) developed, and the researcher followed, nine steps in the process of collecting and analyzing data:

1. talk little, listen a lot
2. record accurately
3. begin writing early
4. let readers "see" for themselves
5. report information fully
6. be candid
7. seek feedback
8. try to achieve balance
9. write accurately. (pp. 125-135)

Credibility is also an issue in relation to reliability and validity. Two strategies were undertaken to enhance the credibility of the research. One strategy involved informing the participants that the researcher himself had years of itinerant teaching experience. Another strategy was ordering the interviews in each district so that the supervisor interview took place in a time frame within that of the itinerant teachers. This arrangement allowed for an internal check on the validity of information gathered from different sources.

A further method employed to increase the validity of the study was based on the model put forth by Langenbach et al. (1994). The participants had the opportunity to read all or part of the notes or transcription of the interview before formal analysis of the data began. Also, some participants were allowed to read the researcher's analysis and interpretations on the data they produced. And, finally, a qualified, independent collaborator examined the data and devised interpretations to cross-check the researcher's conclusions.

Limitations of the Study

The accuracy of the data obtained depended on the openness and candidness of the participants. Negation of these qualities would affect the validity of the study. With a sample size of n=13, generalization to another population could be difficult; however, Lincoln and Guba (1985) have suggested that there may be a degree of transferability through their concept of "fittingness." Fittingness is defined as the degree of congruence between sending and receiving contexts. "If Context A and Context B are 'sufficiently' congruent, then working hypotheses from the sending originating context may be applicable to the receiving context" (p. 124).

A qualitative phenomenological method was applied in this study to gather, organize, and depict a rich and thick description of the supervision of itinerant teachers. It was hoped that the perceptions of both itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers would help to increase the knowledge base in an area almost devoid of information. Analyses of the data and the findings of the study are presented in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to explore the work of itinerant teachers and those who supervise them. Specifically, the researcher sought to provide an understanding of the supervision of itinerant teachers by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers. Through such a study, it was hoped to contribute to the understanding of itinerant teachers and those who supervise them. A phenomenological methodology was utilized.

This chapter presents the data that emerged from the interviews of nine itinerant teachers and four supervisors. The findings are organized and presented from the analysis of the transcripts and field notes, all gleaned from the researcher's interviews with the participants. Following the description of the participants, the remainder of the chapter is organized according to the research questions:

1. What specific data can be generated regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers?
2. How do itinerant teachers perceive the itinerant experience and the supervision they receive?
3. How do supervisors of itinerant teachers describe their role and extent of involvement with itinerant teachers throughout the supervisory process?

4. How satisfied, if at all, are itinerant teachers in regard to the supervision they receive?
5. How satisfied, if at all, are the supervisors of itinerant teachers with the process of supervising itinerant teachers?
6. To what extent, if any, do itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers believe that supervision is a necessary component in the development and improvement of the itinerant teacher?
7. If supervision is seen as necessary, what supervisory processes and procedures do itinerant teachers want and need to improve their instructional practices and effectiveness?
8. If supervision is deemed important, what conditions, processes, and/or procedures do supervisors of itinerant teachers want and need in order to deliver effective supervision to itinerant teachers?

Each interview lasted between 45 and 74 minutes. The administrative interviews were conducted in offices; however, interviews with the itinerant teachers were held in the most convenient and conducive venue available. The audio taped interviews were reviewed multiple times by the researcher and were transcribed. Transcripts were then compared to field notes. Impressions and additional data from the field notes were added to the margins of the transcriptions as appropriate, and salient points were also noted in the margins. Emerging themes were noted, and the data from the transcripts were then coded. Subsequent examination revealed that data could be linked to more than one

theme. Notations, revisions, and needed changes were made until the data revealed no more new thematic material.

Participant Profiles

The Teachers

The criteria for participant selection were teachers who had a minimum of two years teaching experience and who traveled to two or more sites, at least two days per week, in one or more school districts, and across one or more school levels (elementary, middle, or high school). Through the process of purposeful sampling, nine itinerant teachers were selected for this study. Five of the teachers were male and four were female. Five of the teachers worked in the subject area of music, and one each practiced in the areas of fine arts, foreign language, gifted education, and physical education. Eight of the teachers taught at a high school each day, eight of the teachers taught at a middle school each day, and two teachers had an elementary school included in their daily schedule.

Years of experience as an itinerant teacher for this group ranged from two to 24 years, with an average of 9.3 years of total experience. The average number of sites visited per day for the teachers was 3.4 and the number of different preparations for the itinerant teachers during a typical day averaged 4.5. The number of supervisors (those administrators in a position of authority and/or those administrators in a position to offer supervision) ranged from four to seven for the group of teachers with the average number being five. All but one of the teachers taught at two different school levels, with one teacher placed daily at three different levels (elementary, middle and high school). Aliases were utilized

to ensure the anonymity of the subjects. Table 5 contains a summary of the teacher participants' demographics.

Table 5.

Teacher Participant Information

Teachers	Number of Years Taught	Number of Years as an Itinerate	Subject Area Taught	Average Sites Per Day	Grade Levels Taught
Rita	7	2	Gifted	3	Elementary Middle
Linda	4	4	Fine Arts	4	Middle High School
Louise	20	10	Foreign Language	3	High School
Brett	17	9	Music	4	Middle High School
Susan	16	12	Music	3	Middle High School
Martin	4	4	Physical Education	4	Elementary Middle High School
Kevin	26	24	Music	4	Middle High School
Sam	12	7	Music	3	Middle High School
Nick	12	12	Music	3	Middle High School

Rita

Rita had the least amount of experience as an itinerant teacher (two years). She was a regular classroom teacher for seven years prior to her itinerant assignment. She was between 24 - 32 years of age, held a bachelors degree, and taught gifted classes. Rita traveled between elementary and middle schools (three schools per day), had four preparations on a daily basis, and reported having five supervisors directly involved with her teaching assignment. (One of the supervisors was a district coordinator).

Linda

Linda had four years of teaching experience, all four as an itinerant teacher, held a masters degree, and was between 53 - 65 years of age. Prior to her teaching experience, she substitute taught. Linda averaged four sites per day, teaching most recently in the fine arts – specifically, general music and visual art classes. Her assignment took her to middle schools and high schools where she dealt with four preparations per day. She reported having five supervisors who were directly involved with her teaching assignment. (One of whom was a district coordinator).

Louise

Louise was a high school foreign language teacher who had taught a total of 20 years and who had been an itinerant teacher for the last ten years. She held a bachelors degree, was between 43 and 52 years of age, and worked at three high schools daily. She had three daily class preparations and reported having four supervisors, one of whom was a district level coordinator. She

mentioned having additional supervisory personnel, but did not believe, due to limited contact, that they had a significant effect on her teaching assignment.

Brett

Brett had taught a total of 17 years in the content area of music with nine of those years as an itinerant teacher. He had a masters degree and was between 43 and 52 years of age. His itinerant assignment had always included high school and middle school; he traveled to four sites per day and averaged five preparations among those sites. Brett reported that he had six supervisors who included one district coordinator.

Susan

Susan was a music teacher between 33 and 42 years of age who had taught for 16 years; 12 of those years she taught as an itinerant teacher. Although most recently she had been itinerant between middle and high schools, she had also taught at the elementary level (five per day) as an itinerant teacher. She averaged three sites per day, had five preparations each day, and she reported having five supervisors who included a district level coordinator.

Martin

Martin was a physical education teacher with four years of experience, all as an itinerant teacher. His daily schedule took him to four different sites including elementary, middle, and high schools. He averaged four preparations per day and had seven supervisors, one of whom was a district level coordinator. Martin had a bachelors degree and was within the 33 - 42 years of age group.

Kevin

Kevin had taught a total of 26 years, 24 of which were as an itinerant. He was in the 43 - 52 years of age group and held a bachelors degree. Kevin was a music teacher who traveled between middle school and high school averaging four sites per day. He dealt with six different preparations daily and considered himself to have four supervisors. At the district level, Kevin reported that he had a content area supervisor as well as a supervisor from another content area.

Sam

Sam was a music teacher who had taught for a total of 11 years, seven of those years as an itinerant. Sam had a masters degree and was in the 33 - 42 years of age category. Sam had been an itinerant teacher in more than one district, but in his latest assignment, he taught at three sites per day at the middle and high school levels. He averaged five daily preparations, and he reported having seven supervisors. Sam's supervisor history revealed that as well as having a district level coordinator for most of his career, he also had "head" teachers in one district who served in a supervisory capacity.

Nick

Nick had taught a total of 12 years, all served as an itinerant music teacher. He had a masters degree and fell into the age group of 33 - 42. His primary traveling assignment was between middle schools and a high school. He averaged three different sites per day with six different preparations. Nick reported having four supervisors, including a district coordinator.

The Supervisors

The supervisors of itinerant teachers were selected based on their position – principal, central office level administrator, or district level coordinator. These administrators had to have at least three years of experience in the supervision of one or more itinerant teachers. The positions of the supervisors when they worked with itinerant teachers included assistant principal, principal, district coordinator, and central office administrator. The four supervisors averaged 15.5 years of experience. The average number of years that they had supervised itinerant teachers was 11.75, and the number of teachers per year that they were responsible to directly evaluate and/or supervise ranged from 20 to 29. Table 6 summarizes the administrators' demographics.

Table 6

Supervisor Participant Information

Supervisor	Education Level	Positions Held	Years as Supervisor	Years Supervising Itinerate Teachers	Had Experience as an Itinerate Teacher	Average Number of Itinerate Teachers Supervised
Frank	Masters	Principal, Assistant Principal	14	12	Yes	6
Gary	Doctorate	Principal, Assistant Principal	12	7	No	6
Sandy	Masters	District Coordinator	8	8	Yes	29
Charles	Doctorate	Central Office, District Coordinator, Principal, Assistant Principal	28	20	No	15

Frank

Frank had been an assistant principal and a principal during his administrative career, but had also been assigned, concurrently with his site administrative duties, to be the district coordinator for instrumental music. His teaching experience, prior to becoming an administrator, was in instrumental music. He also had several years of teaching experience as an itinerant. Frank was in the 33 - 42 age range, had a masters degree, and had spent 14 years as an administrator. He had supervised itinerant teachers for 12 years, and he

regularly evaluated 20 teachers per year at his site. Frank also indicated that there were usually six itinerant teachers at his site during a typical year, and that he supervised all of them.

Gary

Gary had a doctorate, was in the 33 - 42 years of age category, and had been an assistant principal and more recently, a principal. He had spent 12 years as an administrator and counted seven of those years as supervising itinerants. Gary had not had personal experience as an itinerant teacher. His average number of teachers to evaluate per year was 20, including the itinerant teachers, and the usual number of itinerant teachers at his school was six.

Sandy

Sandy was a district level coordinator between the ages of 43 - 52. She had a masters degree, eight years experience as a supervisor in the area of gifted education, and supervised 29 itinerant teachers per year. During Sandy's teaching career, she had worked as an itinerant teacher for four years.

Charles

Charles had worked as an assistant principal, a principal, a district level coordinator, and a central office administrator for a total of 28 years. For 20 of those years, he had supervised itinerant teachers. Charles had a doctorate and had had no experience as an itinerant teacher himself. His supervision/evaluation load averaged 25 teachers, and he often had as many as 15 itinerant teachers at his site when he was a building administrator.

Findings and Analysis

The data were organized across two broad content areas: (1) the conditions surrounding the itinerant teacher and related effects on supervision, and (2) supervisory issues for the itinerant teachers and their supervisors. Themes relating to the conditions of the itinerant teacher included: (a) workplace and job related conditions, (b) issues regarding communication for the itinerant teacher, (c) supervisors' perspectives on communication, (d) feelings of alienation on the part of the itinerant teacher, (e) confusion over multiple supervisors, and (f) administrative understanding of the conditions of the itinerant teacher.

Findings from the second broad content area, supervisory issues for the itinerant teachers and their supervisors, included such information as: (a) type and frequency of supervision events, (b) perceived satisfaction with supervision processes, (c) the perceived importance of supervision, and (d) desired improvements for more effective supervision.

Conditions Surrounding the Itinerant Teacher and Related Effects on Supervision

It was noted that the conditions surrounding the itinerant teacher were often inextricably intertwined with their supervisory experiences. For the purpose of clarity, the conditions are examined first and include aspects of supervision related to the experiences of the itinerant teachers. Following the conditions, a more explicit discussion of the findings related to supervision will be rendered. Table 7 summarizes the base-line data relating to the type and frequency of supervision received by itinerant teachers. The data in Table 7 were self

reported by the itinerant teachers. As the data in the table indicates, almost all of the teachers were evaluated in only one building, and none was evaluated or supervised at each grade level they taught. None of the itinerant teachers was assigned a formal supervisor, and most of the supervision they received was of an informal nature through colleagues.

Table 7.

Base-line data regarding supervisory experiences per year as self reported by the itinerant teachers.

Teacher	Legal Evaluation/ Primary Supervisor	Formal Supervision/ Primary Supervisor	Informal Supervision Conducted by whom	Number of Sites Where Itinerants Received Administrator Supervision	Supervised at Each Grade Level?
Rita	1/Site Principals	None	Several/ Coordinator Site Principals	2	No
Linda	None/only Entry Year Teacher Experience	None	Many times/ Colleagues	1/Entry Year Teacher Experience	No
Louise	1/Assistant Principal	None	Few times/ Colleagues and one Principal	1	No
Brett	1 per career/ Principal	2 per career/ Coordinator, Principal	Many times/ Colleagues, Coordinator	1, but not yearly	No
Susan	1, or 2, or 0/ Site Principals	3 per career/ Coordinator	Many times/ Colleagues	1	No
Martin	1/Site Principals	None	Several times/ Colleagues	1	No
Kevin	1/several years none/ Site Principals	None	Many times/ Colleagues	1	No
Sam	1/Site Principals	None	Many times/ Colleagues	1	No
Nick	2/Site Principals	None	Several times/ Colleagues	1	No

The definitions of supervision and evaluation were as diversified as the participants in this study. Both the itinerant teachers and their supervisors had developed a lexicon to describe their contact with each other. There was much disagreement and confusion of meanings between what evaluation and supervision was. The participants used some names that are foreign to the world of supervision, such as "legal supervision." Where differences occur in definitions in the meaning of supervision and evaluation, as conceptualized in the buildings in which the itinerants worked, a definition is provided.

To these participants, supervision became evaluation whenever the intention of the supervision did not explicitly promote professional growth. The itinerants did not portray evaluation in a positive light.

Table 8.

Terms Used by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Evaluation.

Terms Used to Talk About Evaluation	Definitions of Terms Provided by the Itinerate Teachers	Itinerate Teacher	District
Checklist	Check off items on evaluation	Brett/Louise	B / C
Do the Paperwork Thing	Sign off on the evaluation document	Sam	A
Dog and Pony show	"Staged" observation	Brett/Rita	B / C
Evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Rita/Susan/Kevin	A / A / C
Formal evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Kevin/Brett/Nick	A / B / C
Formal supervision	Mandated evaluation	Sam/Martin/Rita	A / B / C
Legal evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Kevin/Martin/Louise	A / B / C
Legal supervision	Mandated evaluation	Sam	A
Legal thing	Mandated evaluation	Susan/Martin/Nick	A / B / C
Lesson plan check	Evaluation by checking lesson plans	Kevin/Brett/Rita	A / B / C
Negotiated Agreement process	Mandated evaluation	Nick	C
Official evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Sam/Linda/Nick	A / B / C
Principal Evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Nick	C
Supervision	Mandated evaluation	Susan/Martin/Louise	A / B / C
Token evaluation	Mandated evaluation	Linda	B
"Truman" show	"Staged" observation	Brett	B

For example, the itinerants (see Table 8) used terms such as "token," "dog and pony," and "do the paperwork thing" to describe their evaluation experiences. Evaluation was equated with being a "staged," "sign-off," and "checklist" oriented process. To complicate matters, the lexicon developed by the nine itinerant teachers showed that the words used to describe supervision took on different meanings. Table 9 highlights the supervision lexicon used by the itinerant teachers in this study.

Table 9.

Terms Used by Itinerant Teachers to Describe Supervision.

Term Used to Talk About Supervision (the Phenomenon)	Definition/ Process/ Application of Term Provided by the Itinerate Teachers	Done by Whom	Reported by Which Itinerant Teacher	District
Informal Supervision	Advice from a colleague or supervisor	Administrators, Teachers	Martin/ Nick	B / C
	Brainstorming	Teachers	Martin	B
	Colleague Consultation	Teachers	Kevin/Sam/ Louise	A / A / C
	Drop-Ins/ Walk Throughs	Administrators	Rita/Louise	C
	Feedback	Administrators, Teachers	Brett/Louise	B / C
	Idea Exchange	Content Area Teachers	Kevin/Nick	A / C
	Informal Comments	Administrators, Teachers	Sam	A
	Networking	Content Area Teachers	Martin	B
	Phone Calls	Administrators, Teachers	Sam/Brett	A / B
	Pop-Ins	Administrators	Brett/Rita	B / C
	Team Teaching	Content Area Teachers	Susan/Brett	A / B
	Watching Peers	Teachers	Kevin/Sam/Rita	A / A / C
Entry Year Process	Administrator, Teacher Observations	Teacher, Principal, Coordinator	Linda	B

Table 9 (cont.)

Term Used to Talk About Supervision (the Phenomenon)	Definition/Process Application of Term Provided by the Itinerant Teachers	Done by Whom	Reported by Which Itinerant Teacher	District
Evaluation	Any Administrator Visitation	Principal, Asst. Principal, Coordinator	Susan	A
Forced Supervision	Mandated Evaluation or Staff Development	Principal, Asst. Principal	Linda	B
Formal Evaluation	Mandated Evaluation	Principal, Asst. Principal	Brett	B
Formal Supervision	Clinical Supervision	Principal, Asst. Principal	Louise/Rita	C
Informal Evaluation	Any Administrator Visitation	Administrator	Brett	B
Legal Supervision	Mandated Evaluation	Principal, Asst. Principal	Brett	B
Pre-Evaluation	Administrator Informal Observation	Principal, Asst. Principal	Sam	A
Unofficial Evaluation	Administrator Observation	Administrator	Susan	A

It is interesting to note that the participants developed ten different names for supervision experiences with 12 subsections for describing informal supervision. Many of the terms for supervision, as well as the processes, definitions, and applications were somewhat chaotically intertwined with evaluation. A result of this confusion between supervision and evaluation was that supervision often took on a negative association. The itinerants' use of such terms as "legal supervision" and "forced supervision" exemplified the negative

context which surrounded supervision for many of the teachers. The fact that there was so much confusion related to what was or was not supervision, and what the purposes of supervision were, pointed to the lack of understanding and communication between the administrators and the itinerant teachers. Because there was very little in the way of a shared language between administrators and teachers, the prospects for meaningful supervision were somewhat dim.

Each of the teachers, in his or her own way, believed that their itinerant status, often linked with being "special teachers," put them at risk for not receiving "adequate" or "meaningful" supervision. Adequate supervision was described, for the most part, as receiving the amount of supervision the itinerant teachers thought necessary for improving instruction. Meaningful supervision was referred to by the itinerant teachers as receiving supervision relevant to a specific content area. Legal evaluation was the term used to describe a school district's process and document for evaluation of teachers required by Oklahoma statute. All three districts in this study required administrators to adhere to the Oklahoma statutes regarding teacher evaluation. Formal supervision was defined by the itinerant teachers as evaluation. Informal supervision was defined by the itinerant teachers as contact vis-a-vis advice and short conversations usually in hallways or parking lots.

Two of the aspects of itinerancy noted by the itinerant teachers included schedules and movement, both of which served to retard their opportunities for supervision. Access to or confusion about those who would or could supervise them as well as difficulty in developing relationships that could lead to

supervision were also seen as important factors. The teachers also cited other conditions that affected their success, including isolation, being and keeping informed, and administrators who lacked the understanding to deal with the conditions of itinerancy. The following sections report what these itinerant teachers and their administrators had to say about the conditions that affected the quantity and quality of the supervision they received or delivered as it related to the conditions of being an itinerant teacher. The conditions are reported across (a) type and frequency of supervision events, (b) perceived satisfaction with supervision processes, (c) the perceived importance of supervision, and (d) desired improvements for more effective supervision.

Workplace and Job Related Conditions

The day-to-day working life of the itinerant teacher provided both obstacles and advantages to their teaching effectiveness. The participants expressed concern that itinerancy had a negative effect on the quality of instruction they could provide as well as the opportunity to receive supervision (see Table 7). The almost daily juggling of overlapping or juxtaposed schedules left little time for anything but minimal involvement with adults at each site. Learning procedures and rules at multiple sites as well as each school's culture took a "back seat to classroom demands" for the traveling teachers.

Almost to a teacher, they believed that in many ways their situation made them unique in the educational setting, a fact which Martin, in the beginning, found daunting: "It was a big culture shock. I was feeling like I was in over my head." A fear which several of the teachers talked about was that of being at the

wrong school on the wrong day. As Louise stated, "Sometimes I would wake up and realize I had had a bad dream about going to the wrong school, I just hope that dream never comes true." The itinerant status was believed to be a cause for "being forgotten by supervisors." All of the teachers cited examples of "lost supervisory experiences" due to administrator oversight. Sometimes, as Kevin stated, even those who paid the most attention to itinerant teachers and their programs were "thoughtless" when it came to supervision, ". . . even the district coordinator did not stop by. I think the administrators overlook our entire program because we are itinerant."

The teachers also reported that the uniqueness of their situation often "collided with the regular classroom teacher experience," be it of those they worked with or the participants' own experience as a "regular" teacher. Linda elaborated, "The problems that are going on are just so different from the problems that non-itinerant teachers experience." Many of the respondents told of adjustments they had to make in their thinking in order to deal with being an itinerant teacher. Linda's statement is representative of others. She believed the itinerant teachers had to change their mindset toward teaching in order to survive. "I think it is a survivor mode. [I]f you are successful in that position (itinerant teacher) you either change or you don't survive."

Many of the itinerant teachers perceived the "regular classroom teacher" as receiving preferential treatment with respect to supervision. Some of the teachers indicated that the "regular daily schedule" of the non-itinerant teachers made it easier for them to receive supervision, but there was also a decidedly

negative undercurrent of feeling toward most administrators who, according to the participants, neglected itinerant teachers. Discussing the fact that supervisors often had time for the regular teacher, but not the itinerant, Kevin retorted, ". . . they do their thing . . . it wouldn't matter if they overlooked me or not. I don't think they have that much to offer." Sam expressed the same sentiment, specifically targeting principals: "If the principals didn't supervise me, well, I wouldn't consider that much of a loss." Kevin reported being supervised sporadically throughout his career, and Sam reported being supervised one time per year.

The experience of travel was problematic for the itinerant teachers in terms of both distance covered and difficulties experienced. The average estimates of travel for these itinerant teachers ranged from 20 miles to 90 miles per week. The itinerants stated that they sometimes expended more energy going from one school to another than they would in the classroom. The topic of feeling some guilt over wasted time was raised repeatedly. Brett reported:

> You waste so much time traveling from one site to the next, it is just lost teaching time. You have to leave five minutes early here and arrive five minutes late there. It takes five minutes to get to your car because you have to park out on the north forty.

Kevin, as with many of the itinerant teachers, found his own partial solution to the problems of travel and time. "I park illegally at both campuses so I can get things out of my car and into the building . . . without going across the parking lot; its a matter of time."

The teachers also expressed frustration over the fact that travel adversely affected their supervision "windows of opportunity." Nick's comment on the subject was typical of all of the teachers, when he stated, "I guess not being at one school for more than 45 minutes – I guess because you travel and don't stay in one school very long – means that you are overlooked or just ignored." Legally, the teachers were evaluated once a year; however, classroom observations in the form of formal supervision or pop-in visitations (informal classroom observations made by a supervisor) just did not occur for the itinerant teachers in this study (see Table 7). Several of the teachers reported that they were the ones who initiated the evaluation and/or supervision process with their supervisors. In many such cases, it was the belief of the itinerant teachers that absent their reminder, the site administrators would not have realized that supervision or evaluation of the itinerant teacher was needed.

Daily problems with schedules at two or more schools was a recurring theme. All of the teachers indicated that they felt "pulled in several directions," particularly when it came to class times, duty, and activities within each school. Linda put it best when she stated:

> . . . actually I had two fine arts committees to meet with, open house at one school was on one night and the other school on another night. There were faculty meetings at both schools, sometimes at the same time, and then there was the question of duty. And you say to someone, "But I'm getting double duty now," and they look at you like you don't know what you're talking about.

Because of the seemingly ever-changing daily schedules of itinerant teachers, the ability to organize and focus taxed the itinerants because of the flexibility needed to accommodate "fast paced" changes. All the itinerants repeatedly spoke of the curricular, psychological, and social flexibility needed in order to adapt to the daily changes in students, schools, and schedules. Kevin exemplified the unique understanding that itinerant teachers must have to travel from school to school and level to level:

> You do have to focus fast. Everyone that is a traveling teacher has to almost be more than one teacher, because you rarely would travel from high school to high school. You are probably going to travel from a high school to a middle school, and that is a totally different mind set. So even during your drive time you have to refocus before you punish the middle school kids or vice versa. Other teachers don't have to do that.

From the administrative point-of-view, Charles (a central office administrator) agreed with Kevin's point, "I would observe them . . . to see how, and if, they could adjust their instruction to the level of the kids as they moved from a senior high class to a fourth grade class."

Understanding the climate of the schools at which they worked, as well as the rules and procedures, was problematic for all of the itinerant teachers. Linda offered that each of her two schools had its own personality and her mantra was, "You have to have a split personality." The itinerant teachers reported that because they were not at one site for a significant length of time, it was difficult

for them to be aware of what was going on at the school on a day-to-day basis. Brett intoned, "When you travel, you don't have a shared history with others at the school." Nick brought up the point that, "Being an itinerant teacher you don't get to establish working relationships with others. You probably don't have time to know them, let alone ask for help or advice."

The upside of traveling, however, resided in the relationships teachers were able to form with different students across school sites. The teachers indicated that they would not trade their contact time with students at the other schools for the elimination of hindrances of being an itinerant teacher. Every day for these teachers brought something new and different; they reported no boredom. There were positives, but the teachers were also realistic. Martin described his day-to-day work as, ". . . a roller coaster situation, first it's great and then it can be bad." And even though none of the teachers would opt for regular classroom status, they all had feelings and experiences similar to those presented by Susan:

> . . . You never leave anything at a school . . . you have to take it all with you because you are a traveling teacher and there is nowhere to keep anything. You take tape, staples, papers, things you put up on the wall; because you teach in the gym, the cafeteria, a foyer, or wherever. So if you need anything for class, you have to bring it with you, and then you have to take it with you because it will not be there the next day. It is abusive.

Issues Regarding Communication for the Itinerant Teacher

Communication was seen by administrators and the itinerant teachers as a key element, but often fragmented in nature. The inherent difficulties created by the traveling teachers' schedules often made effective communication the exception and not the rule. The importance of good communication was trumpeted by all of the teachers and supervisors. On a deeper level, the quality of communication between the itinerant teachers and their supervisors was also an indication of the type of supervision that could occur, because communication is the currency of the supervision exchange (e.g., pre- and post- observation conferences). Although many variations of communication were noted, the most prominent patterns of communication were administrator to teacher, and administrator to administrator.

The importance to the itinerant teacher of the relationships and communication among site and district level supervisors and themselves was mentioned by several of the teachers. Rita pointed this out when she stated:

> They have to work well together. It can be a problem if the principal and the coordinator don't get along. You will have this huge idea planned and then go to the coordinator and she will give you the backing and the money. But if the principal does not like the coordinator, he will say no. So that can be a big problem if they don't communicate and don't get along.

Many of the teachers commented on the difficulty in communicating with administrators. Susan stated, "So when I miss out on anything, I am supposed to

know what is said. Communication is difficult." Brett experienced the lack of communication on a daily basis, "You don't have the day-to-day input so that you can pick up on procedures." Martin brought up the point that supervisors communicating with teachers other than himself also had an effect on him, "The district coordinator was looking out for my best interests, but he didn't communicate with the teachers I worked with, so there were more problems." Kevin stated that the information he got from the middle schools was, ". . . vicarious and second-hand."

The fact that itinerant teachers are not always at one site was seen as a cause of many of the communication problems. The itinerant teachers believed that most of the problems could be avoided, but also that site administrators did not always think it affected the teachers "that much." Kevin's experience with lost communication illustrated the strong feelings engendered through a communication error:

> I walked in to my class one day, and I didn't have anyone in class. Even though busted my butt to get from the high school to the middle school sooner than I normally would, no one was there because they . . . had an assembly. I guess that is lack of communication on my part because I wasn't in the building when it was announced. So does that affect me? Yeah! Does it affect other teachers? Yeah!

Supervisors' Perspectives on Communication

The supervisors of itinerant teachers reported varying degrees of communication with other administrators and with itinerant teachers. With regard to communicating with administrators from any of the itinerant's sites, Frank stated succinctly, "No communication, if there is no problem. Communication if there are problems." Gary, a middle school principal without any experience as an itinerant teacher, stated his level of communication with other administrators in practical terms, "I don't call the high school principal and ask her what she thinks (about an itinerant teacher), but I would talk to the middle school principal. We have the opportunity to see each other more." Charles, a central office administrator, commented on weekly meetings with other building principals and that, of the items to be discussed:

> . . . one of the things would be teachers we shared who were itinerant. We always knew where the other person was in terms of how the itinerant was doing. That was part of our agenda.

On the subject of communicating with the itinerant teachers, all of the administrators thought that communication was important. Two of the supervisors mentioned open lines of communication and the development of trust (important elements for supervisory experiences). Sandy, a district coordinator, spoke of keeping itinerant teachers informed and broached the subject of access when she stated that, "Sometimes they come to me because it is easier to get in touch with me than it is the principal." Charles summed up the general beliefs of the supervisors on communicating with itinerant teachers when he stated that:

> I think maintaining communication is the hardest thing, and probably the most important. Staying in touch with them, watching what they do, recognizing what they do, listening to their needs, understanding their problems because they have many problems.

Itinerant teachers not only experienced a lack of informational communication, they also perceived a lack of emotional communication which often created a negative effect on them. Every itinerant teacher reported that he or she had experienced negative feelings from faculty and administrators. As a result of these negative feelings, most of the itinerant teachers held an ambivalent attitude with regard to engaging in supervision, in particular supervision with colleagues. Some of the participants perceived negative feelings toward them that they directly attributed to their itinerant status. Linda reported that when she walked into her teaching assignment, "I notice that these people are really cold." Furthermore, she had difficulty with other teachers when it came to sharing rooms.

> I got the message that I wasn't important (being there only one class period every other day) and that this was his room. In fact, I have actually had to move out of a room because the teacher was so uncooperative.

Sandy, an administrator with itinerant experience, also believed that many administrators had negative feelings toward itinerant teachers. She bluntly stated that she remembered her own experience as an itinerant, "The principal

looked at you like you were a foreign substance in the building. I was an outsider. I was not a 'regular classroom teacher'."

Frustrations that continued to build were reported by many of the itinerant teachers. Issues such as shared rooms, excessive duty assignments, and missing meetings and activities all contributed to the negativity that was experienced. As Nick stated, "Oh Yeah! There are some hard feelings, there's definitely been some of that." Resentment was also a word that several teachers used to describe the feelings other teachers had for them. Most of the participants who perceived negative feelings also pointed out that much of the problem arose from a lack of understanding on the part of the regular classroom teachers and administrators of what an itinerant teacher is and does. Kevin summed up this point that teachers remain resentful:

> Only because I don't have time to interact. They see it as being non-social. They don't understand that you don't go down and have lunch with them because you just came from the other building. So you don't have time to sit down and have lunch with them because you drove through McDonalds and grabbed your hamburger and walked right into class for the next class period. They see it as not being social. They don't know your work stacks up and you don't have time to be a lounge lizard.

Feelings of Alienation on the Part of the Itinerant Teacher

Sharing with other teachers was found to be critically lacking in the itinerant teachers' experience. Not knowing the regular classroom teachers,

even their names, created a feeling of "aloneness" for the participants. This estrangement also included administrators to some degree and made it difficult to ask for, or receive, help or supervisory attention. Although eight of the nine itinerant teachers stated that they had a designated "home" school, they still believed that there was no "home base" to center their assignment. Homelessness often resulted in the itinerant teachers being overlooked by site supervisors and others. Alienation also resulted from the itinerant teachers' belief that they were neglected, by both teachers and administrators.

Some of the itinerant teachers stated that there was a certain freedom to be found in their isolation, but none of them thought that that advantage outweighed the disadvantages of feeling "cut off from others." Rita made the point that:

> When you travel, people forget that you are here. I will get a phone call and they will forget that I'm here and say that I'm not here because they can't remember in the office what days I am at their school.

Linda stated that she believed that she had "fallen through the cracks," and that "No one gets to know you because you just walk through; they have their routine, and you really don't belong with them."

The administrators had several comments regarding the feelings of isolation that itinerant teachers experienced. Frank, a principal who also served simultaneously as a district music coordinator, stated that, ". . . they don't know people and people don't know them." Sandy, a district gifted coordinator,

expanded on one theme that also emerged in the teacher data, that of having other teachers in the same situation with which to share thoughts and ideas.

> I just think the itinerant teacher feels lonely because itinerant teachers are not regular classroom teachers; they are "special" teachers. Special teachers are lonely or alone anyway because there are only one or two in the building. Part of the strength of teaching is that you have other teachers in the building that you can sit and plan and meet with and share problems and successes with. But you are already alone if you are a special teacher, and then you are doubly alone because you are not in the building. They are not there enough to gain confidences of the people in the building. So I think you do a double whammy of loneliness.

The fact that most itinerant teachers were also "special programs" teachers only served to widen the gulf between themselves and those who could supervise them. Not only did the itinerant teachers perceive that they were alienated from administrator supervision, but they also found it difficult to initiate peer supervision for the same reason. Nick responded that he would opt for more supervision if, ". . . you had a master teacher, somebody that you felt comfortable with, who was in your field. That would be a great opportunity." Several of the teachers commented that they welcomed supervision, but they wanted to interact and exchange ideas with someone in a like situation and believed that absent that, there was "little value in being supervised."

All of the teachers indicated that they had made some effort to reduce the feeling of isolation. Kevin stated, "I always made it a point for secretaries and administrators to know me," but he also admitted, "Do I know other teachers? Not so well." Charles, a former site administrator with no itinerant teaching experience, but with vast administrative experience, related what he had done to alleviate the loneliness of the itinerant teacher.

> I think we incorporated a lot of them into some of the things that were going on in our schools. If we were doing some group or committee work, we would include them in it as much as they could make the meetings. Sometimes we had to double back, but we would certainly include them in celebrations and special occasions that you had as a faculty, and just try not to forget them even when they weren't there. When it was not possible for them to be there, we'd try to remember them and collect things to make sure they had an idea of what happened when they were not there. It's almost an out of sight out of mind kind of a thing.

The problem of sharing with like teachers was only partially solved for most of these itinerants during district level meetings. However, these meetings were not frequent enough to completely eradicate the day-to-day feelings of isolation that the itinerants experienced.

A feeling of "homelessness" was also reported by most of the itinerant teachers. Of the itinerant teachers who had any feeling of "home," they attributed the feeling, in large part, to the principal at that site. The majority of the teachers

stated that they did have a home school, but that it was in name only, a point made by Louise, "It wasn't because I spent more time there. I guess it was just from an administrator's standpoint, they had to assign me to one school in order to have my body counted."

Brett stated that he had never felt like he had a home school and that for part of his itinerant experience, he was at a different school every hour of the day. Having a mailbox at the school and possibly a parking place did help "a little" to create a feeling of "home," but as Linda explained, it went deeper than that:

> You lack a feeling of ownership as an itinerant. You need that feeling of ownership and a relationship with other teachers. Sometimes they just forget you – forget you are there. These are wonderful people and they are serious when they apologize, but it doesn't change the feeling. The message is that I am not a part of who they are and what they do. No matter how sincere, it can't be undone.

Susan and several other teachers pointed out that they did not know the faculty and administration well enough either. The lack of familiarity with teachers and administrators compromised the environment for supervision. Effective supervision, as viewed by the teachers, was threatened by the absence of a bonding, two-way relationship that a "home" could provide. The possibility of the itinerant teachers having the time to spend initiating such a relationship was not thought to be likely.

The itinerant teachers also reported outright feelings of neglect when it came to dealing with schools and supervisors. Administrators frequently neglected to inform itinerant teachers of changes in the daily schedule. Many of the itinerants stated that they doubted that supervisors actually knew when they were at their site. The worst fallout from administrator neglect was missed opportunities for supervision. The itinerant teachers expressed their thoughts on the lack of supervision in several ways. Susan believed that she needed supervisory "support." Brett requested help in ascertaining goal attainment and assistance with remedial strategies when goals were not met. Rita, mentioning a feeling of burn out, "Just wanted some new ideas." Linda thought that being neglected from a lack of supervision had "negatively affected her career" by forcing her to navigate largely through "trial and error."

Brett found one school that did not neglect him, but that was the exception: "They (one of his sites) accept the traveling teacher. Other schools that I have gone to, they don't have any idea who I am. They have no idea why I am there." Susan, who had the answer to a scheduling difficulty between schools, attributed neglect to her itinerant status. "There were big problems. They could have asked me, *but I was just the traveling teacher.*"

Many of the itinerant teachers experienced a need for supervisors to interact with them, even to the point of personally inviting them to their classes, but much of the time these overtures were unsuccessful. Louise reported that, "I have invited administrators in a few times, but they haven't come, or haven't been able to come." Martin wished many times for an administrator to be there,

but with the exception of one school, he had no contact, and he felt "out of the loop." All of the teachers reported such feelings, and many had experienced the kind of neglect that Susan pointed out, "Well, nobody comes in my room, ever. Even when I invite assistant principals and principals into my room, they usually don't come. It's, 'Sorry, I don't have time.' At my sites now, nobody comes by my room."

Overall, the supervisors did not think that they neglected their itinerant teachers, but it was obvious that the expectations of the itinerants were not taken into account at the supervisor level. Two of the administrators commented that it was nice to have experienced itinerant teachers because they required very little supervision. However, Kevin, a veteran itinerant teacher for 24 years, voiced an opposing view from the less experienced itinerant teachers when he stated: "You are more knowledgeable at this age and you are more ready for someone to help you – give you constructive ideas. Not like when I was young and thought I knew it all." Although the administrators cited numerous examples of interacting with itinerant teachers, even they conceded that they were not always successful. Charles, a central office administrator, was forthright in his admission that, although he tried to adequately supervise itinerants, he had often fallen short of his goal.

> No, I probably did not really have adequate time for them. Oftentimes they would be there for a specified period of time and I might have a conflict, and if I couldn't see them at that specific time they were gone and off to the next school. That was an obstacle. I

think communication is important, and there were some I didn't stay in touch with. Events conspired to keep that from happening. One conflict after another, or something like that, would keep me from being able to even say hello to them. That is difficult.

Confusion Over Multiple Supervisors

The average number of assigned supervisors that the participants had was five. The fewest number was four and the most was seven.

Table 10.

Assigned Supervisors for Itinerant Teachers

Teacher	Number of Assigned Supervisors	Title of Supervisors	Who was Perceived as Responsible for Evaluation
Rita	5	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Linda	5	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Louise	4	Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Brett	6	Principal, Assistant Principal District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Susan	5	Principal, Assistant Principal	Principal, Assistant Principal
Martin	7	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Kevin	4	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal
Sam	7	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator, Department Head	Principal, Assistant Principal
Nick	4	Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coordinator	Principal, Assistant Principal

If an itinerant teacher only went to two schools, in all likelihood he/she would have a principal and an assistant principal at each school to interact with, as well

as a coordinator at the district level. In addition to the other stresses accompanying the itinerant's situation, the confusion created by multiple supervisors, became frustrating. As Linda indicated, it was not merely a matter of discerning who the right supervisor was, but also, "Because I am an itinerant, I have less leverage than the regular teachers."

The position the itinerant teachers found themselves in, for the most part, was having to go to more than one supervisor. The itinerant teachers who were also special teachers had to get approval or help from two to five supervisors when they undertook projects, events, or activities with their students. Rita outlined some of this process:

> All of my money comes through the district coordinator, but then I also have to talk to a principal. She approves my field trips, but I can't just tell the principal I'm going on a field trip . . . I have to get it cleared. The principal runs the school, but I have to go to the coordinator for practically everything. Somehow I have to keep them both happy.

Nick captured the viewpoint of most of the teachers when he said that:

> . . . there are several people to answer to – at different sites, more at some sites, even some for different reasons. I guess in our district its sort of like layers, but in addition to the overall layers, there may be layers at each site.

Several of the participants shared their strategies for dealing with this p roblem. Most determined which administrator would be most likely to address

the matter at hand (at least at first). Susan had organized her needs per administrator; the district coordinator for money, the principal for site problems, a district colleague for teaching questions. Sam opted to go first to whoever had the strongest personality. Linda decided based on the amount of attention the administrator could give her. Louise started with the administrator whom she knew the best. Both Louise and Martin stated that much of the time they believed they had to be their own supervisor.

Another aspect of having multiple supervisors was an "administrative shuffle." The itinerant teachers believed that it was hard to "pin down just who was in charge of what." Brett experienced confusion, not only from having multiple supervisors, but also even more problematically, knowing whom to go to and in what order. Brett indicated:

> There is a district coordinator and then there is someone in between him and the rest of the staff that organizes meetings and things. It is difficult to tell sometimes whether the district coordinator is saying this and saying the words that our boss is saying to us, or did that really come from the district coordinator. There is some confusion there because I am not sure their philosophies are even in the same bucket at all. So you get a little mixed up.

Martin revealed a period in his itinerant career where his schedule was changed back and forth by different administrators who had not communicated with each other. He saw this as a direct result of having multiple supervisors: "I have got

several it seems like. And that may have been the cause of some of the confusion." A few of the itinerant teachers expressed the opinion that confusion over who is "in charge" as "supervisor" could be greatly reduced if "the supervisors knew the itinerant teachers better, and communicated with each other more frequently."

The administrators of itinerant teachers also acknowledged that there was confusion unique to the supervision and evaluation of itinerant teachers, and that this confusion can be an obstacle. Gary related one of the difficulties with two administrators evaluating the same itinerant teacher.

> When you get into two administrators who have to evaluate the traveling teacher there may be problems. The principal that has her at [that] school may think she is wonderful and awesome, but I think vice versa. Or sometimes I will think a teacher is awesome and she (the other principal) thinks they have problems.

Frank, a middle school principal, pointed out that when supervisors are working with an itinerant teacher, they frequently hear difficulties that occur in the "other" building. He pointed out what all of the administrators experienced when he stated, "I can't instruct another administrator to do something a certain way."

The data from administrators revealed what the teachers often stated, that supervisors were sometimes confused as to their responsibilities and torn between helping teachers and following district guidelines. The district coordinator position was many times the most accessible and helpful supervisory position to the itinerant teachers. However, those very coordinators usually

worked in an administrative environment that was confusing to the teachers and to the coordinators themselves. The ambivalence of the district coordinator position was explained by Sandy this way:

> For me, it is that I am supposed to be responsible for the program, but I don't have any power. Responsible for what they teach and how they teach it, and yet . . . I have to wait for a building principal to come to me and say "I am having problems with this teacher, can you come into my building and help?" So that's my frustration, for me and for the teachers.

Charles, currently a central office administrator, reported a different system of evaluating traveling teachers in one district in which he worked, a system he believed could alleviate much of the confusion for teachers and administrators. For each traveling teacher there was a "primary evaluator" but there was also information required from "contributing evaluators." Charles further stated that contributing evaluators, ". . . could be other colleagues at an equal level, other principals or assistant principals, curriculum directors, or in some cases, department chairs." However, none of the teachers in this study reported having ever been evaluated or supervised using a system similar to what Charles outlined.

Administrative Understanding of the Conditions of the Itinerant Teacher

All of the teachers indicated a need for administrators to understand the conditions of itinerancy. It was considered to be of paramount importance to the teachers' ability to do their jobs. "Understanding" to the teachers meant access

to supervisors, scheduling help, allowance for travel difficulties and a two-way, trusting relationship that would encourage growth-oriented supervision of instruction in the classroom. The teachers believed that while some administrators did seem to understand the working conditions of the itinerant, most did not.

Susan gave an example of a district coordinator who did not understand the conditions in which the itinerant teacher worked: "He was upset about whether I was there before class started. I was traveling and couldn't get there before it started. He should have been more familiar with traveling teachers." Linda did not believe any of her administrators understood her itinerant status, and she offered a possible explanation:

> I think . . . there is a tendency the higher up you go in administration to not think outside of the box. It is very tough to find the answers to these things (problems for the itinerant) if you are not willing to look outside the box. It can be very difficult for a supervisor to understand.

The teachers also gave examples of supervisors' lack of understanding related to the "special programs" aspect of being an itinerant teacher. For example, Susan was warned about teaching to only one side of the room when she was actually rehearsing the violin section (which sits together on one side of the room). Sandy was berated for not having her students quiet and in rows while her class was engaged in a gifted activity that required group conversation. Some of the

teachers, however, gave the administrators credit for at least a partial understanding of their conditions. Brett stated:

> I think they understand the traveling part, but they don't understand the difficulties. Sometimes I think they lose perspective; on scheduling for instance. They may understand that you travel, but they don't put that in the game plan for the school. Everybody does site based management, but they don't realize how un-site based we are.

Another theme reported by the teachers was that administrators who had been itinerant teachers had, for the most part, a better understanding of their situation and were seen as more effective with regard to supervisory experiences. Kevin related that, ". . . the music people certainly did (understand itinerancy) because they had done it. If you have been there, you understand it, good or bad." Rita agreed with Kevin and stated with certainty that:

> The only way they could (understand) is if they had ever done this. I have two assistant principals who have traveled and they do know. I did have good support from both of those people. The ones that have been traveling teachers do understand.

Given the fact that itinerant teachers travel, they have an abbreviated amount of time in any given school. All of the teachers recognized that lack of time was a major factor that kept administrators from developing a better understanding of the itinerant teacher. The teachers understood that the daily responsibilities of their administrators left them little time, for the most part, to

engage in formal (planned for and structured) or informal (usually brief interaction) supervision. The expectations for supervisory contact reported by the itinerant teachers were not high, but all of them believed that even those expectations were not met. More than one administrator commented that understanding the itinerant situation was a "two-way street," but a comparison of the data indicated that the itinerant teachers had the more difficult road to travel. Both the administrators and the teachers, however, did agree that understanding and cooperation were necessary for both formal and informal supervision to occur.

The administrators who supervised itinerant teachers believed they had an empathetic understanding of the conditions surrounding itinerant teachers. They all indicated that they had learned how to adjust to and for the teachers through experience. Issues such as travel, scheduling, becoming a part of the building, extra stress, and being there for advice and support were all discussed by the administrators. Three of the four administrators indicated that they discussed the difficulties of being an itinerant in the hiring process, a point made by Frank:

> I think itinerant teachers should know what they are getting into. Most of them are going to teach in two or three buildings. There are even some issues that no one is going to tell them until they experience them. You should spend time telling them about different school climates and cultures, missing faculty meetings, and having your office in your car.

Sandy, a district coordinator, and Frank, a building principal, both indicated that their previous experience as itinerant teachers helped immeasurably in their understanding of their itinerant teachers' situations. Gary, a middle school principal with no actual itinerant experience, drew on his experience of sharing a room with an itinerant teacher and Charles, a central office administrator, put himself "into their shoes" as much as possible. All of them spoke not only of understanding, but also of developing a relationship through short time increments, and "learning their personality." This latter point was seen as very important in dealing with the daily problems of the itinerant teacher as well as laying the groundwork for supervision. Charles, a central office administrator, showed perhaps, the most complete understanding of the itinerant experience when he stated that:

> They have problems other teachers don't have. They have all of the problems other teachers have and then they have some additional ones because they are itinerant. That puts a whole new set of obligations on them and it's tiring. It is more exhausting than having a regular classroom environment, colleagues on each side of your classroom that you know and work with all of the time. It is hard to shift gears and change from one school to another. You go into a different school and there are different expectations, different personnel, different personalities that you have to deal with . . . I think you can help all of that, but if you work with them, nonetheless they are going to have a feeling of transience.

The teachers' conclusion that most administrators do not understand the condition of itinerant teaching did not correspond to the statements made by the administrators in this study. The data from the administrators indicated that they had a fairly complete understanding of the situation and made concerted efforts to prevent or work out problems with and for the itinerant teachers. There was a clear gap between teachers and administrators in their perception of the level of understanding attained by each. One possible explanation for the split could be, as Nick put it, "Some administrator saying they know what I deal with and that they understand is different than understanding through their actions."

Supervisory Issues for the Itinerant Teachers and their Supervisors

The definition of supervision, offered in Chapter One, stated that it could consist of enabling actions toward schools, administrators, and teachers in service of organizational goals and improved instruction. Further, it was posited that the best possible scenario for the achievement of the intents and purposes of supervision might be the improvement of instruction, educator professionalism, and the school environment, through all supervisory change agents in the system, utilizing supervision that is appropriate to each and every individual, group, or situation. A composite definition of evaluation might center on the fact that it is a process used to determine the nature and quality of the act of teaching as performed by teachers. In the state of Oklahoma, evaluation also carries with it legal ramifications concerning teacher employment.

Meaningful and adequate supervision was desired by all of the itinerant teachers, and by those who supervised them. The supervisors and the teachers

both reported that the unique conditions surrounding the itinerant teacher had a pronounced effect on the ability to give and receive supervision. All of the participants agreed that the lack of access and time, created by travel and schedules, limited the opportunity for supervision for itinerant teachers. However, each of the participants believed that supervision was of sufficient importance for teacher and school wide success and that time should be "carved out" for supervision. These experiences were found to include evaluation, formal supervision, and informal supervision. Varying degrees were reported as to the frequency of these experiences and Table 7 summarized these experiences with supervision.

The previous section contained descriptions of supervision that were related to the conditions that the itinerant teachers experienced. Although there were as many views on the process of supervision as there were participants, the data revealed that, in general, the supervisors were more satisfied with the process than were the itinerant teachers. Both the teachers and the administrators viewed supervision as a necessary component in the development of itinerant teachers, but they also admitted that there were systemic and environmental obstacles to maintaining a supervisory relationship. Ideas for improving supervisory processes or procedures were forwarded by the participants (some in the section above), but the most resounding theme to emerge from the data, in terms of improvement, was the desire and need for content area supervision. Itinerants and their supervisors recognized the challenges of working together and many of them were constantly in the process

of searching for solutions, as well as strategies, to interact more frequently than the yearly evaluation process mandated by the state.

Type and Frequency of Supervision Events

The evaluation process used by districts in the state of Oklahoma can be reduced to the purpose of recommendations for future employment. Through the process of evaluation, districts can call for the termination of a teacher, recommend a plan for improvement, or suggest that the teacher continue employment in the district. To this end, evaluation is summative in nature and not concerned with growth and development (McGreal, 1983; Millman & Darling - Hammond, 1990). The process of formal supervision (pre-observation conference, observation, and post-observation conference, or some variation of this model) can be utilized in total or in part as a component of a district's evaluation process. However, formal supervision, standing alone, carries with it no legal employment issues unless supervision is linked to a plan of improvement.

The data from the itinerant teachers were fairly consistent with respect to the type and frequency of supervision they received or did not receive (see Table 7). Eight of the nine teachers reported being evaluated, usually once per year. The one teacher who was the exception cited the entry year teacher process as her single legal contact with supervisors. Six of the teachers stated that they were evaluated once per year; one teacher averaged twice per year; and one teacher indicated that he had been evaluated only once in his 17 year career. The teachers revealed a "virtual" absence of experiences with formal supervision.

Seven of the teachers had never experienced the process of the pre-observation, observation, and post-observation conference – the baseline of most forms of supervision (Zepeda, 2000). Of the two teachers who had formal supervision experiences, one reported two occurrences in nine years and the other stated that formal supervision had "happened only one time" in her career. Informal supervision (usually short conversations or interaction) experiences, those experiences not legal or formal, were the most frequent for the itinerant teachers. Many of the teachers reported some informal contact with administrators and district coordinators, but informal exchanges with colleagues and instances of peer supervision (sometimes involving out of district contact) greatly outnumbered the others (see Table 7).

One fact of life for itinerant teachers was teaching at different sites, and in all but one case, different grade levels. The teachers, and most of the supervisors, believed it was important to observe itinerants at different sites and across different grade levels. However, the data revealed that none of the teachers was supervised by administrators at each of his or her sites, and in fact, only one was supervised at more than one site. There were no itinerant teachers who were supervised at each of the grade levels that they taught through any type of supervision. In spite of the importance given to supervisory relationships by the teachers and the administrators, none of the itinerant teachers was supervised across sites in one year. In all cases where supervision and evaluation events occurred, only building-level administrators performed

evaluations, while district coordinators delivered what little formal supervision was experienced.

Perceived Satisfaction with Supervision Processes

Both the supervisors and the itinerant teachers expressed satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the process of supervision. The types (e.g., informal, formal), frequency of supervision, competency of the supervisors, and the delivery of supervision were topics that emerged from the data. When the teachers in this study spoke about and described their experiences with supervision and evaluation they often used the words supervision and evaluation interchangeably. Therefore, great care was undertaken to provide definitions for supervision and evaluation and other terms used to explain the phenomenon of one person working with another person, albeit a principal, an assistant principal, district coordinator, or central office administrator (see Tables 8 and 9).

The participants agreed that informal supervision was the most "honest" and "helpful." The teachers reported that they were more comfortable with informal supervision, because informal supervision was more "realistic" and that it was much more "appropriate" to both itinerant and special programs teachers. The teachers reported more satisfaction with informal supervision because it provided them with opportunities to exchange ideas and information. Nick stated, "Informal supervision is the best . . . you feel comfortable in that situation, you feel like you got an honest response instead of someone trying to put ideas into your head." Likewise, the administrators reported being more satisfied with the informal aspects of supervision, and all of the administrators indicated that they

believed that they were more effective while informally supervising the itinerant. Gary (middle school principal) indicated, "I am much more effective on the informal level. I like going in and just sitting down and then talking. I like the informal."

Peer supervision was viewed by the teachers as a powerful tool. Their understanding of peer supervision was the same as defined by Anderson and Snyder (1993), to include the elements of peer-level supervisory interaction, and teachers observing and reacting to each others' work. Rita indicated that she had "learned the most" from watching her peers. Linda attributed her best supervisory experiences to watching and working with her mentor teacher. Martin shared that he was indebted to the more experienced teachers at one of his schools who had made him a part of their "teacher network" where he could "watch, discuss, and learn to be a better teacher." Kevin, Louise, Brett, Nick, and Sam all mentioned spending time outside of school and even outside of their own districts to receive peer supervision. Informal supervision and peer supervision were also thought to be effective because supervisory events could take place within the time constraints binding the itinerant teachers to their deployment at multiple sites. Informal supervision, for these teachers, consisted of short episodes (sometimes with a richness and density requiring reflection) which could be delivered and received in the small amounts of time they often spent at their sites, and continued on subsequent contacts.

Another factor which created a satisfactory supervisory environment for the teachers was an exchange with competent personnel, be they supervisors or

peers in the same content discipline. In the few instances where supervisors had a background in the same content area as the itinerant teachers, the teachers expressed satisfaction with their supervision regardless of the type. Administrators were also dissatisfied with systems that did not allow the most competent supervisors (those within the same content area, regardless of their administrative position) to interact with the itinerant teachers. Sandy (district coordinator) expanded this with the following:

> A couple of schools won't even call me in on an interview, and yet I am supposed to be the expert in the district. I had one principal who would not even take my recommendation. It is frustrating for all coordinators. We are not allowed to evaluate our (itinerant) teachers, even though we are the most in touch with their subjects and their traveling problems.

Dissatisfaction with supervision centered largely on legal evaluation. The itinerants saw the legal evaluation "tool" as too general, inauthentic, and geared only toward the regular classroom teacher. Speaking of her district's evaluation "tool," Louise made the point that:

> It hits a lot of areas and allows for a fair amount of breadth in what is observed. It just doesn't seem like you can do all that in such a short (for her, 15 to 20 minute observations) period of time.

The teachers spoke of their evaluation experiences as being "rushed" or "hurried" in some cases, and all of them believed that there was an element of "staging" to the evaluations and formal supervision that negated their value. Nick referred to

these formal events as putting on a "dog and pony show." Brett was more up to date when he likened his evaluation event to the movie "The Truman Show" (the main character's entire life, along with those around him, was staged). Rita spoke of teachers bribing students, sending students with behavior problems to the library, and preparing a "great lesson" for "legal observations." But she also expressed what the other teachers believed, ". . . that evaluation is not true supervision. I feel it is somewhat like standardized testing, it doesn't show what a person can really do."

Most of the teachers found evaluation to be limited with little meaning. They described it as "intrusive," and "threatening," and four of the teachers stated that evaluations "had no relation to their job," and furthermore had "not helped them to improve their instruction." Frank, thinking back to his days as a band director, admitted that most site administrators today were often like the ones he had, "clueless" as to what could really help him (an itinerant) be a better teacher.

The constant "shuffling" of administrators who evaluated and supervised the itinerants created dissatisfaction, and many of the teachers believed that because they were not "permanent fixtures" at their sites that some administrators "did not think we even needed to be supervised." The administrators did express some frustration over this dilemma as well, but none of them offered that system procedures should be changed to accommodate the itinerant teachers. Charles, a central office administrator, with reference to consistency in teachers, revealed a frustration for the supervisors, "Some people don't respond to supervision whether you are knowledgeable or consistent."

The Perceived Importance of Supervision

Supervision was seen by the teachers and the administrators as a vital component in the development and improvement of instruction. The importance of supervision to the success of itinerant teachers was seen by many to be diluted by limited exposure to supervision due to scheduling and travel time. The technical side of supervision was delineated by Sam, a music teacher, who stated that, " . . . structure, goals, implementation of curriculum, and skill development" were important functions of supervision; and that "itinerant teachers often lagged behind others in receiving [this type of] supervision."

Informal supervision (non-planned and usually limited contact) was deemed the most important type of supervision by the teachers. Linda believed that "developing a bond" was important. Louise pointed out that informal supervision centered on "essential verbal feedback" rather than the "checklist supervision" she experienced through evaluations. Nick thought the most important aspect of any supervision, although the informal was superior, was to, ". . . make me think, to let ideas percolate, and to allow me the opportunity to reflect on my teaching."

The word most often mentioned by the teachers to describe the value of supervision was growth. Data from every teacher indicated in some form that they valued supervision because of its potential to help them grow personally and professionally. Brett thought that supervision helped him to avoid being "stuck in a rut" and he welcomed the "challenging new ideas" that others could share with him. Susan expressed that ". . . peer supervision has definitely enhanced my

career. I wouldn't have gotten better without it." Kevin spoke particularly to informal supervision when he stated, "Supervision is very important. It has made me a 100% better teacher every year."

Not all of the responses on the importance of supervision were positive. Formal supervision was seen as only marginally important to these teachers. Evaluation was not even recognized by most of the teachers as true supervision, and was thought to be important only in the legal sense of "getting rid of teachers" and "keeping your job." Many of the teachers also related experiences that convinced them that administrators sometimes did not believe in the value of supervision. The teachers commented that some administrators were "nonchalant," "didn't want to bother with it," "didn't have time," and in general, treated supervision as an "imposition."

The administrators extolled the virtues of supervision, and agreed with the teachers that supervision was essential, although often difficult. Each of the supervisors had a particular "slant" or "agenda" when it came to supervising itinerant teachers. Gary, a middle school principal, viewed supervising as "coaching," and that "one of the main goals in supervising those (itinerant) teachers is to bring them on to the teaching team." Frank, a former itinerant teacher and current principal, believed that supervision of itinerants was "especially important because you don't have as many opportunities, you don't get to see them that much." Sandy, a gifted education district coordinator, thought that her itinerant teachers "needed someone knowledgeable that they can relate to." Charles, a former principal and current central office

administrator, had the most general response when describing the importance of supervision as, "Helping them to be more successful than maybe they could have been if you hadn't intervened. To grow along with them as they grow. Supervision is critically important to the success of the school and the teacher."

On the subject of evaluation, there was a chasm between the perceptions of the teachers and the administrators. Three of the four administrators considered the evaluation document as a viable and important form of supervision (only Charles dissented). There was also no hint from these administrators of the "nonchalant" attitude toward supervision that the teachers reported. All of the participants in this study purported to believe in the value of supervision.

Desired Improvements for More Effective Supervision

The two major elements that itinerant teachers believed would improve their instructional practices and effectiveness were supervisor understanding of the complexities of the itinerant experience and supervisors who were knowledgeable about the content area taught by itinerant teachers. All of the teachers agreed that if supervisors would, as Kevin put it, ". . . learn more about what we do and how we do it," communication would be improved and isolation, supervisor confusion, negative feelings about itinerants, and daily stress could be greatly reduced. Time after time the desire to have a content area specialist supervise the teachers emerged from the teacher data. While all of the teachers agreed that regular administrators could supervise them on basic classroom

skills, they pleaded for "expert" help. Susan represented all of the itinerants on this subject when she commented that:

> You could be a good regular classroom teacher and a bad music teacher. Just because you know the right way to question or how to achieve closure in a lesson doesn't mean you are teaching them to play well. That's where a supervisor in the same field would know whether you were both a good classroom teacher and teaching the subject matter appropriately.

Receiving supervision from qualified content area supervisors was the overwhelming factor that the itinerant teachers desired for improving their instructional practices.

The teachers all reported that more informal supervision could increase their effectiveness. This informal supervision could come from supervisors, but they preferred peer supervision from colleagues in like disciplines. Charles, a former district coordinator and current central office administrator, agreed with the teachers that informal supervision, "was the most powerful kind of supervision for creating change and improvement." The itinerants also believed that more contact was needed with "mentor teachers," "master teachers," "veteran teachers," and credible and experienced supervisors. Kevin, a veteran music teacher, even admitted that the formal supervision process, ". . . could be beneficial with a competent supervisor."

The teachers and supervisors recognized that supervisors needed adequate time in order to be more effective. The itinerant teachers desired more

frequent supervision by their administrators. Brett pointed out that frequency of supervision was connected to improvement:

> If it [supervision] happened on a more regular basis it would be more meaningful. It would make me better. If you wanted to modify somebody's teaching style it would have to be done on a more regular basis.

Another request from the teachers was for administrators and/or coordinators to take the time to educate site teachers and staff on the conditions under which the itinerant teachers worked. As Martin stated, "When they understand what you are dealing with it is easier to do your job," and, therefore, "be a more effective teacher."

The supervisors had both general and specific prescriptions for improving the supervision of itinerant teachers. They all agreed that a better understanding of itinerancy would help them to make adjustments needed for more effective supervision for the traveling teachers. Two of the administrators stated that all supervisors should attempt to learn as much as possible about the content area of those they supervised in order to increase administrator credibility. Opening lines of "consistent communication" was also cited by the administrators as important for good supervision to occur.

A supervision strategy suggested by Gary, a middle school principal, would be to, "encourage more peer supervision for the itinerants." Frank, a middle school principal, believed that itinerant teachers "must be supervised at each of their sites," and for the supervision to be meaningful "they have to be

observed by the same supervisor." In addition to this, Frank suggested that, "Administrators should delegate whenever possible to those who better understand the subject area of the teacher." The administrators were not as enthusiastic about content area specialists supervising itinerant teachers, but Sandy, a district coordinator, captured the reality of the situation when she stated, "Most administrators don't have the foggiest idea what my teachers are teaching. They (the teachers) need someone who knows their subject matter."

Another administrative concern that was aired by all of the supervisors was the negativity associated with being both evaluator and supervisor. They believed that this dichotomy adversely affected the relationship with their itinerant teachers, particularly because they could spend less time with them to develop trust and credibility. In all of the districts in this study, site administrators were the only supervisors allowed to evaluate teachers. The teachers understood that evaluation did relate to their employment, but they were also somewhat confused as to whether the evaluation process constituted supervision. There was reported difficulty for the teachers in separating the supervisor/evaluator roles for site administrators, but the role of coordinator was almost always viewed as primarily, if not only, supervisory in nature. Sandy (a district coordinator) opined that itinerant teachers "trust their coordinators much more than their building principals," and she directly attributed this to the fact that, ". . . we (coordinators) aren't able to evaluate, and therefore we don't pose a threat to the teachers. So naturally they are more comfortable with us." Charles' (formerly a building principal and now a central office administrator) comments summarized the

importance of the administrators' need to improve supervision for itinerant teachers:

> We, as supervisors, have to understand our itinerant teachers, we have to make allowances and we have to accommodate them in every way possible. Maybe our greatest challenge in supervising them is to realize that they are different than classroom teachers, and because of that we must put in extra effort to ensure that they are successful. They see so many students across our district, have so much influence . . . we must do everything in our power to guide them and help them grow.

Although the itinerant teachers and supervisors indicated a level of dissatisfaction with the state of itinerant teacher supervision, all parties agreed that supervision was important to the development of the teachers. Both the teachers and the administrators considered supervision important enough to offer suggestions for improving the process of supervising itinerants. Put simply, they wanted better understanding, and ultimately, better teaching. The next chapter will present a discussion of the findings.

CHAPTER FIVE

Interpretation of Findings, Implications, and Recommendations

This study sought to examine the supervision of itinerant teachers. The perceptions of itinerant teachers and those who supervise them were solicited to describe the conditions surrounding itinerant teaching, and to delineate supervisory issues related to the itinerant teachers and their supervisors. Resulting data were examined and analyzed to ascertain specific conditions and issues relating to the supervision of itinerant teachers.

A review of the study, including an overview of the research questions, procedures employed, and the demographics of the participants are presented in this chapter. Following these areas, the major findings from the study are discussed and implications and recommendations are offered for school systems that employ itinerant teachers, colleges and universities that prepare teachers and administrators, and for those interested in conducting further research on the supervision of itinerant teachers.

Review of the Study

A qualitative research design and methods, with a phenomenological orientation, were used to collect and analyze data relating to the supervision of itinerant teachers. Questions used to direct this study sought to uncover specific data regarding supervision and supervisory events for itinerant teachers and their supervisors, and the perceptions of the experiences of supervision for itinerant

teachers and the perceptions of the supervisors about their involvement with supervising itinerant teachers.

Procedures

Through the process of purposeful sampling, nine itinerant teachers and four supervisors of itinerant teachers were chosen to participate in this study. Permission was obtained from the relevant school districts and signed consent forms were received from the participants. Data collection was then initiated in the form of personal interviews with each subject. Interviews were undertaken in the fall of 2000, and consisted of 45 minute to 74 minute exchanges. Interview guides for itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers (see Appendices C and D, respectively) were utilized for the interviews.

Each interview was audio-taped and transcribed, and field notes were made. Data were read to determine meaning units and coding began. When subsequent data were added, additional reading and coding was undertaken until no new information was revealed. Analysis of the data was initiated seeking both meaning units and overall themes relating to the conditions and supervision of itinerant teachers.

Demographics

The teacher participants for this study represented five subject areas, all of which were considered as "special programs" areas. All of the teachers except for one had spent at least half of their teaching careers as itinerant teachers, and five participants had spent 75% or more of their careers as full-time itinerant teachers. The itinerant teachers traveled to at least three sites. Six

of the itinerant teachers taught at the high school and middle school levels. One of the teachers traveled between elementary and middle schools, and one teacher included all three grade levels in his assignment. Each of the teachers had four or more supervisors, whose titles included principal, assistant principal, department head, and district coordinator.

The four supervisors of itinerant teachers in this study had a wide range of experience as administrators as well as a combined 47 years of experience in supervising itinerant teachers. All but one of the supervisors had been an assistant principal and a principal, in addition, one administrator had also been a district coordinator and served in the central office. One supervisor participant had experience as a district coordinator only. Two of the supervisors had been itinerant teachers before becoming administrators, and the other two supervisors did not have itinerant teaching experience.

Interpretation of Findings

Perhaps ironically, several of the traveling teachers related short stories or events that centered around shoes. One such story involved a first-year itinerant teacher who had to walk in all kinds of weather conditions, but was required to wear her "best Sunday shoes" in the schools. Before entering each of the buildings in which she taught, she had to quickly change from her traveling shoes to her teaching shoes. Another teacher's car broke down on the way to teach a class where he was being evaluated. He changed into coveralls and old tennis shoes to fix the car, but he forgot, and left the old shoes on during the class. This fact was noted on his evaluation. And then there was the case of the

teacher who wore out her shoes driving her standard transmission car from school to school. To solve this, she wore a pair of driving shoes and then hurriedly changed into her school shoes when she arrived at the building. On one embarrassing occasion, she became distracted, and only changed into one of her school shoes before entering the school.

The conditions of the itinerant teacher are perhaps closely tied to their shoes, for travel is the key identifier of itinerancy. Like the first year teacher's shoes, itinerants are required to change their orientation regarding curriculum, grade levels, and school cultures with each assignment. Frequently, as in the case of the teacher whose shoes were noted in his formal evaluation summary, the hazards of itinerancy can have a deleterious effect on relations with administrators. And finally, itinerant teachers suffer from a constant state of flux, having one foot in the car and one foot in the classroom.

Supervision for these teachers might also be likened to shoes. Putting on your best pair of shoes, the ones you rarely wear, because the administrator is coming for an evaluation – can rub you raw. The chafing and blisters that can result from this do not create a desire for more of the same. What is needed for the itinerant teacher to be and feel successful is a comfortable pair of shoes, not so big that movement is difficult, but with enough room for growth. In any case, supervision that does not fit, puts the focus on the process of supervision itself, and therefore takes the focus away from the improvement of the act of teaching.

One of the administrators in this study also mentioned shoes. He stated that to help him empathize with itinerant teachers he tried to "put himself in their

shoes." He would have covered many miles had he literally accomplished that feat. The idea of having empathy for the itinerant teacher; however, pointed to one of the central findings in this study.

The single most important concept that could be gleaned from the data could perhaps be reduced to one word – understanding. The itinerant teachers demonstrated a depth of understanding of the conditions in which they worked; however, they reported that they needed understanding on the part of administrators and districts to bridge the gulf between the complexities of their status and effective supervision. The teachers apparently lacked an understanding of what supervision they did receive, based on the fact that the language used to describe supervision was sometimes particularistic and at other times, "all over the road." And finally, the itinerant teachers yearned for supervisors and supervision that could promote growth and development in their specific content areas.

Discussion and interpretation of the findings of this study are presented in this chapter under four broad headings: (a) the conditions of itinerant teaching, (b) the effects of itinerant teaching on the supervision process, (c) confusion surrounding the supervision process with respect to the lexicon used to describe supervision and evaluation, and (d) the type of supervision and supervisor desired by the itinerant teachers.

The Conditions of Itinerant Teaching

The data pertaining to the conditions of the itinerant teacher from this study both supported and extended previous research (Bina, 1987; French,

Lavay, & Montlione, 1986; Hass, 1986; Luckner & Miller, 1993; Swenson, 1995; Yarger & Luckner, 1999). The teachers in this study were well aware of the complexities and difficulties of their itinerant status and many of the ramifications resulting from that status, with respect to dealing with teachers, schools, students, staffs, and administrators. Problems, as outlined by prior researchers (Olmstead, 1995; Webster, 1989), were also experienced by the teachers in this study (e.g., travel, scheduling, communication, multiple supervisors). The supervisors of itinerant teachers in this study indicated that they understood the conditions surrounding the itinerant teacher, but data gathered from the itinerants suggested just the opposite. These opposing perceptions served to set the stage for missed supervision opportunities, misunderstandings, and a general mishandling, in many cases, of the supervision of itinerant teachers.

The Effects of Itinerant Teaching on the Supervision Process

Perhaps the most substantial finding related to the effects of itinerancy on the supervision process was the isolation experienced by the teachers in this study. Yarger and Luckner (1999) noted in their study that isolation among itinerant teachers led to frustration with their environment. The teachers in this study did indicate some frustration, but more significantly, isolation and its related causes and effects had a negative effect on the amount and quality of supervision itinerant teachers received. Due to the fact that the itinerant workforce is distributed over several schools, the feeling of "homelessness" experienced by itinerant teachers was very intense. Because they do not have a "home," administrators often do not consider itinerant teachers "theirs." For the

teachers in this study, they believed they were "forgotten," "neglected," and "abandoned" by the people who "legally" were responsible for providing supervision.

The data from the administrators in this study suggested that they did consider the itinerant teachers as a part of their schools and as such, they were evaluated and/or supervised. Clearly, the itinerant teachers believed their situation to be different. The teachers in this study desired supervision to such an extent that many of them related instances of asking, almost pleading with, administrators to come to their rooms. The conclusion that many of the itinerant teachers formed was that the administrators did not have the time for them (though several teachers noticed that they had time for the regular classroom teachers), or that they just did not care about the teacher or their program. Having supervisory or evaluative attention given to only (on average) at one grade level from only one third of the schools in which they taught, one time per year (see, for example Table 7), did not send the message that the administrators valued the teachers or their programs.

Isolation not only affected the teachers in terms of administrative supervision, but this isolation made it difficult to talk with and develop relationships with other faculty and school personnel. Although the number of events reported by the itinerants of colleague supervision was far greater than that of administrative initiated supervision, the itinerant teachers still indicated supervision fell short of what they wanted and needed. Added to this is the fact that because of their special programs status, many itinerant teachers are often

content area singletons in each and every building in which they teach. Frequently, there is no one in the building (sometimes even the district) with whom to discuss their craft, talk over a journal article, or debrief with after an energizing convention or event. Itinerant teachers are often alone in their jobs, and then must suffer the negative feelings, words, and actions of administrators and fellow teachers who perceive them as being "non-social" and "outsiders."

The isolation and attendant feeling of homelessness created by itinerancy was often magnified through a lack of understanding on the part of other school personnel, and resulted in missed opportunities for supervision. But even when supervision (or evaluation) did occur, the language that was used to describe the events was such that it was often unclear whether the teachers understood the meaning or intent of the processes in which they participated.

Confusion Surrounding the Supervision Process with Respect to the Lexicon Used to Describe Supervision and Evaluation

The importance of communication to the success of the itinerant teacher has been noted in the literature (Davis, 1983; Hass, 1994). Difficulties involving communication with itinerant teachers has also been well documented (French, et al., 1986; Hoover, 1984; Rosenberg, 1973; Zepeda & Langenbach, 1999). Both the teacher and supervisor participants in this study have indicated that "Communication is difficult," and that " . . . communication is the hardest thing" (in dealing with itinerant teachers).

Communication has been recognized in supervision as essential to the successful growth and development of teachers (Goldhammer, 1969; Hunter,

1980; Mosher & Purpel, 1972; Pajak, 1993). Zepeda (1999) noted that the establishment of a common language between a facilitator and a learner is a necessary condition for meaningful interaction in supervisory experiences. Other researchers have also commented on the significance of language in the supervisory exchange (Bowers & Flinders, 1990; Costa & Garmston, 1985; Retallick, 1990). There is agreement among many researchers that a common, understood language between the supervisor and the supervisee is important to the success of supervision.

The teachers in this study reported many terms to describe the supervision they received. A lexicon (words used in a particular profession or subject) of terms used to identify the phenomena of supervision and evaluation emerged from the teacher data in this study. Few of the names that the teachers used to describe supervision and evaluation were listed as synonyms, modifiers, or accepted terminology from reviews of related literature in the field of supervision (Badiali, 1998; Tracy, 1998). The teachers themselves had created a lexicon for their supervision and evaluation. The names that teachers bestowed upon the supervision they received revealed attitudes toward, and confusion over, the supervision they received.

It is interesting to note that of the 38 terms mentioned, seven were used across all three districts and those seven all related to the evaluation process. There appeared to be a greater amount of shared knowledge among the teachers about evaluation than any type of supervision. The fact that most administrative contact with teachers seemed to have occurred through evaluation

(see Table 7) probably accounted for the amount of inter-district agreement on the itinerants' terms for evaluation.

The terms used to talk about evaluation reflected the perceptions that the teachers held about the events. Perhaps a nonchalant or perfunctory administrative treatment of the evaluation process resulted in such terms and phrases as "checklist," "do the paperwork thing," and "token evaluation." These terms related to the perception held by the itinerant teachers that evaluation was unimportant to the administrator and then, in practice, became unimportant to the teachers. Recognition by the teachers that evaluation was sometimes a singular performance was expressed by such terms as "dog and pony show," and "Truman Show." Evaluation was also perceived by the teachers as fulfillment of a legal obligation ("legal evaluation," "legal thing," "negotiated agreement process") or as a formal and fixed event ("formal evaluation," "official evaluation").

Of the terms used to describe informal supervision, the teachers displayed little, if any, negative perceptions. Many of the terms used by the itinerant teachers also carried with them one of the major beliefs that informal supervision was an active exchange of information (e.g., "colleague consultation," "feedback," "idea exchange," and "networking"). The finding is consistent with modern supervisionists (Blase & Blase, 2000; Zepeda, 1999; Zepeda, 2000) who believe that at least, supervision needs to be an active process in which the teacher engages in the act of constructing knowledge. There seemed to be no confusion for the teachers about what constituted informal supervision, but when it came to

describing other types of supervision, the line between supervision and evaluation blurred significantly.

The itinerant teachers indicated through the use of descriptive language a lack of understanding of what constituted supervision, and the differences between supervision and evaluation. Four of the terms used to describe evaluation were also used to describe supervision, and of those four definitions, three were used *within the same district.* Participants used such language as "evaluation," "formal evaluation," "informal evaluation," and "unofficial evaluation" to describe supervision experiences. Moreover, data from the teachers indicated such terms as "formal supervision," "legal supervision," and "supervision" as terms used to talk about the evaluation experience.

The confusion related to evaluation and supervision for the itinerant teachers was significant on several fronts. Without a common, understood language and terminology shared with administrators and supervisors, the teachers appeared not to know which they were receiving, evaluation or supervision. This fact alone may not have been of great consequence, but when coupled with the itinerants' generally negative attitude toward evaluation experiences, it became significant for the successful implementation of supervision. The melding of supervision and evaluation definitions by these teachers created a negative association for instructional supervision. Terms from the teachers such as "forced supervision" and "legal supervision" bore this point out even further.

One of the reasons that all of the participants preferred informal supervision over other types, was that the acts associated with informal supervision were different enough from the itinerants' understanding of and experience with "formal" and "legal" supervision and evaluation. The teachers favored informal acts of supervision as a result of the acts being more "honest," "true," "comfortable," and "meaningful", all qualities that were not found in evaluation or other types of supervision that the itinerant teachers in this study experienced.

The Type of Supervision and Supervisor Desired by the Itinerant Teachers

Another finding from this study was the overwhelming desire on the part of the itinerant teachers to receive content area supervision from supervisors with expertise in the teachers' specific subject areas. The supervision literature supports this finding. Nolan and Francis (1992) called for content-related supervision and indicated that the supervisory process was most effective when content-specific strategies and methods were utilized. Pajak, Adamson, and Rhoades (1998) reported the advantages of having content area specialists at least at the district level that could provide supervision at the site level. Studies have also indicated that content area specialists consider direct service to teachers and face-to-face supervision of primary importance to teacher development. All of the teachers in this study reported experiencing at least some of this kind of supervision, and because of the perceived results, they all wanted more of this type.

While there was recognition that the teaching process and the subject taught were interrelated, the participants largely viewed teaching as a vehicle to deliver content. The itinerants' call for "master teachers," "qualified supervisors," and "experienced experts" in the participants' respective fields was found throughout the data. Meaningful supervision, to these teachers, was equated most frequently with supervision from a supervisor or colleague in the same content area. This finding is consistent with Mosher and Purpel's (1972) assertion that it was not feasible to analyze teaching effectiveness independently of what was being taught.

The fact that these teachers spent the bulk of their contact time at the secondary level (see Table 5) could account for the amount of importance they placed on their content areas. Nonetheless, the teachers also believed that they were often judged (by schools and communities) by their students' understanding and performance level within the content area. Some of the subject areas taught by itinerant teachers contained a depth and complexity with which most administrators could not possibly be familiar. In fact, Oliva (1989) believed the content and methods for most subjects change so rapidly that a general supervisor or administrator could not keep up with the emergence of new concepts and techniques.

All of the teachers in this study indicated they would opt for more supervision, with the qualification that it was delivered by "competent" supervisors. This hunger for growth was demonstrated by the fact that several of the teachers had gone outside of their own districts because there were no

supervisors, administrators, or teachers with the necessary expertise to aid them in their own. These itinerant, special programs teachers needed supervisors who understood that "general" teaching strategies were sometimes necessarily contrary to the strategies employed in their respective disciplines. They wanted an "authentic" and "honest" evaluation and supervision of their teaching and their programs that the itinerant teachers believed only an expert in their content area could provide. The teachers in performance-based special programs (e.g., music) needed supervisors who could meaningfully evaluate the "living portfolios" that they and their students produced both in and out of the formal classroom (e.g., evening concerts). In short, the teachers endured the mis-handling, however well-intentioned, of their supervision and evaluation by their administrators. The teachers relished the assistance they received from like-content area colleagues and supervisors, and they desired more experiences of "meaningful" supervision for the purpose of further growth as an itinerant.

After reviewing the literature, the researcher posed the question, What would supervision look like to be considered differentiated? After examining the data, the following might be added to that question – Could supervision be differentiated in such a way that it could serve the needs of the itinerant teacher? As reported above, itinerant teachers, for the most part, did not receive the type or amount of supervision they desired. While there was no explicit call for a new type of supervision from the participants, implicit in their pleas for "qualified supervisors" and "meaningful supervision" was the desire for change and improvement in the type of supervision they presently received from

administrators both at the site and district levels. The essence of the descriptions of the supervisory experiences of the itinerant teachers, the type of supervisor preferred by the itinerants, and their statements regarding desired improvements in supervision, formed a dense, aggregate response that pointed directly to a different type of supervision to serve the needs of the itinerant teachers.

The teachers stated the need for supervisors who understood both their itinerancy and their special programs status. The teachers and the administrators believed that supervisors with itinerant teaching experience offered more effective supervision than the supervisors without itinerant teaching experience. The special programs itinerant teachers also believed that supervision from those in like-content areas was the most meaningful. The data indicated that the teachers found most "legal evaluation" and "formal supervision" experiences negative in nature. It was not only a case of the administrators and the teachers being at "cross purposes," (Zepeda & Ponticell, 1995) from the teachers' point of view, but also that "legal" or "formal" supervision served "no purpose."

The developmental supervision of Glickman et al. (1998) could provide some assistance to the itinerant teachers. The directive, collaborative, and non-directive approaches to supervision offered by Glickman et al. are all based on the ability to ascertain the conceptual level of the teacher to be supervised (Gordon, 1990). Given the nature of the data gleaned from the itinerants, it would seem that the non-directive approach might be more appropriate for them;

however, this would assume that every itinerant teacher functioned at the highest conceptual level. Even if the itinerants had attained the highest conceptual level, these teachers would still have many unresolved issues pertaining to their itinerant and special programs status that could not be addressed through developmental supervision alone.

Differentiated supervision, as forwarded by Glatthorn (1984) called for more teacher choice in the type of supervision received. Glatthorn believed that the teachers should be able to choose from clinical, cooperative, self-directed, and administrative monitoring types of supervision. The itinerant teachers in this study would agree with Glatthorn's "learning-centered" concept of supervision that targeted student learning as the goal of supervising the teacher. The teachers in this study would also approve of the "cooperative professional development" choice in the differentiated supervisory model. This choice consists, for the most part, of "peer" or "collegial" supervision. The "self-directed development" portion of Glatthorn's model involved goal setting and performance-objective assessment by the teachers themselves. At least three of the teachers in this study directly reported using a similar strategy on their own. In spite of all of the matches between the itinerant teachers and differentiated supervision, the model offered by Glatthorn did not directly apply to many of the problems encountered through supervising the itinerant teacher.

Clinical supervision proved to be, of the three types discussed here, the only type of supervision with which the participants were familiar. All of the teachers desired the face-to-face interaction that the clinical model offered, and

they even found some (although limited) value to the data such supervision produced. However, the experiences that the participants related with respect to the cyclical nature of clinical supervision were largely negative, perhaps mostly due to the fact that it was the model employed by administrators for evaluative purposes.

Phrases such as "forced supervision" and "legal supervision" were used in a negative manner to describe experiences that used some form of the clinical model. The teachers also reported that the process was often "rushed" and "hurried" (probably due to the limited time in the itinerants' schedules for pre-observation and post-observation conferences). The seemingly hasty application of the necessary clinical supervision resulted in a perception that the itinerant teachers were not highly valued. Because of its negative association with evaluation as well as the loss of value for the itinerants, clinical supervision as a total model for supervision would not be effective for these teachers. Even though the clinical model would most likely enjoy only limited success with the teachers, the metaphor offered by Acheson and Gall (1997) could be expanded toward a new type of supervision, from "face-to-face" and "side-by-side" to "in-their-shoes."

It was noted that there is a gap in the supervision literature on how to supervise teachers who are not a part of the mainstream of any given school. The three types of supervision experienced by the itinerant teachers in this study sorely fell short of meeting the unique needs of the itinerants. Ham (1986) indicated in a study that the supervisors who were the most effective were those

who were able to match appropriate supervision and strategies to the specific needs of the teacher. The data in this study indicated that the types and strategies of supervision needed to be tailored to itinerant teachers.

In order for supervision to be effective and meaningful for itinerant teachers, it must not only include accepted supervisory processes (e.g., developmental, differentiated, and clinical), but it must also align with the complexities of the work itinerant teachers do. The concept of putting the supervisor into the shoes of the itinerant is perhaps the beginning of a type of supervision that could be of assistance to itinerant teachers. The data from the itinerants also seemed to ask administrators to "walk a mile in their shoes." Charles (a central office administrator) mentioned the concept of "empathy" when dealing with itinerants. All of these ideas seem to point toward a type of supervisor and supervision that would be in a symbiotic relationship with the itinerant teachers.

A symbiotic supervisor would, in the first place, embody an understanding of the conditions of itinerant teaching and the specific content area of the itinerant teachers. Supervisors would be versed in general supervisory techniques with the added tasks of how to mediate the complexities of itinerancy and apply supervisory strategies in content-specific situations. Their organizational rank would have to be of sufficient height to garner the attention and cooperation of building administrators and teachers. The symbiotic supervisor could help to organize and prioritize workplace and job related conditions of the itinerant teacher. This supervisor could aid in the process of scheduling, securing room

assignments, and obtaining materials and supplies. Maximizing opportunities for supervision experiences and assisting in the adjustments to different school environments and grade levels could also be a function of the supervisor. Stress, for the itinerants, as it related to the conditions of travel, work environment, and aspects of the job, might be reduced.

The supervisor could splice together the often fragmented and patchwork lines of communication that occur for the itinerant at a single site as well as across sites. Such a supervisor should be able to provide a consistent and open line of communication for the itinerants. Also, the improvement and expedition of communication between or among site administrators of itinerant teachers might then be more likely. Communication with all school personnel could be improved and the image and understanding of the itinerant situation could be clarified to reduce negative feelings from administrators and other teachers.

One definite "home" school could be designated for the itinerants where they would receive all of the amenities that the regular classroom teachers have. The symbiotic supervisor could make sure that all personnel at all relevant schools were aware of who the itinerant teachers were, and what their function was at that school and the other schools at which they taught. The supervisor could possibly encourage and arrange for the itinerants to attend events at each of their sites that would optimize the teachers' socialization with the respective schools. The organization and facilitation by the supervisor of a network of like-content area teachers (within or outside the district) for the purpose of an informal exchange of ideas on a regular basis, might also be considered.

Decreasing the feelings of isolation and alienation for the itinerants as well as increasing their recognition by others might result in a greater feeling of ownership and validation.

The symbiotic supervisor might also be the central informational authority for the itinerants. Itinerant teachers would know where to go to find out or get what was needed, or they could be told what the next step should be. Although site administrators could choose to evaluate and to supervise itinerant teachers, the symbiotic supervisor would be the primary supervisory figure. Such a supervisor could observe and relate to the itinerant teachers in every school and at every grade level. Streamlining the multiplicity of supervisors for the itinerant teachers might result in better job efficiency and more meaningful and consistent improvement from the supervision they receive.

Supervision and supervisory practices could be molded to the conditional and content area needs of the itinerant teachers. The elements of "honesty," "trust," and "curricular competence" should be uppermost in the development of the supervisory relationship. A type of supervision could be created that would be comfortable for the itinerants, that would address the situation-specific and content-specific needs of these teachers, and that would also promote their growth and development. "General" supervision might be more accepted and more meaningful to the teachers when applied through the conduit of the content area. Supervision could become a positive, ongoing experience that fostered growth and development for these teachers. Through understanding of the itinerant teachers' situation, and of their wants and needs for supervision, a type

of supervision could be developed that offered just the right fit, and yet would be as comfortable as an old pair of shoes.

Implications and Recommendations

The limitations of this study, including the unique position of the participants and the demographics of the communities and schools in which they practiced, affect the generalizability of the implications and recommendations. Schools and districts with similar populations and similar contexts may find value in some of the implications and recommendations made based on the findings of this study.

Implications for School Systems Employing Itinerant Teachers

The demographic data from the three districts in this study revealed that between 12.5 and 15% of the teaching population was itinerant. It would appear that the number of teachers across the three districts who are itinerant is large enough to warrant attention. Coupled with this estimate was the fact that itinerants taught at three or more sites per day. Conceivably, the itinerant teachers were in contact with a larger number of students than regular teachers, and in the case of some special programs teachers (band, choir, orchestra, physical education), the number is even greater. The large number of students in contact with itinerant teachers indicates that it is important to pay attention to their unique needs.

Pajak (1989) has pointed out the importance of district-level and central office assistance to the field of supervision. One of the administrators in this study worked as a district coordinator out of the central office (Sandy), and

another worked as an assistant superintendent at the central office level (Charles). Both of these administrators believed that they could have a positive influence on the supervision of itinerant teachers. Sandy (a district-level coordinator) had commented that although she believed that she was "more accessible" and had "a little more time to supervise than site administrators," she thought that given more time she could "do even more with the itinerant teachers." If central office administrators believed that itinerants needed a specialist to help supervise them (as Charles seemed to recognize), then perhaps they could relieve the content-area district coordinators of some of their administrative duties in order to free up time for more supervisory contact with itinerant teachers.

It was noted in the data that several of the itinerant teachers had to go outside of their district to engage in informal supervision with teachers in a like content areas and itinerant status. Central office level administrators could develop relationships with administrators in other districts to foster the creation of a network of content area specific itinerant teachers across districts. All of the teachers in the study indicated that they valued exchanges and discussions with similar situated teachers, whether they were in or out of their district. From this finding, it is recommended that a central administrator develop specialized induction and mentoring opportunities that address the needs of the itinerant teachers within the same district.

French et al. (1986) found that the complexities of itinerant teaching had a negative effect on the professional development of the teachers in their study.

District-wide professional development, initiated through the central office, could help to reverse the negative effect on professional development for itinerant teachers. First, a staff development model could be created for all of the itinerant teaching staff in the district. This type of staff development could address the unique problems encountered in itinerant teaching, the specific aspects of their content areas, and allow for discussion and exchange among the teachers. Second, the central office could encourage and even develop a presentation relating to itinerant teachers to be used as a portion of the professional development plans at school sites within the district. Increased understanding of the itinerant teachers would lead to more effective teaching and organization at the schools.

At the school sites where itinerants teach, the building level administrators, staff, and personnel can play an important role in the effectiveness and socialization of the itinerant teachers. The fact that Jeffs' (1986) study found that itinerant teachers were distinctly "child" and "task" oriented, should please most building administrators, but this educational posture, as verified in the data of this study, can quickly become compromised by obstacles the itinerants encounter at the building level. Site administrators of itinerant teachers could take what would probably amount to a little time and effort to make the itinerants feel more at "home." Administrators could make sure that the itinerant was introduced at a faculty meeting and given some opportunity to socialize with school personnel. The principal(s) could coordinate and mediate scheduling differences with other schools, and make certain that office personnel

were aware of the itinerant's schedule. A regular system of communication could be established, with emphasis placed on the itinerants being a part of any "list" for the faculty at the site. Finally, the building administrator could hold an induction session with itinerants who are new to the school to inform them of school rules, procedures, and climate, as well as a general description of the school's mission and goals.

Kevin, a veteran music teacher in this study, stated that supervision had made him a better teacher every year. All of the participants commented on the importance of supervision, and with the realization that itinerants quite possibly influence as many or more students than the regular classroom teacher, it would appear incumbent upon school personnel to offer adequate and meaningful supervision to these teachers. An initiative from the central office level could form a "supervision team" composed of central office personnel, district coordinators, site principals, and itinerant teachers to develop a type of supervision and/or the supervision strategies that would more readily meet the needs of the itinerant teacher. Such a coordinated effort could go a long way toward increasing the effectiveness of itinerant teachers and the understanding about itinerant teaching.

McGreal (1983) addressed the importance of evaluation to teachers and schools that in essence, all supervisory roads lead to evaluation. Although the teachers in this study indicated much dissatisfaction with the evaluation process and the limited expertise of those who evaluated them, they were not negative toward the concept and goals that undergirded evaluation. Three of the

administrators in the study believed that the evaluation process could be supervisory in nature. The administrator who did not agree with this had perhaps based his perception on the fact that evaluation was used in his district only as a recommendation for termination.

Many experts in the field of supervision have pointed out, as did Gary (a middle school principal) in this study, that it is very difficult to develop a trusting supervisory relationship with teachers when you are also their evaluator (Glatthorn, 1984; Glickman, et al., 1998; McGreal, 1983; Sergiovanni & Starratt, 1998; Zepeda, 1999). Recognizing this fact, coupled with the itinerant teachers' call for content area specialists to evaluate them, central office administrators could amend district policy if necessary and establish an out-of-district qualified evaluator for the itinerant special programs teachers. The stigma of "supervisor as evaluator" would be avoided for site administrators, and the content area expertise requested by the itinerants could be met.

Implications for Colleges of Education that Prepare Teachers and Prospective Administrators

Researchers have documented the fact that teachers rarely, if ever, receive training to become itinerants (Brown, 1976; Rozik-Rosen & Atlas, 1994). Findings from these studies addressed the negative effects for itinerant teachers who had not received such training. Teacher education programs at the university level could include a unit of study to prepare teachers for the often complex and confusing worklife of the itinerant teacher. Those teachers who would become itinerants would perhaps directly benefit from such study, and

those who would become "regular classroom" teachers would perhaps attain a level of understanding that could aid both them and the future itinerant teachers with whom they would work.

Prospective administrators could also benefit from a unit or presentation on the itinerant teacher in their course of study at the university level. The administrators should be made aware of the conditions in which the itinerant teacher works, the special programs connection to itinerant teaching, and the resulting unique supervisory needs of the itinerant. Central office, district coordinator, and building level administrators have the greatest amount of influence in school systems and therefore have the best opportunity to effect the changes and strategies needed to aid the itinerants as well as their schools and school district. The university curriculum could be the catalyst for increasing the understanding and effectiveness of the itinerant teacher position.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the paucity of research on the supervision of itinerant teachers, this study provides a base-line of information that can perhaps guide future research in this area. The findings of this study provided no new avenues of research for the condition of the itinerant teachers; however, what was borne out in this study was a need to examine more closely the supervision of itinerant teachers by including a larger sample of participants. It is also recommended that an entire school district, its itinerant teachers, and those who supervise them be examined more in-depth.

One of the limitations of this study was the fact that all three school districts were considered suburban. This study needs to be replicated in urban and rural school systems to determine whether or not the supervision of itinerant teachers is any different than it was for the participants in this study.

Still needed is further research overall that focuses more directly on the differences between the supervision of instruction for itinerant teachers as provided by the site-level administrator and central office personnel (e.g., district coordinator). The findings of this study were unclear as to the type of instructional supervision provided by central office personnel; therefore, a closer look at supervision across central office personnel and itinerant teachers might be worthy of further study.

Further studies on itinerant teachers and those who supervise them should be conducted utilizing different research methods, both qualitative and quantitative. For example, a more in-depth case study examining itinerant teachers and their supervisors at a single site might result in different findings. Perhaps quantitatively, a survey instrument might provide a different type of base-line information regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers.

Concluding Commentary

The purpose of this study was to examine the supervision of itinerant teachers by extending a pilot study conducted by Benson (1999). Although the findings from this study provide a more solid base-line of information on the supervision of itinerant teachers from the perspectives of the itinerant teachers themselves and those who supervise them, much more work in this area needs

to be done. The utilization of itinerant teachers has had a long history in education, and throughout that history, itinerant teachers have provided invaluable services to school systems. Therefore, it behooves us to further explore supervision that will make a difference for the itinerants who provide these unique services to schools.

References

Abrams, M. (1991). Readership survey results. Perspectives in Education and Deafness, 9 (4), 20-21.

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1992). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and in-service applications (3rd. ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1997). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Preservice and inservice applications (4th. ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Aiken, J. A., & Tanner, D. (1998). Supervision in secondary schools. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 621-666). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Alfonso, R., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1981). Instructional supervision: A behavior system. (2nd. ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Anderson, R. H., & Snyder, K. J. (1993). Clinical supervision: Coaching for enhanced performance. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Badiali, B. J. (1998). Teaching of supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 957-967). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Benson, B. N. (1999). Supervision of itinerant teachers. Journal of the Oklahoma Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 10 (1), 55-58.

Bina, M. J. (1987). Rural special education itinerant service delivery: Practical suggestions to overcome job realities and shortcomings. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 7 (4), 20-26.

Blase, J. R., & Blase, J. (2000). Handbook of instructional leadership: How really good principals promote teaching and learning. (2nd. ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bogdan, R. K., & S. K. Biklen (1998). Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolin, F., & Panaritis, P. (1992). Searching for a common purpose: A perspective on the history of supervision. In Carl D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 30-43). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bowers, C. A., & Flinders, D. J. (1990). Responsive teaching: An ecological approach to classroom patterns of language, culture, and thought. New York: Teachers College Press.

Briody, P. (1982). The instrumental music program unit in the South-West Queensland Priority Country Area. Priority Country Area Program Evaluation Series: (Report No. 8). Brisbane, Australia: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 889)

Brown, L. (1976). The itinerant resident. Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons, 61 (11), 20-21.

Calabrese, R., & Zepeda, S. J. (1999). The reflective supervisor: A practical guide for educators. (2nd. ed.). Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.

Charon, J. M. (1979). Symbolic interactionism: An introduction, an interpretation, an integration. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Collins, C. (1972). The itinerant teachers. Young Children, 27 (6), 375-379.

Cook, G. E. (1998). Supervision in academic disciplines. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 493-505). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Costa, A. L., & Garmston, R. J. (1985). Supervision for intelligent teaching. Educational Leadership, 42, 70-80.

Costa, A., & Garmston, R. (1994). Cognitive coaching: A foundation for Renaissance schools Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Danaher, P. A. (1993, June). Lessons from the carnival: The implications for Australian teacher education of a distance education program designed for the children of the Showmen's Guild of Australia. Paper presented at the International Conference on Teacher Education, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Davidson, R. (1981). Survival: The itinerant ESL teacher. TESL Talk, 12 (3), 8-16.

Davis, J. E. (1983). Correspondence courses: A new role in rural secondary education. The Rural Educator, 5 (1), 1-6.

Dawson, G. G. (1986). Causes of stress in teachers of the hearing impaired: A comparison between itinerant teachers and self-contained classroom teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

De La Fleur, F. J. (1961). Shared Services Boards: An analysis of the development of a pioneering educational experiment in suburban and rural areas of New York State East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 038 190).

Elder, R. G. & Bulloughs, B. (1990). Nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists: Are the roles merging? Clinical Nurse Specialist, 4 (2), 78-84.

Elgarten, G. H. (1991). Testing a new supervisory process for improving instruction. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 6 (2), 118-129.

Ellis, J. R., & Matthews G. J. (1982). Professional role performance difficulties of first year itinerant specialists (Report No. 143). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 228 802).

Eyring, M. (1998). How close is close enough?: Reflections on the experience of doing phenomenology. In K. B. deMarrais (Ed.), Inside stories: Qualitative research reflections (pp. 139-150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferguson, D. L., & Ralph, G. R. (1996). The changing roles of special educators: A development waiting for change. Contemporary Education, 68 (1), 49-51.

Fitzpatrick, K., & Charter, W. W. (1986). A study of staff development practices and organizational conditions related to instructional improvement in secondary schools (Final report). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 558)

Florence, C. W. (1938). The federally-aided program of vocational teacher training in Negro schools. Journal of Negro Education, 7 (3), 292-302.

Flynn, R. M. (1991). The drama specialist: Controlled by . . . controlling by . . . . Youth Theatre Journal, 5 (3), 3-10.

Fogarty, M. (1980). The Queensland itinerant teacher service 1901 - 1930. Teachers' Forum (Australia), 3 (3), 10-14.

Fogarty, M. (1983). The itinerant teacher service, Queensland. Queensland, Australia: Historical Monograph. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 082).

Fowler, C. F. (1979a). The primary itinerant teacher service in South-West Queensland: Priority country area program evaluation series (Report No. 1). Canberra, Australia: Australian Schools Commission. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 760).

Fowler, C. F. (1979b). The secondary itinerant teacher service in South-West Queensland: Priority country area program evaluation series (Report No. 2). Canberra, Australia: Australian Schools Commission. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 184 761).

French, R., Lavay, B., & Montelione, T. (1986). Survival strategies: Itinerant special physical educators. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 57 (8), 84-86.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6 (2), 207-227.

Garman, N. B. (1990). Theories embedded in the events of clinical supervision: A hermeneutical approach. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5 (3), (201-213).

Garubo, R. C. & Rothstein, S.W. (1998). Supportive supervision in schools. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Glanz, J. (1998). Action research: An educational leader's guide to school improvement. Norwood, MA: Christopher Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Glaser, R. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Glatthorn, A. A. (1990). Supervisory leadership: Introduction to instructional supervision. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, and Brown.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Glickman, C. D. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (1998). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (4th. ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. (1980). Clinical supervision (2nd. ed.). New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Gordon, S. P. (1990). Developmental supervision: An exploratory study of a promising model. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 5 (4), pp. 293-307.

Gordon, S. P. (1992). Paradigms, transition, and the new supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 8 (1), pp. 62-76.

Ham, M. C. (1986). The impact of collaborative action research in promoting the cognitive development and enhancing the supervisory effectiveness of five school administrators (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 3259A.

Handley, L. (1985). Music a la cart: A rolling music room. Music Educators Journal, 72 (2), 40-41.

Hanlon, H. (1979). Our art gallery. School Arts, 78 (6), 4-6.

Harris, B. (1985). Supervisory behavior in education (3rd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hass, J. (1994). Role determinants of teachers of the visually impaired. British Columbia Journal of Special Education, 18 (2), 140-148.

Higgins, A. H. (1980). An historical and geographical perspective on providing education to children in isolated places: North Queensland, 1919 - 1939. Paper presented to the Annual Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society Conference (10th), Newcastle, South Wales, Australia.

Higgins, A. H. (1981). Distance education and pupils: From horseback to satellite. Paper presented to the Annual Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society Conference (11th), Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

Hockley, F. (1983, July). Coping with curriculum. Paper presented to the National Workshop on Distance Education (2nd), Perth, Western Australia.

Holifield, M., & Cline, D. (1997). Clinical supervision and its outcomes: Teachers and principals report. NASSP Bulletin, 8 (1), 109-113.

Holland, P. E., Clift, R., Veal, M. L., Johnson, M., & McCarthy, J. (1992). Linking preservice and inservice supervision through professional inquiry. In C. D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (pp. 169-182). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1994). Phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and interpretive practice. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 262-272).

Hoover, J. J. (1984). Behavioral intervention program for remediating mild emotional/behavioral problems in rural county elementary schools. Education, 104 (3), 287-290.

Hunter, M. (1980). Six types of supervisory conferences. Educational Leadership, 37, 408-412.

Isely, R. B., & Sanwogou, L. L. (1983). The itinerant health worker: An experiment in rural health care delivery. African Journal of Medicine and Medical Sciences, 12 (1), 47-55.

Jeffs, A. (1986). Motivation as a consideration in organizational change and staff development within a peripatetic support group. Journal of the British Educational Management and Administration Society, 14 (1) 39-48.

Johnson, V. L. (1952). A study of the music program in relation to the itinerant music teacher program in five elementary schools for Negroes in Houston, Texas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas Southern University, Houston.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40 (1), 4-10.

Kitt, J. (1983). School of the air by satellite: A study of the improvement of distance education in North-West Queensland using the Australian satellite system (Report No. 142). Brisbane, Australia: Queensland Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 247 883).

Knupfer, A. M. (1999). The arm of the school that extends into the homes: The visiting teacher movement, 1906 - 1940. Teachers College Record, 100 (3), 627-655.

Krome, R. L. (1986). The itinerant emergency physician. Annals of Emergency Medicine, 15 (11), 1366-1367.

Langenbach, M., Vaughn, C., & Aagaard, L. (1994). An introduction to educational research. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Luckner, J. L., & Miller, K. J. (1994). Itinerant teachers: Responsibilities, perceptions, preparation, and students served. American Annals of the Deaf, 139 (2), 111-118.

Luckner, J. L., & Miller, K. (1993). On the road: Meeting the challenge of itinerant teaching. Perspectives in Education and Deafness, 11 (4), 16-18.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McBurney, C., & O'Reilly, R. R. (1985). Availability and acceptability as factors in the delivery of rural resource teacher service. Research in Rural Education, 3 (2), 89-96.

McFadden, G. (1990, April). Physically disabled students: The challenge to community schools. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (68th), Toronto, Canada.

McGreal, T. (1983). Effective teacher evaluation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McKay, J.A. (1992). Professional development through action research. Journal of Staff Development, 13 (1), 18-21.

McKenzie, H. S., Egner, A. N., Knight, M. F., Perelman, P. F., Schneider, B. M., & Garvin, J. S. (1970). Training consulting teachers to assist elementary teachers in the management and education of handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 37 (2), 137-143.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education . San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd. ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Miller, L. (1995). Goin' mobile. Private Schools, 6 (8), 16-17.

Millman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.). (1990). The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary teachers. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Monk, D. H. (1988). Disparities in curricular offerings: Issues and policy alternatives for small rural schools (Office of Educational Research and Improvement No. 400-86-0001). Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.

Morse, J. M. (1998). Designing funded qualitative research. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 220-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mosher, R. L., & Purpel, D. E. (1972). Supervision: The reluctant profession. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Mullen, E. A. (1990). Decreased Braille literacy: A symptom of a system in need of reassessment. RE:view: Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, 22 (3), 164-169.

Neville, R. F., & Garman, N. B. (1998). The philosophical perspective on supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 200-241). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Nolan, J. F. (1997). Can a supervisor be a coach? No. In J. Glanz & R. F. Neville (Eds.), Educational supervision: Perspectives, issues, and controversies (pp. 100-108). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Nolan, J., & Francis, P. (1992). Changing perspectives in curriculum and instruction. In C. D. Glickman (Ed.), Supervision in transition: 1992 Yearbook of the association for supervision and curriculum development (pp. 44-60). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Norman, C. D., & Balyeat, R. R. (1974, May). A model for diffusing exemplary teaching practices in a disadvantaged rural region. Paper presented to the International Reading Association (19th), New Orleans, LA.

Noseworthy, R. P. (1997). The school car: Bringing the three r's to Newfoundland's remote railway settlements (1936 - 1942) Whitborne, Newfoundland, Canada: R.P.N. Publishing.

Oklahoma Secondary Schools Activities Association (2000). Administrators Handbook [Handbook]. Oklahoma City, OK: Oklahoma State Department of Education.

Oliva, P. (1993). Supervision for today's schools (4th. ed.). New York: Longman.

Olmstead, J. E. (1995). Itinerant personnel: A survey of caseloads and working conditions. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 89 (6), 546-548.

Olson, M. R. (1978). O & M instruction for blind children in rural areas: Whose responsibility? Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 72 (1), 21-24.

Pajak, E. (1989). The central office supervisor of curriculum and supervision: Setting the stage for success. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Pajak, E. F. (1993). Approaches to clinical supervision: Alternatives for improving instruction. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.

Pajak, E. F., Adamson, P. G., & Rhoades, J. M. (1998). Supervision in district central offices. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 667-687). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pollitt, P. A. (1994). Goldie Allen: Appalachian itinerant Red Cross nurse. American Association for the History of Nursing Bulletin, 2 (43), 3-6.

Ratner, S. C. (1961). The role of psychology in the traveling science teacher program for high schools. The American Psychologist, 16 (3), 702-704.

Retallick, J. A. (1990). Clinical supervision and the structure of communication. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April 1990.

Rex, E. J. (1995). The resource room itinerant model. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 89 (2), 105-106.

Ringo, M. L. (1986). How can you cooperate with the home instruction teacher? Momentum, 17 (2), 40-41.

Roberts, A. (1975). Establishing realistic case loads for rehabilitation teachers. The New Outlook for the Blind, 69 (2), 62-63, 85,87.

Rogow, S. (1978). Mainstreaming: It can work for blind children. Education Canada, 18 (2), 18-21, 48.

Rosenberg, H. (1973). Theatre education: The Belgrade team. Elementary School Journal, 74 (2), 84-87.

Rozik-Rosen, A., & Atlas, S. (1994). Special needs–special answers: The story of 'TLALIM' at the service of sick children. Educational Media International, 31 (1), 36-41.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sallop, M. B., & Butler, J. W. (1977, June). Itinerant teachers of the hearing impaired: What do they really do?. Paper presented at the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, Los Angeles, CA.

Schmidt, T., & Stipe, M. (1991). A clouded map for itinerant teachers: More questions than answers. Perspectives in Education and Deafness, 9 (4), 6-7, 24.

Seidman, I. E. (1998). Interviewing as qualitative research (2nd. ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (1998). Supervision: A redefinition (6th. ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Shoemaker, J. R. (1970). A classroom on wheels for the circuit-riding teacher. Music Educators Journal, 56 (7), 57-58.

Smith, J. (1998). The traveling teacher. Clavier, 37 (10), 43.

Spicer, M. R. (1975). Traveling teacher. The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 6 (6), 17-21.

Stainback, S. B., & Stainback, W. C. (1988). Understanding and conducting qualitative research. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Stovall, B. J., & Tongue, C. (1970). The itinerant resource teacher: A manual for programs with gifted children. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 053 506).

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Swenson, A. M. (1995). Itinerant teaching: An insider's view. RE:view: Association for Education and Rehabilitation of the Blind and Visually Impaired, 27 (3), 113-116.

Toepfer, C.F. (1998). Supervision in middle level schools. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 601-620). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Tracy, S. J. (1998). Models and approaches. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 80-108). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Trusdell, M. L. (1985). An analysis of service delivery models for learning disability programs in the U.S.: 1984-1985 school year. Annals of Dyslexia: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the Orton Dyslexia Society, 35 (3), 175-186.

Valverde, L.A. (1998). Organizational forces and schooling. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 1156-1172). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Waite, D. (1998). Anthropology, sociology, and supervision. In G. R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (Eds.), Handbook of research on school supervision (pp. 287-309). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Weber, R. C. (1987). Survival as a rural cooperative itinerant adapted physical educator. Early Winter, 44 (4), 406-410.

Webster, W. E. (1989). The new principal: Learning about your school and community (Report No. 1). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Wilde, W. D., & Sillito, M. T. (1986). Evaluation report of the provisions for gifted and talented in Calgary board of education (Report No. 142). Alberta, Canada: Alberta Department of Education, Edmonton.

Wolcott, H. F. (1990). Writing up qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Workinger, W. (1994). The role of the music supervisor. Teaching Music, 2 (1), 38-39.

Wyer, D., Thompson, I. K., & Danaher, P. A. (1993, June/July). Here today, gone next week: Some lessons for the delivery of itinerant primary schooling of a distance education program designed for children of the Showmen's Guild of Australia. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Distance Education Conference, Cairns, Queensland, Australia.

Yarger, C. C., & Luckner, J. L. (1999). Itinerant teaching: The inside story. American Annals of the Deaf, 144 (4), 309-314.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research: Design and methods (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Young, P. S., Dickerson, L. R., & Jacobson, W. H. (1980). A study of the job responsibilities of the field rehabilitation teacher. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 74 (10), 386-389.

Zepeda, S. J. (1999). Staff development: Practices that promote leadership in learning communities. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. J. (2000). Supervisory practices: Building a constructivist learning community for adults. In J. Glanz and L. Horenstein (Eds.). Paradigm debates in curriculum and supervision: Modern and postmodern perspectives (pp. 93-107). New York: Greenwood.

Zepeda, S. J., & Langenbach, M. (1999). Special programs in regular schools: Historical foundations, standards, and contemporary issues. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Zepeda, S. J., & Mayers, R. S. (2000). Supervision and staff development in the block. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticell, J. A. (1995). The supervisory continuum: A developmental approach. NASSP Practitioner, 22 (1), 1-4.

Zepeda, S. J., & Ponticell, J. A. (1998). At cross-purposes: What do teachers need, want, and get from supervision? Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14 (1), 68-87.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Research Study Request Form
Oklahoma School Districts

I hereby request permission to conduct a research study in the Richmond Public School District during the period September, 2000 to December, 2000.

My topic of study is "Supervision of Itinerant Teachers: Perspectives from Itinerant Teachers and Those Who Supervise Them."

If this request is granted, I agree to abide by the Board of Education Policy and administrative procedures.

_____

Signature of Researcher

Daytime Phone Number_____

University of Oklahoma Graduate College

Institution of Higher Education

_____

Signature of Sponsoring Faculty Member
(If required)

Approval:

This request was Approved ____ Disapproved ____ _____
(Date)

_____

Signature of District Administrator

APPENDIX B

PURPOSE OF STUDY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH: INFORMATION FOR THE INTERVIEWEE

Purpose of the Study

Previous research on the supervision of itinerant teachers has emerged largely as a by-product of studies targeted at some other aspect of the itinerant teaching experience. While there is research and data available on the itinerant teacher, there is a limited knowledge base regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers. The literature has revealed nothing about guidelines or suggested strategies or methods for the supervisor of itinerant teachers. It is the purpose of this study to contribute to the knowledge base on the supervision of itinerant teachers with a corollary contribution regarding the supervisors of itinerant teachers.

Significance of the Research

Research into the supervision of itinerant teachers can increase the knowledge base in this area that has received only limited study. It is desired that an increased awareness of the problems of the itinerant teacher (with specific reference to supervision), as well as the conditions and viewpoints of the supervisors of itinerant teachers, will result in a deeper understanding in both areas of concern. Through the responses of the participants, insights into various problems surrounding itinerant supervision should be brought to light, including feelings, wants, and needs for better supervision.

The findings from this study could be used by similar districts to better understand the supervisory needs of itinerant teachers. Itinerant teachers themselves may gain knowledge from the study, and possibly of equal importance, the realization that they are not isolated with no recourse for change. Supervisors of itinerant teachers could develop a more empathetic view of their itinerant teachers, and gain insight into more effective supervisory practices. Finally, the deep insights revealed by the participants into the entirety of the itinerant teacher experience could lead other researchers to further study.

- You must sign the Informed Consent Form that explains the research project and your rights as a participant. You may keep a copy of the form for your records.

- During the reporting of the findings of this study, neither your name, nor the name of your school or district will be used. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained at all times, and all data resulting from the study will be secured in a locked cabinet and revealed only to the sponsoring university faculty member.

- To obtain an accurate transcript of our interview, and to assure the accuracy of the data, our conversation will be taped. Again, this tape and the resulting transcript will be stored securely and confidentiality will be maintained.

  Thank you for your participation in this study.

APPENDIX C

Question Protocol for Itinerant Teachers

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

Purpose of Study

It is the purpose of this study to contribute to the knowledge base of the supervision of itinerant teachers with a corollary contribution regarding the supervisors of itinerant teachers.

A cluster of related questions follows guiding questions for each of the main questions. The question flow loosely follows the "tree and branch" method with probing and follow-up questions interlaced as needed.

Questions of Type and Frequency

"What specific data can be generated regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers?"

- For what length of time have you been an itinerant teacher?
- At how many sites, during a typical year, did you teach?
- How many different "bosses" do you have, including building level and district level administrators?
- How many different classes, groups, and/or preparations did you teach during the average year?
- How many times throughout the school were you evaluated?

- How many times during a year did you receive supervision in a formal and planned for session?
- At how many sites did you receive supervision?
- Were you supervised in each different grade level, class preparation, or group taught?
- How many times per year did you receive supervision in an informal way? Please take your time. Do not rule out very short talks, telephone conversations, advice given, meetings, etc.?

Descriptive Questions

"How do itinerant teachers perceive the itinerant experience and the supervision they receive?"

- Have you felt confusion about who your "boss" is?
- Do you feel that you have more than one "boss"?
- How do you decide which boss to ask when you have a question about procedures?
- How do you decide which boss to ask when you have a question about teaching?
- Who had performed your evaluations – principles, assistant principles, or curriculum directors/specialists?
- If you were supervised by more than one person per year, what was the administrative position of those who supervised you?

- Did you receive supervision at each site, and for each class or grade level that you taught?
- If you were supervised at more than one site, was it by the same supervisor or different supervisors?
- During your career, have you always been supervised throughout each school year?
- Have you always been evaluated during each school year?

Affective and Prescriptive Questions

"How satisfied, if at all, are itinerant teachers in regard to the supervision they receive?"

- How did the experience of evaluation compare to your idea of supervision?
- Have you wanted and/or needed more supervision than the administrator or supervisor was able to provide?
- Considering formal supervision sessions (you may include the evaluation process), and informal supervision experiences; which do you feel were more meaningful to you.
- What factors made the formal or informal acts of supervision more meaningful to you?
- As a result of your being an itinerant teacher, do you feel that you have been shortchanged or overlooked with regard to supervision?

- Do you feel that those charged with supervising you have adequate time within their job description to spend the supervisory time with you that you need?

"To what extent, if any, do itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers believe that supervision is a necessary component in the development and improvement of the itinerant teacher?"

- Do you feel it is important to receive evaluation?
- Why is it, or is it not important to receive evaluation?
- Do you feel it is important to receive supervision?
- Why is it, or is it not important to receive supervision?
- In what specific ways has supervision affected your classroom skills?
- In what way or ways has supervision affected your teaching career? Your development as a professional teacher?

"If supervision is seen as necessary, what supervisory processes and procedures do itinerant teachers want and need for improving their instruction?"

- Given the choice, would you opt for more supervisory experiences or less?
- If you want more supervisory experiences, please relate the reasons, if less, please do the same?

- What were the positions and general backgrounds of those who formally supervised you?
- Do you feel that your supervisor had the requisite knowledge and background in your area to effectively supervise you?
- Do you feel that those who supervised you adequately understood the complexities of the itinerant teacher experience?

Finally, is there anything that you would like to add about your experience as an itinerant teacher that we have not covered?

APPENDIX D

Question Protocol for Supervisors of Itinerant Teachers

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

Purpose of Study

It is the purpose of this study to contribute to the knowledge base of the supervision of itinerant teachers with a corollary contribution regarding the supervisors of itinerant teachers.

Guiding question are followed by a cluster of related questions for each of the main questions. The question flow loosely follows the "tree and branch" method with probing and follow-up questions interlaced as needed.

Questions of Type and Frequency

"What specific data can be generated regarding the supervision of itinerant teachers (e.g., type and frequency) by interviewing itinerant teachers and the supervisors of itinerant teachers?"

- How many teachers, in an average year, are you personally responsible to evaluate?
- How many teachers, in an average year, are you personally responsible to supervise?
- From the number of teachers you supervise, how many of those would be considered itinerant teachers?
- For what length of time have you supervised itinerant teachers?

- If you share the supervision of itinerant teachers, what is the frequency of communication with the other responsible supervisor(s)?
- How often do you formally, in a preplanned structured setting, supervise each of the itinerant teachers during a typical school year?
- How often do you informally (short talks, advice, critiques, telephone conversations, written comments, etc.) supervise itinerant teachers during the school year?

Descriptive Questions

"How do supervisors of itinerant teachers describe their role and extent of involvement with itinerant teachers throughout the supervisory process?"

- Do you supervise itinerant teachers at every site at which they teach?
- Do you supervise itinerant teachers in every class, grade level, or preparation that they teach?
- Are you totally responsible for the itinerant teachers' supervision, and if not, for what portion(s) of their supervision are you responsible?
- If you share the supervision of itinerant teachers with another supervisor or supervisors, what type of communication do you have with the other responsible supervisor(s)?
- What are some of the unique problems you face supervising itinerant teachers?

Affective and Prescriptive Questions

"How satisfied, if at all, are the supervisors of itinerant teachers with the process of supervising itinerant teachers?"

- Do you feel that your job responsibilities allow you adequate time to effectively supervise itinerant teachers?
- Do you feel that you have the requisite knowledge and background to address the content area of itinerant teachers?
- Do you feel that there is a system in place to compensate for the complexities of the itinerant teacher in the supervision process?

"To what extent, if any, do itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers feel that supervision is a necessary component in the development and improvement of the itinerant teacher?"

- Is evaluation of teachers important, and does it serve a supervisory function?
- Is supervision of teachers important?
- If supervision of teachers is important, what are some of the reasons why?

"If supervision is deemed important, what conditions, processes, and/or procedures do supervisors of itinerant teachers want and need in order to deliver effective supervision to itinerant teachers?"

- Would formal or informal acts of supervision be more helpful to assure that itinerant teachers receive the supervision that they need? If the answer is mixed, please give examples to support both.
- If you had the means to make the supervisory experiences of the itinerant teacher more meaningfui, what specific things would you add or change?
- What was your position and general background when you supervised itinerant teachers?
- Do you feel that you had the requisite knowledge and background in the area of the itinerant teacher to effectively supervise them?
- What areas of supervision did you target, in addition to, or instead of the content area of the itinerant teachers?
- Do you feel that you adequately understood the complexities of the itinerant teacher experience, and were able to factor that understanding into the supervision of those teachers?

Finally, is there anything that you would like to add about your experience as a supervisor of itinerant teachers that we have not covered?

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

This research is being conducted under the auspices of the University of Oklahoma-Norman Campus.

Introduction

"Supervision of Itinerant Teachers: Perspectives from Itinerant Teachers and Those Who Supervise Them" is the dissertation topic being investigated by Brad Benson. The study is sponsored by Dr. Michael Langenbach, Assistant Dean, College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. This document serves as the individual's consent to participate in this study.

Description of the Study

Mr. Benson is investigating the scope and depth of the supervisory experience of itinerant teachers from the viewpoint of itinerant teachers and supervisors of itinerant teachers. He wishes to interview you to ascertain your perception of the supervisory processes, procedures and environment that you have experienced. Additional questions will focus on your feelings about the supervision of itinerant teachers, as well as your thoughts on improving the situation, if needed. The interview will be audio taped and transcribed. The initial interview will last approximately forty-five minutes to one hour. Subsequent interviews or contact may be required for clarification.

Potential Risks and Benefits of Participation

No foreseeable risks beyond those present in normal everyday life are anticipated in this study. Your participation in this study will consist of an interview and there should be no risk to your reputation or your general well-being. The possible benefits to you could be a clearer understanding of the position and potential of itinerant teachers with thought toward improving the supervision process. The benefits to society could include enhancing the knowledge base for both itinerant teaching and the supervision of itinerant teachers, encouraging further research, and improving conditions in the supervisory process and environment. The researcher will benefit from your participation through analyzing and reflecting upon your answers. The resulting dissertation may be submitted for publication at a later date.

Participation and Confidentiality

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may discontinue the interview at any time without any penalty. To participate, you must be 18 years

of age or older. At all times your confidentiality will be maintained, neither your name or identifying information will be used in the researcher's notes, the transcripts, or written reports. All forms of data will be secured in a locked cabinet. Only the researcher and the researcher's sponsoring professor will have access to the data. All data will be destroyed when it is no longer needed.

If you have questions about the research you may contact Brad Benson at 366-5954 or Dr. Michael Langenbach at 325-1081. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Administration at 325-4757. Two copies of this document will be provided, one for the participant's records, and the signed form that is to be returned to the researcher.

I hereby agree to participate in the above-described research. I understand my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits.

_____ _____

Signature Date