1

Building on the Philosophical Framework of the Three-Minute Walk-Through for Reflective Inquiry

The Downey informal walk-through with follow-up reflective discourse has a major intent of changing our approach to supervision and the relationship between supervisor and supervisee. The aim is to move the supervisory approach from a hierarchical inspection approach to one that is collaborative in motivating and promoting growth. It is to be collegial in nature, with coaching and mentoring the strategy. The heart of the Downey Walk-Through is actually not the structured classroom observation but the follow-up reflective dialogue. The overriding goal is to provide an environment that helps each person become a self-reflective, self-analytical, self-directed person who is always learning and improving one's practice.

This chapter is intended to help you reflect on your own approach, not only on the walk-through and follow-up approach but to your overall supervision and/or coaching of colleagues. The key question is what are the philosophical underpinnings of your supervision or coaching approach? The ideas and questions are designed to guide you in considering the beliefs and values you currently hold and how they influence your practice.

DETERMINING YOUR VALUES AND BELIEFS REGARDING HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND MOTIVATION AND HOW THESE INFLUENCE YOUR SUPERVISION APPROACH

It is important to be very familiar with your values and beliefs regarding supervision and how they impact your interactions with people. This, of course, would include your classroom walks and conversations with colleagues. Your actions reflect your beliefs, so one of the ways you can reflect on your beliefs is to start with analyzing your actions and what beliefs they convey to others. Answers to these questions might help you begin the journey of analysis:

- What are the key messages you share with those you supervise/ coach as to your role as a supervisor/coach?
- What are the strategies you employ to gather data and to influence staff in their continual improvement practices?
- Why do you walk into classrooms?
- What are you looking for when you go into classrooms?
- How judgmental are you regarding what you observe?
- Do you leave notes/e-mails to staff or do you embrace the conversation as a follow-up tactic?
- What are the words you use when you talk with staff in follow-up conversations?
- What strategies do you use to motivate people you coach/supervise to grow in their practice?

Using a Traditional Supervisor Process Often Lacks in Effectiveness

Educators view the purposes of supervision in different ways. Historically, the intent of supervision was to improve teaching. According to Frase (2005), there is little evidence in his literature analysis that indicates that we have been successful in this purpose. Steffy (1989) indicates that most districts' formal procedures for evaluating teachers are ineffective in maintaining and supporting the growth process.

We do believe in the value of a teacher appraisal process, but we advocate for quality appraisal processes that focus on growth (Downey & Frase, 2003), and for the process to engage teachers in reflective questioning, both of which are intrinsically motivating. The value of teachers and professionals making adjustments in practice based on individually gathered input and reflection cannot by overstated. When change is a result of choice, such change is personally relevant and long lasting. Ultimately, they become beneficial to students (Downey, 2008).

KNOWING HOW YOUR BELIEFS REGARDING THE HUMAN NATURE OF PEOPLE IMPACTS YOUR MOTIVATIONAL STRATEGIES

Underlying one's approach to supervision and coaching are the beliefs about the nature of people and how they are motivated. One of the ways we can simplistically look at how we view people is the Theory X versus Theory Y concept. These two alternative theories of motivation are proposed by Douglas McGregor (1960) in his book *The Human Side of Enterprise*. Theory X (Drucker, 1974) is based on the belief that people have to be coerced into doing a good job, do not want to work, and lack internal motivation to grow; therefore, supervision is viewed as the means by which employees are forced to work. Theory Y (Drucker, 1974) is based on the belief that people want to do a good job, want to work, and have an internal motivation to grown and learn.

We contend that the type of supervision approach that will be most effective in improving teaching and learning is that which reflects a supervisory purpose congruent with a Theory Y approach. Frase (2005) states,

> Theory X was built on the fundamental belief that people are like machines and that the only effective means of motivating them is through coercion and external rewards (Drucker, 1974). This theory was built on the assumption that using external motivation and inculcating fear is not only proper, but that it is the only source of human motivation. (p. 433)

Adhering to this belief system about educators and their source of motivation is directly contrary to the belief system we want reflected in teaching practices in the classroom. It is not surprising that many teachers do not believe that students do their best work when internally motivated, as many principals frequently do not believe teachers are intrinsically motivated to grow in their practice.

Motivational practices based upon extrinsic motivation and reliance on inspectional approaches to see if the work is being carried out as expected are proving to be unproductive in effecting long-lasting change in teacher behavior (Peterson, 2000). Unfortunately, some administrators and coaches continue to use such processes; checklists are developed, with ratings, rankings, and degrees of proficiency built right in, and their implementation is being pursued with single-minded intensity. National mandates and the adoption of state and national standards have resulted in too many administrators falling back on supervisory processes that seldom work. The sudden influx of walk-through checklists on the market gives rise to the concern we have about the misapplication of informal walk-throughs as an "inspectional" practice of the Theory X variety. We believe in accountability but not using an inspectional approach for achieving such. We work toward personal accountability on the part of every individual with respect to the mission of the organization.

Downey and Frase (2003) advocate a humanistic and intrinsically motivational approach congruent with Theory Y, one that helps people reflect on their practice and grow professionally. At one of Downey's first meeting with Dr. Edward Deming (1991), she asked him for advice for educators. Without hesitation he replied, "Stop rating and ranking people, stop the competition within the organization, stop rewarding people, and put joy back into the workplace." It was a powerful message for those of us who supervise others: We need to put joy into our supervision, joy into the culture of learning, and joy into the profession of serving children.

Obviously, nothing is quite as simple as either Theory X or Theory Y in human interactions. Caution needs to be taken when thinking in this binary manner. People are multidimensional and so is one's supervision and coaching. But what we are looking for are one's fundamental basic beliefs about human beings. Downey (Downey & Frase, 2003) indicates that her philosophy is very Rogerian (Rogers, 1961) in that she believes that people are neither good nor bad but are in the process of becoming.

McGregor, according to Kopelman, Prottas, and Davis (2008), acknowledged "that a Theory Y managerial style will not be appropriate in all situations (Heil et al., 2000; McGregor, 1967)" (p. 1). Hoffman (2009) indicated that Maslow, in his latter years, had difficulty with the Theory X and Z dichotomy. Before his death in 1970, Maslow was conceptualizing Theory Z, which places more reliance on the attitudes and responsibilities of workers. As Hoffman (2009) states,

He theorized that as people grow toward self-actualization, their psychological needs at work undergo a corresponding change. Salary increases alone, for example, don't mean much to those

propelled by higher needs. The chance to be creative and autonomous becomes increasingly important as a job motivator . . . we ought not lose sight of the simple fact that people have different motivational needs. (p. 3)

So we are not necessarily suggesting that there is one approach that works with each person, but we are highly recommending that you be aware of your beliefs about how you view the human nature of people and how people are motivated. From that understanding should then come actions that are congruent with those beliefs as they relate to supervision, coaching, and mentoring. When we apply these beliefs to our walk-through and follow-up conversation actions, it readily becomes apparent that our beliefs about people and how they learn and grow influence our actions and purpose of coaching and supervision.

The key is that we want to make sure that our supervision, coaching, and mentoring will have long-lasting influence over those with whom we interact. We encourage you to see individuals as good people who are working to make a difference and to contribute. Therefore, posing reflective questions to help the individual think about his or her own practice is a viable strategy in helping influence a person's growth and professional practice.

USING VARIOUS TYPES OF INTERACTIONS CONGRUENT WITH A THEORY Y PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH

In the Downey approach to follow-up conversations, she provides for a continuum of interactions from direct to indirect to collaborative. One can believe in a Theory Y approach and use various types of interactions. The words used, the power of choice, and the encouragement of reflection can take place in all types of interactions.

Some have interpreted Downey's direct approach as not including reflection. This is not the case. Her approaches always include reflection. When she uses the term *direct,* she means that the supervisor/coach is going to be in a teaching mode. During the conversation, the coach provides ideas for reflection regarding a specific purpose and the thinking that might go on to make decisions regarding that particular practice.

Downey, in *The Three-Minute Walk-Through* (Downey et al., 2004) wrote extensively about the three types of interactions—how they might sound. Figure 1.1 below illustrates the range and approaches of a conversation for a direct, indirect, and collaborative approach. Notice, that reflection is built into all three of the types of interactions.

Figure 1.1	Range and Approach to Reflective Dialogue After Several Walk-Throughs
Dependent (direct)	Supervisor/coach selects an area for reflective conversation, teaches as needed to the area, and invites the teacher to reflect in the conversation and builds in a reflective question near the end of the conversation.
Independent (indirect)	Supervisor/coach invites teacher to reflect on a short segment of observed teaching and follows up on those teaching practices that the teacher mentions, and hopefully, finishes the conversation with a reflective question.
Interdependent (interactive and collegial)	Supervisor/coach poses reflection question in a conversation and invites further dialogue in the future if teacher so chooses. When the teacher chooses to continue the conversation it moves to collaborative.

Adapted from Downey, C. et al. (2004). *The Three-Minute Classroom Walk-Through: Changing School Supervisory Practice One Teacher at a Time.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Chapter 4 provides more detail about these types of conversations.

One of the misunderstandings of some individuals using the Downey approach is that they think a direct approach is linked to Theory X, while the collaborative approach is linked to Theory Y. This is not the case. Downey believes in a Theory Y approach with all three types of interactions and recognizes that people are at different stages of their careers and in their learning. This calls for differentiation of coaching and supervision. In fact, in any given case, a supervisor may use a direct approach with a teacher on one matter and on another use a more collegial approach in a different situation.

Another misinterpretation of Downey's reflective conversations is that a supervisor uses only one approach in a conversation. In her videotape of a middle school teacher (Downey, 2006a), she illustrates how a conversation can move in and out of being direct and teaching with reflection to highly interdependent without any teaching going on—only reflection. Chapter 5 presents several illustrations of how the conversation is used with different types of individuals and how a conversation with an individual can vary in approach based upon how the dialogue evolves.

BUILDING STAFF CAPACITY AS A WAY OF IMPROVING ONE'S PRACTICE

As mentioned, our perspective is that the traditional approach to supervision is no longer a viable means for effecting lasting change in the classroom and on professional growth. As Burks stated, the Downey approach is about "expecting rather than inspecting and respecting rather than directing." Checking to see if teachers are doing what they are supposed

to be doing will not have long-term or lasting effects on today's workers. It is a highly demotivating approach to change.

Many of us were taught as administrators to reinforce teachers for those practices we judged to be effective, even though we infrequently observed teachers, and to identify areas for refinement. This puts the responsibility for learning on the wrong individual: on the administrator rather than on the instructor. Teachers are quite outspoken about the type of supervisor they admire and learn from (Blasé & Blasé, 1998). They like a coach and a person who is "value added" to their lives. They have little respect for the person who is a "fix-it, tell-it" personality, even though such a person might mean well. External direction in the form of telling teachers what to do and what to change seldom influences teachers to make needed changes, especially experienced teachers.

Our viewpoint on supervision differs from the "tell-it" or "sell-it" type. Our belief is that supervision is a human development enterprise— it is to create the conditions that increase a person's zest for continuous growth. We believe that people are capable problem solvers and learners. Our goal should be to provide them the opportunity to discover and learn independently. They will then be in the preferred position of making decisions about their growth and making changes on their own, out of an intrinsic desire to do so. Our role is to facilitate the reflective inquiry that encourages introspection and individual decision making.

We believe in the curriculum and assessment accountability movement; however, as mentioned earlier, many administrators have interpreted accountability to mean that we must revert to "inspecting" whether people are carrying out the work. There must be caution here; we wish to balance the accountability of teachers in delivering the curriculum aligned with the standards and tests in use with a Theory Y approach to our monitoring. How can we help people successfully teach the standards and objectives and appropriately use the assessment tools, as well? The informal walk-through with reflective inquiry is a great vehicle for achieving this balance.

With walk-throughs, one can informally gather relevant data on the decisions teachers are making regarding what to teach. Our goal is to help each teacher be committed to teaching the standards at the right level of difficulty for students. The walk-through yields the type of information we need to be able to assist the teacher in reflecting on his or her own practice and in making decisions about how to best improve the delivery of the curriculum. We think this type of decision making is most effective and is best accomplished through reflective inquiry and providing needs-based staff development for new knowledge.

This means we need to use coaching and mentoring approaches that assist the teacher in being responsible for his or her decisions for professional growth. Teachers should not feel primarily accountable to us. Rather, they need to be personally accountable. When principals try to force teachers to teach the standards, they may move teachers away from

a commitment to these learnings. We do not want resentful or even belligerent behavior, which forced compliance often brings. It is difficult for people to carry out work they do not believe in or are not vested in. We want people who have decided on their own to value the standards and understand the inherent benefits in using powerful strategies to teach those standards. These teachers self-direct their behavior, and because what they value and believe is congruent with our goals as an administrator, they are more likely to act accordingly, with a mutual focus.

Our supervision can be the greatest asset to assisting teachers to examine their values and beliefs regarding their teaching and the needs of their students. As Glickman (2002) states,

> The goal is always to use approaches that strengthen a teacher's capacity for greater reflection and self-reliance in making improvements in classroom teaching and learning. However, all leaders should first understand themselves, their predominant ways of interacting, and their core beliefs about working with others. (p. 44)

Steffy (1989) states, "Supervision should not be viewed as an end, but as a means to an end. . . . Supervision should facilitate the growth and development . . . of the teacher" (p. 74).

Nearly everything we read about change indicates that the fear and compliance approach to supervision is no longer effective unless the supervisor is present at all times. In this case, having the supervisor around constantly may be perceived as a form of punishment. None of us wants to be viewed in such a role, nor could we be "around all the time." The role of the principal needs to be about creating a culture of learning—for staff as well as for students. Peter Senge (1990) describes a learning community as, "a place where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly desire, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together" (p. 3).

Not only does the principal influence the reflection and decision making of one teacher, but the influence extends to all the teachers. The principal is in the business of building capacity—capacity for collective actions and attitudes of personal leadership. Also see Glasser (1992).

POSING QUESTIONS FOR REFLECTIVE INQUIRY AS THE WAY TO MOTIVATE GROWTH RATHER THAN USING FEEDBACK

We highly recommend that you refrain from giving "feedback" to teachers about their performance from walk-through information. Feedback is when you tell a person what you think about his or her work. It is an

evaluative approach. This is very different from normal practice, and the reason is tied to how people are motivated to grow. As mentioned earlier, adherents to a Theory X approach would use feedback, and adherents to a Theory Y approach would use reflection. The Theory X (Ouchi, 1981) management style is one whose adherents believe that employees are basically unmotivated and in need of constant inspection and direction to accomplish the goals of the organization. This creates an environment of dependency that satisfies many employees until such time as their needs are no longer being met.

Figure 1.2 is a motivational dichotomy used by Downey and Frase (2003) in their training on walk-throughs with reflective inquiry.

| Figure 1.2 | Motivational Supervision Paradigm |

Traditional (Theory X)	Transformational (Theory Y)
Feedback	Reflection
Controlling environment	Growth environment
Hierarchical structure	Community of learners (Senge, 1990)
Rewards, bribes, and punishments	Recognition of growth
Extrinsic motivation	Intrinsic motivation
Supervisor control	Inner locus of control
Origin of behaviors—others	Origin of behavior—self
Boss-manager (Glasser, 1992)	Lead manager (Glasser, 1992)
Work as task (Deming, 2000)	Work as joy (Deming, 2000)
Approval	Increase capacity
Others for efficacy	Self-efficacy

SOURCE: Downey and Frase (2003).

When you examine motivational theory, you will find that most of Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman's (1959) employee dissatisfiers are on the left-side column above and satisfiers on the right side. We want to be satisfiers in our work with teachers. Satisfiers identified by Hertzberg et al. (1959) included setting goals, learning needed to reach the goals, and goal achievement.

Expectancy Theory (Vroom, 1964) is also on the right-hand side of the paradigm. This approach, which deals with motivation and management, indicates that behavior results from conscious choices and that people are

motivated by the belief that there is a positive correlation between efforts and performance. If we look at Maslow's (1970) pyramid of movement toward self-actualization, we see the importance of goal setting and growing in one's life. Our reflective inquiry transformational approach is about helping people have a sense of efficacy, a sense of being in control, in power, and personally responsible.

Our approach is one of promoting intrinsic motivation toward change rather than using an extrinsic approach. This is why Downey (2006a) does not recommend leaving notes of reinforcement. Such notes usually include some form of judgment and are extrinsically focused. We wish to avoid creating a dependency in others on a supervisor's affirmation of their importance. Environments that foster such a dependency are commonly found in schools and can negatively impact a faculty's ability to experiment and use action research to determine the effectiveness of practices.

We wish teachers to be confident in their abilities and to extend that confidence to taking risks and experiment for the purpose of improving practice. To achieve this, it is important that we drive out fear (Deming, 2000), and we can begin by breaking the hierarchical structure between principal and teacher and cease using rewards and punishments as our approach. We want to be seen as "valued added" (Downey, Frase, & Peters, 1994) in people's lives.

It is not that we would not recognize Herculean efforts. We would do so. However, what we praise and when we praise needs to be based upon helping people be self-motivated. We do not wish to foster a situation where we are unable to effect change or growth without praise; we wish to foster change that is intrinsically motivated. We, by perpetuating a reward/punishment culture, are maintaining dependency environments that also perpetuate the "us versus them" syndrome. Seldom would we praise performance, but we would praise and recognize dialogue, reflection, and thoughtful ideas (Downey, 2006a).

If you are a person who frequently leaves notes, you do not need to immediately stop that practice, but you might prepare staff for a different relationship—one that does not place you in the hierarchical position of "boss." Glasser (1992) addresses the boss-manager versus lead-manager role. He indicates that over time a lead-manager helps the teacher analyze his or her own practices, and the supervisor comes to believe the teacher's analysis is more valid than the supervisors.

Using Dialogue Not Feedback as a Motivator

Garmston (2000) states that "when mentors, coaches, and supervisors report their observations to teachers, they build the teacher's dependence on that input and that actually robs the teacher of working the internal muscles necessary to improve their ability to self-reflect." He defines

feedback as "observations from others about one's performance, particularly when the information is judgmental ('You made a good synthesis when . . . ') or comes with advice ('Next time you might . . . ')" (p. 2).

Garmston (2000) has further identified two myths about feedback, for both students and teachers:

- Myth 1: Feedback causes people to see themselves more accurately.
- Myth 2: Feedback improves team effectiveness.

He reports on a study conducted at DuPont and Colgate-Palmolive where team members listened to feedback about how to be better workers. The feedback came from peers, supervisors, subordinates, or both. The goals were to understand one's impact on others and to improve one's ability to work with others. However, what occurred was that the feedback undermined those goals and was negative in some cases. The feedback model was not found to effect the desired changes in employee growth.

Sanford (1995, as cited in Garmston, 2000) has indicated that feedback reduces the capacity for accurate self-reflection. "External feedback actually reduces the capacity for accurate self-reflection," says Sanford. "Continuing feedback reinforces the expectation that others will and should tell us how we are doing and reduces our capacity to be self-reflective and self-accountable" (p. 2).

How we choose to motivate staff members to grow in their work needs to be very clear in our minds, as it affects what we say and what we do in the supervisor coaching process. Are your approaches getting the desired results? We believe that the reflective conversations and questions, when used after several informal walk-throughs, have one of the highest probabilities of impacting and creating self-reflective and self-directed teachers. It is a meaningful way to help teachers think about their practices and grow professionally.

The best motivation for growth comes from self-generated information. This is why we pose our reflective question for the teacher, not for ourselves. They are the ones intended to benefit from the answer to that question. This is also why we refrain from providing the research supporting a given teaching practice on our own initiative; rather, it is better to wait until the teacher is interested and then, upon his or her request or initiative, engage in further conversation or share the research in written form.

BEING REFLECTIVE ON CHAPTER CONTENT

Here are some questions for you to reflect on with respect to the content of this chapter:

1. As you think about your values and beliefs regarding human behavior and how to motivate people to group, how would you characterize your values and beliefs? What actions can you identify that you use that would illustrate these values and beliefs?

2. Think about several actions you have taken in the last week and label them as a Theory X or a Theory Y approach.

3. As you plan interactions with colleagues and you are thinking about motivational approaches you might use, what criteria do you use to determine which approaches you will use to impact behavior?

4. As you think about ways to increase the capacity of a person with whom you work, what are the variety of ways you think about for influencing behavior and what criteria do you use to decide on the strategies to use?

5. Find a learning partner and share your ideas about feedback versus dialogue. Do you find yourself thinking about when and when not to give feedback to people about their performance? What is it that you are thinking about? Might you find yourself moving away from feedback and moving toward dialogue to provide for more adult-to-adult conversations? Do you view dialogue itself as a motivational strategy?