

How to Cite:

Alnajjar, K. (2022). Can new teachers learn teaching by reciprocating?. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(S6), 6294–6311.

<https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6nS6.10987>

Can new teachers learn teaching by reciprocating?

Khaled Alnajjar

Department of English Language and Literature | Isra University, Jordan.

*Corresponding author email: Khaled.alnajjar@iu.edu.jo

Abstract---Preservice teachers are expected to learn to teach through opportunities provided by their supervisors in their field experience. This study explores supervisor-supervisee reciprocity as a learning opportunity. Supervisor-supervisee reciprocity is an empirically undocumented phenomenon in teacher education. This study examines how it relates to supervisors' roles. Using interviews and focus groups, this study found that reciprocity relates to three aspects of supervisors' roles: educational trainer, sentimental underpinning, and social facilitator. The study also reported perceived effects of reciprocity on the building of supervisory relationships.

Keywords---reciprocity, supervisors' role, supervisor teacher, preservice teacher (supervisee), field experiences.

Introduction

Field experience is a cornerstone of preservice teachers' learning to teach. How supervisor teachers educate, assist, and engage student teachers impacts the quality of teacher education (Butler & Cuena, 2012). Supervisors collaborate with supervisees (pre-service teachers) by observing, reflecting, and enacting the teaching process. In reality, communication between supervisors and supervisees and the resulting relationships often influence the quality of learning to teach and the supervision. Supervisors' roles have been studied all over the world (Ambrosetti & Dekkers, 2010; Butler & Cuena, 2012; Koç, 2011), but there isn't much research on how communication affects supervisors' roles, how preservice teachers learn to teach, and how relationships are built. This study examines reciprocity and further investigates how it relates to the three supervisors' roles Butler and Cuena (2012) proposed: Educational trainer, sentimental underpinning, and social facilitator. Built on this discussion, the researcher further look at the effects of reciprocity on supervisor-supervisee relationship building from perspectives of social penetration theory (Altman & Taylor, 1973).

Reciprocity as a communication tool is information verbally shared between Person A and Person B that would remain between them (Cozby, 1973; Spence, Fox, Golding, & Daiches, 2012). We examine this common but undocumented phenomenon in the field experience because both supervisors and supervisees share more or less personal information with each other in addition to professional conversations. Reciprocity is a common human behavior, and therefore, the author believes that this study may shed light on future research of reciprocity in supervision within a certain cultural context or comparative studies to examine the impacts of culture on reciprocity in supervision. In the current study, we did not explore what supervisors and supervisees disclose nor how they disclose; rather, we examined how supervisors and supervisees viewed the function of reciprocity in their learning to teach and supervisory relationships. The research questions include: 1) in what ways does supervisor-supervisee perception of reciprocity relate to supervisors' roles; and 2) to what extent does supervisor-supervisee perception of reciprocity influence supervisor-supervisee relationship building?

Theoretical Framework

To address the first research questions, we use Butler and Cuenca's (2012) supervisor role theory in teacher education as the theoretical framework. Butler and Cuenca (2012) conceptualized three major roles of the supervisor teacher: Educational trainer, sentimental underpinning, and social facilitator. As an Educational trainer, supervisors focus on the instructional methods. They devote time to "providing pedagogical, technical, and organizational advice" and "observing and evaluating instructional practice and providing constructive feedback" (p. 299). It is not uncommon to see, in many teacher education programs, coaching being used as a beneficial model to enhance preservice teachers' learning to teach (Zeichner, 1996). Regarding the role of supervisor as an sentimental underpinning for preservice teachers, supervisors in field experience understand preservice teachers' emotional needs and provide emotional support "as a needed catalyst to teacher learning" (p. 301). Additionally, building trust and respect between supervisors and supervisees requires emotional support. (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 1997). In the supervisor role as a social facilitator, supervisors influence preservice teachers' perspectives and practices (Zeichner & Gore, 1990), so socializing effects can be constructive or destructive to novice teachers' learning the art of teaching. These three concepts of supervisors' roles guided the researcher to propose the first research question (In what ways does supervisor-supervisee perception of reciprocity relate to supervisors' roles?), analyze the data, and discuss the emerging findings.

To propose the second research question (to what extent does supervisor-supervisee perception of reciprocity influence supervisor-supervisee relationship building?), the researcher used Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory to show how reciprocity affects supervisor-supervisee relationship building. Social penetration theory was founded on interpersonal communication's dyadic and reciprocal interactions. The theory uses the layers of an onion to refer to developing levels of communication from being shallow (the peripheral layers) to being deep (the central layers). Altman and Taylor argue that people tend to advance the relationship from a non-intimate to an intimate one. Further, Altman

and Taylor argue that there is no certain pattern that all people follow in all human relationships and that there is no changing relationship that must go through a certain order of development (1973). Personality, motives, time, and gender can all have an impact on the development of a relationship. The developed deep-level relationship can be moved back or terminated. Reciprocity is seen as an interactional aspect in the formation and development of interpersonal relationships because "making self-accessible to another person is intrinsically gratifying" (Altman & Taylor, 1973, p.50). Social penetration theory also posits a reciprocal process of reciprocity, and the scope and depth of the process shifts, affecting the development of relationships. Altman and Taylor also identified "four stages of relationship development: orientation, exploratory emotional exchange, emotional exchange, and stable exchange" (1973, p.50).

Social penetration theory has been used in general communication, but it may help researchers in teacher education to investigate supervisor-supervisee communication and relationship building since learning to teach in the field experience is both professional and social (Butler & Cuena, 2012). Although this theory can be used to examine reciprocity and its impacts on supervisory relationships with multi-levels through its four stages, this study, as an exploratory study, did not intend to address all the aspects of social penetration theory; instead, it aimed to identify preliminary evidence that both supervisors and supervisees viewed reciprocity as a tool for learning to teach and relationship building.

Literature Review

In a study of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity in clinical counseling, reciprocity was shown to be a useful strategy that both supervisors and supervisees may utilize to promote supervisee learning by sharing experiences, feedback, and expertise (Christ, 2004; St-Jean, 2012; Wanberg et al., 2007). St-Jean and Mathieu (2011) investigated the effect of supervisee reciprocity in determining supervisory results and concluded that reciprocity enabled supervisors to employ improved job, role-model, and mental reasons, resulting in improved supervisee learning. Furthermore, Bradbury and Koballa (2008) highlighted the origins of conflict in supervisory programs, concluding that supervisors' and preservice teachers' inability to communicate effectively would deprive the preservice teachers of bridging the gap between their expectations of teaching and reality. As a result, they would refuse to adapt.

Other research looked into the effects of sharing information on the development of supervisory relationships, particularly the effects of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity on the establishment of trust and respect between the supervisory partners. Hudson (2013) stated that sharing academic knowledge, resources, and experiences led to the building of trust and respect, thus setting the foundation for preservice teachers and their supervisors' relationships. Moreover, supervisees reported supervisor reciprocity of challenging clinical circumstances, low self-esteem, stress in the supervisory rapport, as well as clinical experiences and personal information, according to Knox et al. (2011). They found that reciprocity is used to normalize, build rapport, and educate. Ladany and colleagues (2003) suggested that supervisors' reciprocity pushed trainees to

reciprocate by assuring trust and respect, demonstrating, and teaching how to exploit sharing in supervision situations to create effective partnerships. The reviewed literature in other fields guided us to investigate supervisor-supervisee reciprocity and examine supervisors' roles as social facilitators, Educational trainers, and sentimental underpinnings (Butler & Cuenca, 2012) as well as their perceived impacts on building supervisory relationships.

Methods

This study explored the phenomenon of reciprocity in the field experience. For the purpose of designing the study and answering the research questions, a qualitative, multiple case-study technique was applied. According to Yin (2003), the technique based on many case studies entails analyzing and combining themes, similarities, and differences from a couple or more case studies that share the same aim, which provides greater support for findings than a single case.

Participants and Context of the Study

This study included two cases. Case 1 consisted of one supervisor, Mr. Sam, and two preservice teachers (student teachers) (The term "supervisees" was used in places where a comparison between supervisor and supervisee was used), Kris and Suzan. Case 2 consisted of one supervisor, Ms. Shirley, and one supervisee, William. Thus, the study included two supervisor teachers and three preservice teachers from a metropolitan high school. In Case 1, Mr. Sam was Caucasian. He had a Bachelor's in English Literature and a Master's in TESOL. Mr. Sam had built his supervisory philosophy over the course of his nine-year supervising experience, which included a readiness to anticipate and forgive shortcomings, a dedication to devotion in establishing practices and techniques, and a personal knowledge of student teachers. Kris was a preservice Hispanic male teacher. He was responsible for teaching seventh and eighth grades in the Department of Language and History under the direction of a language teacher. Suzan was a female of African American origin. Under the supervision and guidance of Mr. Sam, Suzan was teaching the seventh and eighth grades for her Practicum II. In case two, Ms. Shirley was a Caucasian female supervisor teacher. She has two years of supervising experience in addition to her nine years of teaching experience, during which she formed her supervisory philosophy "student teachers' total involvement." William was a preservice teacher who was Caucasian. Under the supervision of a language instructor, William was teaching the seventh and eighth grades.

Since 2009, the high school involved in this study has maintained collaboration with the university to offer teacher candidates with a two-semester field experience working alongside teacher supervisors (practicum and student teaching). In addition, the high school permitted preservice teachers to teach in a real-world classroom setting, following the guidance of experienced supervisor teachers. During the 2015–2016 academic year, the school had nine teacher supervisors in several subjects and ten pre-service teachers. While the study participants did not exemplify all supervisors' or preservice teachers' perspectives

on reciprocity, they provided preliminary data for this study on the perceived usefulness of reciprocity.

Data Sources and Data Collection

Using several data sources enhances the validity of the data (Yin, 2003). Two data sources were utilized, including semi-structured interviews (see Appendix A) and focus group interviews (see Appendix B). Each research participant was interviewed three times, at the beginning, midpoint, and end of each school semester. The interviews were conducted in a semi-structured format (Merriam, 1998), which allowed the interviewer to ask a variety of questions. As a result, restricted questions, unrestricted questions, and a combination of the two were employed. Although this method, according to Lindlof and Taylor (2011), incorporates organized inquiries, follow-up questions will arise depending on the interviewee. By using semi-structured interviews, the interviewer was able to gain a better understanding of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity in field experience. Besides, it allowed the researcher "to enter into the other person's perspective" (Patton, 2002, p. 341) to fathom the essence of the phenomenon from both the supervisors' and supervisees' perspectives. The interview questions were designed to investigate three aspects of supervisors' roles and perceived effects regarding the supervisory relationship, as well as the consequences for preservice teachers' learning to teach. All of the interviews took place on the school grounds and were tape recorded.

As described by Thomas et al. (1995), a focus group interview involves conducting in-depth joint interviews with a select group of people chosen for their knowledge of a particular community rather than for their ability to reflect on their own experiences. Focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews directed the data analysis and contributed to answering the three research questions. Data collection was conducted throughout three phases. The researcher visited the school and had meetings with supervisors and preservice teachers for a school semester. Three sets of semi-structured interviews with supervisors and supervisees were conducted at the beginning, midpoint, and end of the semester. Two focus group interviews were conducted for the study, one with the two supervisors and the other with the supervisees, to validate the findings, ensuring that each party shared their perceptions of reciprocity and perceived effects on learning to teach and supervisory relationships independently and freely.

Data Analysis

In the process of examining the phenomenon of reciprocity in the field experience from the perceptions of both supervisors and supervisees, the researcher identified similarities, clarified potential assumptions, and improved the trustworthiness of the interpretations of the data (Patton, 2002; Stake, 2005). Data analysis was conducted throughout three phases. First, by using triangulated data sources, we coded the data of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity. Second, by applying the theoretical framework, we identified three themes related to supervisors' roles as social facilitators, Educational trainers, and sentimental underpinnings (Butler & Cuena, 2012). Third, using the social penetration theory

(Altman & Taylor, 1973), we examined the influence of teacher reciprocity on building supervisory relationships, which extended an understanding of theoretical perspectives to both the social penetration theory and the supervisory theory.

Replication in cross-case analysis requires comparing and contrasting findings in a single case, then examining findings throughout cases to discover how they connect. Reading the transcripts repetitively allowed the researcher to fully comprehend the collected data and recognize the barriers that emerged across all of the transcripts (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). If there are no similarities among the cases, the researcher must reconsider the original themes. If there are commonalities throughout the cases, however, identical replication is achieved. However, theoretical replication is achieved if no commonalities are detected among cases, but for expected reasons (Yin, 1994). But, if there are similarities for expected reasons, theoretical replication is possible.

Findings and Discussion

Reciprocity and Educational Trainer

Research on supervisor reciprocity in clinical counseling found that supervisors exploited reciprocity as an approach to facilitate supervisees' development of knowledge and skills in counseling (Knox et al., 2011; Ladany & Walker, 2003; St-Jean, 2012; St-Jean & Mathieu, 2011). The researcher assumed that supervisor-supervisee reciprocity may also occur in field experience, which influences preservice teachers' learning to teach. The current study confirmed this finding and provided evidence that reciprocity involves a supervisor's role as an Educational trainer who provides pedagogical, technical, and organizational advice (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). Reciprocity helps preservice teachers rethink their teaching practices, further their communication with supervisor teachers, and think about their work more deeply.

The interviews in two cases showed that supervisor-supervisee reciprocity serves as a hidden curriculum and an instructional tool for preservice teachers' learning to teach. Reciprocity provides preservice teachers with practical knowledge, strategies, advice, and live examples. If "field experiences hold the potential to significantly enrich the lived curriculum of teacher education" (Butler & Cuenca, 2012, p. 298), it is possible that supervisors' interactions involve the process of creating a curriculum. In Case 1, two supervisees, Mr. Sam, employed information sharing as an informal curriculum, according to Kris and Suzan, in which he provided examples of how to teach social studies lectures and discussed their assignments. Suzan remarked:

What I'm studying here seems to go beyond what I acquired in university lectures. My supervisor appears to be using information sharing to increase my information and make me want to learn more. I learned that connecting with the students is the key to teaching, but I would not have realized it at the university until I witnessed how it impacted students' learning and my interaction with them in the classroom (2nd interview).

The current study confirmed that supervisors talked about their own practice and experience as new teachers to assist, not prescribe, and practice (Jones & Straker, 2006). Both supervisors provided supervisees with guidance, tactics, and illustrations. Ms. Shirley noted, "I had talked about my experiences when I started teaching in order to encourage him [William] to use my experiences and stories. I can see these shared experiences while reading his lesson plans or while watching him handle classroom management issues "(2nd interview). Ms. Shirley also mentioned that she shared her professional experiences and teaching challenges with William in order to provide him with feedback, tactics, and real-life examples to help him overcome his difficulties: I discussed my early teaching experiences and lessons learned, as well as provided helpful suggestions. For example, I was used to constructive criticism when I was graded and instructed to alter anything, and I still do it now (3rd interview).

William also echoed what his supervisor said in the third interview: "I learn by asking questions." "Besides, her advice is too beneficial to me. Experienced teachers, as you may know, always have interesting stories to share. " This study found that supervisor-supervisee reciprocity helped preservice teachers develop learning instructional strategies. It was suggested that supervisor-supervisee communication and exchanges in the field experience produced a satisfactory setting which enabled novice teachers to understand most aspects of teaching while working alongside their supervisors (Lampert et al., 2013). Teacher reciprocity does not come from supervisors for no reason. When preservice teachers talked about stories or challenges in their teaching practices, supervisor teachers used this opportunity to engage in meaningful conversations about teaching and learning to teach. In the first interview, Kris stated that he shared his content and pedagogy inadequacies in order to receive guidance and enhance his teaching abilities: "I always talk to him about my struggles with some historical facts and terms, lesson planning, and classroom management." Similarly, Suzan noted, "I often tell my supervisor about the problems I have with classroom management, and he will either give me a solution or tell me something he has learned from his own experience" (1st interview). By sharing their concerns regarding content and pedagogy, their supervisor not only noticed their problems, but also equipped them with solutions and insights to help them overcome them.

Similar to Case 1, Ms. Shirley was able to realize William's challenges once he shared them with her, and she was able to assist him with solutions and real-life examples of how to face them: "When I tell Ms. Shirley about the difficulties I face with classroom management or sometimes the content, she provides me with examples and explains why I should do this instead of that" (3rd interview). During the first interview, William described why he went to his supervisor for help: We usually talk before and after classes about my teaching tactics and performance. I'm learning a lot about problem-solving techniques. Basically, I'm a firefighter who doesn't have a hosepipe. Whenever a heat begins, she cools it off, and I am able to learn the way to do it properly. When I'm stumped on how to put the concepts I studied in university into practice, I turn to my supervisor, who almost always has a solution. This has given me a good idea of how to apply managerial and educational theories to my work as a teacher every day (2nd interview).

Ms. Shirley echoed: Teaching and reflecting on supervisor feedback and shared experiences helps preservice teachers learn best, in addition to the assigned assignments, because what is on paper does not always appear in the classroom. As a result, we constantly discuss his intellectual capabilities and help him stay motivated (*1st interview*). Furthermore, when questioned about the kind of information she discussed with William about teaching, Ms. Shirley replied "I shared many anecdotes about how I learned organization skills from various teachers and classrooms when I was in practicum 1 and 2, and by visiting other teachers' classes" (*3rd interview*).

Through formal and informal communication, supervisor teachers provided a showcase for supervisees in teaching so that preservice teachers could also learn how to use reciprocity in their teaching. Kris mentioned that Mr. Sam shared stories to become a role model of sharing; that is, using reciprocity in language lessons: I presume Mr. Sam shares stories with me in order for me to share them with my students; as a result, he is showing me "the art of sharing," or how to convey information in my classroom. He does it, I feel, to set a positive example for me in terms of the challenges I will encounter as a teacher (*3rd interview*).

Another aspect of reciprocity involves supervisors' life experiences that they share with their supervisees. It is not a surprise that Mr. Sam told the interviewer "My supervisees use my stories "You can hear them retelling my own stories in classes, in curricula, and in extracurricular activities." In particular, the term "curriculum" was frequently mentioned by the participants in Case 2. For instance, William said, "I would still know as much about teaching as I did on day one, if it wasn't for my supervisor to reflect on her experiences and show me how to do stuff" (*2nd interview*). Additionally, he said that his supervisor used "information sharing" to illustrate concepts, clarify tasks, and make learning more enjoyable. While disclosing her stories, she is attempting to demonstrate to me just how to put what I learned in college into practice. Despite the fact that it is clear to me what I'm talking about, I am unsure of how to do so in this (classroom) setting. As a result, I believe she is instructing me on a variety of topics, like how to learn what to do and what not to do based on what ended up going well and what went poorly, as well as how to learn everything there is to know about teaching from her own experiences when she first started out.

The current study found preliminary evidence of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity that functions as an informal or live curriculum. The curriculum includes supervisors' advice, strategies, and examples, as well as their own teaching experiences when they were new teachers. Usually, reciprocity originates from preservice teachers' talks about their challenges or failures in teaching, and this disclosure results in supervisors' reciprocity about their teaching experiences as student teachers or new teachers. The study also identified self-reported impacts of a supervisor's role as Educational trainer. Fairbanks, Freedman, and Kahn (2000) revealed that involving preservice teachers in conversation and fostering thinking allowed them to address bigger teaching and learning challenges and broaden their perspectives (cited in Butler & Cuena, 2012). Although in this case study, we found evidence for reciprocity that helps supervisors' role in providing a platform for preservice teachers to gain experience in the classroom, researchers need to investigate what Butler and Cuena (2012) stated about supervisory as an

Educational trainer. Researchers should examine how reciprocity helps teachers-in-preparation training's to teach through in-depth reflection or supervisor-supervisee co-reflection on the shared stories or information or advice "in order to gain insights that will support the development of their teaching skills" (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1993, p. 716).

Reciprocity and Social Facilitator

Another significant finding of supervisor-supervisee reciprocity regarding its relation to supervisory is that it serves as a social facilitator for preparing preservice teachers for the profession. In clinical counseling, reciprocity as a social facilitator increased supervisees' (supervisees') chances to develop their socialization and achieve success in the early phases of their careers (St-Jean, 2012; St-Jean & Mathieu, 2011; Wanberg et al., 2007). According to education experts, supervisors should be in charge of enculturating new teachers in their school contexts, welcoming them into their classrooms, fostering open dialogues, as well as providing feedback and assistance (Carver, 2009; Gravells, 2006). This information is evident in Case 1. Successful supervisors, according to Mr. Sam, should relate to pre-service teachers' concerns and queries in order to prepare them for the realities of teaching. As a result, he told Kris and Suzan about his job-search experiences:

Lecturers are not in demand by administrators. They're searching for teachers who can deliver well-planned lessons while still managing the classroom. The individual whom I met when I applied for teaching positions taught me how to interview for a teaching job. I also learned that you have the right to ask questions as an interviewee. Moreover, I talk about the job interviews I underwent with my supervisees. For example, who is your role model, and are you interested in preserving or improving your test scores? (2nd interview). Mr. Sam also shared his professional experiences with Kris and Suzan, offering them guidance and ideas to help them succeed as teachers: "I told Kris and Suzan that in order to master a craft, it takes time and needs experience, and you cannot rush either one" (3rd interview). Moreover, Mr. Sam said in the focus group interview: I try to show them teaching harsh truths, and because of the demographic and academic problems we face, this is a difficult school to teach in. They understand that if they can teach at this school, they can teach at all of the district's schools. And I repeatedly advise them to visit the school and learn about it before they are hired. You will find that it is very much like our school community.

Two supervisees, Kris and Suzan, revealed that sharing these questions with Mr. Sam supported them in realizing the realities of teaching. As Suzan put it. We discuss politics at the school and in the district. I'd never heard of such a thing. I believe that what he shared with me will make me ready to teach in the real world. I'm referring to how things aren't perfect in schools right now, but they're manageable. As he prepares me to succeed in my teaching career, he wants me to relax and open up, so he's trying to do that (2nd interview). While the preliminary findings suggest that preservice teachers needed their supervisors to talk about the realities of teaching and that supervisors also believed that talking about the schools' administration, students, staff, and their teaching and job searching helped preservice teachers and further shaped their supervisees' perspectives and

practices, the reciprocity that was documented in the current study triggers the researchers to further examine whether the reciprocity has just reified preservice teachers' perspectives about teaching, learning, and learning to teach that they developed prior to their teacher education program. While Suzan praised her supervisor for sharing her knowledge of teaching with her, she believed that what she had learned from her supervisor was more than what she had learned in her university classes. There is, however, no case or story that explores how preservice teachers and supervisors discuss theories and innovative practices; in this situation, student teachers may disregard what they have learned at university and even revert to the perspectives of teaching and learning that they developed prior to their program (Eisner, 1992; Lortie, 2002).

Butler and Cuenca (2012) noted that socializing may be positive or negative for preservice teachers' educational perspectives. The limited data did not allow researchers to further explain in what ways reciprocity has exerted both positive and negative effects on supervisees' learning to teach and supervisory relationship development. This task is given to the future researchers of reciprocity and supervisory. Additionally, there is an important task in supervisor preparation, training, and recruitment. If supervisors who are assigned to supervisor preservice teachers do not have reform-minded teacher education programs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), and maintain the traditional perspectives on teaching and learning to teach, they may consciously or unconsciously invite their supervisees to follow them and their teaching completely. This socialization through reciprocity and other teaching practices and interactions may stifle preservice teachers' exploration of effective instructional methods and deal with classroom issues with new visions. Consequently, preservice teachers can be socialized "into the status quo of schools or into supervisor teachers' own practices" (Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2002, p. 196). Further research should even explore how reciprocity positively or negatively influences preservice teachers' learning to teach and supervisory relationship development, as well as how supervisors should properly use reciprocity as a social facilitator.

Reciprocity, Sentimental Underpinning and Learning Environment

Another role of supervisors is as sentimental underpinnings (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). Reciprocity itself is not emotion; however, reciprocity relates to personal emotions, which may be positive or negative. The need for emotional support for pre-service teachers cannot be overstated because creating a caring work environment with trust, collaboration, and communication helps preservice teachers understand the context of teaching and learning to teach in the field experience (Feiman-Nemser & Beasley, 1997). The finding of creating a comfortable learning environment for preservice teachers learning to teach in the field experience is consistent with research on supervisor-supervisee reciprocity in clinical counseling (Wanberg, Welsh, & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007), which found that supervisor-supervisee reciprocity enables supervisees to feel safe disclosing failure experiences and motivates supervisors to self-disclose similar difficult experiences. As a result, the learning of supervisees improved. Other research (Hudson, 2013; Knox et al., 2011; Ladany & Walker, 2003) suggested that the shared stories between the supervisor and supervisee influenced the supervisees' emotions and minimized stress and anxiety.

In the two cases, supervisees succeeded in sharing their failing experiences or challenges in teaching practices. This sharing led to supervisors talking about their own experiences in learning to teach. Preservice teachers relieved their stress and anxiety because they understood it was OK to have unintentionally failing experiences as their supervisors. They were making similar mistakes as everyone else makes when they are a new teacher. William stated that sharing his worries and questions about the educational process helped him to feel less stressed and anxious: When I come across knowledge that contradicts the university program and the real world, I share it. When I'm frustrated, it helps me relax. When I communicate an unfavorable administrative judgment, for example, she nods in agreement; I think it's a form of appeasement (1st interview).

Ms. Shirley further noted that information sharing would have an impact on the learning process throughout the field experience. Therefore, she reacted to William's worries, inquiries, and mistakes in order to reduce his stress and anxiety: "When I share these experiences with him, obviously, I want him to feel that it is not an epic failure if he has a rough day, and that things become easier and more natural with time" (1st interview). Related to emotions, reciprocity also contributed to preservice teachers' learning environment. For new teachers, the knowledge of the reality of learning to teach ensures their success when they are in the initial phases of their teaching career (Christ, 2004; Bradbury & Koballa, 2008). They need supervisors to work with them to create a more positive learning environment. Preservice teachers understand the importance of creating a teaching-learning reality through sharing: You should anticipate learning a lot during your field experience. The entire experience would be horrible if you couldn't communicate your worries, anxieties, flaws, successes, and problems. We are social creatures. If you give me a hard assignment to do in a kind way, I'll gladly do it because I know you'll be there to help me correct my mistakes (2nd interview).

Interestingly, the reality of learning to teach and the working environment are changing because of the changing relationship between supervisors and supervisees. This change involves the relationship development through formal and/or informal communication. William and his supervisor, Ms. Shirley, did not start with much reciprocity. William told his story in a way that indicated how the relationship has changed between him and his supervisor: I tried to offer personal information at first, but I felt ignored. For example, during a recent rainfall, my entire kitchen flooded, and I had to fix it. She said 'Oh no' when I told her that and I told her I wanted to show her images of the damage. She acted as though she didn't care at all. So when I tried to open up again after a few days and said that they would come to work on my kitchen on Saturday, she completely did not care to say anything (1st interview). Nonetheless, towards the midst of the semester, William reported some progress in the relationship with his supervisor:

As we have been working together for more than two months, I feel much more at ease than I did when the semester started. We talk and also have a stronger professional relationship as a result of that than previously. We were able to become acquainted with one another. Sharing is both beneficial and pleasant, and it generally improves my mood (2nd interview). Similarly, Ms. Shirley then mentioned terms "comfort and familiarity" to describe the effect that

information sharing has on building a welcome learning atmosphere in which supervisees may voice their concerns and ask questions.

Our relationship will be better and stronger if we share more with them. As a result, kids communicate more effectively and learn more quickly. As a result, when individuals perceive our maximum comfort and familiarity with us, they become more accessible (focus group interview). The findings of the study showed that supervisees valued the opportunities for them to formally and informally communicate with their supervisors. Reciprocity, if it's appropriate, can help preservice teachers deal with their emotions and make their classrooms more positive.

Reciprocity and Supervisory Relationships

Social interactions between supervisors and supervisees in the field experience and the interactions relate to produced and reproduced concepts of supervisory that determine supervisor-supervisee relationships (Butler & Cuenca, 2012). The current study found that supervisor-supervisee reciprocity creates a safe learning environment and further sets the foundation for supervisory relationships building. This finding confirms earlier research findings (Hudson, 2013; Knox et al., 2011). In such relationships, supervisors are aware of supervisees' feelings of incompetence when they make mistakes. Thus, the supervisors reflect on their own experiences to encourage supervisees to accept challenges and missteps, and thus support the supervisees in their early stage of career development. The interviews in Case 1 indicated signs of closeness, mutual trust, and respect between supervisors and supervisees.

From the supervisors' perspectives, Mr. Sam viewed exchanging information as a bridge that brought supervisor and supervisee closer together by raising the degree of liking and closeness, "We discuss plenty of things, and sometimes we share unusual stories." They are honest, which makes it easier to make it through the internship. Mr. Sam went on to say that reciprocating puts the supervisor and the supervisees at ease and brings them closer together: It enhances the level of comfort between supervisors and supervisees, and they grow friendly with one another. As a result, when they receive feedback from us, it is not an attack on their character or their actions; rather, we are critiquing something they have done. (Group interview). Mr. Sam further mentioned that sharing information should result in a mutually beneficial working relationship based on mutual trust and mutual respect:

Once realizing we will not be offended if they don't do it properly the first time, they open up to us. Preservice teachers are no different than any other student in your classroom; you must be benign towards them, develop a good rapport with them, and ensure that they are comfortable sharing problems and asking questions. They then tell you about their fears, flaws, strengths, successes, and concerns if they feel safe with you in a focus group interview. The supervisees' perspectives echoed those of the supervisors regarding the influence of reciprocity on establishing relationships between supervisors and supervisees. In Case 1, when asked: "Why does Mr. Sam share his personal information with you?" Kris responded, "I think he wants to build rapport with me and help me learn" (1st

interview). Kris also commented when questioned about the impact of information sharing on the development of supervisory relationships: "It brings us closer... I think the closer we get to each other, the more information I get from him." (2nd interview). Kris said, "As the semester comes to a close, I believe I have learned a lot about him. We have shared a lot of personal things about ourselves. Personal information sharing strengthens a bond between two people, in my opinion (3rd interview). Suzan mentioned the influence of supervisors' disclosing of personal information on relationship building:

My supervisor once told me, "You met me in a terrible year." Because of my wife's health, I'm not who I truly am when I teach. ' I feel he told me about his personal experiences in order for me to get to know him, trust him, and open up to him (2nd interview). Suzan believed that by exchanging information, "not only a friendship, but also trust and mutual respect" was established. He now has enough faith in me to leave me alone in the classroom." (3rd interview). However, when questioned about the relationship with her supervisor, Suzan said, "I was amazed by how close I became to my supervisor throughout my internship. In the beginning, I believed it would be a brief but rigid relationship" (3rd interview). In Case 2, William saw that increased information exchange with Ms. Shirley aided in the development of their supervisory rapport: Ms. Shirley and I spend more time interacting with one another and being kind to one another than we did in the past. We now have a stronger working relationship than we had previously. She is nicer, and as we've been working together for a while, she asks for my input. As a result, we got the opportunity to get to know each other (3rd interview).

William also mentioned that as a result of increased information sharing based on mutual trust and respect, their supervisory relationship improved: "Now she asks my opinion about things, which makes me feel she is a reliable teacher." Also, when I check her exams, I can see my contribution. (Second interview). Ms. Shirley also reported that the increased amount of reciprocity between supervisors and supervisees improved their supervisory relationship: With our student instructors, we have a very intimate relationship. They know us and can contact us at any time of day or night. This, I believe, is critical for them to feel our commitment and to know that we are there for them (focus group interview). Ms. Shirley also noted that exchanging information should lead to a stronger supervisory relationship built on respect and trust: "The more we share with them, the better and stronger our relationship will be. "They exchange information and acquire knowledge more rapidly. As a result, they are more receptive to our instruction." (Focus group interview).

Using Altman and Taylor's (1973) social penetration theory, the researcher found answers to the research question regarding supervisor-supervisee relationship building through reciprocity. This study identified preliminary evidence that both supervisors and supervisees viewed reciprocity as a tool for relationship building. Reciprocity not only provides emotional support and creates a more open communication context, it further influences supervisor-supervisee relationship building and establishes trust and respect. More importantly, this trusting and respecting relationship encourages preservice teachers to be more willing to discuss their stresses and frustrations in teaching. However, due to the limitation

of this study, there is neither an investigation of reciprocity patterns that supervisors and supervisees follow nor an order of relationship. Despite the fact that reciprocity between supervisor and supervisee moves from less to more, from a shallow to a deeper level in Case 2 the researcher should be careful before drawing any judgments about the findings because supervisors and supervisees have varied methods of reciprocity. There is a need to examine the four stages of relationship building (orientation, exploratory affective exchange, affective exchange, and stable exchange). This study did not allow researchers to look at the factors such as personality, motives, gender, or cultural perspectives that influence self-disclosing behaviors. Moreover, reciprocity is connected with identity, and it is important for future researchers to further explore how culture influences communication and reciprocity in supervision and how reciprocity influences preservice teachers' identity development in their learning to teach. Through the discussion of findings on reciprocity that involves supervisory relationships, we viewed reciprocity as both a personal and a professional curriculum and tool in supervisor-supervisee communication. Different from reciprocity in social settings, supervisor-supervisee reciprocity embeds personal aspects into professional aspects.

Conclusion

Reciprocity has been studied in other professional fields such as counselling and communication. This study contributes to theorizing reciprocity in teacher education research internationally as it is a ground-breaking work. Knowing the functions of reciprocity is significant to enacting three aspects of supervisor roles. Through this preliminary study, we proposed several research questions to be further investigated regarding how reciprocity can enhance both learning to teach and supervision. This study will also help teacher education programs train supervisors to use reciprocity to provide preservice teachers with more opportunities to learn instructional strategies, relieve their stress, develop confidence in a safe sharing environment, and improve their understanding of the profession as a teacher.

Appendix (A) Interviews with Supervisors and Preservice Teachers

Interviews with Supervisors (Part 1)

- What is your educational and professional history?
- What kind of stories do you exchange with your supervisee? Could you give an example?
- Why do you talk about your personal stories with your supervisee?
- How do you rate your relationship with your supervisee?
- What effect does information sharing have on the development of supervisory relationships?
- Please include details about your supervisory relationship. What effect does providing information have on the development of supervisory relationships?
- What kinds of teaching concerns does your supervisee express to you?

Interviews with Supervisors (Part 2)

- Do you open up to your supervisee and discuss personal or professional material? Why?
- How comfortable are you with sharing personal or professional material with supervisee? How
- do you know if your supervisee is open to exchanging information with you? Could you please give me an example?
- Why does your supervisee provide you with personal or professional material?
- How does disclosing personal information affect your supervisee's relationship with you?
- How does the information your supervisee provides you with help you supervisor better?

Interviews with Supervisors (Part 3)

- How comfortable are you with sharing personal or professional material with supervisee? How do you know if your supervisee is open to exchanging information with you?
- Describe how exchanging personal or professional information during this field experience affect the development of your connection with your ST?
- How does sharing information assist your ST in his or her quest to become a teacher?
- What difficulties does your supervisee face as a teacher? How can you use personal communication to assist him/her in overcoming such obstacles?

Interviews with Preservice Teachers (Part 1)

- What is your educational and professional history?
- What kind of stories do you exchange with your supervisor?
- How does information sharing affect the development of supervisory relationships?
- What difficulties do you have when dealing with your supervisor? Do you discuss such difficulties with him/her?
- When you're having trouble teaching, do you express your concerns to your supervisor?
- Why do you disclose your supervisor your professional information?
- When discussing your teaching issues with your supervisor, does he or she include his or her own experiences while learning to teach?

Interviews with Preservice Teachers (Part 2)

- Do you exchange any professional stories with your supervisor?
- What factors influence the level of communication between you and your supervisor? Could you provide an example?
- How does revealing personal information affect your supervisor's connection with you?

- What motivates you to open up to your supervisor and offer personal or professional information? What factors influence your decision to reveal or withhold such information from your supervisor?

Interviews with Preservice Teachers (Part 3)

- How does sharing personal or professional information affect the development of your supervisor-supervisee relationship throughout this field experience?
- How can sharing information assist you in being a better teacher?
- How do you incorporate information sharing into your teaching? Could you please give me an example?
- What difficulties does your supervisee face as a teacher? How do you assist him/her in overcoming such obstacles by sharing your personal experiences?

Appendix B Focus Group Interviews

- How did sharing personal information aid your supervisee's success as a new teacher learning to teach?
- How did revealing personal information affect preservice teachers' relationships with their supervisors?
- What obstacles did your supervisee experience as he or she learned to teach? How did you use sharing your personal information to assist your supervisee in overcoming these obstacles?

References

- Allugunti V.R (2022). A machine learning model for skin disease classification using convolution neural network. *International Journal of Computing, Programming and Database Management* 3(1), 141-147
- Altman, I., & Talyor, D. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Ambrosetti, A., & Dekkers, J. (2010). The interconnectedness of the roles of mentors and mentees in preservice teacher education mentoring relationships. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 42-55.
- Bradbury, L. U., & Koballa, T. R., Jr. (2008). Borders to cross: Identifying sources of tension in mentor-intern relationships. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 24(8), 2132-2145.
- Butler, B. M., & Cuenca, A. (2012). Conceptualizing the roles of mentor teachers during student teaching. *Action in Teacher education*, 34(4), 296-308.
- Carver, C. (2009) Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces. *Educational Policy*, 23(2), 295-328.
- Christ, S. (2004). Examining learning to teach through a social lens: How mentors guide newcomers into a professional community of learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(2), 7-24.
- Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 79, 73-91.
- Eisner, E. (1992). Educational reform and the ecology of school. *Teachers College Record*, 95(4), 610-627.

- Fairbanks, C. M., Freedman, D., & Kahn, C. (2000). The role of effective mentors in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2), 102-112.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1055.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Beasley, K. (1997). Mentoring as assisted performance: A case of coplanning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education: Building a world of new understandings* (pp. 108-126). Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1993). Mentoring in context: A comparison of two U.S. programs for beginning teachers. *International Journal of Education Research*, 79(8), 699-718.
- Gravells, J. (2006). Mentoring start-up entrepreneurs in the East Midlands – troubleshooters and trusted friends. *The International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching*, 4(2), 20-1.
- Hudson, P. (2013b). Developing and sustaining successful mentoring relationships. *Journal of Relationships Research*, 4, 10. e1 doi:10.1017/jrr.2013.1.
- Hudson, P. B. (2013a). Desirable attributes and practices for mentees: mentor teachers' expectations. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 2(3), 107-118.
- Jones, M., & Straker, K. (2006). What informs mentors' practice when working with trainees and newly qualified teachers? An investigation into mentors' professional knowledge base. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32(2), 165-184.
- Knox, S., Edwards, L. M., Hess, S. A., & Hill, C. E. (2011). Supervisor self-disclosure: Supervisees' experiences and perspectives. *Psychotherapy*, 48(4), 336-341.
- Koç, E. M. (2011). Development of mentor teacher role inventory. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 193-208.
- Kumar, S. (2022). A quest for sustainium (sustainability Premium): review of sustainable bonds. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, Vol. 26, no.2, pp. 1-18
- Ladany, N., & Walker, J.A. (2003). Supervisor self-disclosure: Balancing the uncontrollable narcissist with the indomitable altruist. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 611-621. doi:10.1002/jclp.10164.
- Lampert, M., Franke, M. L., Kazemi, E., Ghouseini, H., Turrou, A. C., Beasley, H., & Crowe, K. (2013). Keeping it complex using rehearsals to support novice teacher learning of ambitious teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(3), 226-243.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods*. (3rd ed.) Sage.
- Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. (2nd ed.) Sage.
- Lortie, D. C. (2002). *Schoolteacher* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Jossey-Bass.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Rahmadeni, A. S. ., Hayat, N. ., Alba, A. D. ., Badri, I. A. ., & Fadhila, F. . (2020). The relationship of family social support with depression levels of elderly in

- 2019 . *International Journal of Health & Medical Sciences*, 3(1), 111-116.
<https://doi.org/10.31295/ijhms.v3n1.188>
- Spence, N., Fox, J., Golding, L., & Daiches, A. (2012). Supervisee self-disclosure: A clinical psychology perspective. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 21, 178-192.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 443-466). Sage.
- St-Jean, E. (2012). Mentoring as professional development for novice entrepreneurs: maximizing the learning1. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 16(3), 200-216.
- St-Jean, E., & Mathieu, C. (2011). Optimizing Learning for Novice Entrepreneurs in a mentoring relationship: The Importance of Mentee's Self-disclosure. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 17(2), 11-21.
- Suryasa, I. W., Rodríguez-Gámez, M., & Koldoris, T. (2022). Post-pandemic health and its sustainability: Educational situation. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, 6(1), i-v. <https://doi.org/10.53730/ijhs.v6n1.5949>
- Thomas L, MacMillan J, McColl E, Hale C & Bond S (1995) Comparison of focus group and individual interview methodology in examining patient satisfaction with nursing care. *Social Sciences in Health* 1, 206-219.
- Wanberg, C. R., Welsh, E. T. and Kammeyer-Mueller, J. (2007). Protégé and mentor Self-disclosure: levels and outcomes within formal mentoring dyads in a corporate context. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 70(2), 398-412.
- Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2002). Teacher preparation research: An insider's view from the outside. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(3), 190-204.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research. Design and methods*. Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Zeichner, K. (1996). Designing educative practicum experiences. In K. Zeichner, S. Melnick, & M. L. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in preservice teacher education* (pp. 215-234). Teachers College Press.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston, M. Haberman, & J. Sikula (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 329-348). Macmillan.