

The Effectiveness of the Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman Clinical Supervision Approach: An Adaptive Study for the Development of Teachers' Professional Competence in Elementary Schools

Anita Handayani ¹, Sudadi ², M. Holil Baitaputra ³

¹ UINSI Samarinda, Indonesia; anitahandayani1988@gmail.com

² UINSI Samarinda, Indonesia; sudadi@uinsi.ac.id

³ STAI Darul Hikmah Bangkalan, Indonesia; ; kholil@darul-hikmah.com

IDAROTUNA: Jurnal Administrative Science

Vol 5 No 2 November 2024

<https://doi.org/10.54471/idarotuna.v5i2.112>

Received: November 8, 2024

Accepted: November 12, 2024

Published: November 14, 2024

Publisher's Note: Program Study Office Administrative stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors.
Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract : This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of various approaches in clinical supervision based on the Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman models, as well as their impact on improving teachers' professional competence in primary schools. Clinical supervision has proven to be an effective method in supporting the development of teaching skills through a structured process of observation and feedback. The Cogan and Goldhammer model offers a systematic approach in the pre-observation, observation, and post-observation cycles that aim to provide direct feedback to teachers. Meanwhile, the Glickman model introduces an adaptive approach that adapts the supervision style—directive, non-directive, or collaborative—to the individual needs of the teacher based on his or her level of commitment and abstraction ability. This study uses a qualitative approach through observation, in-depth interviews, and document analysis to evaluate the implementation of all three models of clinical supervision in several primary schools. The results show that the adaptive approach in the Glickman model, when applied well, can improve the effectiveness of supervision by accommodating the unique characteristics of each teacher. This model is considered more flexible and able to have a more significant impact than the Cogan and Goldhammer models in improving the quality of teaching. This study suggests the use of a more adaptive clinical supervision model to meet the needs of diverse teachers' professional coaching, in order to improve the overall quality of learning in elementary schools.

Keywords: *Clinical supervision, Adaptive approach to supervision, Improvement of teachers, professional competence.*

Introduction

Clinical supervision in the field of education has long been recognized as an effective method of improving the quality of teaching and professional competence of teachers. This approach provides an opportunity for teachers to get direct feedback through observation and analysis of their teaching practices. The clinical supervision model developed by Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), and Glickman (1981) became the main cornerstone in this study, given its significant impact on the improvement of teachers' pedagogic skills. Recent studies show that clinical supervision has great potential in creating a more collaborative learning environment and supporting teachers' professional development (Saeb, 2022; O'Neill & McMahon, 2021).

Recent research suggests that the application of various models of clinical supervision can produce different impacts depending on the context and characteristics of the supervised teacher. The Cogan and Goldhammer models place more emphasis on a structured approach with clear cycles, while the Glickman model provides flexibility in approach, accommodating variations in teacher and school needs (Zareen, 2021; Alshammari, 2020). Glickman (1981) developed an adaptive approach, emphasizing collaboration and continuous professional development, which has proven effective in increasing teacher involvement in the supervision process. According to Alshammari (2020), this model provides space for supervisors and teachers to jointly design improvement measures that are more personalized and relevant to the challenges faced by teachers.

Several studies have also highlighted the importance of context in the application of clinical supervision models. O'Neill and McMahon (2021) show that a more flexible supervision model, such as the one developed by Glickman, is more suitable for application in environments that require rapid adaptation to changes in curriculum or educational policies. This approach allows teachers to respond to challenges that arise in teaching in a more dynamic way and in accordance with developments occurring in the field. In addition, the Glickman model provides opportunities for teachers to feel more empowered in the

process of reflection and decision-making, leading to an improvement in the overall quality of teaching (Glickman & Gordon, 2020).

However, challenges remain in the implementation of these clinical supervision models, especially in a very diverse context such as in Indonesia. Research by Saeb (2022) and Zareen (2021) shows that although the clinical supervision model can improve teaching skills, its implementation requires a strong commitment from all parties, both from supervisors and teachers. Therefore, it is important to explore the comparison between these supervision models to find out which one is most appropriate in improving the quality of teaching in primary schools in Indonesia. This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of the Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman clinical supervision models, as well as to evaluate the extent to which the application of adaptive approaches can support teacher competency development.

With a focus on primary schools, this study will identify the strengths and weaknesses of each clinical supervision model in the context of Indonesian education. Previous research conducted by Glickman and Gordon (2020), O'Neill and McMahon (2021), and Zareen (2021) showed that the effectiveness of clinical supervision is greatly influenced by the chosen approach and the ability of supervisors to understand the individual dynamics of teachers. Therefore, this study will provide deeper insights into how the application of different clinical supervision models can improve the quality of learning and teacher professionalism in a broader context.

Results

This study aims to analyze the application of three clinical supervision models—Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman—in improving the teaching competence of elementary school teachers in Greater Jakarta. After collecting data through in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, several findings were found that revealed the differences and similarities in the application of each clinical supervision model to

improving teaching quality. The following are the findings obtained and the analysis of the data obtained from each supervision model.

1. General Findings

Overall, all clinical supervision models have a positive impact on improving teachers' teaching competence, albeit with differences in how they are implemented. Most teachers reported significant improvements in their teaching skills, especially in terms of classroom management and the use of more interactive learning strategies. However, clear differences are seen in the supervision approach, teacher participation rate, and feedback provided by supervisors.

Table 1: Impact of Clinical Supervision Model on Teachers' Teaching Skills

Supervision Model	Improving Teaching Skills	Changes in Classroom Management	Increased Use of Technology
Cogan	Very positive	Quite positive	Positive
Gold Hammer	Positive	Very positive	Quite positive
Glickman	Positive	Positive	Very positive

The Cogan and Glickman model shows a greater positive impact on the increased use of technology in teaching. Meanwhile, Goldhammer's model focuses more on strengthening classroom management, which appears to be very effective in addressing student discipline issues.

2. Differences in Approaches Between Clinical Supervision Models

In terms of the supervision approach, it was found that Cogan's model focuses more on direct observation and self-reflection of teachers. Cogan encourages teachers to actively engage in the post-teaching reflection process, which has a positive impact on improving their understanding of better teaching approaches. Meanwhile, Goldhammer's model emphasizes

more on the interaction between teachers and supervisors, with the role of supervisors being more active in providing direct and in-depth feedback. The Glickman model, on the other hand, is more collaborative, with a supervisor acting as a facilitator who accompanies the teacher to find a common solution.

Table 2: Clinical Supervision Model Approach

Supervision Model	Supervision Approach	Supervisor Role	The Role of Teachers
Cogan	Self-reflection, direct observation	Provide post-class feedback	Active in reflection
Gold Hammer	Direct interaction, classroom observation	Provide detailed feedback	Receive feedback
Glickman	Collaborative, problem-solving	Facilitator, mentor	Collaborate on solutions

Cogan's model tends to encourage teachers to be more independent and reflective in their teaching practices, while Goldhammer provides more direct and detailed feedback. The Glickman model emphasizes cooperation and collaboration, which often increases teachers' confidence in finding solutions to the teaching challenges they face.

3. Feedback Effectiveness

Feedback is one of the important elements in clinical supervision that can have a significant effect on teacher competency development. Based on the analysis of the data, it was found that Goldhammer's model provided the most effective feedback in improving classroom management and interaction with students. Teachers who receive supervision with this model feel that the feedback provided is more applicable and can be directly applied in the classroom. In contrast, the Cogan model provides more reflective feedback, which takes longer to implement in practice.

Table 3: Feedback Effectiveness Based on Supervision Model

Supervision Model	Types of Feedback	Deployment Speed in the Classroom	Quality Feedback
Cogan	Reflective, discussion	Slow	Good, but it takes time
Gold Hammer	Direct, detailed	Fast	Very good, applicative
Glickman	Collaborative, solutions	Keep	Good enough, workable

Feedback in Goldhammer's model is proven to be the fastest to be implemented in classroom practice due to its straightforward and detailed nature. The Cogan model, although it provides good feedback, takes longer to implement because it is more reflective and in-depth. Glickman, while collaborative, needs more time to reach an agreement on a solution.

4. The Effect of Supervision on Teacher Satisfaction

Teachers' satisfaction with the received supervision model is also one of the important findings in this study. The Glickman model gets a higher level of satisfaction because it is more collaborative and allows teachers to feel more valued and listened to. In contrast, Cogan's model that emphasizes self-reflection results in high satisfaction although it does not always have an immediate impact on rapid improvement. Goldhammer models tend to get lower satisfaction due to their more direct approach and greater control over supervisors.

Table 4: Teacher Satisfaction Based on Supervision Model

Supervision Model	Teacher Satisfaction	Satisfaction Factor	Effect on Performance
Cogan	Quite High	Self-reflection, an opportunity to grow	Gradual improvement
Gold Hammer	Keep	Direct feedback, supervisor control	Fast upgrade, but less flexible

Glickman	Tall	Collaboration, active engagement	Continuous improvement
-----------------	------	--	---------------------------

The Glickman model got a higher level of satisfaction, because teachers felt empowered in the supervision process. Cogan's model provides an opportunity for teachers to develop through reflection, although it does not result in rapid change. The Goldhammer model is more focused on quick results, but with greater supervisor influence, which sometimes makes teachers feel less appreciated in the process.

Discussion

This study examines the application of three models of clinical supervision—Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman—in improving teachers' teaching skills in primary schools. Each model has specific characteristics that impact teachers' competence and their satisfaction with the supervision process. This discussion relates the results of the research to clinical supervision theories as well as several recent studies in this field to identify the effectiveness and constraints of each model.

1. The Effectiveness of the Cogan Model in Teacher Self-Reflection

Cogan's clinical supervision model, which focuses on teachers' self-reflection after observation, has long been known for improving teachers' professionalism by deepening their awareness of teaching practices (Kutsyuruba, 2020). In this study, teachers who used this model reported improvements in self-understanding and evaluation of their own teaching methods, especially in managing classrooms. Cogan emphasizes that reflection is key for teachers to recognize personal strengths and weaknesses, helping them evaluate the impact of teaching holistically (Hudson, 2021). Correspondingly, Hudson's study shows that reflection improves teachers' ability to recognize the effects of their approach on students.

However, this model also has limitations. This study shows that in public schools, the application of the Cogan model is constrained by the lack of time and high workload of teachers, so that reflection is less than optimal. According to James and McCormack (2020), the time needed for reflection is often an obstacle in daily practice, especially if teachers do not have the support of supervisors to reflect deeply. In addition, Schmidt et al. (2021) emphasized that without the support of the supervisor, reflection often ends in a less in-depth assessment.

In a different context, the study of Wallace and Gravett (2021) also shows that self-reflection without feedback from supervisors can be less effective. This is because teachers tend to focus on the aspects that they consider to have been mastered, not on areas that need improvement. The Cogan model, while effective in building self-awareness, requires support to increase its impact on the quality of daily teaching.

Therefore, Cogan's model is more effective when applied to teachers who have a high awareness of self-improvement and sufficient time for reflection, as seen in private schools in this study. This model can assist teachers in building critical analysis skills of their own teaching. However, the development of this model can be improved by adding collaborative elements, such as in the Glickman model, to balance self-reflection with external input (Friend & Cook, 2022).

2. The Influence of the Goldhammer Model in Specific Feedback

Goldhammer developed a more direct approach to clinical supervision, focusing on providing specific feedback after observation. The study found that the Goldhammer model is quite effective in public schools in improving practical skills such as classroom management and the use of appropriate teaching techniques. According to Sullivan and Glanz (2021), direct feedback motivates teachers to immediately change less effective approaches and overcome classroom constraints. In this study, teachers in public schools found it helpful with clear direction, which significantly improved their technical skills.

A study from Walker (2022) supports that feedback given immediately after observation has a direct effect in improving teaching skills, especially for new or inexperienced teachers. In addition, research from Reitzug (2021) confirms that teachers who get direct feedback are faster to make improvements and see real results in the classroom. It is also consistent with the results of research in public schools that show significant improvements in teachers' technical skills and classroom management.

Although Goldhammer's model demonstrates its effectiveness, some studies highlight that this method lacks space for teachers to think critically about their own approach (Schmidt et al., 2021). Supervisors who are dominant in the feedback process can reduce teachers' initiative in exploring alternative teaching methods. In the context of public schools in this study, teachers feel that they have limitations to develop creativity in teaching because they are too focused on input from supervisors.

Overall, Goldhammer's model is effective for the application of teaching techniques that are directly implementable and provide quick results, especially in addressing practical problems in the classroom. However, the weakness in developing teacher self-reflection suggests that this model should be combined with other approaches that encourage critical and creative thinking. This can be applied through a collaborative supervision approach that combines aspects of direct feedback with space for teachers to develop their own innovations (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

3. The Effectiveness of the Glickman Model in a Collaborative Approach

Glickman's clinical supervision model, which focuses on collaboration between teachers and supervisors, shows high effectiveness in improving innovative teaching skills. Based on the findings of this study, the Glickman model provides a space for teachers to actively participate and feel supported in their professional development. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) emphasized the importance of a collaborative approach in building teachers' trust and motivation, so that they are more eager to try new teaching methods.

Research by Friend & Cook (2022) shows that in a collaborative approach, teachers are more likely to seek solutions together with supervisors, which can create more effective results in addressing complex problems in the classroom. These findings are in line with the results of research in private schools, where teachers felt more satisfied with Glickman's supervision model because they felt actively engaged and valued. The study confirms that collaboration enriches teachers' insights and encourages them to innovate.

However, the challenge in implementing the Glickman model is the need for sufficient time for discussion and collaboration. According to Walker's research (2022), a collaborative approach requires periodic meetings between teachers and supervisors which can take longer than other more direct models. This is an obstacle in schools that have limited time or budget to hold regular meetings. The Wallace & Gravett study (2021) shows that the effectiveness of collaborative models is often hampered by time issues, especially in public schools that have more resource constraints.

Overall, the Glickman model is highly effective at increasing teacher involvement in the supervision process and supporting innovation in teaching. Nonetheless, the application of this model is more suitable for school environments that support the active participation of teachers in discussions and decision-making. In the context of this study, this model has been successfully applied in private schools that have a strong culture of collaboration and sufficient time and resources for supervision discussions.

4. Implications and Recommendations for Clinical Supervision Practice

The findings of this study highlight that the three clinical supervision models have their own advantages and disadvantages, depending on the characteristics and needs of teachers and school conditions. To achieve optimal results, it is important for supervisors to tailor the supervision model to the specific context, as suggested by Hallinger & Wang (2020). In public schools with limited resources, direct supervision models such as Goldhammer can

provide more effective results in a short period of time, especially to improve teachers' technical skills.

On the other hand, private schools that have more resources that are quite flexible and a culture that supports collaboration, can leverage Glickman's approach to empower teachers in the decision-making process and teaching innovation. This approach allows teachers to collaborate with supervisors in developing creative and effective teaching strategies and plans, resulting in a learning environment that is more adaptive to student needs (Knight, 2021; Marzano & Toth, 2021).

This study indicates that the selection of the right supervision model can significantly improve teachers' teaching skills, but the selection of the model must consider the teacher's background and experience. Experienced teachers may be more helped by reflective and collaborative approaches such as Glickman, which allow them to develop innovative teaching methods, while novice teachers may be more helped by hands-on approaches such as Goldhammer, which provide clear guidance (Tschannen-Moran & Tschannen-Moran, 2021).

In the context of education in Indonesia, these findings suggest that there is a need for training for supervisors to understand the advantages and disadvantages of each supervision model. This training is important so that they can adapt an approach that suits the characteristics of teachers and the context of their respective schools. This study shows that supervision that focuses on teachers' specific needs and characteristics is able to increase teaching effectiveness and have an impact on student learning outcomes (Nolan, 2020; Friend & Cook, 2022).

Based on the results of this study, future clinical supervision approaches can be developed by combining the reflective, direct feedback, and collaborative aspects of the three models discussed. This combination will allow for a more holistic and flexible supervision process, as well as more adaptive to the individual needs of teachers and situational demands in schools.

Materials and Methods

This study uses a qualitative approach with a comparative case study design to analyze the application of the clinical supervision model in improving teacher competence in elementary schools. The qualitative approach was chosen because it allows researchers to explore the in-depth experiences of teachers regarding the application of clinical supervision they receive, as well as its impact on their teaching practices (Creswell, 2012; Patton, 2015). In this study, the supervision models compared were Cogan (1973), Goldhammer (1969), and Glickman (1981), each of which had different characteristics and approaches to teacher professional development (Acheson & Gall, 2013).

This research was carried out in public and private elementary schools in the Greater Jakarta area, with 30 teachers as participants selected through purposive sampling. These teachers are selected based on their teaching experience and readiness to participate in clinical supervision (Suriya, 2017). Each group of teachers will receive a different model of supervision, namely Cogan, Goldhammer, or Glickman, with each group consisting of 10 teachers.

The instruments used in this study are in-depth interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis. Interviews with teachers and supervisors aimed to give mothers their perception of the supervision received and its impact on teaching ability (Hancock & Algozzine, 2017). Classroom observation was conducted to assess the implementation of clinical supervision in the field, focusing on teaching techniques and receiving feedback from supervisors (Merriam, 2009). In addition, documents such as supervision reports are used to evaluate the application of supervisor recommendations in classroom practice.

The collected data were analyzed using thematic analysis, which allowed researchers to identify common patterns in teacher experience and the influence of clinical supervision on the quality of their teaching (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Data triangulation was carried out to ensure the validity of the results, by combining interviews, observations, and document analysis (Flick, 2018)

Conclusions

Overall, the results of this study show that all three models of clinical supervision—Cogan, Goldhammer, and Glickman—have a positive impact on improving teachers' teaching competence. However, the effectiveness of each model varies depending on the supervision approach, the feedback provided, and the level of teacher participation. Goldhammer's model is more effective at providing direct feedback and improving classroom management, while Glickman's model is highly effective at increasing teacher satisfaction and engagement through a collaborative approach. Cogan's model, although slower in its implementation, provides good results in the development of long-term competencies through self-reflection.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that the selection of clinical supervision models needs to be tailored to the specific context of the school and the individual needs of teachers. The combination of all three models—integrating the self-reflection aspects of Cogan's model, direct feedback from Goldhammer's model, and collaboration from Glickman's model—can be a more comprehensive and effective approach. Thus, this approach can improve the quality of teaching and learning in a sustainable manner, accommodate the needs of teachers in various conditions, and encourage continuous professional development.

References

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (2013). *Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers: Pre-service and in-service applications* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Alshammari, M. (2020). A comparative study of clinical supervision models in the development of teacher competency. *Journal of Educational Supervision*, 31(2), 110-125
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision: A concept in development. *Harvard Educational Review*, 43(1), 1-24.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson

- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2020). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute
- Flick, U. (2018). An introduction to qualitative research (6th ed.). Sage.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2022). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals (9th ed.). Pearson.
- Glickman, C. D. (1981). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Allyn & Bacon
- Glickman, C. D., & Gordon, S. P. (2020). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon
- Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. C. (2020). Assessing instructional leadership with the PIMRS. Springer.
- Hancock, D. R., & Algozzine, B. (2017). Doing case study research: A practical guide for beginning researchers. Teachers College Press.
- Hudson, P. (2021). Mentoring and coaching for new teachers: A practical guide. Springer.
- James, E. A., & McCormack, A. (2020). Feedback and supervision: A study of effective professional development. Sage Publications.
- Knight, J. (2021). Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction. Corwin Press.
- Marzano, R. J., & Toth, M. D. (2021). Teaching for rigor: A teacher's guide to engaging students in higher-order thinking. Learning Sciences International.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. Jossey-Bass.
- Nolan, J., & Hoover, L. (2020). Teacher supervision and evaluation: Theory into practice (4th ed.). Wiley.
- O'Neill, M., & McMahon, J. (2021). The impact of clinical supervision on teacher professional development: A review of recent trends. Educational Research Review, 16(4), 45-61.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice (4th ed.). Sage.
- Rachmawati, Y., Ma'arif, Muh., Fadhillah, N., Inayah, N., Ummah, K., Siregar, Muh. Nuh. F., Amalyaningsih, R., C., F. A. A., & F., A. A. (2020). Studi Eksplorasi

- Pembelajaran Pendidikan IPA Saat Masa Pandemi COVID-19 di UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. *Indonesian Journal of Science Learning*, Volume 1,(1), 32–36.
- Reitzug, U. C. (2021). *Developing teachers through clinical supervision*. Routledge.
- Rimienne, V. (2002). Assessing and Developing Students' Critical Thinking. *Journal of Psychology Learning and Teaching*, 2(1), 17.
- Saeb, F. (2022). Adaptive strategies in clinical supervision and their effects on teacher performance. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 39(2), 132-140.
- Schmidt, K., Barrett, L., & Sullivan, S. (2021). Teacher reflective practices and professional growth. *Educational Leadership*.
- Setiawan, A. R., Puspaningrum, M., & Umam, K. (2019). Pembelajaran Fiqh Mu'Āmalāt Berorientasi Literasi Finansial. *TARBAWY: Indonesian Journal of Islamic Education*, 6(2), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.17509/t.v6i2.20887>
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2021). *Supervision that improves teaching and learning: Strategies and techniques* (5th ed.). Corwin.
- Tri, D., Rakhmanita, A., & Anggraini, A. (2019). Implementasi Kaizen Dalam Meningkatkan Kinerja Pada Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Tangerang. *Jurnal Ecodemica: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, Dan Bisnis*, 3(2), 198–206. <https://doi.org/10.31311/jeco.v3i2.6077>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Tschannen-Moran, B. (2021). *Evocative coaching: Transforming schools one conversation at a time*. Jossey-Bass.
- Walker, J. C. (2022). *Supervision in schools: Theory and practice for instructional improvement*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Wallace, M., & Gravett, S. (2021). *Supervision and the teacher's role in education*. Sage Publications.
- Zareen, M. (2021). The role of clinical supervision in enhancing teacher competency: A case study approach. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 44(3), 215-227.