DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 776 56 SP 001 500

By-Kallenbach, W. Warren

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED PRACTICE TEACHING SESSIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY INTERN TEACHERS. FINAL REPORT.

San Jose State Coll., Calif.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-1303
Pub Date 25 Aug 67
Grant-OEG-4-6-061303-1885
Note-36p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.52
Descriptors-COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, FEEDBACK, *MICROTEACHING, PRESERVICE EDUCATION, RATING SCALES, *STUDENT TEACHING, TEACHER EVALUATION, *TEACHER INTERNS, VIDEO TAPE RECORDINGS
Identifiers-Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities, IOTA, Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide, STCAG

To extend previous research findings on the effectiveness of microteaching techniques, all 40 candidates in the 1967 San Jose State College summer elementary intern teaching program were randomly divided into 2 groups. Both groups had the same program except that 1 participated in an off-campus observation and teaching program; the other participated in an on-campus microteaching program. Five-minute pre- and postsummer lesson excerpts were video tape-recorded for each of the candidates. These were judged independently by each member of 2 independent teams of trained evaluators using the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide and the Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities. A similar field follow-up assessment was made of each intern teacher in the fall and spring. No significant differences between the 2 groups appeared at the end of the summer or developed in the assessments during the school year, indicating that a microteaching program, while saving time for staff and interns (80% in this study), can be just as effective as a regular student teaching program. Judges' findings were found to be moderately but significantly correlated with some exceptions. Included are 4 statistical data tables, the rating measures used (14 pages), a description of the microteaching program, and a 29-item bibliography. (JS)

Final Report
Project No. 6-1303
Grant No. OEG 4-6-061303-1885

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED PRACTICE TEACHING SESSIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY INTERN TEACHERS

August, 1967

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED PRACTICE TEACHING SESSIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY INTERN TEACHERS

Project No. 6-1303
Contract or Grant No. OEG 4-6-061303-1885

W. Warren Kallenbach

August 25, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

San Jose State College

San Jose, California

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDICES

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF VIDEOTAPED PRACTICE TEACHING SESSIONS IN THE PREPARATION OF ELEMENTARY INTERN TEACHERS

Introduction

The study was designed to demonstrate whether or not two randomly assigned groups of elementary intern teaching candidates differed significantly in selected teaching skills and overall teaching competence after one group had completed a summer microteaching[1] program and the other had completed the regular summer classroom observation and student teaching programs, and whether these relationships, if any, persist in the field. The study was designed to extend the Stanford University School of Education microteaching studies to the elementary pre-service teacher education level.

The microteaching program requires far fewer hours than the student teaching program (80% less in this study) and is logistically more feasible for the students and staff of the college. If the outcomes of research studies favor the microteaching program or show no significant differences between them and student teaching programs, then teacher education planners can select between programs on the basis of economy.

Another contribution of the study is the knowledge of whether or not a given group of groups of teaching candidates have achieved the goals of your teaching program.

Review of Related Research

There have been many studies requiring the measurement of teacher traits, teacher competence, or teaching effectiveness, but most authorities write that the studies reported are considerably lacking in either research design or conceptualization of an underlying theory or both.[2] Microteaching itself is comparatively new (first study reported in 1963), and most reports are from studies at the Stanford University School of Education where the microteaching procedures were first developed. The bibliography cites the majority of the studies reported to date.

A. Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis was that there would be no significant differences in teaching skills and overall teacher competence of

---

[1] The microteaching procedures are described in Appendix A.

[2] Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

the two randomly divided groups of pre-service elementary intern teachers either (1) at the end of the summer program or (2) during the regular school year.

Other questions studied were as follows:

1. That there would be no significant differences between the groups in demographic factors: age, sex, marital status, grade point average, or previous teaching experience (some had had one semester of student teaching).

2. That there would be no significant differences between total scores of the judges or teams of judges using the teacher competence instruments of the study.

B. Method of the Study

The experimental design was as follows:

	Pre-service	Inservice
Microteaching Group:	R O_1 X_1 O_1	O_1 O_2 O_1 O_2
Student Teaching Group:	R O_1 X_2 O_1	O_1 O_2 O_1 O_2

Where R equals randomly assigned group, O equals observation with a given measuring instrument or instruments, and X equals the introduction of the experimental variable or variables which, in this study, were the Microteaching Program (X_1) and the Student Teaching Program (X_2).

The independent variable was the score from the Diagnostic Lesson evaluations. The dependent variables will be the scores from the Criterion Lesson and the field study evaluations.

The study population was the elementary intern teaching candidates (N=40) selected by the San Jose State College Intern Selection Committee in the spring of 1966. This population was randomly divided into two groups.

Immediately after the summer program commenced, each intern presented a five-minute Diagnostic Lesson which was recorded on videotape. Each intern chose his own topic for the presentation.

Each group followed the regular summer program of methods, curriculum and learning theory courses with the exception of the administration of the experimental variables, the Microteaching Program, and the Student Teaching Program.

At the end of the summer program, each intern again presented a five-minute lesson of his own choice which was again recorded on videotape.

These videotaped teaching episodes were transferred (dubbed) in random order onto a third set of tapes which served as the basis for judgments of teaching skills by two teams of trained evaluators using the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide (STCAG). All judging was double-blind.

Field evaluations were conducted by a team of evaluators trained in use of STCAG and Instrument for the Evaluation of Teaching Activities (IOTA).[3] The instruments were administered two times each.

Tests of significance were made between and among the variables of the study, and correlations were made between selected variables.

C. Results

No significant difference was found in teaching skills between the Microteaching and Student Teaching groups at the end of the summer. This finding was determined for both teams of judges and is shown in Table 1.

The same finding was demonstrated in the field follow-up studies.

An unexpected finding occurred for one team of judges when it was judged that the Microteaching group differed significantly from the Student Teaching group in the Diagnostic Lessons (the Pre-Tests). The difference was at the .05 level and favored the Student Teaching group. Table 1 shows outcomes of this and other correlational studies.

The correlational studies make for ambiguity in the study in that not all of these revealed significant relationships between or among the observers. These are shown in Table 2.

There were significant correlations between the STCAG and IOTA field observer teams, each of these having been trained in judging until a ninety percent level of agreement was reached between evaluators. An interrater reliability check was conducted in the spring with the principal IOTA evaluator and another trained evaluator, and the correlation coefficient obtained, .74, is significant at the .01 level (df=10).

The summer STCAG judges' observations were not significantly correlated on the Pre-Tests but were significant at the $p < .01$ level on the Post-Tests (Table 3).

No significant differences were found between the Microteaching and Student Teaching groups' scores on the basis of age, sex, GPA, prior teaching experience, or marital status.

---

[3] Copyright 1960, 1966 by Bradley, Kallenbach, Owen, and Washington.

TABLE 1

CRITERION LESSON MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS, COMBINED TEAM RATINGS AND TEAM RATINGS, 1967 MICROTEACHING STUDY, SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE ELEMENTARY INTERN TEACHING PROGRAM

Group	N	$\bar{X}$	σ	t	Significance Level
All Teams' Combined Ratings					
Microteaching	33	3.80	1.04		
				1.98	n.s.
Student Teaching	33	3.64	1.02		
Team A Combined Ratings					
Microteaching	38	4.29	1.01		
				1.99	n.s.
Student Teaching	34	4.18	.96		
Team B Combined Ratings					
Microteaching	28	3.12	.62		
				2.00	n.s.
Student Teaching	32	3.06	.72		
Team A Ratings					
Pre-Test					
Microteaching	38	4.23	.79		
				1.99	n.s.
Student Teaching	34	3.95	.98		
Post-Test					
Microteaching	38	4.29	1.01		
				1.99	n.s.
Student Teaching	34	4.18	.96		
Team B Ratings					
Pre-Test					
Microteaching	28	2.93	.61		
				2.03	.05*
Student Teaching	30	3.37	.63		
Post-Test					
Microteaching	28	3.12	.62		
				2.00	n.s.
Student Teaching	32	3.06	.72		

* Degrees of freedom = 56.

TABLE 2

FIELD FOLLOW-UP CORRELATIONS FOR STCAG AND IOTA OBSERVATIONS, COMBINED RATINGS AND TEAM RATINGS

Fall STCAG[1] vs. Fall IOTA[2]	.44**
Spring STCAG[3] vs. Spring IOTA	.10
Fall STCAG vs. Spring IOTA	.42**
Spring STCAG vs. Fall IOTA	-.05
Fall IOTA vs. Spring IOTA	.58**
Fall STCAG vs. Spring STCAG	.20
Combined STCAG vs. Combined IOTA	.49**

[1] Two observers.

[2] One observer.

[3] One observer.

** Significant at $p < .01$, df = 34.

TABLE 3

INTERRATER CORRELATIONS OF SUMMER OBSERVATIONS, STCAG

Summer Pre-Test	
Team A	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.22
Team B	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.37
Summer Post-Test	
Team A	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.73**
Team B	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.72**

** Significant at $p < .01$, df = 21.

D. Discussion

The null hypothesis can be accepted for the summer microteaching results, viz., that no significant differences would occur between the Microteaching group and the Student Teaching group as judged from their post-summer Criterion Lessons. Likewise, no significant differences appeared between groups in the fall and spring semester follow-up studies. The latter studies involved two independent teams of evaluators, one team using the summer evaluation instrument, STCAC, and the other using IOTA.

The fact that the Microteaching group was judged by one team of judges to be significantly less capable than the Student group at the beginning of summer probably adds weight to the value of microteaching in these programs. For, if less able teaching candidates can achieve equality via microteaching with other more capable candidates by the end of summer program, then the Microteaching Program has merit in addition to a far greater economy of candidate and staff time. Although informal measures determined that the Microteaching group had fewer teaching problems at the beginning of school and was given higher commendations by their principals and supervisors, no formal assessments were made until mid-October 1966.

One authority on microteaching[4] feels that the benefits of microteaching are apparent for only the first few weeks of teaching, and after that, several other factors may contribute significantly to strengthening or changing teaching skills.

Multiple significances tests and correlations were run between and among the scores of the evaluators. Some of these reached significance; most did not. There is probability of some Type I errors where interrater correlations are low. There is also the probability of some findings appearing as significant due solely to chance: The low interrater reliabilities during the observations suggest either that the judges drifted apart in their conceptualizations or that the behaviors observed were too complex for highly interrelated judging. These findings appear in Appendix B.

E. Conclusions

Elementary intern teaching candidates participating in the Microteaching Program prior to their first year of teaching are equally capable in teaching skills as are candidates who participate in the summer Student Program. This is maintained into and throughout the teaching year.

Both groups achieved satisfactory beginning teaching skill and teacher competence levels by the end of summer, and this ability

---

[4] Personal communication with Dwight Allen, Stanford University School of Education.

was maintained, increasing slightly, throughout the teaching year.

Both groups achieved satisfactory levels (for beginning teachers) on the teacher competence appraisals; some (N=7) reaching superior levels on IOTA. While more of the Microteaching group reached the superior level on IOTA in the fall, this difference was not significant and was not present by spring. The same was true for those judged to be in the lower competence levels (N=9).

The judging of the Criterion Lessons probably should have demonstrated the Microteaching group as superior to the Student Teaching group inasmuch as they spent time during the summer in Microteaching sessions. Yet they did no better than the Student Teaching group at the end of summer. In a way, they did do better, as they may have begun at a significantly lower level of teaching skill. It may be that our summer instruction and supervisor reinforcement was not specific enough in the teaching skills to be mastered.

One researcher has shown that instruction sheets plus discussion of a given teaching skill has been demonstrated to be most effective if incorporated in a microteaching session critique that includes positive intermittent reinforcement by the supervisor plus his pointing out of salient cues during the videotape playbacks.[5]

The study demonstrated that elementary intern teaching candidates can be just as effective after a summer Microteaching Program as candidates in a regular summer Student Teaching Program and achieve this objective at a very considerable savings in time for staff and intern candidates.

---

[5] M. E. J. Orme. The Effects of Modeling and Feedback Variables on the Acquisition of a Complex Teaching Strategy. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford: Stanford University School of Education, 1966.

ABSTRACT

All teaching candidates (N=40) in the 1967 SJSC summer elementary intern teaching program were randomly divided into two groups. One group, the Microteaching Group, participated in a summer microteaching program on campus with no planned off-campus contacts with students. The other group, the Student Teaching Group, participated in a limited summer observation and student teaching program. Both groups otherwise has the same summer program.

Pre- and post-summer lesson excerpts (five minutes each) were videotape recorded for each of the candidates and these were judged, double-blind, and independently by each member of two independent teams of trained evaluators. The evaluators used the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide (STCAG) to judge the teaching skills from the videotaped recordings.

A field follow-up by two independent teams of trained evaluators made both a fall and spring assessment of each intern teacher. One team used the STCAG and the other used Instrument for the Observation of Teaching Activities (IOTA). Each team member judged independently.

No significant differences between the two groups appeared at the end of the summer programs nor developed in the assessments during the school year. Judges' findings were found to be moderately but significantly correlated with some exceptions. One team of judges found the Microteaching Group candidates significantly less able in teaching skills ($p < .05$) at the beginning of summer but this difference did not appear at the end of summer. This might be interpreted as favoring microteaching as a teaching procedure inasmuch as the less able candidates reached comparable levels of teaching skills with the more able candidates in the ten-week summer program and continued at an equivalent or higher level of competence throughout the school year.

One major contribution of microteaching as compared to student teaching is in the time saved by the microteaching program--over 80 per cent in this study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, Keith A. The Effects of Feedback from Television Recordings and Three Types of Supervisory Treatment on Selected Teacher Behaviors. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1964.

Allen, Dwight W., McDonald, Frederick J., and Orme, Michael E. J. Effects of Feedback and Practice Conditions on the Acquisition of a Teaching Strategy. Mimeographed. Stanford University: School of Education, 1966.

_____ and Ryan, Kevin A. A Perspective on the Education of Teachers in California in 1980. Sacramento: State of California Department of Education State Committee on Public Education, November, 1966.

_____ and Young, David B. Television Recordings: A New Dimension in Teacher Education. Mimeographed. Stanford University: School of Education, 1966.

Aubertine, Horace E. The Use of Micro-Teaching in the Process of Training Clinical Supervisors. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Belt, W. Dwayne. Micro-Teaching: Observed and Critiqued by a Group of Trainees vs. One Instructor and One Trainee. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Biddle, Bruce J. and Ellena, William J. (Editors) Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.

Berliner, David C. A Comparison of Different Modeling Procedures in the Acquisition of a Teaching Skill. Paper presented at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Bradley, Ruth, Kinney, Lucien B., Owen, Viola, and Washington, Eva. "A Criterion for the Appraisal of Student Teachers." Evaluating Student Teachers. Thirty-Ninth Yearbook. Association for Student Teaching. Dubuque: William Brown Company, 1960.

Brigham Young University. Micro-Teaching at Brigham Young University. Mimeographed. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1966.

Bush, Robert N. and Allen, Dwight W. Micro-Teaching: Controlled Practices in the Training of Teachers. Paper presented at Santa Barbara Conference of Teacher Education, Ford Foundation, April 30, 1964.

Cooper, James M. Micro-Teaching as a Pre-Internship Training Technique for the Development of Specific Teaching Skills. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Cyphert, Frederick R. Video Recordings: The Most Desirable Tool for a Specific Job. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Fortune, Jimmie C. Instructional Set, Cognitive Closure, and Test Anxiety in the Presentation of Social Studies Content. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1965.

_____. Toward a Research Strategy to Investigate Attributes of Specific Teacher Behavior. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Gage, N. L. (Editor) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally, 1963.

Johnson, William D. Micro-Teaching: A Context for Studying Teaching Techniques. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Kallenbach, Warren. "Can We Measure Success in Teaching?" California Elementary Administrator. January, 1961.

_____ and Owen, Viola. "Measuring Teaching Effectiveness: A Training Program for California Administrators." California Elementary Administrator. March, 1962.

_____ and Ramonda, Robert. The Effectiveness of Micro-Teaching in the Preparation of Elementary Intern Teachers. Mimeographed. San Jose State College: School of Education, 1967.

Kinney, Lucien B. and others. "A Design for Teacher Evaluation." National Elementary Principal. Volume 43, No. 2. November, 1963.

McDonald, Frederick J., Allen, Dwight W. and Orme, Michael E. The Effects of Self-Feedback and Reinforcement on the Acquisition of a Teaching Skill. Paper read at 1966 AERA Conference, Chicago.

Meier, John H. Remote Control Supervision of Teachers Using Video Recordings. Paper read at 1967 AERA Conference, New York City.

Olivero, James L. Video Recordings as a Substitute for Live Observations in Teacher Education. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1966.

Orme, Michael E. J. The Effects of Modeling and Feedback Variables on the Acquisition of a Complex Teaching Strategy. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1966.

Ramonda, Robert. "The Effectiveness of Micro-Teaching in the Preparation of Elementary Intern Teachers: A Pilot Study." Newsletter, Phi Delta Kappa, Gamma Iota Chapter. San Jose State College, Spring, 1967.

Ryan, Kevin A. The Use of Students' Written Feedback in Changing the Behavior of Beginning Secondary School Teachers. Unpublished dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1966.

Ryans, David G. "Teacher Effectiveness." in Harris, Chester W. (Editor) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Third Edition. New York: MacMillan Company, 1960.

Stanford Teacher Education Program. Micro-Teaching: A Description (revised). Unpublished monograph. Stanford University: School of Education, 1967.

APPENDIX A

The Microteaching Program

The Microteaching Program was begun as follows. The intern planned and taught a five-minute lesson or lesson segment to a group of four or five children. For most lessons, a topic to teach was assigned. For example, in one lesson, the interns were required to introduce and motivate a reading lesson. Present during the lesson, in addition to the intern teaching the lesson and the children, were a microteaching supervisor and a technician to operate the video taping equipment. As the lesson was taught, it was recorded on video tape.

When the lesson was ended, the children evaluated the teaching using special forms (an adaptation of the Stanford Teacher Competence Appraisal Guide) in the use of which they had been especially trained. The children left the room[1] and the microteaching supervisor and the intern viewed the playback of the tape. At this time, they looked for a particular skill or pattern of teacher behavior which might be improved. It was stressed that only one skill or pattern would be considered during the course of one lesson. If too many aspects of the lesson were considered, it was found in another pilot study[2] that the teacher became confused and often did not improve any aspect of the lesson. One striking example of the improvement of a teaching skill or pattern was that of questioning behavior on the part of the teacher. Many of the interns started their lessons with a tendency to lecture the children and without knowing whether or not the children could understand or even if they were interested in what was being presented. During the course of the microteaching lessons, they learned to ask questions in order to determine where to start with the children and how the lessons should be paced.

One goal of the viewing of the video tapes was to help the teacher to look more objectively at himself and at his teaching patterns. The aim was to move the intern from looking at his physical appearance and his performance in terms of "good" and "bad" to critically analyzing his teaching behavior in terms of its impact and effectiveness upon the learning of the children. At first, the microteaching supervisor took the lead in guiding the intern in determining whether or not he had achieved his objective. As the lessons progressed the supervisor helped the intern by asking questions

---

[1] The pupils returned to a "ready room" where the teammate of the intern supervised them until his turn came to do microteaching.

[2] Warren Kallenbach and Robert Ramonda. "The 1965 Microteaching Study," Educational Forum, A Journal of San Jose State College Chapter, PDK, 1967.

pertaining to the lesson as it was being viewed in order that the intern could look for the answers in his teaching activity. Ultimately, a number of the interns did not need the questioning, and they took the lead in evaluating their own performance and in looking at themselves almost as if another person was doing the teaching.

During and after the viewing of the video tape, the evaluations made by the youngsters were considered and compared to that of the microteaching supervisor. Common ratings on particular items were considered. If most of the children rated the teacher low or high on a particular item, the reasons for this were discussed by the supervisor and the intern. When low and even average items were found and discussed, means were determined for improvement. Often portions of the video tape were replayed in order to attempt to determine why children gave particular ratings on particular items.

When the microteaching supervisor and the teacher had concluded the viewing and the evaluation of the lesson, the teacher was given a few minutes to revise the lesson in light of the suggestions for improvement, and a new group of four or five children was brought in.[3] The lesson was retaught to this group of children, the children evaluated and left the room, the tape was viewed and a determination was made as to whether or not the lesson had improved.

As the final experience in the Microteaching Program, the Microteaching Group was divided into smaller groups on the basis of the grade level which they were going to teach in the fall. Because of the numbers involved and the diversity of grade levels to be taught, some grade levels were combined. For example, those who were to teach seventh and eighth grade worked with those who were to teach fifth and sixth. Thus, there were five groups made up of from three to four interns. Each group was to plan a social studies unit to be taught to the children. Each member of the group of interns was to be responsible for teaching one twenty-minute segment of the unit within the format of microteaching, viz., the lesson was to be taught to a small group of children (four or five), was to be evaluated and then retaught. This portion of the program was called the microclass. The differences between the unit teaching and the five-minute lessons were two--the lesson length (twenty minutes) and the critique. The latter was held with the whole team rather than with the supervisor alone. By this means, all the members of the group had an opportunity to see the continuity of the unit and to have the experience of helping each other improve in their teaching skills.

---

[3] There is some evidence that a longer wait (15-20 minutes) is more productive.

APPENDIX B

Interrater and Team Correlations

Summer, Fall, and Spring STCAG and IOTA Observations

PART I

STCAG Summer Pretest Scores

Team A	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.22
Team B	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.37*

STCAG Summer Posttest Scores

Team A	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.73**
Team B	
Observer 1 vs. Observer 2	.72**

STCAG Summer Pretest/Fall Scores

Team A, Summer vs. Team A, Fall	-.22
Team B, Summer vs. Team A, Fall	.46**

STCAG Summer Posttest/Fall Scores

Team A, Summer vs. Team A, Fall	-.35*
Team B, Summer vs. Team A, Fall	.09

---

* Significant at $p < .05$, df = 34

** Significant at $p < .01$, df = 34

PART II

STCAG Summer/IOTA Observations

Team A, STCAG Summer Pretest vs. Fall IOTA	.04
Team B, STCAG Summer Pretest vs. Fall IOTA	-.06
Team A, STCAG Summer Posttest vs. Fall IOTA	.10
Team B, STCAG Summer Posttest vs. Fall IOTA	-.08

Summer/Spring Observations

Team A, STCAG Summer Pretest vs. Spring IOTA	.04
Team B, STCAG Summer Pretest vs. Spring IOTA	-.07
Team A, STCAG Summer Posttest vs. Spring IOTA	-.10
Team B, STCAG Summer, Posttest vs. Spring IOTA	.08

PART III

Fall STCAG vs. Fall IOTA[1]	.44**
Fall STCAG vs. Spring IOTA[2]	.42**
Spring STCAG[3] vs. Fall IOTA	-.05
Spring STCAG vs. Spring IOTA	.10
Fall IOTA vs. Observer 1, Fall STCAG	.20
Fall IOTA vs. Observer 2, Fall STCAG	.32*
Spring IOTA vs. Observer 1, Fall STCAG	.37*
Spring IOTA vs. Observer 2, Fall STCAG	.51*

---

* Significant at $p < .05$, df = 34.

** Significant at $p < .01$, df = 34.

[1] One observer only.

[2] Two observers used in twelve cases, r = .74, significant at $p < .01$, df = 10.

[3] One observer only.

APPENDIX C

STANFORD TEACHER COMPETENCE APPRAISAL GUIDE

TEACHER COMPETENCE APPRAISAL

STANFORD G U I D E

STANFORD TEACHER COMPETENCE APPRAISAL GUIDE

			0	30%	15%	15%	15%	15%	10%	
			0 UNABLE TO OBSERVE	1 WEAK	2 BELOW AVERAGE	3 AVERAGE	4 STRONG	5 SUPERIOR	6 OUTSTANDING	7 TRULY EXCEPTIONAL
1	**Clarity of Aims.**	The purposes of the lesson are clear.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	**Appropriateness of Aims.**	The aims are neither too easy nor too difficult for the pupils. They are appropriate, and are accepted by the pupils.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	**Organization of the Lesson.**	The individual parts of the lesson are clearly related to each other in an appropriate way. The total organization facilitates what is to be learned.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	**Selection of Content.**	The content is appropriate for the aims of the lesson, the level of the class, and the teaching method.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	**Selection of Materials.**	The specific instructional materials and human resources used are clearly related to the content of the lesson and complement the selected method of instruction.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	**Beginning the Lesson.**	Pupils come quickly to attention. They direct themselves to the tasks to be accomplished.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	**Clarity of Presentation.**	The content of the lesson is presented so that it is understandable to the pupils. Different points of view and specific illustrations are used when appropriate.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	**Pacing of the Lesson.**	The movement from one part of the lesson to the next is governed by the pupils' achievement. The teacher "stays with the class" and adjusts the tempo accordingly.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	**Pupil Participation and Attention.**	The class is attentive. When appropriate the pupils actively participate in the lesson.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10	**Ending the Lesson.**	The lesson is ended when the pupils have achieved the aims of instruction. There is a deliberate attempt to tie together the planned and chance events of the lesson and relate them to the immediate and long range aims of instruction.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11	**Teacher-Pupil Rapport.**	The personal relationships between pupils and the teacher are harmonious.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

AIMS

1
2

PLANNING

3
4
5

PERFORMANCE

6
7
8
9
10
11

APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

1964 Revision

I nstrument for the O bservation of T eaching A ctivities

Bradley
Kallenbach
Owen
Washington

PART I

OBSERVATIONAL RATINGS

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. ATTRACTIVE INTEREST CENTERS (1)

   A. Centers of interest suggest some evidence of children's ideas and cooperation and are related to current classroom activities.

   B. No well-defined centers of interest are observable although there are some visual aids displayed.

   C. Centers of interest in some way reflect children's ideas but they are not specifically related to current classroom activities.

   D. Teacher and students share in planning and arranging stimulating centers of interest that have definite relationships to learning activities.

   E. Little or no evidence that centers of interest of any kind are used to foster learning.

INSTRUCTION: MATERIALS AND ACTIVITIES

2. VARIETY IN CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES - Elementary (1)

   The teacher:

   A. Provides for a few supplemental activities and projects.

   B. Shows evidence of abundant and varied creative activities for all children.

   C. Presents little or no opportunity for children to express aesthetically or creatively.

   D. Restricts creative work to special programs only.

   E. Provides opportunity for a number of creative activities and projects.

3. USE OF MATERIALS FOR INSTRUCTION (1)

The teacher:

A. Makes effective use of a wide variety of well-selected materials.

B. Makes good use of a few additional materials to supplement what the school provides.

C. Makes ineffective use or does not use common materials provided by the school.

D. Makes good use of materials provided by the school.

E. Makes limited use of the more common materials provided by the school.

SOCIAL CLIMATE

4. CLASSROOM CONTROL: Maintaining Classroom Control (1)

A. Teacher imposed standards of conduct are generally maintained.

B. Teacher authority is rigorously imposed, circumvented, or ignored.

C. An atmosphere of industrious self-regulation consistently maintained.

D. Self-imposed standards of conduct are generally maintained with minor lapses.

E. Class requires frequent teacher intervention to maintain order and industriousness.

5. IDENTIFICATION OF LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (2)

The teacher:

A. Disregards individual learning difficulties.

B. Identifies most cases of learning difficulty; and provides effective individual and group instruction.

C. Is skilled in identifying learning difficulties; provides effective relevant instruction for individuals and groups.

D. Identifies obvious learning difficulties; ineffective in providing help.

E. Identifies general learning difficulties; provides group instruction accordingly.

6. TEACHER-PUPIL PLANNING ACCORDING TO THE NEEDS OF EACH PUPIL (1)

The teacher:

A. Plans for group assignments in skill development subjects only.

B. Plans with children some individual instruction, plus some general group assignments.

C. Plans assignments with children to permit each child to work according to his needs, plus group assignments in various areas.

D. Plans group assignments for children in a variety of areas with attention to obvious individual needs.

E. Uses one textbook for entire class.

7. COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASSROOM GOALS (1)

In determining immediate goals the teacher:

A. Develops goals with class and plans cooperatively for their attainment.

B. Gives inadequate directions without making goal known to the children.

C. Encourages class to share in planning for attainment of previously determined goals.

D. Informs class of pre-determined goals; children follow without manifest resistance.

E. Discusses goals, and the plans by which they may be reached, as pre-determined by the teacher.

8. OPPORTUNITY FOR WIDE PARTICIPATION (1)

A. Students are largely passive; teacher "lectures" the large part of the time.

B. Students are encouraged to participate in discussion and related activities.

C. Students respond when called upon.

D. Students respond well in teacher-led discussion.

E. Students have maximum opportunity for discussion and participation in activities.

9. DEVELOPMENT OF VALUE JUDGMENTS (3)

The teacher:

A. Calls attention to the right of individuals to hold differing opinions.

B. Is indifferent to student opinion.

C. Provides an environment in which students are encouraged to explore different opinions and judgments.

D. Utilizes differing opinions and judgments as motivation for study.

E. Is intolerant of differing opinions of students.

10. TEACHER ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDENT OPINION (1)

With regard to empathy toward students, the teacher:

A. Shows little regard for student opinion.

B. Is open to suggestion within limits; permits expression of different opinions.

C. Is aware of student opinion.

D. Is always open to pupil suggestion; encourages expressions of different opinions.

E. Discourages expressions of student opinion.

11. STUDENT INITIATIVE (3)

There is evidence that students:

A. Volunteer to accept responsibilities and evaluations for their own conduct in a wide variety of activities.

B. Volunteer to accept responsibilities for their own conduct in a wide variety of activities.

C. Respond willingly when asked by teacher to accept routine responsibilities.

D. Passively accept responsibilities when delegated by teacher.

E. Reluctantly accept responsibilities when so delegated by teacher.

12. TEACHER AWARENESS OF PUPIL BEHAVIOR (1)

The teacher:

A. Is inconsistent in recognizing deviations in social behavior and is inconsistent in taking action.

B. Provides an atmosphere of cooperation and morale so high that behavior problems seldom occur.

C. Anticipates problems in social behavior and takes appropriate preventive action.

D. Recognizes obvious deviations in social behavior and takes constructive action.

E. Recognizes obvious deviations in social behavior and takes negative action.

COUNSELING AND GUIDANCE

13. SOCIAL CLIMATE (1)

Quality of peer relationships within the group is indicated by:

A. Apathy and lack of interest in one another's opinions and activities.

B. Spirit of cooperation and interest in each other's welfare with prevails with high morale.

C. Spirit of cooperation and interest in each other's welfare which prevails with notable exceptions.

D. Acts of rejection and/or antagonism between members of the group.

E. Necessity for teacher to intervene to obtain consideration for others.

SUBJECT MATTER

14. SUBJECT MATTER PREPARATION (3)

With respect to subject matter preparation of the teacher:

A. Evidences thoroughness in background and resourcefulness in use.

B. Evidences inadequate preparation; is inaccurate.

C. Is limited; adheres closely to text content.

D. Is well informed and makes occasional enrichment application.

E. Is sufficiently informed to cope with any ordinary class situation.

15. UTILIZATION OF CURRENT APPLICATIONS OF SUBJECT MATTER*

The teacher:

A. Presents subject matter indicating where applications to current problems may be made, but gives little opportunity to utilize.

B. Relates subject matter to its current application as enrichment in some areas.

C. Evidences skill in relating subject matter to its current application by providing opportunities for utilization.

D. Makes no connection between subject matter and its application to daily living.

E. Stresses subject matter overlooking most possibilities for application to current utilization.

* Suitable to grade level and in relationship to daily living.

PART II

INTERVIEW ITEMS

16. PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL STAFF ACTIVITIES (5)

The teacher:

A. Willingly follows administrative leadership and occasionally shows initiative in school staff activities.

B. Is willing and ably assumes leadership with excellent rapport.

C. Follows directions promptly and accurately, but without special show of initiative.

D. Has little time or inclination to assist in school activities.

E. Is unpredictable in quantity and quality of responsibility acceptance.

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

17. ARTICULATION OF CLASSROOM TO TOTAL SCHOOL CURRICULUM (5)

The teacher:

A. Is willing and ably adjusts his program to the total program.

B. Displays effort to understand the problems of other grades or subjects as related to his own.

C. Resists suggestions for changing his own program to that of the school.

D. Does not see the place of his own procedures to the total program.

E. Accepts suggestions for adapting his program to the school program.

18. EFFECTIVENESS IN PARENT CONFERENCES (2)

The teacher:

A. Cooperates routinely in parent conferences.

B. Lacks effectiveness in parent conferencing.

C. Is superior in enhancing home-school relations; gains the respect and cooperation of parents.

D. Contributes to increased home-school relations; gains the respect and cooperation of parents.

E. Makes little effort to improve home-school relations or enlist the cooperation of parents.

COMMUNITY, PARENT, AND LAY RELATIONSHIPS

19. UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES (3)

The teacher:

A. Makes little use of community resources.

B. Takes an occasional study trip.

C. Has organized inter-relationship between pupils, others, community both for class work and benefits of total school program.

D. Has some topics in which he uses study trips and resources of others to learn about the community.

E. Systematically organizes his class work to utilize educational community resources in classroom procedures.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

20. PARTICIPATION IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (6)

The teacher:

A. Helps to organize state and/or local programs, committees, and activities.

B. Serves as a member of a local, state, and/or national organization.

C. Assumes a leadership role in some continuing activities of local, state, and/or national organization.

D. Does not belong to an organization.

E. Maintains membership in one or more organizations but does not participate.

21. PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY (6)

The teacher:

A. Participates in meetings where improved practices are discussed.

B. No evidence of interest in new or more effective practices.

C. Formally reports at meetings and/or in the literature on new practices he has developed and tested.

D. Is unfamiliar with the literature reporting on improved practices.

E. Develops and tests out new and imaginative practices, but does not formally report them.

EVALUATION PROGRAM

22. SOCIOMETRIC CLASS STRUCTURE (2)

The teacher:

A. Does not recognize the importance of peer relationships.

B. Is aware of peer relationships and attempts some organization accordingly.

C. Is thoroughly aware of the structure of peer relationships in the classroom and takes constructive action.

D. Attempts to become aware of peer relationships in class.

E. Considers peer relationships as impediments to learning.

23. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL PUPIL PROGRESS BY THE TEACHER (2)

The teacher:

A. Keeps inadequate records with little concern for pupil difficulties.

B. Keeps highly adequate accumulative records; evaluates progress of each pupil and adjusts the program accordingly.

C. Keeps adequate records; evaluates progress of students and makes some adjustments in the program.

D. Keeps records, but makes little evaluation other than grading.

E. Keeps test records, making only general evaluations of group needs.

24. DEVELOPMENT OF PUPIL SELF-EVALUATION (2)

The teacher:

A. Provides some opportunities for students to appraise their own progress and suggest means of self-improvement in group conferences.

B. Provides little opportunity for students to appraise their own progress; seldom holds conferences.

C. Encourages each student to appriase his own progress and suggest means of self-improvement in individual and group conferences.

D. Students are motivated by grades alone; teacher sees little value in conferences.

E. Encourages many students to appriase their own progress and suggest means of self-improvement in individual and group conferences.

25. SKILL IN PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH INDIVIDUAL PUPILS (2)

With regard to the teacher's skill in establishing effective relationships with individual pupils:

A. Students occasionally seek out this teacher for counsel on personal and instructional problems.

B. Students seldom seek out this teacher for counsel.

C. Students seek out this teacher for counsel on instructional problems; seldom with personal problems.

D. Students avoid contacts with this teacher.

E. Students frequently seek out this teacher for counsel on both personal and instructional problems.

26. ASSIST STUDENTS IN EXPLORING VOCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES (2) (Primary Grades; EARNING A LIVING)

The teacher:

A. Assists all interested students in exploring vocational opportunities; stimulates interest through group and individual discussions.

B. Assists more able students in exploring vocational opportunities.

C. Discourages potentially qualified candidates from exploring vocational opportunities.

D. Discusses vocational opportunities with groups of students.

E. Does not discuss vocational opportunities with his classes or individuals.

27. WORKS EFFECTIVELY WITH THE SPECIALIZED SERVICES* (2)

The teacher:

A. Works effectively with most necessary specialized services.

B. Works with none of the specialized services.

C. Works effectively with all necessary specialized services.

D. Resents the specialized services.

E. Works effectively with a few of the necessary specialized services.

* For example, speech, reading, health, psychological and all other available pupil personnel services.

OBSERVATION SHEET
INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES (IOTA)

OBSERVATION DATA

Competence Area	Item No.	Point Value 5	4	3	2	1
Observation						
1. Interest centers	1	D	A	C	B	E
2. Variety in activities	2	B	E	A	D	C
3. Use of materials	3	A	B	D	E	C
4. Classroom control	4	C	D	A	E	B
5. Identifies difficulties	5	C	B	E	D	A
6. Plans for pupil needs	6	C	B	D	A	E
7. Cooperative planning	7	A	C	E	D	B
8. Wide Participation	8	E	B	D	C	A
9. Development of value judgments	9	C	D	A	B	E
10. Attitude toward opinion	10	D	B	C	A	E
11. Student initiative	11	A	B	C	D	E
12. Awareness of behavior	12	B	C	D	E	A
13. Social climate	13	B	C	E	A	D
14. Subject matter	14	A	D	E	C	B
15. Current applications	15	C	B	A	E	D
Interview						
16. Staff activities	16	B	A	C	E	D
17. Articulation of program	17	A	B	E	D	C
18. Parent conferences	18	C	D	A	E	B
19. Use of community	19	C	E	D	B	A
20. Professional membership	20	C	A	B	E	D
21. Professional growth	21	C	E	A	D	B
22. Class Structure	22	C	B	D	A	E
23. Evaluation of pupil work	23	B	C	E	D	A
24. Pupil self-evaluation	24	C	E	A	B	D
25. Personal relationships with pupils	25	E	A	C	B	D
26. Vocational assistance	26	A	B	D	E	C
27. Specialized services use	27	C	A	E	B	D
Composite						
28. Composite rating	28	A	B	C	D	E
Totals:						

Date_____

Teacher_____

School_____

Grade_____

Subject(s) observed

_____

Unusual conditions

_____

_____

Time began_____

Total time_____ .

Minutes_____

OBSERVATION SHEET*--INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES (IOTA)

Letter Rating		Letter Rating	
____	1. Attractive Interest Centers Evidence:	____	9. Development of Value Judgments Evidence:
____	2. Variety in Classroom Activities Evidence:	____	10. Teacher Attitude Toward Pupil Opinion Evidence:
____	3. Use of Materials for Instruction Evidence:	____	11. Student Initiative Evidence
____	4. Classroom Control Evidence:	____	12. Teacher Awareness of Pupil Behavior Evidence:
____	5. Identification of Learning Difficulties Evidence:	____	13. Social Climate Evidence:
____	6. Teacher-Pupil Planning According to the Needs of Each Pupil Evidence:	____	14. Subject Matter Preparation Evidence:
____	7. Cooperative Development of Classroom Goals Evidence:	____	15. Utilization of Current Applications of Subject Matter Evidence:
____	8. Opportunity for Wide Participation Evidence:		Teacher_____ Date_____ Grade Level _____ Subject(s) _____

*Statements in each category are to be in terms of observed behavior or direct quotations.

TEACHER_____

DATE_____

INTERVIEW SHEET--PRINCIPAL

INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES (I.O.T.A.)

Letter Rating	
_____	16. Participation in School Staff Activities What staff responsibilities does this teacher have beyond his classroom teaching? How well does he perform them?
_____	17. Articulation of Classroom to Total School Curriculum How effectively does this teacher fit his program to the total school program? Give examples.
_____	18. Effectiveness in Parent Conferences How effective is this teacher in conferencing with parents? Give examples.
_____	22. Sociometric Class Structure How effective is this teacher in improving pupil-to-pupil relationships? Give examples.
_____	23. Evaluation of Individual Pupil Progress by the Teacher How effective does this teacher evaluate each pupil's work in his class? Give examples.
_____	25. Skill in Personal Relationships with Individual Pupils Do pupils go to this teacher for assistance with educational and personal problems? Give examples.
_____	27. Works effectively with the Specialized Services How effectively does this teacher work with the necessary, available specialized services? Give examples.
_____	28. Composite Rating From your experience and your concept of the "good" teacher, would you rate this teacher: A. 10% B. 25% C. 30% D. 25% E. 10% (Highest to the lowest ___)

TEACHER_____
DATE_____

INTERVIEW SHEET -- TEACHER
INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES (I.O.T.A.)

Letter Rating	
_____	19. Utilization of Community Resources How often do you use study trips (or walking trips) and resource speakers in your curriculum? Give examples.
_____	20. Participation in Professional Organizations To what professional organizations do you belong? Do you hold office in any of these? (Participation? Any responsibility in the professional organization?)
_____	21. Personal Professional Responsibility What professional journals do you read? In what curriculum workshops have you recently participated? What experimentation or new practices have you tried?
_____	22. Sociometric Class Structure What have you done to improve pupil-to-pupil relationships in your classroom? Give examples.
_____	23. Evaluation of Individual Pupil Progress by the Teacher What information do you keep about each pupil? What use do you make of this information?
_____	24. Development of Pupil Self-Evaluation How often do you confer with each pupil about his classwork. Give examples. What responsibility does the pupil have in evaluating?
_____	26. Assists Students in Exploring Vocational Opportunities (Earning a Living) (Elementary level) In what ways have you discussed vocational choices (earning a living) with your pupils? (Secondary Level) In what ways have you assisted students in making vocational choices?
_____	27. Works effectively with the specialized services What use have you recently made of the specialized services that are available in your school? Give examples.