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 Teaching 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 (807 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)
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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 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. 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.

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:

Microteaching Group: Pre-service Inservice
R 01 X1 01 01 02 01 02
Student Teaching Group: R 01 X2 01 02 01 02

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 (X1) and the Student Teaching Program (X2).

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). 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Teams' Combined Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team A Combined Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team B Combined Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team A Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team B Ratings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Degrees of freedom = 56.
TABLE 2

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall STCAG vs. Fall IOTA</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring STCAG vs. Spring IOTA</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall STCAG vs. Spring IOTA</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring STCAG vs. Fall IOTA</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall IOTA vs. Spring IOTA</td>
<td>.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall STCAG vs. Spring STCAG</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined STCAG vs. Combined IOTA</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Two observers.
2 One observer.
3 One observer.

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

TABLE 3

INTERRATER CORRELATIONS OF SUMMER OBSERVATIONS, STCAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Pre-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 vs. Observer 2</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 vs. Observer 2</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 vs. Observer 2</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer 1 vs. Observer 2</td>
<td>.72**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 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, STCAG, 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 a 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 significance 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.

---

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.
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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 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 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.

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. 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<sup>1</sup> | .44** |
| Fall STCAG vs. Spring IOTA<sup>2</sup> | .42** |
| Spring STCAG<sup>3</sup> 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 $p < .01$, $df = 34$.

<sup>1</sup> One observer only.

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

<sup>3</sup> One observer only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clarity of Aims.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appropriateness of Aims.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Organization of the Lesson.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Selection of Content.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Selection of Materials.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Beginning the Lesson.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Clarity of Presentation.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pacing of the Lesson.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pupil Participation and Attention.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ending the Lesson.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teacher-Pupil Rapport.</td>
<td>0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

INSTRUMENT FOR THE OBSERVATION OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES
Instrument for the observation of eating activities

Previous Copyright (c) 1960
Copyright (c) 1964 by:

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 which 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. SOCIO METRIC 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 appraise 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 appraise 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

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

Totals: 28 A B C D E

Date__________________
Teacher__________________
School__________________
Grade__________________
Subject(s) observed__________________
Unusual conditions__________________
Time began__________________
Total time__________ Minutes__________

Previous (c) 1960.
Copyright 1964 by Ruth Bradley, Warren Kallenbach, Viola Owen, and Eva Washington

ERIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Variety in Classroom Activities Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Teacher Attitude Toward Pupil Opinion Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Classroom Control Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Teacher Awareness of Pupil Behavior Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Identification of Learning Difficulties Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Social Climate Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Cooperative Development of Classroom Goals Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Utilization of Current Applications of Subject Matter Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Opportunity for Wide Participation Evidence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher________ Date________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade Level ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject(s) ________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright: 1964 by Bradley, Owen, Kallenbach, and Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statements in each category are to be in terms of observed behavior or direct quotations.
### INTERVIEW SHEET--PRINCIPAL

**TEACHER**

**DATE**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>16. Participation in School Staff Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>What staff responsibilities does this teacher have beyond his classroom teaching? How well does he perform them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Articulation of Classroom to Total School Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effectively does this teacher fit his program to the total school program? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Effectiveness in Parent Conferences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective is this teacher in conferencing with parents? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Sociometric Class Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective is this teacher in improving pupil-to-pupil relationships? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Evaluation of Individual Pupil Progress by the Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effective does this teacher evaluate each pupil's work in his class? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. Skill in Personal Relationships with Individual Pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do pupils go to this teacher for assistance with educational and personal problems? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Works effectively with the Specialized Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How effectively does this teacher work with the necessary, available specialized services? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Composite Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From your experience and your concept of the &quot;good&quot; teacher, would you rate this teacher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Highest to the lowest)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>19. Utilization of Community Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>How often do you use study trips (or walking trips) and resource speakers in your curriculum? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Participation in Professional Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what professional organizations do you belong? Do you hold office in any of these? (Participation? Any responsibility in the professional organization?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Personal Professional Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What professional journals do you read? In what curriculum workshops have you recently participated? What experimentation or new practices have you tried?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Sociometric Class Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What have you done to improve pupil-to-pupil relationships in your classroom? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Evaluation of Individual Pupil Progress by the Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What information do you keep about each pupil? What use do you make of this information?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Development of Pupil Self-Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you confer with each pupil about his classwork. Give examples. What responsibility does the pupil have in evaluating?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Assists Students in Exploring Vocational Opportunities (Earning a Living)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what ways have you discussed vocational choices (earning a living) with your pupils?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Elementary level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary Level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>27. Works effectively with the specialized services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What use have you recently made of the specialized services that are available in your school? Give examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>