

Through the eyes of the teacher

Mandy Klatt¹, Dr. Gregor Kachel^{1, 2}, Dr. Christin Lotz¹, & Prof. Dr. Anne Deiglmayr¹

¹ Leipzig University

² Max-Planck University for Evolutionary Anthropology

Author Note

The Ethics Advisory Board of Leipzig University has dealt with the research project and has come to the conclusion that there are no objections to the implementation of this research project. The Ethics Advisory Board points out that the scientific and ethical responsibility for the implementation of the project remains with the project director.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mandy Klatt, Egelstraße 2a 04103 Leipzig. E-mail: mandy.klatt@uni-leipzig.de

Abstract

12

13 This document is a supplement to the paper and shows first graphs findings from the pilot
14 study.

15 *Keywords:* Professional Vision, Expert-Novice-Paradigm, Eye-Tracking

16 Word count: 1949

Through the eyes of the teacher

State of research

Teaching and classroom management are multidimensional settings in which teachers have to respond immediately to events as they develop (Barnes, 2004). The different interests and abilities of students must be managed in a way that maximizes the active learning time of students and minimizes disruptions whilst teaching. Learning to develop such classroom management skills and to teach effectively is a complicated and complex process (Wolff, Jarodzka, & Boshuizen, 2017).

During teaching, teachers must be able to select from a variety of visual and acoustic impressions to focus their attention on the essential and to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant events. This ability is called professional vision and is a key component of teacher expertise and successful teaching (Barth, 2017). Eye tracking technology has become a reliable means to study teachers' visual focus of attention (Bogert, 2016; Pouta, Lehtinen, & Palonen, 2020; Wolff, Jarodzka, & Boshuizen, 2017)

Educational research has repeatedly shown that there are differences between experienced and novice teachers in terms of perception and behavioral competencies (Barth, 2017; Bogert, 2016; Wolff, Jarodzka, & Boshuizen, 2017). For example, experts direct their attention more often and more evenly to all students, whereas novices only direct their attention to some students. The frequency and duration of fixations as eye movement are decisive (Stuermer, Seidel, Mueller, Häusler, & Cortina, 2017). Mobile eye-tracking technology has also shown that experienced teachers distribute their focus more efficiently to solve tasks (Jarodzka, Scheiter, Gerjets, & Van Gog, 2010). Furthermore, in contrast to novices, experts are able to focus their attention on the entire class and guide the class while giving feedback to individual students and answering questions (Cortina, Miller, McKenzie, & Epstein, 2015).

Research questions

The aim of the pilot study was to investigate whether there are differences in how expert and novice teachers manage scripted classroom disruptions. The disruptions were experimentally varied using a previously written script. Thus, our aim was to find out whether differences in the allocation of attention between expertise groups can be detected in this controlled context.

In order to answer this question, the hypothesis was formulated that teachers with more professional experience not only notice more disruptions but also notice them faster. In the hypothesis, therefore, it is necessary to check what has already been shown in the research literature: In complex teaching situations, experts have a more structured and elaborate professional knowledge than novices in order to perceive and interpret relevant events and to act appropriately (Berliner, 2001; Lachner, Jarodzka, & Nückles, 2016).

Methods

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study.

Participants

For the sample recruitment of the subjects ($N = 8$, experts $n = 2$, novices $n = 6$), schools in the city of Leipzig in Saxony were contacted. The institutions as well as the subjects were informed in detail about the aim and intention of the study in advance. Participation in the study was voluntary and only took place after written consent has been given.

The selection of the subjects was based on extreme groups, whereby professional experience is the crucial criterion for the selection of experts or novices. Novices were recruited as teachers who have been working in the teaching profession for no more than 3

Table 1

Demographic Information and Teaching Experience

group	N	Male	M age	Min age	Max age	SD age	M exp.	Min exp.	Max exp.	SD exp.
expert	2	1	47.50	44	51	4.95	20.00	15.00	25.00	7.07
novice	6	2	25.67	20	33	4.89	0.68	0.00	1.50	0.68

years, whereas experts were considered to have professional experience of 10 years or more (Messner & Reusser, 2000).

Procedure/ Data collection

Set up. For this study, scripted mini-lessons with $n = 2$ experts and $n = 6$ novices were recorded in the mobile Lab of the Empirical School and Classroom Research at the University of Leipzig. The subjects were divided into groups of four, so the study was conducted on two different sessions. All participants were asked to hold a 10-minute lesson. The duration of each appointment was approximately 2h: per group 10min briefing, 4 x 10min mini-lessons, 10min technical preparation and follow-up and 4x 10min transition points between the lessons and answering questionnaires.

One person from the group of 4 acted as a teacher, the other three subjects acted as the class. The subjects, who represented the class, were given behavioral instructions in a pre-written script to simulate typical events and disruptions in the classroom (e.g. putting their heads on the table, chatting, looking at their mobile phones, etc.).

The lesson disruptions were displayed as instructions during the lesson for all “students” but not the teacher. In order to avoid learning effects, the disruptions in each lesson were distributed pseudo-randomly over the short teaching phase. In addition, the order of the data collection was taken into account in the analyses and variance caused by

84 order was controlled.



Figure 1. Example for set up during a mini-lesson

85 **Questionnaire data.** After each mini-lesson, the students answered items on the
86 teaching quality using a validated questionnaire (Helmke et al., 2014) and scales on the
87 teacher's presence behavior (students $n = 24$). In addition, the teacher was asked to give a
88 self-assessment on his/her classroom management by completing the questionnaire after
89 each mini-lesson (teachers $n = 8$).

90 **Behavioral data.** The speech, sounds and voices were recorded with an audio
91 recorder installed in the middle of the Lab. Movements, facial expressions and gestures of
92 the subjects were recorded by four cameras from different angles. One camera was installed
93 to film the class from the side. Two more cameras were installed on the blackboard and at
94 the end of the Lab to film the teacher and class from the front and back. Furthermore, the
95 fourth camera was installed in such a way that only facial expressions and gestures of the
96 teacher were recorded, which enables a semi-automated analysis of the movement
97 sequences.

Eyetracking data. A binocular Tobii Pro Glasses 2 eye-tracker consisting of a wearable head unit and a recording unit was used to record the eye movements of all 8 participants. The head unit is a measuring device with different sensitive sensors. A high-definition scene camera captures a full HD video and an integrated microphone records the surrounding sounds. Infrared light illuminators support the eye tracking sensors which record the eye orientation. The videos were recorded with a sampling rate of 50 Hz and a video resolution with 1920 x 1080 at 25 frames per second. The scene camera has a field of view of 90 deg. in 16:9 format (82 deg. horizontal and 52 deg. vertical) and has a frame dimension of 179 x 159 x 57mm (width x depth x height). The Tobii Pro Glasses Controller software was used to record and calibrate the eye movements.

Coding/ Data preparation/ Reliability

Questionnaire Data. The evaluation after each mini-lesson was conducted using paper questionnaires. Time needed to complete the questionnaire was about 5 minutes. The scales on the quality of teaching are a validated questionnaire (Helmke et al., 2014). Whereas the scales on the teacher's presence behavior were derived from the research literature (Brophy, 1986; Kiel, Frey, Weiß, & Weiss, 2013; Kounin, 2006; Marzano, 2007; Nolting, 2012) and were used in the pilot for the first time. The questionnaire is 4-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree). Data was obtained from N = 32 subjects (students n = 24, teachers n = 8).

The following scales were assessed:

- (1) Classroom management
- (2) Positive climate and motivation
- (3) Clarity and structuredness
- (4) Activation and support
- (5) Presence: posture/gaze

(6) Presence: voice

(7) Presence: verbal and non-verbal intervention

(8) Natural behaviour

Table 2 provides an overview over the mean, the standard deviation, the range, Cronbach's Alpha and the Skewness & Kurtosis of all scales for the teachers' self-assessment.

Some items (ks_sichtbar) were negatively correlated with the total scale and ## probably should be reversed.

To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option

Some items (pi_nonverbal) were negatively correlated with the total scale and ## probably should be reversed.

To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option

Some items (pi_nonverbal) were negatively correlated with the total scale and ## probably should be reversed.

To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option

Table 2

Scale analysis for teachers' self-assessment

scale	N items	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's a
Activation and support	3	2.46	1.14	1	4	0.10	1.65	0.85
Clarity and structuredness	2	2.81	0.91	1	4	-0.17	2.17	-0.76
Classroom management	4	2.44	0.88	1	4	0.19	2.38	0.83
Natural behaviour	3	2.83	0.76	2	4	0.28	1.84	0.90
Positive climate and motivation	6	2.85	0.87	1	4	-0.49	2.65	0.78
Presence: posture/gaze	7	2.70	1.01	1	4	-0.44	2.15	0.85
Presence: verbal and non-verbal intervention	3	2.75	0.79	1	4	-0.07	2.48	-0.75
Presence: voice	3	2.79	0.72	2	4	0.32	2.03	0.77

Table 3 provides an overview over the mean, the standard deviation, the range, Cronbach's Alpha and the Skewness & Kurtosis of all scales for the students' perception of the teacher's behaviour in class.

```
## Some items ( phb_stand ) were negatively correlated with the total scale and
## probably should be reversed.
## To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option

## Some items ( pi_direkt ) were negatively correlated with the total scale and
## probably should be reversed.
## To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option

## Some items ( phb_stand ) were negatively correlated with the total scale and
## probably should be reversed.
## To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option
```


Table 3

Scale analysis for students' perspective

scale	N items	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach's a
Activation and support	3	2.64	1.13	1	4	-0.32	1.73	0.48
Clarity and structuredness	2	3.58	0.68	1	4	-1.75	6.09	0.62
Classroom management	4	3.18	0.91	1	4	-0.87	2.86	0.75
Natural behaviour	3	3.43	0.67	2	4	-0.74	2.46	0.85
Positive climate and motivation	6	3.41	0.83	1	4	-1.40	4.29	0.82
Presence: posture/gaze	7	3.24	0.89	1	4	-1.05	3.31	0.59
Presence: verbal and non-verbal intervention	3	3.18	0.81	1	4	-0.66	2.70	0.20
Presence: voice	3	3.60	0.60	2	4	-1.18	3.36	0.71

150 The individual items of a scale are further represented in graphs.


151 (1) Classroom management




152

153 (2) Positive climate and motivation


Positive climate and motivation



155 (3) Clarity and structuredness



157 (4) Activation and support






Figure 2. (5) Presence: posture/gaze




Figure 3. (6) Presence: voice





Figure 4. (7) Presence: verbal and non-verbal intervention

159 (8) Natural behaviour



161 In addition, we plotted all scales. Graph provides boxplots and individual data for
162 experts and novices.




Figure 5. (#fig:boxplot scales) Boxplots and individual data for experts and novices


Behavioral Data. The recorded lessons were coded in a post-hoc procedure with the coding software MAXQDA by previously trained raters (Kuckartz & Rädiker, 2019). The following coding scheme was developed:

- phase - lesson begin, state event: teacher starts the lesson with a noise, talk, taking a position in class
- phase - lesson end, state event: teacher finishes the lesson with a noise, talk, taking a position in class
- phase - organization/transition points, state event: any situation that does not imply effective learning time (fetching chalk, working material, organizing desks, opening windows, printing work results etc.)
- phase - single, state event: any individual student activity on a given task (reading, writing, drawing etc.)
- phase - group, state event: any student activity on a given task together in a group of at least 3 students (reading, writing, drawing etc.)
- phase - class discussion, state event: discussion in class, teacher talks to class/individual/group
- phase - pair: state event: any student activity on a given task together in a team of 2 students (reading, writing, drawing etc.)
- phase - teachers lecture, state event: any teacher's presentation on a certain topic which maybe supported by a PPP, PREZI, notes on board, OHP etc.
- phase - other, state event: not categorizable
- phase - break, state event: e.g. drinking, relaxation exercises

- 185 • phase - external interruption, state event: external interruptions (e.g. fire alarm,
186 technical problems, other teachers coming into the room)
- 187 • speaking time - teacher, state event
- 188 • speaking time - students, state event
- 189 • disruption - chatting with neighbor, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted:
190 verbal, non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 191 • disruption - asking a question, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
192 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 193 • disruption - yelling, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
194 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 195 • disruption - looking at phone, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
196 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 197 • disruption - staring out of window, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted:
198 verbal, non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 199 • disruption - drawing, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
200 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 201 • disruption - head on table, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
202 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 203 • disruption - clicking pen, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
204 non-verbal/ not reacted)
- 205 • disruption - drumming hands, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal,
206 non-verbal/ not reacted)

- disruption - walking around, state event (perceived/ not perceived, reacted: verbal, non-verbal/ not reacted)

First, we coded the speaking time of the teacher and the students to compare all perspectives: coder, observer, students, teacher. The graph below shows the result of the coded speaking duration compared to the estimated speaking duration assessed with the questionnaire.



Eyetracking Data. The Tobii Pro Lab 2 software was used to analyze the teachers' visual attention during each mini-lesson. The software allows for non-screen based recordings of a participants' attention while moving in real-world settings. The recordings of the glasses contain both HD-video from the subjects' perspective as well as the respective gaze data mapped onto the video. In order to map multiple recordings to AOIs, we first imported the eye-tracking recordings into the Tobii Pro Analyzer software. Second, we created dynamic Areas of Interest (AOI) manually to plot the gaze data. Once the

AOIs are created, the gaze recordings of multiple recordings can be mapped and analyzed in aggregated form. Tobii Pro does not allow to do AOI based analyses within Pro Lab. So we exported a tsv. file to do further analyses in the software R.

Gaze relational index (GRI).

The GRI is a measure of visual expertise in information processing. This metric is calculated as the ratio of mean fixation duration to fixation count. The GRI is higher for novices than for experts. (Gegenfurtner et al., 2020)

Data analysis

We used R [Version 4.0.3; R Core Team (2019)] and the R-packages *dplyr* [R-dplyr], *corrplot2017* (Wei & Simko, 2017), *forcats* [Version 0.5.0; Wickham (2020a)], *Formula* [Version 1.2.4; Zeileis and Croissant (2010)], *ggplot2* [Version 3.3.2; Wickham (2016)], *Hmisc* [Version 4.4.2; Harrell Jr, Charles Dupont, and others. (2020)], *lattice* [Version 0.20.41; Sarkar (2008)], *moments* [Version 0.14; Komsta and Novomestky (2015)], *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth (2020)], *papayar* (Muschelli, 2016), *psych* [Version 2.0.12; Revelle (2020)], *purrr* [Version 0.3.4; Henry and Wickham (2020)], *readr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham, Hester, and Francois (2018)], *sjPlot* [Version 2.8.7; Lüdtke (2021)], *stringr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham (2019)], *survival* [Version 3.2.7; Terry M. Therneau and Patricia M. Grambsch (2000)], *tibble* [Version 3.0.4; Müller and Wickham (2021)], *tidyr* [Version 1.1.2; Wickham (2020b)], and *tidyverse* [Version 1.3.0; Wickham et al. (2019)] for all our analyses.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat, sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat,

sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet.

Questionnaire Data.

Behavioral Data.

Eyetracking Data.

Results

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat, sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat, sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet.

Questionnaire Data.

Behavioral Data.

Eyetracking Data.

Discussion

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat, sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consetetur sadipscing elitr, sed diam nonumy eirmod tempor invidunt ut labore et dolore magna aliquyam erat, sed diam voluptua. At vero eos et accusam et justo duo dolores et ea rebum. Stet clita kasd gubergren, no sea takimata sanctus est Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet.

References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*.

Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>

Barnes, D. (2004). The significance of teachers' frames for teaching. In *Teachers and teaching* (pp. 16–38). Routledge.

Barth, V. L. (2017). *Professionelle wahrnehmung von störungen im unterricht*. Springer.

Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(5), 463–482.

Bogert, N. J. van den. (2016). *On teachers' visual perception and interpretation of classroom events using eye tracking and collaborative tagging methodologies*. Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.

Brophy, J. (1986). Classroom management techniques. *Education and Urban Society*, 18(2), 182–194.

Cortina, K. S., Miller, K. F., McKenzie, R., & Epstein, A. (2015). Where low and high inference data converge: Validation of CLASS assessment of mathematics instruction using mobile eye tracking with expert and novice teachers. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 13(2), 389–403.

Gegenfurtner, A., Boucheix, J.-M., Gruber, H., Hauser, F., Lehtinen, E., & Lowe, R. K. (2020). The gaze relational index as a measure of visual expertise. *Journal of Expertise*. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 2020, Vol. 3, Iss. 1.

Harrell Jr, F. E., Charles Dupont, with contributions from, & others., many. (2020). *Hmisc: Harrell miscellaneous*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Hmisc>

- Helmke, A., Helmke, T., Lenske, G., Pham, G., Praetorius, A.-K., Schrader, F.-W.,
& AdeThuwow, M. (2014). Unterrichtsdiagnostik mit EMU. *Aus-Und Fortbildung
Der Lehrkräfte in Hinblick Auf Verbesserung Der Diagnosefähigkeit, Umgang
Mit Heterogenität Und Individuelle Förderung*, 149–163.
- Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools*. Retrieved
from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr>
- Jarodzka, H., Scheiter, K., Gerjets, P., & Van Gog, T. (2010). In the eyes of the
beholder: How experts and novices interpret dynamic stimuli. *Learning and
Instruction*, 20(2), 146–154.
- Kiel, E., Frey, A., Weiß, S., & Weiss, S. (2013). *Trainingsbuch klassenführung* (Vol.
3992). UTB.
- Komsta, L., & Novomestky, F. (2015). *Moments: Moments, cumulants, skewness,
kurtosis and related tests*. Retrieved from
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=moments>
- Kounin, J. S. (2006). *Techniken der klassenführung*. Waxmann Verlag.
- Kuckartz, U., & Rädiker, S. (2019). *Analyzing qualitative data with MAXQDA*.
Springer.
- Lachner, A., Jarodzka, H., & Nückles, M. (2016). What makes an expert teacher?
Investigating teachers' professional vision and discourse abilities. *Instructional
Science*, 44(3), 197–203.
- Lüdecke, D. (2021). *sjPlot: Data visualization for statistics in social science*.
Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sjPlot>
- Marzano, R. J. (2007). *The art and science of teaching: A comprehensive
framework for effective instruction*. Ascd.

Messner, H., & Reusser, K. (2000). Die berufliche entwicklung von lehrpersonen als lebenslanger prozess. *Beiträge Zur Lehrerinnen-Und Lehrerbildung*, 18(2), 157–171.

Muschelli, J. (2016). *Papayar: View medical research images using the papaya JavaScript library*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=papayar>

Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble>

Nolting, H.-P. (2012). *Störungen in der schulklasse*. Beltz.

Pouta, M., Lehtinen, E., & Palonen, T. (2020). Student teachers' and experienced teachers' professional vision of students' understanding of the rational number concept.

R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>

Revelle, W. (2020). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>

Sarkar, D. (2008). *Lattice: Multivariate data visualization with r*. New York: Springer. Retrieved from <http://lmdvr.r-forge.r-project.org>

Stuermer, K., Seidel, T., Mueller, K., Häusler, J., & Cortina, K. S. (2017). What is in the eye of preservice teachers while instructing? An eye-tracking study about attention processes in different teaching situations. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 20(1), 75–92.

- 343 Terry M. Therneau, & Patricia M. Grambsch. (2000). *Modeling survival data:*
344 *Extending the Cox model*. New York: Springer.
- 345 Wei, T., & Simko, V. (2017). *R package "corrplot": Visualization of a correlation*
346 *matrix*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/taiyun/corrplot>
- 347 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag
348 New York. Retrieved from <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>
- 349 Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string*
350 *operations*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr>
- 351 Wickham, H. (2020a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables*
352 *(factors)*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats>
- 353 Wickham, H. (2020b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from
354 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>
- 355 Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., . . .
356 Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*,
357 4(43), 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>
- 358 Wickham, H., Hester, J., & Francois, R. (2018). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*.
359 Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>
- 360 Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., & Boshuizen, H. P. (2017). See and tell: Differences
361 between expert and novice teachers' interpretations of problematic classroom
362 management events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 66, 295–308.
- 363 Zeileis, A., & Croissant, Y. (2010). Extended model formulas in R: Multiple parts
364 and multiple responses. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 34(1), 1–13.
365 <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v034.i01>

Table 4

GRI

TOI	ID	Group	Duration TOI ms	M Duration Fixation	Number Fixation	Time TOI Duration	Old GRI	New GRI
Asking question	01_04_C	Novice	3,869.00	2,925.62	3.00	1.32	975.21	0.44
Asking question	01_02_A	Expert	7,112.00	2,925.62	13.00	2.43	225.05	0.19
Asking question	01_03_B	Novice	12,863.00	2,925.62	4.00	4.40	731.41	1.10
Asking question	01_01_D	Expert	7,648.00	2,925.62	7.00	2.61	417.95	0.37
Asking question	02_01_A	Novice	7,422.00	2,925.62	3.00	2.54	975.21	0.85
Asking question	02_02_B	Novice	7,082.00	2,925.62	9.00	2.42	325.07	0.27
Asking question	02_03_C	Novice	8,045.00	2,925.62	8.00	2.75	365.70	0.34
Asking question	02_04_D	Novice	6,595.00	2,925.62	6.00	2.25	487.60	0.38
Calibration phase	01_04_C	Novice	17,224.00	12,275.12	14.00	1.40	876.79	0.10
Calibration phase	01_02_A	Expert	13,335.00	12,275.12	10.00	1.09	1,227.51	0.11
Calibration phase	01_03_B	Novice	10,615.00	12,275.12	17.00	0.86	722.07	0.05
Calibration phase	01_01_D	Expert	16,470.00	12,275.12	9.00	1.34	1,363.90	0.15
Calibration phase	02_01_A	Novice	17,902.00	12,275.12	13.00	1.46	944.24	0.11
Calibration phase	02_02_B	Novice	12,325.00	12,275.12	12.00	1.00	1,022.93	0.08
Calibration phase	02_03_C	Novice	16,494.00	12,275.12	18.00	1.34	681.95	0.07
Calibration phase	02_04_D	Novice	20,964.00	12,275.12	14.00	1.71	876.79	0.12
Chatting with neighbour	01_04_C	Novice	9,843.00	4,070.12	27.00	2.42	150.75	0.09
Chatting with neighbour	01_02_A	Expert	2,607.00	4,070.12	1.00	0.64	4,070.12	0.64
Chatting with neighbour	01_03_B	Novice	11,060.00	4,070.12	10.00	2.72	407.01	0.27
Chatting with neighbour	01_01_D	Expert	6,612.00	4,070.12	3.00	1.62	1,356.71	0.54
Chatting with neighbour	02_01_A	Novice	7,429.00	4,070.12	5.00	1.83	814.02	0.37
Chatting with neighbour	02_02_B	Novice	8,397.00	4,070.12	11.00	2.06	370.01	0.19
Chatting with neighbour	02_03_C	Novice	11,713.00	4,070.12	11.00	2.88	370.01	0.26
Chatting with neighbour	02_04_D	Novice	11,443.00	4,070.12	4.00	2.81	1,017.53	0.70
Clicking pen	01_04_C	Novice	12,980.00	8,809.75	4.00	1.47	2,202.44	0.37
Clicking pen	01_02_A	Expert	12,071.00	8,809.75	20.00	1.37	440.49	0.07
Clicking pen	01_03_B	Novice	26,272.00	8,809.75	16.00	2.98	550.61	0.19
Clicking pen	01_01_D	Expert	11,597.00	8,809.75	11.00	1.32	800.89	0.12
Clicking pen	02_01_A	Novice	16,114.00	8,809.75	11.00	1.83	800.89	0.17
Clicking pen	02_02_B	Novice	9,409.00	8,809.75	12.00	1.07	734.15	0.09
Clicking pen	02_03_C	Novice	16,269.00	8,809.75	27.00	1.85	326.29	0.07
Clicking pen	02_04_D	Novice	24,220.00	8,809.75	19.00	2.75	463.67	0.14
Drawing on paper	01_04_C	Novice	39,979.00	34,414.38	27.00	1.16	1,274.61	0.04
Drawing on paper	01_02_A	Expert	44,971.00	34,414.38	87.00	1.31	395.57	0.02
Drawing on paper	01_03_B	Novice	129,708.00	34,414.38	79.00	3.77	435.62	0.05
Drawing on paper	01_01_D	Expert	74,511.00	34,414.38	92.00	2.17	374.07	0.02
Drawing on paper	02_01_A	Novice	43,469.00	34,414.38	31.00	1.26	1,110.14	0.04
Drawing on paper	02_02_B	Novice	147,788.00	34,414.38	295.00	4.29	116.66	0.01
Drawing on paper	02_03_C	Novice	26,495.00	34,414.38	46.00	0.77	748.14	0.02
Drawing on paper	02_04_D	Novice	27,915.00	34,414.38	11.00	0.81	3,128.58	0.07
Drumming hands	01_04_C	Novice	43,507.00	11,415.88	41.00	3.81	278.44	0.09
Drumming hands	01_02_A	Expert	20,530.00	11,415.88	27.00	1.80	422.81	0.07
Drumming hands	01_03_B	Novice	12,615.00	11,415.88	6.00	1.11	1,902.65	0.18
Drumming hands	01_01_D	Expert	23,121.00	11,415.88	17.00	2.03	671.52	0.12
Drumming hands	02_01_A	Novice	62,326.00	11,415.88	50.00	5.46	228.32	0.11
Drumming hands	02_02_B	Novice	24,699.00	11,415.88	25.00	2.16	456.64	0.09
Drumming hands	02_03_C	Novice	27,775.00	11,415.88	49.00	2.43	232.98	0.05
Drumming hands	02_04_D	Novice	14,998.00	11,415.88	9.00	1.31	1,268.43	0.15
Looking at phone	01_04_C	Novice	7,984.00	11,563.00	8.00	0.69	1,445.38	0.09
Looking at phone	01_02_A	Expert	19,897.00	11,563.00	28.00	1.72	412.96	0.06
Looking at phone	01_03_B	Novice	40,427.00	11,563.00	30.00	3.50	385.43	0.12
Looking at phone	01_01_D	Expert	32,387.00	11,563.00	29.00	2.80	398.72	0.10
Looking at phone	02_01_A	Novice	33,557.00	11,563.00	14.00	2.90	825.93	0.21
Looking at phone	02_02_B	Novice	16,321.00	11,563.00	19.00	1.41	608.58	0.07

Table 5

GRI

Variable1	TOI	M Fixation Duration	M Number Fixation	M TOI	M Old GRI	SD Old GRI	M New GRI	SD New GRI
Expert	Asking question	2,108.50	10.00	7,380.00	231.70	98.30	0.39	0.18
Expert	Calibration phase	12,283.00	9.50	14,902.50	1,296.54	96.50	0.13	0.03
Expert	Chatting with neighbour	1,829.00	2.00	4,609.50	1,219.33	862.20	1.32	0.16
Expert	Clicking pen	5,416.50	15.50	11,834.00	381.62	156.68	0.15	0.06
Expert	Drawing on paper	25,514.50	89.50	59,741.00	285.30	11.27	0.03	0.01
Expert	Drumming hands	8,405.00	22.00	21,825.50	402.85	129.48	0.13	0.05
Expert	Looking at phone	8,484.50	28.50	26,142.00	297.79	7.39	0.11	0.03
Expert	Putting head on table	7,605.50	15.50	14,878.00	1,091.53	1,145.29	0.16	0.07
Expert	Yelling	580.00	1.00	2,120.00	580.00	0.00	3.66	0.30
Novice	Asking question	3,198.00	5.50	7,646.00	703.26	320.81	0.51	0.30
Novice	Calibration phase	12,272.50	14.67	15,920.67	853.95	130.15	0.09	0.03
Novice	Chatting with neighbour	4,817.17	11.33	9,980.83	617.28	384.64	0.26	0.18
Novice	Clicking pen	9,940.83	14.83	17,544.00	955.00	774.90	0.15	0.09
Novice	Drawing on paper	37,381.00	81.50	69,225.67	1,233.52	1,156.72	0.04	0.02
Novice	Drumming hands	12,419.50	30.00	30,986.67	791.90	760.35	0.10	0.04
Novice	Looking at phone	12,589.17	22.83	26,409.33	747.59	459.89	0.10	0.05
Novice	Putting head on table	20,198.00	44.50	40,305.33	535.53	252.70	0.04	0.02
Novice	Yelling	992.67	2.83	6,611.83	635.78	409.08	4.76	4.60

Table 6

GRI

Variable1	M Fixation Duration	M Number Fixation	M TOI	M Old GRI	SD Old GRI	M New GRI	SD New GRI
Expert	8,025.17	21.50	18,159.17	1,953.05	2,871.09	0.16	0.08
Novice	12,645.43	25.33	24,958.93	1,878.32	2,902.64	0.13	0.15

Table 7

Number and Duration (in msec) of Fixations during calibration

Participant	Variable1	Fixation Number	Fixation Duration	M Duration Fixation	TOI	GRI
01_01_D	Expert	9.00	14,372.00	1,597.00	16,470.00	177.44
01_02_A	Expert	10.00	10,194.00	1,019.00	13,335.00	101.90
01_03_B	Novice	17.00	9,234.00	543.00	10,615.00	31.94
01_04_C	Novice	14.00	15,311.00	1,094.00	17,224.00	78.14
02_01_A	Novice	13.00	5,157.00	397.00	17,902.00	30.54
02_02_B	Novice	12.00	10,654.00	888.00	12,325.00	74.00
02_03_C	Novice	18.00	14,151.00	786.00	16,494.00	43.67
02_04_D	Novice	14.00	19,128.00	1,366.00	20,964.00	97.57

Table 8

Number and Duration (in msec) of Fixations Calibration End to Lesson Start

Participant	Variable1	Fixation Number	Fixation Duration	M Duration Fixation	TOI	GRI
01_01_D	Expert	101.00	38,177.00	378.00	53,133.00	3.74
01_02_A	Expert	27.00	6,736.00	249.00	15,502.00	9.22
01_03_B	Novice	57.00	36,378.00	638.00	58,763.00	11.19
01_04_C	Novice	65.00	22,387.00	344.00	39,235.00	5.29
02_01_A	Novice	14.00	2,619.00	187.00	30,195.00	13.36
02_02_B	Novice	46.00	15,851.00	345.00	30,297.00	7.50
02_03_C	Novice	86.00	27,643.00	321.00	42,603.00	3.73
02_04_D	Novice	53.00	27,783.00	524.00	36,204.00	9.89

Table 9

Number and Duration (in msec) of Fixations for Disturbance 'head on table' to first intervention

Participant	Variable1	Fixation Number	Fixation Duration	M Duration Fixation	TOI	GRI
01_01_D	Expert	3.00	2,079.00	693.00	5,735.00	231.00
01_02_A	Expert	7.00	2,778.00	397.00	8,454.00	56.71
01_03_B	Novice	1.00	460.00	460.00	3,493.00	460.00
01_04_C	Novice	29.00	12,653.00	436.00	16,245.00	15.03