Through the eyes of the teacher - Multimodal exploration of expertise differences in the perception of classroom disruptions

Mandy Klatt[1], Dr. Gregor Kachel[1, 2], Dr. Christin Lotz[1], & Prof. Dr. Anne Deiglmayr[1]

[1] Leipzig University

[2] Max-Planck University for Evolutionary Anthropology

Author Note

We received funding from QualiFond of University Leipzig. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose. This article is based on data used at conference presentations (DACH-Nachwuchsakademie, 2022; EARLI SIG 11 2022; EARLI SIG 27, 2022).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mandy Klatt, Dittrichring 5-7, 04109 Leipzig. E-mail: mandy.klatt@uni-leipzig.de

Through the eyes of the teacher - Multimodal exploration of expertise differences in the perception of classroom disruptions

Introduction

Managing classroom disruptions is a crucial aspect of effective classroom management (Evertson, Weinstein, et al. (2006); Kounin (2006)).

Accordingly, teachers must be able to quickly notice and appropriately react to significant events in the classroom. This ability is referred to as classroom professional vision (Goodwin (2015); Sherin (2007)).

The process of professional vision can be divided into two main aspects: focusing on relevant situations for learning and teaching (“noticing”) and applying knowledge to draw appropriate conclusions in these situations (“knowledge-based reasoning”; Seidel and Stürmer (2014)).

Therefore, the early visual perception of classroom disruptions is a key component to effectively maximize students’ learning time and minimize classroom interruptions. According to Kounin (2006), these important classroom management strategies are called “withitness” and “overlapping” and can be summarized under the concept of monitoring (Gold and Holodynski (2017)).

Learning to develop such classroom management skills is a demanding and complex task for student teachers (Wolff, Jarodzka, Bogert, and Boshuizen (2016)). Research on teacher expertise showed that expert and novice teachers differ in their ability to perceive classroom events, “[. . .] whereas only a few studies have focused on the basal process of noticing, i.e. the recognition of possible disturbing situations” (Grub, Biermann, and Brünken (2020), p.75). Mobile eye-tracking data can fill this research gap by providing new insights in how expertise differences in teacher´s professional vision manifest in teacher-student interactions (Lachner, Jarodzka, and Nückles (2016); @Wolff et al. (2016)).

Theoretical background

Professional competence

Classroom Management

- Disruptions defintiion

Professional Vision

Expertise

Parameter/Indicators of professional vision

Research Questions

This study examined how the degree of teaching experience influences (a) the number of fixations on relevant areas (e.g., the student performing the disruption), (b) the fixation duration in relevant areas and (c) the time to first fixation on relevant areas, using mobile eye-tracking data in a controlled, micro-teaching setting. Based on the existing literature, we expect expert teachers to outperform novices by (H1) showing more fixations on relevant areas with (H2) shorter fixation durations and (H3) perceiving classroom disruptions faster (cf. Van den Bogert, Bruggen, Kostons, and Jochems (2014)).

Methods

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

Participants

The sample consists of $N = 28$ participants with $n = 7$ expert teachers and $n = 21$ novice teachers.

The inclusion criterion for experts was that they have successfully completed teacher training and are actively employed in the teaching profession. According to Palmer, Stough, Burdenski, and Gonzales (2005), we selected teachers as experts who had at least three years of professional experience and ideally had worked in another teaching position, such as subject advisor or trainer for trainee teachers, in addition to their teaching profession in school. Novices were student teachers who had successfully completed their first internship in a school and gained one to four hours of teaching experience.

The expert teachers (5 women; 71.40%) had a mean age of 45.10 years ($SD = 12$; range: 27-59) and an average teaching experience of 18.10 years ($SD = 14.10$; range: 3-37). 71% of the experienced teachers were also engaged in an secondary teaching activity, such as lecturers at the university, main training supervisors for trainee teachers and subject advisers.

The novice teachers (13 women; 61.90%) had a mean age of 23.30 years ($SD = 1.70$; range: 20-27) with an average teaching experience of 0 years. On average, the student teachers were in their 7.40 semester ($SD = 2.50$; range: 3-11). Furthermore, they had an average teaching experience of 12 teaching units à 45min ($SD = 8.60$; range: 0-36) through the internships during their studies. 90.50% of the student teachers were also engaged in an extracurricular teaching activity, such as tutoring or homework supervision.

The subjects were primarily recruited through personal contacts, social media (Facebook), e-mail distribution lists and advertising in lectures at the University Leipzig. All study procedures were carried out in accordance with the ethical standards of the University's Institutional Review Board. The authors received a positive vote on the study procedures from the Ethics Committee Board of Leipzig University. All participants were informed in detail about the aim and intention of the study prior to testing. Participation in the study was voluntary and only took place after written consent has been given.

Material

Eye-Tracking equipment. During the unit, teachers wore a binocular Tobii Pro Glasses 2 eye-tracker (https://www.tobiipro.com/product-listing/tobii-pro-glasses-2/). The system consisted of a wearable head unit and a recording unit. As shown in Figure 1, the head unit was a measuring device with different sensors. A high-definition scene camera captured a full HD video of the teacher's field of vision. An integrated microphone recorded the surrounding sounds. Infrared light illuminators supported the eye tracking sensors which recorded the eye orientation to capure the tacher's gaze point as shown in Figure 2. The videos were recorded with a sampling rate of 50 Hz in a video resolution with 1920 x 1080 at 25 frames per second. The scene camera had a field of view of 90 deg. in 16:9 format (82 deg. horizontal and 52 deg. vertical) and a frame dimension of 179 x 159 x 57 mm (width x depth x height).



Figure 1. Tobii Pro Glasses 2; Source: https://www.tobiipro.com/product-listing/tobii-pro-glasses-2/

Video and Audio recording equipment. The speech, sounds and voices of the participants were recorded with Zoom H3-VR Ambient Recorder

Figure 2. Teacher's Gaze Point

(https://zoomcorp.com/en/gb/handheld-recorders/handheld-recorders/h3-vr-360-audio-recorder/) installed in the middle of the lab setting. The Zoom H3-VR recorded with four built-in mics arranged in an Ambisonic array with a bitrate of 4608 kBits/s.

Movements, facial expressions and gestures of the subjects were recorded by four Go Pro Hero 7 black cameras (https://gopro.com/content/dam/help/hero7-black/manuals/HERO7Black_UM_ENG_REVC.pdf) from different angles. The videos were recorded with a sampling rate of 50 Hz in a video resolution with 1920 x 1080 at 50 frames per second in 16:9 format with a linear field of view.

Questionnaire. After each micro-teaching-unit, the students answered items on teaching quality using a validated questionnaire (Helmke et al., 2014) and scales on the teacher's presence behavior. In addition, participants were asked to give a self-assessment on classroom management by completing the questionnaire after each micro-teaching-unit. The questionnaire was a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 =

Agree; 4 = Strongly Agree).

Procedure

In June 2021, the study was piloted with student teachers volunteers to refine the study procedure. Data collection was conducted between July 2021, and July 2022.

Data analysis

We investigated whether experts and novice teachers differed

All reported data analyses were conducted with the R (Version 4.1.3; R Core Team, 2021) and the R-packages *ARTofR* (Version 0.3.3; Zhang, 2021), *cowplot* (Version 1.1.1; Wilke, 2020), *dplyr* (Version 1.0.8; Wickham, François, Henry, & Müller, 2022), *forcats* (Version 0.5.1; Wickham, 2021), *ggplot2* (Version 3.3.5; Wickham, 2016), *gridExtra* (Version 2.3; Auguie, 2017), *ltm* (Version 1.2.0; Rizopoulos, 2006), *lubridate* (Version 1.8.0; Grolemund & Wickham, 2011), *MASS* (Version 7.3.55; Venables & Ripley, 2002), *moments* (Version 0.14; Komsta & Novomestky, 2015), *msm* (Version 1.6.9; Jackson, 2011), *needs* (Version 0.0.3; Katz, 2016), *papaja* (Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust & Barth, 2020), *polycor* (Version 0.8.1; Fox, 2022), *purrr* (Version 0.3.4; Henry & Wickham, 2020), *readr* (Version 2.1.1; Wickham, Hester, & Bryan, 2021), *readxl* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham & Bryan, 2019), *sjPlot* (Version 2.8.10; Lüdecke, 2021), *stringr* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham, 2019), *tibble* (Version 3.1.6; Müller & Wickham, 2021), *tidyr* (Version 1.2.0; Wickham & Girlich, 2022), *tidyverse* (Version 1.3.1; Wickham et al., 2019), *tinylabels* (Version 0.2.3; Barth, 2022), *viridis* (Version 0.6.2; Garnier et al., 2021a, 2021b), and *viridisLite* (Version 0.4.0; Garnier et al., 2021b) and IBM SPSS 28.

Results

Discussion

References

Auguie, B. (2017). *gridExtra: Miscellaneous functions for "grid" graphics*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gridExtra

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Prepare reproducible APA journal articles with R Markdown*. Retrieved from https://github.com/crsh/papaja

Barth, M. (2022). *tinylabels: Lightweight variable labels*. Retrieved from https://cran.r-project.org/package=tinylabels

Evertson, C. M., Weinstein, C. S.others. (2006). Classroom management as a field of inquiry. *Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice, and Contemporary Issues*, *3*(1), 16.

Fox, J. (2022). *Polycor: Polychoric and polyserial correlations*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=polycor

Garnier, Simon, Ross, Noam, Rudis, Robert, … Cédric. (2021a). *viridis - colorblind-friendly color maps for r*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4679424

Garnier, Simon, Ross, Noam, Rudis, Robert, … Cédric. (2021b). *viridis - colorblind-friendly color maps for r*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4679424

Gold, B., & Holodynski, M. (2017). Using digital video to measure the professional vision of elementary classroom management: Test validation and methodological challenges. *Computers & Education*, *107*, 13–30.

Goodwin, C. (2015). Professional vision. In *Aufmerksamkeit* (pp. 387–425). Springer.

Grolemund, G., & Wickham, H. (2011). Dates and times made easy with lubridate. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *40*(3), 1–25. Retrieved from https://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i03/

Grub, A.-S., Biermann, A., & Brünken, R. (2020). Process-based measurement of professional vision of (prospective) teachers in the field of classroom management. A systematic review. *Journal for Educational Research Online*, *12*(3), 75–102.

Helmke, A., Helmke, T., Lenske, G., Pham, G., Praetorius, A.-K., Schrader, F.-W., & AdeThurow, 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

Jackson, C. H. (2011). Multi-state models for panel data: The msm package for R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *38*(8), 1–29. Retrieved from https://www.jstatsoft.org/v38/i08/

Katz, J. (2016). *Needs: Attaches and installs packages*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=needs

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.

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

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

Palmer, D. J., Stough, L. M., Burdenski, T. K., Jr, & Gonzales, M. (2005). Identifying teacher expertise: An examination of researchers' decision making. *Educational Psychologist*, *40*(1), 13–25.

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.

Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Rizopoulos, D. (2006). Ltm: An r package for latent variable modelling and item response theory analyses. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *17*(5), 1–25. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v017.i05

Seidel, T., & Stürmer, K. (2014). Modeling and measuring the structure of professional vision in preservice teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *51*(4), 739–771.

Sherin, M. (2007). *The development of teachers' professional vision in video clubs. Video research in the learning sciences. R. Goldman, r. Pea, b. Barron and SJ derry.* Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Van den Bogert, N., Bruggen, J. van, Kostons, D., & Jochems, W. (2014). First steps into understanding teachers' visual perception of classroom events. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *37*, 208–216.

Venables, W. N., & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern applied statistics with s* (Fourth). New York: Springer. Retrieved from https://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/pub/MASS4/

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis.* Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr

Wickham, H. (2021). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors).* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., … Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*, *4*(43), 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

Wickham, H., & Bryan, J. (2019). *Readxl: Read excel files.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readxl

Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2022). *Dplyr: A grammar of data manipulation*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

Wickham, H., & Girlich, M. (2022). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

Wickham, H., Hester, J., & Bryan, J. (2021). *Readr: Read rectangular text data*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr

Wilke, C. O. (2020). *Cowplot: Streamlined plot theme and plot annotations for 'ggplot2'*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=cowplot

Wolff, C. E., Jarodzka, H., Bogert, N. van den, & Boshuizen, H. (2016). Teacher vision: Expert and novice teachers' perception of problematic classroom management scenes. *Instructional Science*, *44*(3), 243–265.

Zhang, H. (2021). *ARTofR: Who ever care about the [art of r] scripts?* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ARTofR