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).

Video and Audio recording equipment. The speech, sounds and voices of the participants were recorded with Zoom H3-VR Ambient Recorder (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 August 2022.

The project was conducted as a laboratory study in a cross-sectional study design to investigate whether and how teachers' experience has an influence on the perception of and reaction to classroom disruptions.

The subjects were informed in detail about the procedure and aim of the study before the survey. For the data collection, student teachers and experienced teachers were asked to prepare micro-teaching-unit of 15 minutes. The subjects taught the micro-teaching-unit to a fictitious class consisting of three student assistants who simulated typical classroom events during the lesson. A mobile eye-tracker recorded the teachers' gaze behavior and audio data of the lesson. All other sounds and voices were also recorded using audio recorders. In addition, the test persons were given a smartwatch to record the number of steps they took and their pulse rate. To record facial expressions, gestures and movements, four mobile cameras were installed to record the fictitious classroom from all perspectives (see figures 5-8). After the lesson, the teacher conducted a letter search in the room. For this, four letters had to be found in order and read aloud. This served as a control condition for the speed of the subjects' perceptual ability. of the test persons. After the end of the teaching sequence, the class and the teacher After the end of the teaching

sequence, the class and the teacher filled out a questionnaire focusing on evidence-based methods of teaching diagnostics (EMU) in order to collect data on self-assessment and assessment by others.

In the second part of the survey, the investigator conducted a Stimulated- Recall Interview (SRI) with the respondents. In this interview, the recorded video of the lesson was watched in its entirety and commented on by the teacher while thinking aloud. Finally, the test persons answered a Situational Judgement Test (SJT, (Gold & Holodynski, 2015)) in the form of a questionnaire. Here they had to assess teaching scenarios and evaluate their behavior in response to them. The SJT was used to assess strategic knowledge about classroom management.

This study is subject to a quasi-experimental study design, as there was no random assignment of the test persons to the experimental conditions. Due to the use of MET technology, the study has a high external validity (Gegenfurtner et al., 2018). The SRI carried out afterwards explicitly investigates the subjects' sense of disturbance and feeling of safety, which speaks for a high content validity of the study. Internal validity can be ensured to the extent that the teaching events that occurred were exactly the same for all subjects, as the learners received precise behavioural instructions. These disturbances followed a script and coding guide in which the actions of the class were precisely described. The sequence of events varied from survey to survey so that disruptions were always random. The scripted behavioural instructions during the teaching sequence characterise this study with a high degree of standardization, especially when compared to events taking place in a real classroom. The study is based on an experimental manual, script and coding guide, which explicitly describes the implementation, evaluation as well as interpretation of the data, thus making it objectively recordable and measurable. As this study takes place within the framework of the dissertation ProVisioNET, the original survey will continue beyond the submission of this scientific work. continues.

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 0.4.1; 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), *kableExtra* (Version 1.3.4; Zhu, 2021), *knitr* (Version 1.38; Xie, 2015), *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 0.1.0.9999; Aust & Barth, 2020), *polycor* (Version 0.8.1; Fox, 2022), *purrr* (Version 0.3.4; Henry & Wickham, 2020), *readr* (Version 2.1.2; Wickham, Hester, & Bryan, 2021), *readxl* (Version 1.4.0; Wickham & Bryan, 2019), *rlang* (Version 1.0.2; Henry & Wickham, 2022), *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), *viridisLite* (Version 0.4.0; Garnier et al., 2021b), and *xtable* (Version 1.8.4; Dahl, Scott, Roosen, Magnusson, & Swinton, 2019) and IBM SPSS 28.

Results

Discussion

177 **References**

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

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

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

184 Dahl, D. B., Scott, D., Roosen, C., Magnusson, A., & Swinton, J. (2019). *Xtable:*
185 *Export tables to LaTeX or HTML*. Retrieved from
186 https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xtable

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

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

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

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

196 Gold, B., & Holodynski, M. (2015). Development and construct validation of a
197 situational judgment test of strategic knowledge of classroom management in
198 elementary schools. *Educational Assessment*, *20*(3), 226–248.

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

202 Goodwin, C. (2015). Professional vision. In *Aufmerksamkeit* (pp. 387–425).
203 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

Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2022). *Rlang: Functions for base types and core r and 'tidyverse' features*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=rlang

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.

Xie, Y. (2015). *Dynamic documents with R and knitr* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman; Hall/CRC. Retrieved from https://yihui.org/knitr/

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

Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra

Table 1

Demographic Information

Group	N	Gender female in percent	M Age in years	SD Age in years	Min Age in years	Max Age in years
Expert	7	71.40	45.10	12.00	27.00	59.00
Novice	21	61.90	23.30	1.70	20.00	27.00

Table 2

Teaching Experience in years, internship experience in teaching units (45min) and extracurricular teachin

Group	N	M Exp.	SD Exp.	Min Exp.	Max Exp.	M Semester	SD Semester	Min Semester	Max Semester	M Internship	SD Internship
Expert	7	18.10	14.10	3.00	37.00	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Novice	21	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.40	2.50	3.00	11.00	12.00	8.60

Table 3

Scale analysis for novices' self-assessment

	N Items	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	alpha
Classroom Management	8.00	2.94	0.26	2.50	3.38	0.02	1.69	0.31
Balance	3.00	3.14	0.56	1.67	4.00	-0.45	3.53	0.71
Presence	8.00	3.10	0.36	2.50	3.88	0.10	2.65	0.66
Natural Behavior	3.00	3.17	0.65	1.67	4.00	-0.65	2.91	0.80

Table 4

Scale analysis for experts' self-assessment

	N Items	M	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	alpha
Classroom Management	8.00	3.00	0.20	2.75	3.25	0.25	1.42	-0.16
Balance	3.00	3.43	0.42	2.67	4.00	-0.57	2.87	0.41
Presence	8.00	3.36	0.45	2.50	3.88	-0.85	2.95	0.84
Natural Behavior	3.00	3.38	0.36	3.00	4.00	0.60	2.36	0.00



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

Figure 2. Teacher's Gaze Point