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Abstract

This paper presents the contextual background of a doctoral study that investigates the process of assessment of teacher competence based on supervisors’ judgment of the pre-service teachers' classroom performance. The study approaches classroom observation as a process conducted under time constraint. As such it is regarded as a process that reflects only restricted aspects of the teacher's competence. The variables in this study are identified and linked by a model of the decision-making process following models of cognitive process in performance appraisal. The variables are within the scope of competence, criteria for assessment, the supervisors' perceptions of the teacher appraisal, supervisor's observation of classroom performance and the determinants of the judgment process. The subjects in this study are supervisors of pre-service teachers in an institute of education in Hong Kong. The organizational and contextual aspects are considered as important determinants in the process of supervisors’ judgment of the pre-service teachers' classroom performance. The paper presents a brief introduction to the institution, a discussion on its demands on teacher practicum, practice and procedure in classroom observation and a report on the preliminary findings of supervisor's views on classroom observation. (This study is part of a Ph.D. programme at The University of Melbourne)

1 The study

This paper presents the contextual background of a doctoral study that investigates the process of assessment of teacher competence of pre-service teachers' classroom performance based on supervisors' judgment. The study approaches classroom observation as a process conducted under time constraint. As such it is regarded as a process that reflects only restricted aspects of the teacher's competence.

The primary research questions in this study is:

1. How do supervisors judge the performance of student teachers in classroom teaching?

Subsidiary research questions are:

2. How do supervisors perceive teacher competence in classroom teaching?
3. How do supervisors collect information in judging performance in classroom teaching?
4. How do supervisors process the information collected in classroom observation in judging performance in classroom teaching?
5. What are the determinants in the collection and processing of information leading to the judgment of performance of student teachers in classroom teaching?

- How does the perception of teacher competence, together with other intrinsic factors of the supervisor (the perception of teacher appraisal, perception of the role of the supervisor and expertise,) influence the collection of information in observation of classroom teaching?
- How do the intrinsic and extrinsic determinants influence the processing of information of the student teacher’s performance?
- How do the intrinsic and extrinsic determinants influence the judgment of performance of the student teachers?
Classroom supervision differs from other kinds of assessment in that it requires the setting of criteria and making of judgments. Bollinger (1990) saw the importance of value free observation and observer in a critical friendly role by recording factual information from the lesson and to provide factual feedback to help teachers to find out their own developmental needs. However, supervisors have to judge and give decisions at the end of the observation. According to Wragg (1996) the criteria for effectiveness of teaching are the behaviour and experience of pupils, the behaviour of the teacher, and the outcomes of teaching. The judgment of the teacher's effectiveness will depend on one or more of these aspects. Wragg continued that in a pluralist society there is no single standard for judgment. What is considered to be effective teaching is up to those who are competent to judge and there is no guarantee of agreement. Murphy and Cleveland (1991) pointed out the need for predetermined explicit criteria to formulate a basis of judgment in distinguishing judgment, rating and evaluation. According to these studies judgment is the private evaluation decision of the assessor, rating is the public statement of the evaluation, while evaluation is the assessment communicated by the assessor to the assesseee. Rating is the final product of the appraisal process, which depends on assessor ability and assessor motivation. There would be the need for predetermined explicit criteria to formulate a basis of judgment open to both the observer and the observed. This is what has been referred to as the criteria in teacher competence in the present study. The present study attempts to find out whether there is a set of criteria in the appraisal of teacher performance in classroom teaching of pre-service trainees. The criteria may be grouped into categories of standard of behaviour for comparison. Comparison may be by referencing to categorization into the norm, to a set of criteria, or to the individual assessor.

**Categorization**

Norm referenced interpretation is based on the basis of the nature of a group of people (Gillis, Griffin, Trembath and Ling, 1997) and what might be expected of the individual's background. In the case of a teacher, it could be qualifications, training, and experience or language ability. Localization of standard appears when expectations of what is 'normal' or average is conditioned by experience and reinforced by successive association with assessments. This is common in the observation of classroom teaching of student teachers in practicum, as supervisors have to do a large number of visits in a short period of time.

Thomson, Mathers & Quirk (1996) pointed out that competency-based assessment is a criterion-referenced assessment. There is a set of prescribed performance criteria (Kearney, 1992, Hager, Athanasou & Gonczi 1994, Hall & Sanders 1993) with standards defined (Masters & McCurry, 1990). Within the standards there is also a scale of increasing competence for assessing the performance (Masters & McCurry 1990; Griffin 1995; Wolf, 1993).

In *ipsative referenced interpretation* the assessment is based on the self as a reference point. The assessor uses his or her own values, preferences and attitudes in assessment. Wragg (1987) pointed out some common fallacies in projection and compensation in classroom observation. In projection the observer sees a lesson in terms of what he or she would do and in compensation the observer sees the teacher in terms of his or her own deficiencies. Gillis, Griffin, Trembath and Ling (1997) agreed those personal preferences; values, other information and even prejudices can confound the judgment against the criteria. The effect can be increased when the criteria are not explicit (Myford 1991, Lunz 1990; 1994; and Mesick 1994). Even in situations where the criteria are explicit, the influences can change the judgment considerably (Lunz 1994).
Information processing

Decision-making and judgment in classroom observation depends on when the assessor collects and processes the information. It would be necessary for the assessor to collect and document the information in classroom observation. When there is no recording and documentation during classroom observation judgment is dependent on recall of performance. However, performance judgments are largely memory-based (Murphy et al. 1985, Kravitz & Blazer 1992). The reliability and validity will be higher when the assessor can recall a lot of information of current and previous performances. Furthermore, the effects of previous performance depend on present performance. Woehr & Roch (1996) found that the assessor is more likely to recall positive past performance if positive performance is observed, but less likely when negative performance is observed. In the present study the decision process in classroom observation has a short time span. Instead of the problem of recall of information, supervisors are under time pressure to arrive at a decision.

The concept of comparing the assessee to categories by an automatic and controlled process was proposed in the models of Feldman (1981) and Ilgen & Feldman (1983) and Lord (1985). The central concept in these models is categorization through person perception (Feldman, 1981) and performance appraisal (Ilgen & Feldman, 1983).

According to Feldman's model performance appraisal the assessor must recognize and attend to relevant information, organize the information in memory for later access; recall this information for rating and integrate the information into a summary judgment. Automatic processing of information happens when the performance or behaviour is familiar; experienced before; relevant to performance on the job; easy to evaluate as good or poor and consistent with the assessor's prior expectations about the assessee. Controlled processing happens when performance or behaviour is inconsistent with established categories. Cognitive energy is then used to put the assessee into categories. Assessors develop expectations of the assessee. They may select information that is consistent with expectations and use automatic processing to categorize the assessee. Further information inconsistent with the category is screened out. When a piece of information is so inconsistent with the category the assessor would change to controlled processing to put the assessee into another category. Then processing will revert back to automatic processing.

Competency decision making

Competency decision-making is further confounded by contextual factors (Giesecke 1993) including personal characteristics, assessor and assessee, organizational characteristics and features of the assessment system itself. Giesecke (1993) points out the importance of contextual factors in a scheme of decision making that is relevant to competence assessment consisting of a rational model, a political bargaining model and an ad hoc model.

The rational model of decision making process in assessments is a rational and orderly process following five steps: first, the purpose is defined; second, sufficient and appropriate evidence is collected, third, the assessment information is interpreted using a criterion frame of reference; then competency decision options are considered and finally a judgment is made and recorded, and recommendations are reported to stakeholders. The political bargaining model is a compromise between individual stakeholders and the supervisor. Decision-making is a negotiating contest among individuals with varying degrees of power. They pursue their own agendas in their organization while considering the needs of other parties. The ad hoc model in decision-making process is reactive. It is dependent upon the timing of events, or chance. In this model of decision making organization goals are not
clearly defined, the objectives are ambiguous and its process uncertain. It is loosely associated with the process; the contextual factors or chance factors influence it.

In this scheme the characteristics of the organization are its goals, the degree of certainty, the degree of the structure and the adequacy of resources. The characteristics of the decision making process can be described by the degree of interdependency, the diffusion of power, the use of information and the perception of issue and the method of solving problem. In examining the political bargaining and ad hoc models, Gillis, Griffin, Trembath and Ling (1997) pointed out three domains of inquiry on the diffusion of power, the adequacy of resources and the assessor's approach.

In following these arguments the present exercise will explores the contextual factors affecting the supervisory process and the general perception of the judgment of student teacher to form a background for the main study to investigate how supervisors judge student teacher classroom performance. The subjects of the study are the staff supervisors of the Hong Kong Institute of Education in Hong Kong. This exercise was a series of interviews with experienced and new staff supervisors in relation to supervision of student teachers in pre-service training. This exercise will help to clarify the variables identified (Appendix 1) and the model proposed (Appendix 2) in the main study.

2 Organizational and contextual aspects of The Hong Kong Institute of Education

The organizational and contextual aspects are considered important determinants in the process of supervisors' judgment of the pre-service teachers' classroom performance. The present paper reports on the administration of teaching practicum in The Hong Kong Institute of Education which forms the background in supervision of student teachers in the present study. The objectives are:

1. To find out the management of teacher practicum, practice and procedure in classroom observation at The Hong Kong Institute of Education;
2. To find out the Institutional demands on teacher practicum in classroom observation;
3. To have some understanding of supervisor's perception on classroom observation.

The Hong Kong Institute of Education was founded in 1995 by amalgamating five old colleges of education in Hong Kong. The Institute moved to a new campus in 1997. In the past seven years the Institute has strengthened its academic foundation and is moving towards self-accrediting status. In the present exercise four academic staff were interviewed. They were one Field Experience Coordinator (FEC) of a Degree awarding add-on program, one Field Experience Coordinator (FEC) of a postgraduate diploma in education program for primary teachers, one lecturer with 12 years of supervision experience and one lecturer who is the Field Experience coordinator of an academic department. They have respectively 25 years, 20, 27, 6 years of teaching experience. In terms of supervisory experience they have 19, 7, 12 and 1 years respectively. The questions asked in the interviews are presented in Appendix 3. Their responses are summarized and reported.

The academic structure of The Hong Kong Institute of Education is a matrix with the Institute Programs organized by four Schools with expert academic support from 20 Departments and Centers (HKIED, 2002). In the 2002 to 2003 academic year the Institute offers a total of 44 validated Programs from certificate to degree level for pre-service and in-service teachers. Most of these programs involve teaching practicum or class observation as academic activity and assessment. At the school level a Field Experience Coordinator is appointed to organize field experience. Field Experience is composed of visits to educational institutions, attachments to schools and sustained periods of block teaching practice.
In 2002 a new Center for the Development of School Partnership and Field Experience is established to coordinate field experience for student teachers at the Institute. A handbook on field experience was published explaining the policy and procedure for field experience to student teachers, supervisors, school and teachers involved (CDSPFE-HKIEd, 2002). Pre-lesson conference is described as a means to build up rapport between the student teacher and the person(s) observing the lesson while the post-lesson conference is described as an essential component of field experience. The dual roles of assessing and assisting are emphasized in the direction to supervisors on assessment. A balance between the two is expected. The written feedback is a reflection of the competence that the student teacher has reached. Recently there is a move by senior management to put the assessment of classroom performance as part of the compulsory assessment for the award of an overall pass grade.

3 Management of practicum

Center for Development of School Partnership and Field Experience CDSPFE

The Center for Development of School Partnership and Field Experience is established to give overall guiding policy on field experience. The Schools of the HKIEd own the program and controls the field experience for the program. The line of management of a Program is from the Dean of the School to the Program Leader then to the Program Coordinator. A Field Experience Coordinator is appointed to take charge of field experience in a Program. Academic Departments provide manpower to the field experience by nominating supervisors. The academic Departments and the supervisors are accountable to the School in respect of field experience. Academic Departments also nominate representatives to the working group organized by the Field Experience Coordinator to set policy and procedure.

Field Experience Coordinator FEC

The Field Experience Coordinator puts into operation policy and context of field experience from the Center for Development of School Partnership and Field Experience. With reference to the features of each program the Field Experience Coordinator and the working group, set policy, prescribe procedure, and coordinate teaching departments, direct learning related to teaching practicum and assessment. The Field Experience Coordinator coordinates field experience among Schools, academic Departments, and the student teachers and professionally the Field Experience Coordinator tries to bridge theory with practice in field experience. However, a new supervisor is not clear of the role of the Program Field Experience Coordinator. The Field Experience Coordinator has institute administrative staff support to liaise with schools for placement of student teachers. The program Field Experience Coordinator at the School level coordinates and gives information to departments, liaise with subject areas, helps in marking portfolios and training the school mentors. Some academic Departments have a timetabling committee. Field experience supervision work is considered as normal workload for staff. It is treated as a subject.

Allocation of supervisors and student teachers

Allocation of supervisors to student teachers is an administrative consideration. The Field Experience Coordinator of the school will allocate supervision duties to those who opt for or allocated to the work. However, there is a tendency to use part-time staff to do the supervision and that senior staff is less involved in supervision. Supervisors are allocated to supervise student teachers by their subject specialism, program involvement and home location. Supervisors can ask for a geographical location. Most likely the supervisor will visit the students of his or her subject. The coordinators think that knowledge of the student by
the supervisor is not important. However, one respondent thinks supervisors prefer students they know and students also prefer supervisors they know.

Student teachers are allocated to schools by their subject specialism and home location. Student teachers at the HKIEd take two electives and usually allocation considers the first elective. Sometimes the student teachers may be allocated by considering both of their two electives. Usually student teachers are placed in Primary 1 to 5 classes for the first teaching practice. School standard and student teacher competence or ability are not considered nor matched. In one program peer support is considered important by putting students teaching the same subject in the same school. Requests from schools are considered. May consider individual student teacher's request or those having part-time job. For language student teachers in English or Chinese their first practicum is a period of language immersion.

4 Class teaching supervision procedure

Procedure

Supervision procedure is generic and standard. Academic Departments nominate representatives to the working group organized by the Field Experience Coordinator to set policy and procedure. A handbook and standardized reporting form for the program are prepared by the working group and published by the School. Field Experience handbook published by the Center for Development of School Partnership and Field Experience (2002) hopes to standardize the practice of field experience by giving guidelines. Supervision consists of four notified visits, two per subject. Pre-observation is strongly recommended and post conference procedure is mandatory. This year the Institute formalizes the tripartite conference, a post-lesson conference held by the supervisor, the teacher mentor and student teacher. There may be variation according to different subjects. According to one supervisor these procedures are not necessarily carried out because of different circumstances, for example, time constraint. Pre-conference is not fully in practice and sometimes supervisors would try best to follow what is set in the handbook.

Recording of information

The instruments used in the observation for collecting information are standardized Report Assessment form and portfolio, written feedback, and verbal feedback. Supervisors are expected to complete the Report Assessment form supplied by the program. Standardized Report Assessment form is mandatory and requires a grade. The design of the Report Assessment form varies with programs. Some are structured while some are fairly open ended. Usage of the Report Assessment form again varies according to Programs. According to one respondent there is no alternative but may supplement by additional reporting or writing observation notes in personal handbook. From another respondent the use of the form is not mandatory. One respondent claims that the form is usually completed after supervision session.

Evaluation and Assessment

According to one respondent for each student teacher the first Field Experience is for formative evaluation and second is for summative grading. Formative evaluation is for feedback to the student teacher and the academic Department would follow-up weak cases. Final grade is obtained by combining grades from the two teaching subjects and the portfolio. The teaching practicum is supported by the school mentor system. School mentors were involved in assessing student teachers but had been found to be not suitable and was stopped. However, there is a tendency to revive this practice. Assessment is on a four-grade system: fail, pass, credit and distinction with earned honour. This four-grade system
replaces the old 3-grade system, with D, P and Fail only. With the new system a C grade credit is acceptable for consideration with other subject assessment grades for the award of 1st Honor. It happened in the past that there was no 1st Honour awarded to the whole course because no D was given to any student in Field Experience, as student must have straight Ds to qualify for 1st Honour. Student teacher would be informed of the final grade. In the teaching practicum, a student teacher failed by one supervisor will be given supervision by another supervisor. When failed by both supervisors a case conference involving all staff will be held to review all the evidence collected. The student teacher may be given a second chance. There are two Field Experience marks from the major and minor elective subjects. The supervision assessment is part of the field Experience portfolio. The mark will be added to the portfolio on teaching practicum. The result will be reported and added to the final GPA for final recommendation to the Board of Examiners. Weak cases may be issued a professional suitability warning to the student teacher. Confirmed failure may lead to discontinuation.

Support

During teaching practicum the support given to student teachers varies. One supervisor holds reflection seminar with the group of student teachers under supervision half way through each practicum. The respondent also thinks that supervisors have to be careful with extreme grades. Student teacher can ask for more supervision visits. There is no limit to the number of supervisions. Student teacher can send complaint to Field Experience program staff on supervision visits.

The HKIEd has a set of standard appeal procedure that applies to teaching practicum. The procedure is published in the current student handbook (Registry - HKIEd, 2002). When results are published student teachers can approach program staff at any time for advice. Student teachers have to appeal on the portfolio as a whole and not only on the teaching supervision only. However appeal cases are not common in some programs for in-service teachers nor successful cases heard of in some programs.

5 The supervisor in class observation

Respondents' views on the supervisor's role in supervision are dependent on the purpose of judgment. One view is that for final year students the supervisor is more important as gatekeeper while for new students more for formative development, that means to give advice for development and give assessment for gate-keeping. Response from experienced supervisors endorse difference on observation focus between experienced and novice supervisors. Supervisor frames own observation that is conceptually driven. According to the novice supervisor the difference in performance depends on how the student teacher copes with the class. The novice supervisor prefers to look at the role of the supervisor as one to trigger the student teacher to prepare a good lesson to show best performance.

Import factors in the performance of the student teacher are performance, contextual consideration, manner, and minimal basic competence. The factors that affect judgment of classroom performance, in order of importance are professional attitude towards teaching, are basic teaching competence, subject matter, pupil reaction, class climate, atmosphere, and discipline. The qualities that supervisors would look for are basic competence in teaching, subject matter knowledge, conscientiousness to student learning, support to students, good preparation and firm classroom management, good manner in teaching, teaching strategies and reflection on the performance.

The top competencies are subject matter knowledge, teaching enthusiasm, communication, method, strategy, management, preparation, and management of class discipline. According
to one respondent lesson plan is not mandatory. Another respondent suggests that the objectives set for the lesson and pupils pace in learning are important. According to the novice supervisor it is more important to see how the teacher adjusts to the class and cope with the unexpected. One supervisor would rather observe class with an open mind and collect evidence.

6 Context

Institute

The Field Experience component of the program has to be validated like any other subject in the program. The institute is increasing its influence in teaching practicum and class observation and assessment by the introduction of policy and procedure issues through the establishment of the Center for Development of School Partnership and Field Experience. The institute also influences the supervision process through setting the program philosophy that affects the design and practice. Recent moves like the emphasis on the post tripartite conference and making the a pass grade in practice teaching mandatory show the tightening control of by senior management. There is also intervention at the critical moment, like student teacher failure. Another influence is on the resources given to practicum, such as workload reduction and the time allowance for supervision visits. According to one respondent time scheduling is very tight and the management does not recognize traveling time. A respondent thinks that a supervisor should keep in mind the stages of development of the student teachers when following Institute influences.

School, class and subject

All agree that the school background may affect student teacher performance when judging classroom performance. The novice supervisor thinks class performance should be considered differently at teaching in primary and secondary schools. Elite class will give student teachers some advantage. All consider class behavior when judging classroom performance. Performance of student teachers could be better in good classes rather than in classes with discipline problem. Consideration is given to whether the student teacher has tried hard in the classroom.

All agree that the subject matter that the student teacher is teaching affects the judgment of classroom performance. Some subjects need more motivation and that could mean more credit to the student teacher. Some hard topics are difficult for the student teacher to tackle. Another opinion is that the amount of subject matter may affect the student teacher's performance. Support from school and teachers, facilities of the school and the risky environment may affect judgment of classroom performance.

Relationship with the student teacher

The question is raised whether knowing the student teacher affect the supervisor's judgment of classroom performance. Responses are varied. Some think that there is no need to develop any relationship in judging student teacher's performance while another respondent thinks that knowing the student teacher is important. It was suggested that some prior knowledge will be useful for formative evaluation in development but for summative assessment no knowledge is better. Another respondent suggests trust between the supervisor and the student teacher is important. A relationship may lead to better conferencing and it does affect the advice given.
Bias

As a whole respondents suggest positive characteristics rather than the negative. One respondent suggests the absence of positive aspects of a teacher rather than the presence of negative aspects is more influencing in the judgment. It was stressed that the gender of the class may make a difference. One respondent would not consider other aspects of a student teacher other than teaching competence. Positive characteristics suggested are like teacher image, appearance, and style as a teacher, manner, speech, whether the need to use a microphone and ability to interact with peers. One respondent suggests the ability to build relationship with pupils, attention to pupils’ feelings or whether giving enough encouragement to pupils.

Consequence

One respondent thinks the consequence of judgment of classroom performance is slight and is a gray area. It does affect the result of marginal student performance. Another respondent believes in the Institute mechanism, with triangulation, is fair. One has trust in the appeal mechanism, not because it is for the student teacher but for the profession of teacher as a whole. The novice supervisor agrees on the appeal mechanism. However, this supervisor would try not to fail students, always give a second visit for poor cases and not so many high grades. Likewise one respondent thinks that supervisors have to be careful in giving extreme grades.

7 Judgment

In gathering information the experienced supervisors agree that the schoolteacher is the best source to collect information in observing classroom performance as they have more involvement with the student teacher. Classroom observation visit by the supervisor is for sampling only. Another suggestion is that the quality of the judgment can be improved by considering evaluation from different parties. However, video recording cannot replace on site observation. The novice supervisor prefers to collect information from his notes and by following standardized Report Assessment form for the Program. The use of portfolio can improve the judgment of performance.

Two respondents agree that they do have a mode of good performance in mind when processing the information collected in classroom performance observation. It is suggested that the determination of "good performance" would be comparison with the supervisor's own notion. Respondents say they do collect evidence to compare the classroom performance to this mode of "good performance" in judging classroom performance. When the classroom performance does not match the supervisor's mode of "good performance" the student teacher probably will be given a low grade. Others would try to collect more evidence or to ask the student teacher to explain further during post conferencing. However, one respondent will not search further for information. Not all respondents have a mode of "good performance" in mind. One suggestion is to collect as much information as possible in observation while another suggestion is to follow grade descriptors as given in the Field Experience handbook issued by the School. The novice supervisor supports reference to instruction from Program Field Experience handbook.

Respondents aim at both formative development and summative assessment when judging the student teacher in observing classroom performance. They stressed the importance to give feedback, and advice so as to help student teachers to make changes to improve. The formal assessment should base on some criteria. The standard can be set by the supervisor or by peers’ performance. A good judgment is the result that is desired by the stakeholders,
one that is socially desirable. A more novice respondent thinks that a good judgment should be a helpful one.

Conclusion

The institutional influence of the supervision in teaching practicum is through institutional policy, organization, course structure, management, and resource. There is also a direct control on conditions of grading; resource and staff deployment and some of these influences have direct impact on the supervisor. Management and organization of teaching practicum at the Institute has lacked central coordination. The responsibilities are shared by the Schools, Departments, and the Field Coordinators and related working groups. The establishment of the CDSPFE in 2001 is a move to centrally coordinate teaching practicum. Steps have been taken in the publication of the handbook, the definitions of roles and purposes, the emphasis on the three-stage procedure and the advocate of the tripartite conference.

The competencies valued by the respondents range from knowledge of subject matter, manner, attitude of the student teacher, to class management and interaction of with pupils. These varied responses calls for a need to investigate the teacher competencies that are seen as most important in short time span of class room teaching.

The schools where student teachers are attached for practicum, the classes and subjects they teach all make differences on the performance of the student teacher as expected. From the responses difference in performance are also seen between teaching in primary and secondary, good schools and poor schools, good classes and poor classes, good behaviour and bad behaviour, and hard subjects or easy subjects.

Supervisor's views on relationship with student teachers are varied. Some hold that relationship could influence either positively or negatively. No negative characteristics mentioned that would affect judgment and only positive characteristics are mentioned. Appeal mechanism is not much used and tends to be avoided by both student teachers and supervisors. Supervisors rather try to solve the problem before the need to appeal arises.

Experienced and novice supervisors are different in their perception of competence for classroom performance and their judgment. The ways in collecting information and processing information are varied. Automated and controlled processing may be used but are not clearly revealed in the present study. Supervisors do have expectation of "good performance". However, one respondent prefers to visit class teaching with an open mind.

Supervisors try to help as much as possible but the support given to student teachers is different. Supervisors try to avoid extreme grades and failure grades are not easily given. Experienced supervisors would judge from their own experience and novice would base on prescribed rules or indicators. Dual role in formative and summative evaluation may be conflicting to some supervisors. The value of judgment is expressed as gate keeping of the profession, to be socially desirable to the stakeholders, to help to develop, to be reflective to both supervisor and student teacher. These findings help to formulate the indicators in variable "value of judgment" in the main study.

This exercise in interviewing a small number of staff supervisors provides support for further study in the effect of contextual determinants. In interviewing the staff supervisors some of the issues and determinants proposed in the main study have been endorsed. Although these findings are definitely not conclusive, they support the views taken by the author in the present study.
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**Appendix 1**

**Variables in this study (under review)**

The variables in this study are identified and linked by a model of the decision-making process following models of cognitive process in performance appraisal. The variables are within the scope of competence, criteria for assessment, the supervisors' perceptions of the teacher appraisal, supervisor's observation of classroom performance and the determinants of the judgment process. The subjects in this study are supervisors of pre-service teachers in an institute of education in Hong Kong.

These broad constructs will be operationalized into variables using indicators identified in the literature review that were then translated into questionnaire items.

The scales to be developed:

Competence C1
Supervisor's perception in the ability of a teacher in classroom teaching built on knowledge, skill and attitude.

Levels from basic behavioural to generic to integrated competencies.

- Integrated
- Generic
- Behavioural

Supervisor role S1

Supervisor's perception in the role of supervision.

Levels from directive to non-directive.

- Non-directive
- Collaborative
- Directive

Expertise S2

Supervisor's experience in supervising student teachers.

Levels from adherence to open.

- Expert
- Novice

Organization E1

Supervisor's reaction to the institution in organizing the supervision.

Levels from compliance to independence.

Attention to

- Goals
- Accountability
- Structure
- Resources

Context E2

Supervisor's reaction to the class of pupils in judging the teaching performance in class.

Levels from (being influenced) to (not being influenced).

Attention to

- Community
- School
- Class
Bias T1

Supervisor's reaction to non-professional qualities of the student teacher in judging the teaching performance in class.

Levels from (being influenced) to (not being influenced).

Attention to

- Background
- Status
- Attributes
- Appearance

Relationship T2

Supervisor's reaction to the relationship with the student teachers in judging the teaching performance in class.

Levels from (not influenced) to (influenced).

Attention to

- Sense of leadership
- Sense of responsibility
- Awareness of role
- Authority over teachers

Consequences T3

Supervisor's reaction to the consequence of result of supervision in judging the teaching performance in class.

Levels from (not influenced) to (influenced).

Attention to

- Organization
- Assessor
- Assessee

Information collecting and recording information G1

Supervisor's way in collecting information during supervision.

Levels from restricted to open.

Adopting a

- Qualitative mode
- Quantitative mode
Process P1

Supervisor's way in processing the information collected in supervision.

Levels from to automatic processing to controlled processing.

Adopting a

- Controlled processing
- Automatic processing

Referencing: (Levels from ipsative referenced (that of the supervisor's own) to norm referenced (that of the cohort of student-teachers supervising) to criterion referenced (that of the prescribed)).

- Criterion referenced
- Norm referenced
- Ipsative referenced

Judgment J1

Supervisor's value on the judgment of performance.

- Reflective
- Developmental
- Social desirable
- Gate keeping
- Administrative

Appendix 2

A proposed model (under review)

Appendix 3

Preliminary questions for

Stage 1 - Interview with stake holders of Teaching Practicum at the HKIEd

Part I On the management of the practicum

The following questions refer to practicum in the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of practicum</td>
<td>• Who manages teaching practicum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Who subordinates?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Input from the Institute, school, department and students | • How are the Schools of the HKIEd involved in the practicum?  
• How are the departments involved in the practicum? |
| --- | --- |
| Allocation of student teachers to schools | • How are student teachers allocated to schools?  
• Guide: Competence  
School standard banding  
Subject (context) |
| Allocation of supervisors | • How are supervisors allocated to supervise student teachers?  
• Guide: Subject (context)  
Geographical location  
Knowledge of the student teacher |
| Supervision procedure (pre-observation meeting, observation and post-conference) | • What supervision procedures are followed?  
• Is this mandatory?  
• Any alternative? |
| Collecting of information | • What sort of instrument is used in the observation for collecting information?  
• Is this mandatory?  
• Any alternative? |
| Supervision reporting | • What sort of reporting is used?  
• Is this mandatory?  
• Any alternative? |
| Consequence of the supervision | • What will be the consequence of the reporting to the student teacher?  
• What will be the consequence of the reporting to the supervisor? |
| Appeal mechanism | • What appeal mechanism for the student teacher?  
• What will be the consequence? |
### Part II On the supervision process in the practicum

The following questions refer to performance of pre-service student-teachers in the classroom during practicum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's experience</td>
<td>- What are the factors that affect your judgment of classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How would you compare the quality of the judgment between experienced and novice supervisors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor's role in supervisor</td>
<td>- What is the role of the supervisor in the supervision process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>- What qualities would you look for in judging classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What are the top 5 competencies that are most important in classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>- How much does the institute influence the supervision process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is this mandatory?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How does this affect the actual supervision exercise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>- Do you consider the school background when judging classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the practicum school affect your judgment of classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>- Do you consider the class behavior when judging classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How does the class affect your judgment of classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>- How does the subject matter that the student teacher is teaching affect your judgment of classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do you consider any thing other than teaching in the school, class or subject in your judgment of classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with the student teacher</td>
<td>- Does knowing the student teacher affect your judgment of his or her classroom performance?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bias                                                                 | • What aspects of a student teacher other than teaching competence would you look for in judging classroom performance?  
|                                                                     | • What are some other things that affect the judgment of classroom performance? |
| Consequence                                                         | • Do you consider the consequence of your judgment of classroom performance:  
|                                                                     | ...to the student teacher?  
|                                                                     | ...to yourself as a supervisor? |
| Gathering information                                               | • What is the best way to collect information in observing classroom performance?  
|                                                                     | • What is the best way to record information in observing classroom performance? |
| Processing information                                               | • Do you have in mind a mode of good performance in your judgment of classroom performance?  
|                                                                     | • Do you compare the classroom performance to this mode in your judgment of classroom performance?  
|                                                                     | • What do you do when the classroom performance does not match your mode?  
|                                                                     | • If you do not have a mode how do you judge the classroom performance? |
| Judgment                                                            | • What would you aim at in giving a judgment to the student teacher in observing classroom performance?  
|                                                                     | • What is a good judgment?  
|                                                                     | ...Fair  
|                                                                     | ...Reflective |