

### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

### Instrumentation for Research, Programming and Evaluation



My Class Activities (Gentry & Gable, 2001; Choi & Gentry, 2007; Pereira, Peters, & Gentry, 2009)

Student Perceptions of Classroom Quality (Gentry & Owen, 2004; Chae & Gentry, 2009)

- Teacher Observation Form—Revised (Peters & Gates, 2009)
- Mathematical Perceptions Survey (Mann, 2004)
- **HOPE** Scale

(Gentry et al., 2008; Peters & Gentry, 2009)



**My Class Activities** 



## Presented by Nielsen Pereira Doctoral Candidate Purdue University

## PURDUE



### Pilot Study (1998) (EFA)

- Confirmatory (CFA) & Comparative Studies
- Creative Learning Press (2001)
- Translation and cross-cultural validation
- Measures 3<sup>rd</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade students' perceptions of
  - Challenge
  - Choice
  - Interest
  - Enjoyment

### **My Class Activities: Sample**



Rural, Urban, Suburban

- 26 Schools in 7 States, 200 classrooms
  - Elementary Schools (18)
  - Middle Schools (8)
- Public schools, G/T magnet schools, Communication magnet school, Ethnically diverse sample
- 3744 students in grades 3-8

## My Class Activities



Alpha reliability estimates (n = 3744)

- Elementary Range (.68-.91)
- Middle School Range (.75-.92)
- Test-Retest reliability estimates (.66-.74)
- Construct Interpretation
  - CFA elementary: CFI .92, RMSEA .04
  - CFA middle sch.: CFI .88, RMSEA .09
  - IRT, definition and response scale



My Class Activities

A Survey Instrument to Assess Students' Perceptions of Interest, Challenge, Choice, and Enjoyment in Their Classrooms

> Marcia Gentry, Ph.D. « Robert K. Gable, Ed.D.

Student ID Student Survey About. . . 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 (4) 5 5 5 \_ We would like to know how you feel about your class activities. Read (5) 6 6 6 \_ each sentence and indicate how often this happens for you in your 6 \_ class by coloring in the doughnut. There are no right or wrong answers. 7 7 7 1 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 \_ Your answers will be kept secret. Remember to color in a doughnut for 9 999 \_ each sentence. 9 9 Grade  $(\mathbf{5} (\mathbf{6} (\mathbf{7}))$ (8) \_ Name/ID (Optional) () Male Female Subject/Class Teacher In the example below, the person indicated Somethat his/her class is often enjoyable. Never Seldom times Often Always Example: My class is enjoyable. Some-Never Seldom times Often Always 1. What I do in my class fits my interests. 2. I have an opportunity to work on things in my class that interest me. 3. What I do in my class gives me interesting and new ideas. 4. I study interesting topics in my class. -5. The teacher involves me in interesting learning activities. 6. What I learn in my class is interesting to me. \_ 7. What I do in my class is interesting. \_  $\bigcirc$  $\bigcirc$  $\bigcirc$  $\bigcirc$ 8. My class has helped me explore my interests. \_ 9. The activities I do in my class are challenging. -10. I have to think to solve problems in my class. \_ Please continue on the back . 

\_



### My Class Activities: Enrichment Program Evaluation

- geri Gifted Education Resource Institute
  - MCA has been used for student program evaluation at Purdue University since 2004
  - Conducting responsible evaluation is important both in general and gifted education (VanTassel-Baska, 2006; Gallagher, 2006)
  - Importance of evaluating an instrument on a new population before making decisions based on results (Joint Committee on Testing Practices, 2005)

# PURDUE Research Questions



- How do MCA data from a Saturday student enrichment program fit the original factor model from Gentry and Gable (2001a)?
- How do alternative models affect overall model fit?
- 3. What changes (if any) should be made to MCA to enable the instrument to be used with enrichment programs?
- 4. Can the MCA, in its current or a revised form, be used as one component to evaluate enrichment programs?

### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

# **Participants**



1,065 students in grades 3-8 from 107 classes in a Saturday enrichment program (seven sessions between 2004 and 2008). N = 826 cases after listwise deletion.

- Students from rural, suburban, and urban locations
- 51% female and 49% male

### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

# **Data Analysis**



- Confirmatory Factor analyses using *MPlus* Software
  - Maximum likelihood estimation: ordinal, moderately non-normal data (skewness <2; kurtosis <7) (Finney & DiStefano, 2006)</li>
- Test different models based on theory and previous studies
- Modifications to the instrument based on previous studies and modification indices for the present sample

## PURDUE

# **Fit Statistics**



- Chi-square: Absolute fit index
- GFI: values approaching 1.0 indicate good fit
- Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA): Parsimony Correction - <.01</li>
- Comparative Fit Index (CFI) : Incremental fit index – values approaching 1.0 indicate good model fit

## PURDUE RESULT Results – Model Fit

d Education burce Institute	Model	$x^2(df))$	GFI	RMSEA	RMSEA 90% CL	CFI
	MCA Original Model	1726.6960 (428)	0.8620	0.0606	(0.0577, 0.0636)	0.893
	Second-order Model	2145.5155 (429)	0.8485	0.0694	(0.0665, 0.0724)	0.885
	Three-factor Model	2089.6308 (431)	0.8304	0.0683	(0.0654, 0.0712)	0.864
	Revised MCA	1269.0860 (379)	0.9107	0.0507	(0.0472, 0.0541)	0.922

### **PURDUE** My Class Activities: Korean Version



- Translationed MCA into Korean
- 648 Korean students in grades 3-6
- Four schools in Korea
- Gifted and non-gifted students
- Interest and Enjoyment combined into Appeal
- Purpose: to verify the validity and reliability of the Korean MCA

### **PURDUE NOTE NOTE:** Korean MCA: Translation Procedures



- Korean-English
- 2. Feedback from Korean students
- 3. Pilot test (2 students)
- 4. Translation back into English
- Congruence of two versions by experts of gifted education
- Removal of items with congruence scores below 3 (on a 4-point scale)

### E MCA, Korean Version: Psychometric Properties



Alpha Reliability Estimates (*n*=648) Appeal: .93 Challenge: .76 Choice: .84
CFI: .91; RMSEA: .036

## JRDUE MCA: Conclusions



- MCA can be used for evaluation and research in both in-school and out-of-school programs
- Original four factors should be retained in the English version.
- A revised version (removing 2 items of the Challenge scale) provided even better model fit for use in out-of-school programs.
- Korean MCA measures three constructs (Appeal, Challenge, Choice)





## Presented by Marcia Gentry, Ph.D. Director, GERI Purdue University for YooJung Chae, Ph.D. 2009 Purdue University

# Student Perceptions of Classroom



## Pilot Study (JSGE, 2002)

- Confirmatory Study (2002)
- Completing Test/Retest reliability
- Measures grade 7-12 student perceptions of:
  - Appeal,
  - Challenge,
  - Choice,
  - Meaningfulness,
  - Academic Self-Efficacy

### Student Perceptions of Classroom Quality: Sample



- Rural, Urban, Suburban
- 26 Schools in 7 States & 1 Foreign Country
  - Middle Schools (12)
  - High Schools (14)
- Prep School, G/T magnet, Vocational Center, Overseas American School
- 7411 students in grades 7-12

# Student Perceptions of Classroom



Alpha reliability estimates (n= 7411)
Appeal (.85)
Challenge (.81)
Choice (.81)
Meaningfulness (.80)
Academic Self-Efficacy (.82)

### **Student Perceptions of Classroom** Quality



- Construct Interpretation
  - CFA: CFI .997, RMSEA .051
    - (.90 CL=.048-.055)
  - CFA: using randomly generated item parcels for each construct (loadings range from .71-.90)



# **CFA Model**





– • Student Survey Ab	out				Sti	ident	ın I	ΔΒ	Ć D
Student	Percent	ions	C I		้อเเ	uent	שו	A D	
<ul> <li>of Classi</li> </ul>	of Classroom Qu		Secondary Version		0	0 0	0	0 0	0 0
Marcia Ge We would like to know h statement and show ho There are no right are no right with Remember to mark an ar person agreed that the this project!	ntry, Steven V. Owe now you feel al ow much you a rong answers. Y nswer for each e class was enj	n, and Penny Springer pout your class a gree with it by our answers will t statement. In the ooyable. Thank yo	ctivities. Read filling in the se kept confid e example belo bu for your h	l each circle. ential. w, the elp in	· 2 3 4 6 6 7 8 9				
Name/ID	Name/ID (Optional)					Your Cu	rrent Gra	de in this	Course
Teacher			School		() A	ОВ	⊖ c	() D	⊖ F
SUBJECT AREA (please choose the answ most closely describes the typ which you are completing th	er that be of class in his survey)	t Which type of community best vey) describes your	GENDE	R Female	Do you receive any special from your school distr Yes No		y special s lool distric No	services ct?	
Math Foreig     Science Art     Social Studies Music     Language Arts Physic     Other:     Is this class an advance     Advanced Placement, or ho	Foreign Language     Art     Music     Physical Education     Suburban     Suburban     GRADE     Placement, or honors course?     7    9    11		ETHNIC GROUF African-American Caucasian-Ameri Hispanic-American Native American Other:		Gifted/talented English as a second language Special education-learning disability Special education-learning disability Compensatory services Other.				
- <u>Yes</u> No	•	8 0 10 12		Strongly					Strongly
FX	ample: My cla	ss is eniovable		Disagree	Disagr	ee Un	decided	Agree	Agree
	umple: my cla	ss is eigeyable	•	0	0		0	•	0
	regarding how	v to show the te	acher what	0	0		0	0	0
1. I am given choices I have learned.	• •			0	0		0	0	0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> </ul>	g other kids ur	derstand conce	pts.	<u> </u>	0				0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> </ul>	g other kids un s of my class in	derstand conce teresting.	pts.	0	0		0	0	0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> <li>4. I find my class time intellectual abilitie</li> </ul>	g other kids un s of my class in e instruction a s.	derstand conce teresting. ppropriately cha	pts. Ilenges my	0	0		0	0	0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> <li>4. I find my class tim intellectual abilitie</li> <li>5. My teacher lets more</li> </ul>	g other kids ur s of my class in e instruction a is. e choose the r	derstand concepteresting. ppropriately cha	pts. Illenges my for projects.	0	0		0	0	0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> <li>4. I find my class time intellectual abilitie</li> <li>5. My teacher lets mm</li> <li>6. When there are dii I can usually pick a</li> </ul>	g other kids ur s of my class in e instruction a is. e choose the r fferent ways t a good way.	derstand concep teresting. ppropriately cha esources I use f o show what I ha	pts. Illenges my for projects. Inve learned,	0 0 0 0	0		0 0 0		0 0 0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> <li>4. I find my class time intellectual abilitie</li> <li>5. My teacher lets m</li> <li>6. When there are di I can usually pick a</li> <li>7. The teacher applie</li> </ul>	g other kids ur s of my class in e instruction a iss. e choose the r fferent ways t a good way. is the lessons t	derstand concep teresting. ppropriately cha esources I use f o show what I ha o practical expe	Illenges my for projects. ave learned, rriences.						0 0 0 0
<ul> <li>1. I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>2. I'm good at helping</li> <li>3. I find the contents</li> <li>4. I find my class timm intellectual abilitie</li> <li>5. My teacher lets m</li> <li>6. When there are difficult can usually pick a</li> <li>7. The teacher applie</li> <li>8. I find my class assi</li> </ul>	g other kids ur s of my class in e instruction a is. e choose the r fferent ways t a good way. is the lessons t ignments a goo	derstand concep teresting. ppropriately cha esources I use f o show what I ha o practical expe od challenge.	pts. Illenges my or projects. ave learned, riences.						
<ol> <li>I am given choices I have learned.</li> <li>I'm good at helping</li> <li>I find the contents</li> <li>I find my class time intellectual abilitie</li> <li>My teacher lets m</li> <li>When there are difican usually pick a</li> <li>The teacher applie</li> <li>I find my class assi</li> <li>The assigned read</li> </ol>	g other kids un s of my class in e instruction a is. e choose the r fferent ways t a good way. is the lessons t ignments a goo ing material fo	derstand concep teresting. ppropriately cha esources I use f o show what I ha o practical expe od challenge. r my class is intr	Illenges my for projects. ave learned, rriences. eresting.						

2	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
I learn best when I am challenged.	0	0	0	0	0
. I am given lots of choices in my class.	0	0	0	0	0
<ul> <li>In my class my teacher relates current issues to the mater we are learning.</li> </ul>	ial 🔿	0	0	0	0
. I am good at connecting material from this class with the real world.	0	$\circ$	0	$\circ$	$\circ$
This class content is an appropriate challenge for me.	0	0	0	$\bigcirc$	0
<ul> <li>I feel responsible for my learning because I am allowed to make choices in my class.</li> </ul>	0	0	0	0	$\circ$
The teacher uses a variety of instructional techniques that make this class enjoyable.	0	0	0	0	0
. I like the challenge of the projects in this class.	0	0	0	0	$\bigcirc$
. The material covered in my textbook is interesting.	0	0	0	0	0
<ol> <li>The textbook provides examples of how the material relates to society and daily living.</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0
. I am good at answering questions in this class	0	0	0	0	$\circ$
<ul> <li>I am encouraged to pursue subjects that interest me in my class.</li> </ul>	0	$\circ$	0	$\circ$	$\circ$
. It is pretty easy for me to earn good grades.	0	0	0	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$
. In my class I explore real issues that affect the world around me.	0	0	0	0	0
. I look forward to learning new things in this class.	0	0	0	$\bigcirc$	$\circ$
. I find the reading material for my class a pleasure to read.	0	$\circ$	0	$\circ$	$\circ$
. I use my critical thinking skills in my class.	0	0	0	0	0
. I'm good at taking tests in this class.	0	$\circ$	$\circ$	$\circ$	$\bigcirc$
<ul> <li>I can relate the material discussed in my class to my daily life.</li> </ul>	0	0	0	0	0
. I can easily understand reading assignments for this class	0	$\circ$	0	$\bigcirc$	$\circ$
. I like going to my class each day.	0	0	0	0	0
<ul> <li>I can usually discover interesting things to learn about in this class.</li> </ul>	0	0	0	0	0
. I like the way my teacher challenges me in this class.	0	0	0	0	0
. I can express my opinions clearly in this class.	0	$\bigcirc$	$\circ$	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$
. Good grades are mainly the result of my hard work.	0	0	0	0	0
. Good grades are mainly the result of my ability.	0	$\circ$	$\circ$	$\circ$	$\circ$
I can improve my intelligence by working hard.	$\circ$	0	0	$\bigcirc$	$\circ$
. I plan to go to college.	0	0	0	0	0

• -

My Class Activities © Copyright 2001 Gentry, Owen, & Springer, 25755 Zachary Ave. Elko, MN 55020. All rights reserved.





### Gifted and General High School Students' Perceptions of Classroom Quality in Korea and the United States

**Yoojung Chae** 





### **Research Questions**

1.Do the original English version of the SPOCQ and the Korean version of the SPOCQ have equivalent constructs?

2.Are there differences in perceptions of classroom quality between gifted high school students and general high school students in Korea and the U.S.?

# **Korean Participants**



-221 Korean gifted students

-128 students from one foreign language high school in Seoul and 93 students from one Science Academy in Busan

 - 220 students from two general high schools in Seoul and one general high school in Kumi- Previous study sample

### **US** Participants



From SPOCQ validation study in 7 states (Gentry & Owen, 2004) - 1,141 gifted students in advanced, AP, or honors classes -2,510 students in general classes -Randomly selected from the SPOCQ validation study sample -221 gifted and 220 general students, 10th-11th students only

### Instrumentation: SPOCQ



### The original SPOCQ instrument (Gentry & Owen, 2004) -5 factors with 34 items: appeal (7 items), challenge (7 items), choice (7 items), meaningfulness (5 items), and academic selfefficacy (8 items) using a 5-point Likert scale of 5 strongly agree to 1 strongly disagree. -Translated into Korean, back-translated, rechecked (Chae & Gentry, 2007)

#### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

### Analyses



### - Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and Multiple group confirmatory factor analysis (MCFA)







•Missing data- multiple imputation for randomly missing data (Schafer and Graham, 2002)

•Checking univariate skewness and kurtosis of variables : at least under 2 and under 7 respectively (Curran, West, & Finch, 1996)

•Normal distribution- maximum likelihood (ML) estimation following Finney and DiStefano (2006).





Invariance investigation

- Factor invariance check : 5 factor Baseline model
- Factor loadings (pattern coefficients) check
- Error variances check

#### **UE** Internal Alpha Reliability Estimates



Appeal.86Challenge.79Choice.86Meaningfulness.84Academic Self-Efficacy.85

Good internal consistency estimates (Gable & Wolf, 1993)

### **Confirmatory Factor Analysis**



Acceptable fit to both the Korean data  $(\chi 2 = 2065.38, p < .001, df = 454; RMSEA = .091; NNFI = .94; CFI = .94)$ 

and to the U.S. data (χ2 =2566.03, p < .001, df =454; RMSEA =.011; NNFI =.93; CFI =.93)

All of the factor loadings were greater than .40

### **Multiple-group CFA**



-Baseline model for factor loading invariance (Model1)

-A five factor model including Appeal, Challenge, Choice, Meaningfulness, and Academic Self-Efficacy.

The acceptable five factor model fit ( $\chi 2 = 4629.92$ , *df* =908, *p*< .001, RMSEA = .099, NNFI = .94, CFI = .93)





- Constrained all variables equally on factor structure and factor loadings across groups (Model 2): to examine factor loading invariance across groups

->The chi-square difference test between Model 1 and Model 2 indicated that factor loadings (pattern coefficients) were not invariant across groups ( $\chi$ 2 difference (27) = 167.06, *p* < .001).




Identification of the variables that affected non-invariance across groups

Each factor loading (lambda parameter) of the 32 variables was examined independently



"The assigned reading material for my class is interesting" (Appeal) "I find the reading material for my class a pleasure to read" (Appeal) "My teacher lets me choose the resources I use for projects" (Choice) "I am given lots of choices in my class" (Choice) "I can relate the material discussed in my class to my daily life" (Meaningfulness) "I am good at connecting material from this class with the real world" (Academic Self-Efficacy) "I can express my opinions clearly in this class"

(Academic Solf Efficient)





- The chi-difference test for investigating error variance invariance across groups showed that the error variance ( $\chi$ 2 difference (5) = 258.864, *p* < .001) was non-invariant.

- A follow-up test to examine the problematic items showed that all 32 variables were non-invariant across groups.

- In conclusion, partial invariance existed between Korean and U.S. groups





### **Research Question 2**

### 2 X 2 MANOVA (Nationality x Giftedness)

 Differences between Korean and U.S. students, differences between gifted and general students, and interaction effects between nationality and giftedness.





### 2) Follow-up simple effect tests

- Gifted students' perceptions: different in each nationality group.
- General student perceptions: different in each nationality group.
- Korean students' perceptions: different in each gifted/general group.
- U.S. students' perceptions: different in each gifted and general group.





### 3) Follow-up DFA

- Giftedness: **Challenge**, Meaningfulness, and Choice.

- Nationality: **Appeal, Choice**, and Meaningfulness





- DFA predicted the 63.7% of the gifted group and 57.5% of the general group correctly.
- The predictions for nationality were good: 85.9% of the U.S. group and 80.3% of the Korean group membership were classified correctly.





Conclusions

- The U.S. and the Korean SPOCQ: Same constructs; good to use for cross-cultural study
- U.S. students and the gifted group had higher scores on the SPOCQ scale





- Both Korean and U.S. students need more enjoyment and interest in class; with means ranging from 3.14 and 3.30 on a 5-point scale.
  - Kim et al. (2006)- Need more interest Gentry, Gable, & Rizza (2002)- 8<sup>th</sup> graders, MCA, Enjoyment and Interest





- Meaningfulness and Choice: Moderate predictor of giftedness
- Different result from the findings of Gentry and Owen (2004); in this current study, gifted students' higher mean scores on the Choice factor.

-> Due to the Korean sample?

### **PURDUE** Teacher Observation Form—Revised



Presented by Jillian Gates Doctoral Candidate Purdue University Paper by Scott Peters Ph.D. University of Wisconsin, Whitewater and Jillian Gates

# PURDUE What is the TOF?



 The Purdue Teacher Observation Form (TOF) has been used to provide feedback to instructors of the Gifted Education Resource Institute's (GERI) Talent Development Programs for over 25 years.

## PURDUE The Research



- Replication of previous reliability and content validity investigations.
- Previous studies sought to identify the most important characteristics of a quality gifted education classroom and develop an observation form.
- They also sought feedback from experts in the field and conducted measures of internal consistency reliability.

# PURDUE Development and Use



- The TOF originally was developed in the late 1970s in order to evaluate the teachers of the Purdue Super Saturday Program.
- The TOF was conceptualized by creating a broad list of competencies from the literature that were seen as important in teachers of gifted students.

# PURDUE Development and Use (2)

geri Gifted Education Resource Institute

The first TOF included items such as "Higher level thinking skills used" and "Chance for self-determination of work" and were rated by observers on a five-point scale (outstanding to not satisfactory), plus a "not observed" category.

# PURDUE Updates and Revisions



- The TOF was used for approximately 25 years with no noticeable changes or revisions.
- However, in early 2007 the authors noticed that several of the TOF items no longer seemed appropriate, or that they required some clarification.

# PURDUE Updates and Revisions

- geri Gifted Education Resource Institute
- 15 experts in gifted education were given the 12 original items and asked to evaluate them for importance of inclusion in the instrument and for clarity of language.
- These data informed the authors in revising the Form's content and language.



	Importance		Clarity	
Areas of Teacher Competence	Mean	Std Dev.	Mean	Std Dev.
Subject matter coverage	4.400	0.737	4.286	0.825
Clarity of teaching	4.467	0.640	4.143	0.770
Motivational techniques	4.286	0.726	4.286	0.825
Pace of instruction	4.600	0.828	4.000	0.877
Opportunity for self-determination of activities by student	4.533	0.743	4.462	0.877
Student involvement in a variety of experiences	4.333	0.724	4.500	0.650
Interaction between teacher and student, student and peers, appropriate to course objectives	4.133	0.915	4.071	0.997
Opportunity for student to follow-through of activities outside of class (homework)	3.133	1.187	4.143	0.770
Emphasis on higher-level thinking skills	4.786	0.426	4.214	0.802
Emphasis on creativity	4.467	0.640	4.143	0.949
Lesson plans designed to meet program, course, and daily objectives	3.600	0.910	3.929	1.072
Use of teaching and learning aids	3.467	0.915	4.786	0.579

# PURDUE Updates and Revisions



In addition to rating each item according to importance and clarity, experts provided comments about the instrument that helped to inform the authors in the revision process.

# PURDUE Quotes



- "In regards to the use of teaching and learning aids) Use of technology that advances what students already know – 21st century skills"
- "Add interdisciplinary items to subject matter and rename category as content "
- "Topics of instruction are related to other subjects / content areas."

# PURDUE Changes Made



Behaviors and Classroom Conditions Observed

**Original TOF Sections** 

Subject matter coverage

Clarity of teaching

Motivational techniques

Pace of instruction

Opportunity for self-determination of activities

by student

Student involvement in a variety of experiences Interaction between teacher and student, student and peers, appropriate to course objectives Opportunity for student follow-through of activities outside class (homework) Emphasis on higher-level thinking skills

Emphasis on creativity

**Revised TOF Sections** Content coverage Clarity of instruction Motivational techniques Pedagogy / Instructional techniques Opportunity for self-determination of activities by student Student involvement in a variety of experiences Interaction between teacher and student, student and peers Opportunity for student follow-up on activities and topics on their own Emphasis on higher-level thinking skills

Emphasis on creativity





## Presented by **Rebecca L. Mann**, Ph.D. Co-Director, GERI Purdue University





## Mathematical Perceptions: Teacher Efficacy, Attitudes, and Performance

Rebecca L. Mann Assistant Professor of Educational Studies Co- Director of the Gifted Education Resource Institute





# Why do we study mathematics in school?

"Because my teacher could get sued if we don't. That's what she said. Any subject we don't know...wham! She gets sued. And she's already poor."

## **PURDUE** Statement of the problem



0.9% of Bachelor degrees awarded in the US in 2000-2001 were in mathematics. (National Center for Education Statistics, 2003)

49% of math & 53% of engineering doctorates in 1994 in the US earned by foreign students. (Young & Bae, 1997)



81% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders and 35% of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in US have positive attitudes about math.

## Background



- Attitude attitude effects teaching and classroom behavior (Phillipou & Christou, 1998)
- Performance teacher content knowledge is essential factor of effective teacher (Darling-Hammond, 2000)
- Content Efficacy self-efficacy judgment should be consistent with and tailored to the domain of functioning (Pajares, 1996)
- Teaching Efficacy Belief about own teaching ability, belief that one can influence students achievement and engagement (Lin & Tsai, 1999)

## Purpose



To validate results from an instrument designed to measure:

- Ability to do basic elementary mathematics *performance*
- Confidence in teaching the specific concept being assessed *content efficacy*
- Teacher efficacy in general mathematics instruction *instructional efficacy*
- Attitudes toward school mathematics *attitudes*





## **Research Question**

# What are the psychometric properties of Mathematical Perceptions?





## Instrument Development

Literature review related to teaching elementary mathematics

- Attitudes (Cornell, 1999; Gellert, 1999; Phillipou & Christou, 1998; Sliva & Roddick, 2002)
- Efficacy (Bandura, 1997; Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Lin & Tsai, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).
- Performance (NCTM, 2000; Kahan, Cooper, & Bethea, 2003; Ma, 1999)

## Part I - Attitudes

#### geri Gifted Education Resource Institute

### Sample Statements

- I have confidence I can do math.
- I view math as a roadblock I cannot get past.
- I saw a purpose in taking high school math classes.
- I dread being asked to do a math problem.
- I had a fear of math during school.

#### Format

• Six-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree)

#### **Content Validity**

- 22 original statements
- Reviewed by panel of 8 content experts
- Researchers narrowed field and retained 10 statements

### Part II – Performance & Content Efficacy

geri Gifted Education Resource Institute

- 14 problems based on the NCTM Strands and Connecticut 5<sup>th</sup> grade standards
  - Number
  - Algebra
  - Geometry
  - Measurement
  - Data Analysis and Probability
- Participants solved each problem, then rated their comfort in teaching that concept on a 6 point scale.
- "I would be comfortable teaching this concept to students" Never to Always

### Sample Problem



Danielle is going to put a wallpaper border around her room. Her room is 11 feet long and 9 feet wide. If trim costs \$3.00 for each foot, how much will it cost her in all?

### Part III – Instructional Efficacy

### Sample Statements

- I will be able to adjust the level of difficulty of my lessons to meet the needs of individual students in my math class.
- I will be able to rephrase a question or provide an alternative explanation when my students do not understand.
- If a student were to grasp a concept quickly, it may be a result of my effective teaching strategies.
- If a student did not grasp a concept presented in a previous lesson, I have the ability to reteach the concept in a way that will increase his or her retention.

#### Format

• Six-point Likert type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree)

#### **Content Validity**

- 10 original statements, all retained
- Reviewed by panel of 8 content experts

### PURDUE

## Sample



- Midwestern elementary teacher candidates near the end of their coursework
- N = 267
- 78% female, 16% male, & 6% unknown
- 93% Caucasian, 3% African-American, 2% Hispanic, and 2% unknown

### **Factor Analysis**

- geri Gifted Education Resource Institute
- Part I Attitudes
  - -2 factors
  - Statements #2 and #9 load on factor 2
  - #2. I view math as a challenge to be undertaken.
  - #9. I had to work hard in math.
- Part II Content Efficacy
  - 1 factor
- Part III Teaching Efficacy
   1 factor

### Reliability



- Part I Attitude
  - Cronbach's Alpha = .82
  - Without statements 2 and 9 = .90
- Part II Content Efficacy
  - Cronbach' Alpha = .96
- Part III Teaching Efficacy
  Cronbach's Alpha = .93
#### Implications



 Mathematical Perceptions could prove useful to gauge teacher candidate attitudes, content efficacy, and teaching efficacy about elementary mathematics



#### The HOPE Teacher Rating Scale



### Presented by Marcia Gentry, Ph.D. Director, GERI Purdue University Paper by Scott Peters, Ph.D. University of Wisconsin, Whitewater and Marcia Gentry



#### Involving Teachers in the Gifted and Talented Identification Process: *The HOPE Teacher Rating Scale*

Scott J. Peters

Marcia Gentry

#### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

# The Problem



30 of 43 states responding in the State of the States report indicated that the GT identification process was initiated after a teacher or parent referral

 Despite advances in psychological testing, much of the ID decision often falls on one teacher or on specific gatekeepers' shoulders

## PURDUE Why Involve Teachers?

"•" "The use of teacher judgments in the identification of gifted children should be continued, and, in fact, expanded" (Hodge & Cudmore, 1986)

 Teachers can notice non-traditional talents that are often culture-specific and not measured by standardized tests (Peterson & Margolin, 1999)

## PURDUE Why Involve Teachers?



- Rating scales can help lend structure to a component of the ID process that is otherwise very subjective
- Can help teachers avoid bias for or against certain genders, races, ethnicities, or income groups
- Can allow for students to be compared across raters

### PURDUE Current Teacher Rating Scales



The vast majority have no psychometric properties and were at best haphazardly designed (e.g., KOI, TABS, KTII)

- Even the best designed and researched rating scales have not been evaluated for group equivalence (e.g., SRBCSS, GRS, GES, GATES)
- None have been specifically designed with a focus on use to identify low-income students

# The HOPE Scale



- Items include behaviors most easily noticeable in underrepresented students
- Only includes 12 items making it easy to complete on a classroom of students
- Asks rater to rate each student as compared to others of similar background and experience in order to create a specific norm / comparison group

## **Evaluation**

#### The HOPE Scale has been:

- Completed by approximately 420 teachers on 7700 students from Indiana and Illinois
- Subjected to EFA and multiple rounds of CFA on the different revisions
- Evaluated for income, gender, and race / ethnicity group differences
- Evaluated for the level of teacher influence

#### PURDUE UNIVERSITY

## Results



- Students should only be compared within their income group, but can also be compared across racial / ethnic groups
- Differential item functioning was found due to gender – gender comparisons should be avoided
- Teacher-level effects were small (i.e., .13 - .15)

# Application

- geni Gifted Education Resource Institute
  - The HOPE Scale can be included as one component / pathway in an identification process
  - Students within major subgroups can be compared in order to determine those who might benefit most from special programming

### PURDUE HOPE Scale: Academic Scale



- 1. Performs or *shows potential* for performing at remarkably high levels.
- 6. Is eager to explore new concepts.
- 7. Exhibits intellectual intensity.
- 9. Uses alternative processes.
- 10. Thinks "outside the box."
- 11. Has intense interests.

Internal consistency reliability estimate: .96

## PURDUE HOPE Scale: Social Scale



- Is sensitive to larger or deeper issues of human concern.
- 3. Is self-aware.
- 4. Shows compassion for others.
- 5. Is a leader within his/her group of peers.
- 8. Effectively interacts with adults or older students.

Internal consistency reliability estimate: .92





Date of Birth: Age:	Sex: Male Female Free/Reduced Lunch
🗌 American Indian/Alaska Native 🗌 Asia	n 🗌 Black or African American 🗌 White
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	Mixed Race 🗌 Hispanic / Latino/a

#### When rating students on each item below please think about the student *compared to other children similar in age, experience, and/or environment.*

Use the following scale to indicate how frequently you observe the traits and behaviors listed in items 1 - 11.

	6	5	4	3	2	1
1. Performs or shows potential for performing at remarkably high levels.						
2. Is sensitive to larger or deeper issues of human concern.						
<ol><li>Is self-aware.</li></ol>						
<ol><li>Shows compassion for others.</li></ol>						
<ol><li>Is a leader within his/her group of peers.</li></ol>						
<ol><li>Is eager to explore new concepts.</li></ol>						
<ol><li>Exhibits intellectual intensity.</li></ol>						
8. Effectively interacts with adults or older students.						
9. Uses alternative processes.						
10. Thinks "outside the box."						
11. Has intense interests.						
12. Please indicate all content areas where the student shows talent.   Math Reading   Science Foreign Language   Arts Other	cial St	udies				

6 = always 5 = almost always 4 = often 3 = sometimes 2 = rarely 1 = never

Please provide additional information concerning this child's potential:

<sup>1</sup>Developed with funding from the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation 2007





#### **Questions/Discussion?**

