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Abstract

The Introduction of a Program of Teacher Self-Evaluation: A Case Study of ESL Teachers’ Use of New Criteria in Professional Self-Development

Master of Arts 2000

Lisa M. Morgan

Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

The purpose of this case study was to obtain feedback from in-service teachers’ perceptions of the self-evaluation process as it was introduced within their teaching program. Eight adult ESL instructors employed by the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB) volunteered to engage in the process of self-evaluation through video observation. A Video Self-Evaluation Package, developed by ESL Program Consultants with the TCDSB was distributed to each instructor to assist with this process. The findings indicated that overall, instructors perceptions of self-evaluation were positive. This process proved to be an enlightening experience that raised their awareness of their teaching practices. However, they also identified some concerns regarding the time involved and the training they felt would be necessary to successfully carry out this process. The instructors felt that the Video Self-Evaluation Package was useful in the self-evaluation process and provided suggestions for its revision to meet the different needs of teachers.
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1. OVERVIEW

1.1 Rationale

Personal Reflection

My inspiration to engage in this research endeavour arose during my position as an adult ESL Instructor and Instructor-in-charge with the Toronto Catholic District School Board. Responsible for the administration and management of a team of eight evening instructors, and a novice teacher myself, I discovered the constant need for teachers to seek answers to their many queries of their teaching practices. In a field requiring unrelenting accountability and performance, I became more aware of the plight of teachers regarding the daily stresses and frustration they felt in such a demanding profession. The constant striving for self-improvement was apparent. The pre-service training and support was, however, close to non-existent. Having devoted several years to educating myself in the teaching profession, beginning with a B.A.A. in early childhood education, followed by two certificates in teaching English as a Second Language, I realized that reflective teaching and self-evaluation in teacher development were either not included within the curriculum of study or merely introduced in one class session of a full year course. As a novice ESL teacher, the desire to better my teaching skills became a significant aspect of my development as a teacher. My studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, did, however, bring the concept of reflection to the surface in various courses taken in teacher development. Although it has been beneficial and worth mentioning, attention to its worth should have been merited in other teacher development programs at the undergraduate level as well, acknowledging that not all teachers proceed to the graduate level in their education.
Through many collaborative conversations with peer practitioners, some who were novice and others who were experienced, I learned that I was not alone. They, too, expressed many frustrations and continuously sought to improve their teaching practices. It became apparent, however, that although these instructors reflected on their practices, they did not have the means through which to employ the necessary changes; they did not have the tools to aid them in their search for answers to their queries. In addition, some instructors expressed their concerns with administrative observation and evaluation and the fear and intimidation they felt by this procedure. This fear was coupled with the anxiety felt by teachers with government cutbacks to ESL programs continuously looming and the potential for a class to close due to low enrolment. Hence, self-evaluation became a concept and process worth investigating, as it provided the possibility for autonomy of one’s evaluative decisions and the changes made to one’s practices.

Upon speaking to several colleagues about self-evaluation, it became evident that few teachers ever engaged in this process, nor did they give it much thought. They did, however, state that they reflected on their teaching at the end of each day, especially if they felt that their lesson was not a successful one. I conceded that there did not appear to be a great deal of interest toward self-evaluation as an initiative for their own professional development because it was perceived as a rather daunting task for teachers, especially for those who have not been provided with the necessary training to carry it out successfully, nor the incentive.
1.2 Introduction

Teacher self-evaluation as a means of systematic reflection has become a significant aspect of professional development for teaching practitioners. It is being introduced in many ESL contexts whereby instructors are becoming more actively involved in the assessment of their own teaching practices and reflecting on the nature of effectiveness of their teaching in order to improve its quality.

Recently, there has been growing interest in this process of self-evaluation in teacher development by researchers, administrators and teachers themselves, as a more autonomous method for teachers to gain a better understanding of their teaching practices and as a means to take the initiative to focus on areas of improvement.

This is especially significant in a time when the ESL profession is undergoing significant changes. These changes include the initiative of TESL Ontario towards uniform standards for the certification of ESL instructors who are involved in teaching adults in non-credit ESL programs. The recommendations proposed in a draft by members of TESL Ontario (TESL Ontario 1998) contain various requirements for certification including: an instructor's formal education, acceptable TESL training, and requirements for re-certification by TESL Ontario. These recommendations are presently being finalized and will be effective toward the end of this year (2000).

I have taken interest in the last recommendation proposed, that of re-certification of instructors, especially those individuals who are already teaching in the profession prior to the implementation of these certification standards. ESL-related professional development will be a requirement for teachers in order for re-certification to occur every five years. It has also been
mentioned that a portfolio of professional accomplishments will be a requirement. As a result, the need for teacher reflection and self-evaluation are expected to become significant aspects of professional development for teachers who prepare a successful portfolio. Although the present research study will not be focussed on the professional teacher portfolio, it will investigate the process of teacher reflection and self-evaluation, a significant and integral part of the portfolio.

1.3 The Problem

Upon reviewing the literature on self-evaluation, two consequential issues were brought to my attention. First, self-evaluation is not a new phenomenon, although it might appear so in educational contexts where it is only now beginning to receive greater attention. The literature to date has presented a wealth of information on teacher reflection and self-evaluation from a theoretical perspective along with several assumptions regarding the rationale for teacher self-evaluation. However, as a reflective process, it is still not being utilized enough among ESL instructors as an effective tool for improving teaching practices and for professional development (see Literature Review, Chapter 2).

In attempts to understand this dilemma, empirical research was sought that may shed some insight into the experiences of in-service instructors who had experimented with self-evaluation of their teaching practices (see Literature Review, Chapter 2). During this search I realized a second issue, a lack of naturalistic research that could provide researchers, school administrators and teachers themselves with information regarding the experiences of in-service ESL teachers and their feedback regarding their perceptions of such a procedure. Few case studies have been done where this process is implemented within a specific program along with
feedback from in-service teachers. There were, however, several examples of research (Allen & Casbergue 1996; Greis 1986; Jensen et al. 1994; Wedman, Espinosa & Laffey 1998) conducted with pre-service teachers and reflections of their experiences, unfortunately, few of these were representative of ESL teachers. According to this research, there seems to be agreement from most pre-service teachers that they perceived self-evaluation of their practices to be beneficial in their teacher development. Although there is a lot to be learned from the experiences of pre-service teachers, their purposes for engaging in self-evaluation and the teaching situations (often microteaching) are not capable of providing the same insights as those from in-service teachers engaged in this process.

The objective of this case study was to obtain a greater insight into the process of self-evaluation for in-service teachers as it was implemented within an adult ESL program. All participants were provided with a Self-Evaluation/Video Observation Package developed by program consultants within the Toronto Catholic School Board's Continuing Education Adult ESL program, to provide a guideline for the instructors involved. This study focused on the feedback obtained from both novice and experienced teachers, as they reflected on their experience throughout this exploratory process using this package. It aimed to provide an in-service teacher perspective on this reflective process by identifying some of the strengths, weaknesses and concerns of such a procedure when it is implemented within a program.

An inquiry into this process has been undertaken by addressing the following questions:

1. What are teachers' initial perceptions and feelings toward self-evaluation?
2. What strengths and weaknesses do the teachers identify in the self-evaluation process?
3. How has the use of this process modified their reported teaching activities?
4. What are their perceptions of the consequences for themselves and their students? With respect to the areas they select for improvement of their teaching practices and learner outcomes, what are their perceptions?
5. What are the changes in teachers' perceptions toward self-evaluation?
6. What lessons can be drawn about the process of self-evaluation in order to improve its effectiveness?

By obtaining feedback from teachers engaged in the process of self-evaluation, this research attempted to address the issues that are identified by teachers and to use it as a basis for future facilitation and implementation of this process within other ESL settings.

As a by-product of the research which involved the collaboration with practicing teachers, it became necessary to add an additional discussion to the research. It was necessary to take into account the specifics of the self-evaluation package developed in the school board as a basis for interpretation of the teachers’ perceptions. As a result, the final thesis incorporates a critical discussion of the design features in the package and includes specific recommendations that would appear to apply to the design of other similar self-evaluation systems for teachers.

1.4 Definitions

To ensure a reader’s understanding of the pedagogical terminology utilized throughout this research, I am including a clarification of some of the terms and definitions which I believe are ambiguous in the literature on teacher development and second language teacher education. These definitions may not be true for all educational contexts and pedagogical purposes, however, they are being applied to the second language teaching discipline of adult ESL education, the intended focus for this research.

Self-Evaluation: Lexical Variation in the Research

Upon reviewing a vast amount of literature pertaining to teacher self-evaluation, it has become apparent to me that there is little consistency in identifying this process. Various
terminology has been used to suggest equal semantic representation or similar to it. In some cases, these terms can be used interchangeably; in other cases, they may not, as they are not in fact a complete definition of self-evaluation, encompassing additional, fewer or varying characteristics than are included in self-evaluation. Therefore, it is important to identify at the outset, what self-evaluation is not. In doing this, I am listing several terms and/or approaches to teacher development that have been conceptualized and implemented in classrooms and in the research. These approaches include: critical reflection, action research, teacher-as-researcher, and so forth. Terms that are similar to self-evaluation and commonly used in second language literature, are: self-monitoring, self-observation, and self-assessment. Self-observation, however, is merely a strategy that can be employed in the self-evaluation process.

Although these approaches entail a great deal of similar characteristics to self-evaluation and teacher development or are a part of the process due to their emphasis on forming inquiries into one’s teaching, they do not succinctly describe the process of self-evaluation as a separate entity. According to Airasian and Gullickson (1997), "self-evaluation is related, but not necessarily identical to, concepts such as the reflective practitioner, reflection on practice, teacher connoisseurship and criticism, teacher research, self-understanding, educational action research, and analysis of practice. All of these approaches seek to put teachers in the center of assessing their own practice" (p. 4). Because this research is focused solely on self-evaluation as a reflective process, definitions and distinctions of the above terms and approaches will not be provided. However, it appears that the ultimate characteristic distinguishing self-evaluation from the above terms and approaches is the emphasis placed on making judgments about one’s teaching practice to assist with self-development.
A more accurate definition of teacher self-evaluation as stated by Airasian & Gullickson (1997), is:

a process in which teachers make judgments about the adequacy and effectiveness of their own knowledge, performance, beliefs, or effects for the purpose of self-improvement. It is the teacher who collects, interprets, and judges information bearing on personal practice. It is the teacher who frames criteria and standards to judge the adequacy of his or her beliefs, knowledge, skills, and effectiveness. It is the teacher who decides on the nature of professional development activities to be undertaken (p. 2).

In summary, "the teacher is at the center of the self-evaluation process. In self-evaluation, the teacher becomes responsible for examining and improving his or her own practices" (p. 2).

Finally, in self-evaluation, the emphasis is solely on one's personal teaching and not on the learners or the curriculum which is often a distinguishing characteristic of many of the other terms identified.

Novice vs. Experienced Teacher

In my personal reflection, I mentioned that as a novice ESL instructor, the desire to better my teaching skills is now a significant aspect of my development as a teacher. Upon considering the possibility that a relationship may exist among instructors who are identified as novice or experienced and their self-evaluation experiences, I realized that literature sources were vague in categorizing teacher experience. I enquired with a member of the continuing education division of the TCDSB about what they identified a novice and experienced teacher to be, according to
the years of service in adult ESL instruction. A definitive time period could not be provided.

Therefore, for the purpose of this research, I have decided to categorize instructors with less than two years experience in ESL instruction to be considered novice and those with over two years of teaching experience, to be considered experienced.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The literature on second language teacher education has only recently begun to expand. This may be due in part to the changes that are presently occurring in the ESL teaching profession, with new professional standards for teachers (see Chapter 1, Introduction). Furthermore, research in second language teacher development is focusing on teacher self-development initiatives to a greater extent. Self-evaluation as a systematic process of reflection, is a form of teacher self-development that is an autonomous process enabling teachers to take control of their professional development and to form their own judgments regarding their teaching practices.

Much of the theoretical information on self-evaluation is not isolated as a separate entity in teacher development; rather, it is conceptualized into two main areas of educational research: teacher reflection and teacher evaluation. For the purpose of this research, I will not focus a great deal of the discussion on self-evaluation as a strategy in teacher evaluation, because the word evaluation generates feelings of anxiety for some teachers and because it would only result in a broad understanding of this process. I will, however, narrow the focus of the literature review to self-evaluation mainly as a reflective process in teacher development. In doing this, I can emphasize teacher reflection as a part of the process of self-evaluation and its significance in promoting ongoing professional self-development in ESL teachers. Because there is not a great deal of literature on self-evaluation in second language teacher education, references will also be made to the general literature on teacher self-development.
This literature review will provide a brief overview of the research on second language teacher development with particular emphasis on teacher self-development for in-service teachers. This will be followed by an analysis of the literature on teacher self-evaluation as a reflective process including a distinction between reflection and self-evaluation and the significance of reflection in the self-evaluation process; a rationale for teacher self-evaluation; the necessary conditions for self-evaluation to occur; strategies in self-evaluation and an examination of recent empirical research on in-service teacher self-evaluation.

2.2 Professional Teacher Development in Second Language Education

More recent literature in second language teaching indicates a growing interest in the need for change in second language teacher development. There is a consensus among researchers and writers of second language education that very little research or theory presently exists (Lange 1990; Bernhardt & Hammadou 1987). Interest in language teacher education research did not surface until the 1980s (Freeman 1989; Richards & Nunan 1990). Prior to that, language teaching and language teacher education have been, in Freeman’s words, "an 'unstudied problem' in which traditional practices, conventional wisdom, and disciplinary knowledge have dominated. These practices and assumptions have been subject to little critical scrutiny and less organized study" (Pennington, 1996, p. 374).

According to Wallace (1996), "in language teaching today, the accelerating pace of change, increased public accountability and a growing awareness of the central role of education in social and economic development have all combined to place extremely heavy professional demands on the individual teacher, to an extent never before experienced... the teachers who
will thrive in this new environment are those who are capable of generating their own professional dynamic, who are pro-active rather than reactive” (p. 281).

There is a general agreement in the literature pertaining to teacher development that teachers’ professional development should be self-directed, resulting in independent and collaborative efforts toward self-improvement and professionalism (Thiessen 1992; Clark 1992). Clark (1992) notes the importance of ‘self-directed professional development’ as a necessary component of teacher development for two reasons. First, he feels that teachers should be in control of their own professional development. It should be a voluntary process, because if it is voluntarily chosen, then “they are much more likely to realize full value from it than when coerced into training situations in which they have little say about the timing, the process or the goals” (p. 77). Second, Clark feels that programs of professional development that are centrally administered cannot possibly meet the needs of all teachers. All teachers are unique and possess various idiosyncratic methods and views of teaching. He refers to teachers as ‘designers of their own professional development’ (p. 77). He states, “to develop ourselves as professionals we must plan, select, sketch, make errors, and rearrange the familiar furniture of the mind. We must design ourselves, and continue to revise, redesign, and learn from experience” (p. 77).

Wallace (1990) summarizes the ideas of other writers (Schon 1983 & 1987) regarding reflection and teacher development, “it has been argued by and others that the most effective method of generating autonomous professional development is through the ability to reflect on one’s own professional practice, with the correlative assumption that trainees can be ‘coached’ in this ability. Such ‘reflective practitioners’ will be able to continue to develop their
professional expertise not away from the classroom practice into academic theory, but by using theory mediated within their continuing practice” (p. 281).

2.3 Self-Evaluation as a Reflective Process

To understand the self-evaluation process, it is necessary to acquire an understanding of the nature of teacher reflection, because in order to evaluate one’s teaching practices, the active process of reflection is necessary. “Reflection is acknowledged to be a key component of many models of teacher development” (Richards, 1990, p. 119). According to Airasian & Gullickson (1997), “self-evaluation occurs when questions, reflections, and interpretations lead a teacher to make a decision about practice” (p. 3). Prior to making decisions about one’s teaching practices, the active process of reflection is, therefore, necessary.

A great deal of the recent literature on teacher development has focused on reflection. Initial theoretical understanding of reflection as part of the teaching process was formulated by John Dewey (1933), who described reflection as the “active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 6). He looked at the importance of reflection and teachers’ thinking by stating, “thinking enables us to direct our activities with foresight and to plan according to ends-in-view, or purposes of which we are aware...it enables us to know what we are about when we act. It converts action that is merely appetitive, blind, and impulsive into intelligent action” (p. 17). He felt that reflective thinking should be an educational aim and emphasized the importance of facilitating teachers outside of the classroom towards reflective practices that would result in improved teaching practices.
The nature and significance of teacher reflection was investigated by Donald Schon (1983), who emphasized moving from a teacher's "technical expertise to reflective practice", whereby he suggested moving away from viewing the teacher as an expert and provider of knowledge to an individual or, rather, a professional who brings their own values and beliefs along with their expertise into the classroom. It is these values and beliefs that would then be explored in relation to their actions within the classroom. To enable this self-awareness within teachers, Schon's conception of the 'reflective practitioner' (1983) focused on the idea of teachers critically reflecting on everyday professional practice. He made a distinction between two forms of reflection: reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action (1987). Reflection-in-action is reflection that occurs simultaneously with the act of teaching, which can lead to on-the-spot decisions. Reflection-on-action is reflection that occurs after the lesson. Zeichner (1982), notes the importance of reflection and that "the skills of self-inquiry and critical thinking are seen as central for continued professional growth" (p. 6).

Literature on reflective teacher development as it relates to second language teaching focuses on the need for teachers to form inquiries within their language teaching practices. According to Richards & Lockhart (1994), "much can be learned about teaching through self-inquiry" (p.3) because teachers collect their own information about their teaching and make decisions based on it. The process of reflection involves the teacher in an ongoing process of examining one's teaching. This process is an important aspect of teacher development.

It is important for teachers to reflect on their beliefs about second language learning and teaching, their roles as perceived by themselves and their students and the types of decisions they make as a result of the culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms they work in. According
to Bartlett, "reflective teaching involves a major shift in emphasis in our thinking and acting. Becoming reflective forces us to adopt a critical attitude to ourselves as individual second language teachers - to challenge our espoused personal beliefs about teaching. Becoming reflective through testing our practice systematically also challenges us to think about the influence we directly or indirectly exert on the formation of society in our role as teachers" (1990, p. 213)

"Reflective teaching goes hand-in-hand with critical self-examination and reflection as a basis for decision making, planning, and action" (Richards, 1994, P. ix). By taking a more systematic focus in their reflections, teachers can engage in self-evaluation practices whereby they monitor and evaluate their own teaching. Nunan (1988) recommended "the encouragement of self-analysis and evaluation by teachers of their own classroom work as a means of professional self-development... such self-evaluation, when tied to classroom action research, can also make valuable contributions to curriculum development" (p. 147).

An awareness of the distinction between reflection and self-evaluation is necessary, even though the research is not always clear on the difference between each of these processes. There is a vast amount of literature on teacher reflection, however, significantly less in teacher self-evaluation, especially in second language education. To provide a brief, yet concise description of self-evaluation, Airasian and Gullickson (1997) summarize it most effectively as "evaluation of the teacher by the teacher and for the teacher" (p. 2). The process of reflection of one's teaching practices, asking questions, etc. is not self-evaluation. Airasian & Gullickson (1997) make reference to the many misconceptions or generalizations in past and present research that have developed several terminologies in reference to self-evaluation along with a variety of
definitions (see Definitions, p. 6). It is not just a process whereby one poses questions regarding one’s own beliefs and practices. Teachers are in fact making their own judgements about themselves and their teaching and any subsequent decisions. “Self-evaluation occurs only when decisions about one’s practice are made as a result of reflections and questions and interpretation” (p. 3). This is further noted by Nunan and Lamb (1996), “Self-evaluation, as a more systematic process of reflection and a means to feedback for teachers, generates teachers’ thoughts on classroom processes and the means to set goals and strive toward more effective teaching and professional growth. It is a process of collecting and interpreting information for decision-making purposes” (p. 230). The teacher is conducting research into his/her own practices. Therefore, the teacher is at the centre of this process whereby he/she decides what method to use and what area of teaching to be examined.

In other second language teacher development literature, Richards refers to self-monitoring, self-assessment and self-observation to describe this process. “Self-monitoring enables teachers to move from a level where they may be guided largely by impulse, intuition, or routine to a level where their actions are guided by reflection and critical thinking” (Richards, 1990, p. 19). He proposes, “self-monitoring shifts the responsibility for initiating improvement in teaching practices from an outsider, such as a supervisor, to teachers themselves (although it does not obviate the need for objective evaluation of teaching). It enables teachers to arrive at their own judgments as to what works and what does not work in their classrooms” (p. 119). Richards illustrates this process in second language education, “in language teaching, self-monitoring refers to the teacher making a record of a lesson, either in the form of a written account or an audio or video recording of a lesson, and using the information obtained as a
source of feedback on his or her teaching. Self-monitoring is an approach to teacher evaluation that complements, rather than replaces, other forms of assessment, such as feedback from students, peers, or supervisors" (p. 118).

2.4 Rationale for Self-Evaluation

Self-evaluation is an important process for several reasons. According to Airasian & Gullickson (1997), self-evaluation

1. Is a professional responsibility.

2. Focuses professional development and improvement on the classroom or school level where teachers have their greatest expertise and effect.

3. Recognizes that organizational change is usually the result of individuals' changing themselves and their personal practices, not of "top-down" mandates.

4. Gives teachers voice, that is, a stake in and control over their own practice.

5. Makes teachers aware of the strengths and weaknesses of their practice: it grows from the immediacy and complexity of the classroom, as do teachers' motives and incentives.

6. Encourages ongoing teacher development and discourages unchanging classroom beliefs, routines, and methods.

7. Treats the teacher as a professional and can improve teacher morale and motivation.

8. Encourages collegial interaction and discussions about teaching (p. 7).

Kremer-Hayon (1993) notes however, that the value one attaches to the process of self-evaluation is personal and subjective. "The benefits that teachers may derive from each of these modes of evaluation depend upon the goals at hand, the specific interests and needs that may
emerge in different situations, and the way teachers feel more comfortable with, and which they perceive as more useful in promoting their professional development" (p. 80).

Although self-evaluation is important and beneficial, many of the researchers and writers note that it is only one part of the teacher evaluation process. It complements, rather than replaces the evaluation process (Airasian & Gullickson 1997; Kremer-Hayon 1993).

2.5 Necessary Conditions for Self-Evaluation

To ensure effective self-evaluation practices among teachers, Kremer-Hayon (1993) refers to two necessary conditions or 'antecedents' to self-evaluation: teachers' environmental conditions as well as their personal characteristics.

Environmental conditions include the necessary contextual support for teacher growth and development. "Teachers are viewed as trained practitioners, working alone, responsible for their own classes, with little need for reflection or discussion" (1993, p. 144). "Some researchers have suggested that variations in teacher reflection may be due to existing institutional policies and practices, as well as to factors in the teaching environment, such as allocated time for teacher planning, administrators' policies and practices, curriculum guidelines, or support for collegial interaction" (Peterson & Comeaux, 1990, p. 4).

According to Cole (1997), many professional contexts do not in fact encourage or support reflective practice. She has observed that "many teachers who engage in systematic inquiry into their practice do so secretly, behind closed doors or away from their places of work" (p. 7). This is further supported by Scriven (1994) who states, "the requirement for serious self-evaluation is a heavy one, and not always recognized as part of every professional job. It is not
likely to be accepted by teachers if they are treated as workers who are constantly being told how to do things, rather than as professionals who are responsible for getting certain things done in the way they judge best” (p. 159).

As a result, Cole emphasizes “the need for researchers to shift their attention away from how teachers think about their work, or that they need to, to consider how it might be made possible for them to do so” (1997, p. 7). She suggests that research be focussed more on preparing educational contexts so that they are more conducive to teacher learning and growth (1997). According to Hargreaves & Fullan (1992), “the seeds of development will not grow if they are cast on stony ground. Critical reflection will not take place if there is neither time nor encouragement for it”. Support for this professional endeavour needs to begin in the workplace.

Kremer-Hayon also states that, “teachers must be convinced that self-evaluation is a necessary constituent of professional development and a helpful element in achieving educational aims” (1993, p. ix). Furthermore, Kremer-Hayon refers to the significance of teacher autonomy in making decisions, “psychologically, teachers, like all other professional adults, need some recognition of the value of their work from their superiors. If these needs are satisfied there is a good chance that they will be motivated to fulfill themselves through teaching and not seek self-fulfillment elsewhere. Consequently, they will probably be more willing to undertake new educational activities and will not fear to take risks” (p. 13). In addition, she feels that self-evaluation initiatives should receive the funding that is required to provide in-service training.

A second condition for self-evaluation includes the personal characteristics of teachers that determine whether or not teachers will engage in self-evaluation of their teaching practices.
These characteristics can be broken down into three primary areas: teachers’ perception of teaching as a profession; teachers’ role perceptions and teacher career stages.

According to Kremer-Hayon, if teachers perceive teaching as a mission and a lifelong process of development which they are dedicated to, “the greater the likelihood of developing a positive attitude and willingness to engage in the self-evaluation process” (1993, p. 15). If they are somewhat autonomous in instructional planning and its implementation, they will probably be more encouraged to evaluate their own work. “Teachers must be convinced that self-evaluation is a necessary constituent of professional development and a helpful element in achieving educational aims” (p. ix). The teaching context needs to encourage this.

A teacher’s perception of his or her role in the classroom is also significant in the process of self-evaluation. “How the teacher perceives his/her role whether it be as a transmitter of knowledge to a facilitator of learning, to teacher as investigator and researcher into the teaching-learning processes in his or her classroom relates to self-evaluation” (p. 15). Therefore, teachers who view teaching and learning as a process of discovery where they take an active role in asking questions and forming inquiries into their practices, are more likely to take part in the self-evaluation process.

Finally, there is a relationship between the stage at which teachers are at in their career and its potential impact on whether or not they will be reluctant or enthusiastic toward self-evaluation. The stages teachers will experience in their entire career from the pre-service level to that of the point when they are exiting their career will determine their interest in engaging in such a process. Teachers who are at the beginning of their teaching career are generally striving to learn new skills and improve on any areas of weakness. These teachers are more likely to take
an interest in self-evaluation. Teachers who are closer to retiring or considering a departure from the teaching profession, may not want to expend the time or efforts required in the self-evaluation process.

2.6 Strategies for Self-Evaluation

Several frameworks and strategies have been recommended in the literature to use as guidelines for goal selection and feedback procedures for successful teacher reflection and self-evaluation. In the second language education literature, Richards (1990) suggests personal reflection through journals or diaries; self-reporting by completing inventories or checklists and audio or video recordings of a lesson. Other strategies include: self-rating forms; self reports; peer observation and; self-study material (Carroll, 1981). Airasian and Gullickson (1997) also suggest: teacher portfolios, student performance data, collegial dialogue, experience sharing, and joint problem solving. In a great deal of the research on self-evaluation, the videotape method is highly praised for its strengths (Airasian & Gullickson 1997; Carroll 1981; Jensen et al. 1994; Richards & Lockhart 1994; McIntyre & Pape 1992;). It provides a more reliable record of what actually happened. “One of the potentially most powerful forms of self-assessment is the opportunity “to see ourselves as others see us” through video and/or audio recordings” (Carroll, 1981, p. 193). The use of video in self-evaluation allows the teacher an opportunity to recall all of the classroom events as they actually occurred. It “creates an unalterable memory of the lesson” (Rogers, 1987, p. 67). Furthermore, the use of media within one’s professional development, increases objectivity and decreases subjectivity (Rogers 1987; Bailey 1981).
2.7 Empirical Research

Much of the research on teacher self-evaluation to date is conceptual. There is a lack of empirical research to illustrate a more humanistic perspective, identifying the interests of teachers and providing the opportunity for teachers' voices to be heard. Although teachers' voices may be viewed as data that is idiosyncratic, personal and perhaps irrelevant, it is data that provides teacher accounts of events and their feedback regarding particular phenomena, taking a more humanistic perspective. "Listening to the teacher's voice should teach us that the autobiographical, 'the life', is of substantial concern when teachers talk of their work... life experiences and background are obviously key ingredients of the people that we are, of our sense of self. To the degree that we invest our 'self' in our teaching, experience and background therefore shape our practice" (Goodson, 1992, p. 116).

The lack of empirical data in self-evaluation literature has also been acknowledged by several writers and researchers of teacher development (Calderhead, 1992; Merriam, 1988; Irvine, 1983). Calderhead noted that "relevant theory and empirical research is sparse... there is little to guide the practice of teachers and tutors involved in programs aiming to promote reflective teaching" (1992, p. 143). Furthermore, the few studies which have been conducted, have focussed on self-evaluation among pre-service teachers in non-ESL contexts with a lack of empirical evidence from the experiences and voices of in-service teachers and the concerns they identify with such a process.

Perhaps the most informative and significant of empirical studies was that by Greis (1986), who conducted a study of teacher trainees working toward a TESL certificate and/or a Master's in TESOL. In this study, the pre-service teachers were asked to engage in self-
evaluation of their teaching by videotaping themselves during a teaching session. Afterwards, the videotape was shown to peers for comments and suggestions. Upon receiving these suggestions as well as comments from the teacher educator, the pre-service teachers summarized and wrote their own self-evaluation based on the feedback received regarding areas of strength and weakness and areas needing further improvement. This study resulted in the following feedback from the pre-service teachers: "The process of self-evaluation involves an understanding of the principles of teaching, careful interpretation of feedback, and a willingness to adapt and improve; it is a process that requires time and coordination on the part of the trainees and the institution, and may, therefore, pose problems for the teacher preparation program" (p. 232).

Although Greis' study identified the potential concerns that arose from implementing self-evaluation within a pre-service teacher education program, it is important to note that pre-service teachers' perceived needs may not be identical to those of in-service teachers who are constrained by other factors relating to context and personal characteristics. In-service teachers are not motivated by credit, such as passing a course/practicum, nor is the process of self-evaluation imposed on them. Rather, self-evaluation for in-service teachers, if pursued, should be for individual motivation stemming from a need for self-improvement, growth and professional development. Therefore, we cannot make generalizations about teachers' feedback from empirical data yielded from the investigation of pre-service practices. It is important to isolate the two experiences in order to acquire a valid understanding of the target research group, namely, in-service teachers.
In another study by Kremer & Ben-Peretz (1984), research was conducted on self-evaluation by distributing questionnaires to 90 teachers representing various school levels. Questions were raised concerning their goals, the training received for self-evaluation as well as actual and desired self-evaluation practices by them. The results obtained from teacher feedback indicated that: “there was a general lack of training for self-evaluation” (p. 59); teachers’ goals of self-evaluation were emphasized more in viewing it as ‘improving students’ achievement’ before improving their own skills; it also revealed “that teachers would prefer to evaluate themselves more than they actually do” (p. 57); finally, “all self-evaluation is used less than desired” (p. 58).

The most recent of studies on teacher self-evaluation was conducted by Wright whose dissertation (1998) was based on an investigation of the effects of a video-based self-evaluation package and the effect of the timing of the self-evaluation, on general and specific praise statements by teachers. The study investigated changes in teacher instructional performance as a result of systematic video-based self-evaluation. Secondly, the study examined differences in teacher instructional performance when the timing of the viewing of a videotaped teaching segment was manipulated to occur immediately after the videotaping or if it was delayed.

The research showed that teachers who received the self-evaluation treatment package significantly increased the frequency of their general praise statements. This study also revealed the satisfaction experienced by teachers of being videotaped ranging from a very good experience to an excellent one (1998, p. 65).
2.8 Summary and Analysis of the Literature

There appears to be a growing interest among researchers in second language education toward teacher development initiatives, especially development that is self-directed by teachers. Self-evaluation, as a form of teacher self-development, is a systematic process of reflection whereby teachers make decisions about their practices. Teacher reflection often occurs either in-action or on-action. If it occurs in-action, the teachers are reflecting during a classroom lesson. If reflection occurs on-action, teachers are reflecting after a lesson has been taught. Unfortunately, research on teacher development to date is not extensive and not clear on the defining characteristics of self-evaluation, often equating it with reflection and other pedagogical terminology. Airasian and Gullickson (1997) attempt to isolate it from other forms of teacher self-development by emphasizing the fact that when teachers self-evaluate, they are making judgements about their teaching practices.

The research on teacher self-evaluation has provided various rationales for the implementation of self-evaluation within a program and among teachers themselves. It fosters teacher awareness, professionalism and improved teaching practices, to name a few. However, for self-evaluation to be effective, there are necessary conditions which should be in place. These conditions include contextual or environmental factors and personal factors. Both of these are imperative because, in order for teachers to be actively evaluating themselves, their environment or teaching context, must be supportive of these teacher initiatives by allotting the necessary time for teachers to carry out self-evaluation and by providing the necessary training and support. On a personal level, teachers’ self-evaluation practices are dependent upon certain personal factors, such as: their perceptions about teaching as a profession, their role as teachers,
and the significance of the stage at which they are at in their teaching career. These conditions are crucial, yet not highlighted enough in the literature, especially when trying to understand why self-evaluation is not widely practiced by teachers.

Teachers can engage in various self-evaluation strategies depending on their needs and preferences. The use of media, especially the video camera, has been used in some of the empirical research on teacher self-evaluation. The outcomes from using this strategy have been significant as an inalterable recording that allows for greater objectivity when evaluating one’s practices.

Finally, there is a lack of empirically-based research on teacher self-evaluation, especially in second language education. Furthermore, research to date has focussed primarily on the experiences of pre-service teachers. In order to understand the needs and concerns of in-service teachers wishing to pursue more self-directed professional development, we must conduct research that is symbolic of their experiences and which allow them to have a voice. This teacher feedback is instrumental in the implementation of a program of self-evaluation. The goal of this research is to enhance current research with the voices of in-service teachers involved in a program of self-evaluation, to understand the needs and concerns they identify.
3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction to Research Methodology

In order to address the research questions that form the basis of inquiry within this research effectively, it became evident that as a result of its naturalistic and interpretative approach, qualitative research would be the most appropriate method to obtain teacher feedback. The case study as a strategy for inquiry or research design, has been chosen to carry out this research in order to understand the experiences of a specific group of in-service teachers.

Qualitative Research

Historically, the focus of qualitative research has been on the study of human life in the social science disciplines. Its approach is naturalistic. Its objective is “to understand the meaning of an experience” (Merriam, 1988, p. 16) from a human perspective. The focus on meaning allows for a greater understanding of the situation within a particular context whereby the researcher can derive information about the participants as it relates to them in their own setting and the meanings construed by them. “Qualitative research is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretative, naturalistic approach to its subject matter…qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2).

This multimethod focus allows the researcher to utilize multiple methods and materials upon which to obtain an in-depth understanding of the situation being studied, without preference or emphasis placed on any one particular method. These include: case studies, personal experience, introspection, life stories, interviews, observations, histories, interactions,
and visual texts—that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals' lives.

The design characteristics of qualitative research are “emergent and flexible, responsive to changing conditions of the study in progress” (Merriam, 1998, p. 8). Therefore, the consideration for variability in this process is a possibility, an important consideration when conducting research focussing on human behaviour in context.

**Case Studies in Qualitative Research**

Case studies are bounded systems (Smith, 1978) that allow the researcher to concentrate attention on the way particular groups of people confront specific problems, taking a holistic view of the situation. They involve "the examination of a specific phenomenon such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group... the case is selected because it is an instance of some concern, issue, or hypothesis" (Merriam, 1988, p. 9). "By concentrating on a single phenomenon or entity ("the case"), this approach aims to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of the phenomenon" (Stake, 1994, p. 10).

The case study provides the researcher with "insight, discovery, and interpretation" (Merriam, 1988, p. 10). Because it is field-based, it allows the researcher to explore phenomena directly from the human experience. Self-evaluation is also field focussed as teachers form inquiries into their teaching practices. "Teachers who evaluate their work seek to interpret, explain the meanings of observed situations or events, put them in a context, assume potential sequences, and use their pedagogical knowledge and experience to account for the studied events" (Kremer-Hayon, 1993, p. 129). Furthermore, "field research better captures situations
and settings which are more amenable to policy and program intervention than are accumulated individual attributes” (Merriam, 1988, p. 33). In fact, “the case study can also be a disciplined force in public policy setting and reflection on human experience... case studies are of value in refining theory and suggesting complexities for further investigation, as well as helping to establish the limits of generalizability” (Stake, 1994, p. 245). This case study aims to expand the theory that is already available on teacher self-evaluation in adult ESL teaching contexts, by providing teacher feedback on this experience and to inform program developers of its effectiveness.

There are, however, limitations to this form of research. The first limitation is the lack of generalizability of findings due to its emphasis on a single or a few cases and it is not reflective of a population of cases. A second limitation is centred around ethical issues regarding the participation of the people being studied and the possible impact on their lives. A third limitation is the possibility of biases which may affect the final product due to a writer's ability to choose from among available data, anything he/she wishes to be illustrated (Merriam, 1988). Furthermore, circumstances may be “oversimplified or exaggerated...leading the reader to erroneous conclusions about the actual state of affairs” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 377). Finally, qualitative research is sometimes viewed as “unscientific” research that may be based solely on personal interpretation due to a lack of experimental conditions to validate the findings.
3.2 Narrative of Research Phases

3.2.1 Preliminary Discussions with Program Consultants of the TCDSB About My Research Interests

Initial discussions with three program consultants involved in self-evaluation initiatives began in June, 1998, at which point I discussed my intention to conduct research with teachers employed by the Toronto Catholic District School Board, by involving them in self-evaluation initiatives. The consultants displayed interest and brought forth their own ideas of some possible methods to conduct this research, however, they recommended discussing this in greater detail in the fall, at which point they would have developed possible strategies for teacher self-evaluation to be introduced to instructors-in-charge. No final details were discussed at this point. They did express concerns regarding the intrusiveness for teachers engaged in this study. The consultants were also not sure whether or not teachers would agree to participate due to time issues and teachers’ busy schedules.

In September, 1998, one of the Program Consultants proposed specializing my research on teacher self-evaluation to include the strategy of video observation and expressed an interest in the results of this research for future conferences and workshops on self-evaluation, especially for the next professional development day for teachers.

Upon careful consideration, I agreed to alter my research to include video observation in teacher self-evaluation. The program consultant discussed a book that she and another consultant were in the process of completing on teacher self-evaluation. She suggested that I review a chapter dedicated to video observation in its draft stage, which would be modified as a package to be distributed to the participants in my research. Upon receiving this chapter, I was asked to provide my own feedback including possible suggestions to refine its contents. After
few revisions, this edited chapter was then published as a Video Self-Evaluation Package for teachers to be utilized during the research.

### 3.2.2 An Overview of The Video Self-Evaluation Package

To understand the rationale behind the development of the Video Self-Evaluation Package, it's necessary to acknowledge the historical events leading to its inception.

#### 3.2.2.1 Self-Evaluation and The Toronto Catholic District School Board

Self-evaluation also became a topic of interest among administrative personnel within the Continuing Education and Adult Education Division of the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB), to explore self-evaluation as a teacher development initiative, a process they would support and encourage instructors to engage in.

This interest was first generated in 1996 by a former consultant for the Board, Vesna Nikolic, who is presently a Project Manager, who came across recent literature on teacher development and self-evaluation in second language teaching. Although she felt that its theoretical content was excellent, she noted a gap between the theoretical and the practical aspects of self-evaluation which teachers could use and relate to. She felt that teachers needed the appropriate tools to carry out self-evaluation. Her search through self-evaluation material yielded little in the way of a systematic format for self-evaluating. Therefore, she and another former consultant, Hanna Cabaj, presently the senior manager of the Continuing Education, Adult Education Division of the TCDSB, decided to develop some tools that would assist ESL teachers in this process. They developed a collection of self-evaluation tasks for teachers.
Their initiatives began with a draft “Self-Evaluation Manual” which they introduced at an annual Professional Development Day in February 1998. In the spring of 1998, funding was provided to purchase a videocamera for the purpose of self-evaluation by instructors. Following this, three consultants, Nikolic, Cabaj and Galli presented “How to facilitate self-evaluation” at the CESBA Conference for continuing education administrators. They also presented a workshop on “Video self-evaluation” at the TESL '98 Conference. Their most recent accomplishment has been the publication of their book: “Am I teaching well? Self-evaluation strategies for effective teaching”. It contains tasks developed by them which are more expanded and includes strategies that can be used by teachers. Future initiatives include more work with in-service teachers and videocamera evaluation to foster awareness-raising among teachers.

3.2.2.2 Description of the Video Self-Evaluation Package

The Video Self-Evaluation package (see Appendix C) guides ESL teachers through a systematic approach toward effective self-evaluation. It includes several steps and tasks for teachers to follow and charts to be completed. Figure 1 provides a flowchart summarizing the procedures involved in the Video Self-Evaluation Package.

This package includes a list of technical considerations suggested to teachers prior to using a video camera during this process as well as the ethical considerations teachers must take into account regarding their teaching centre’s policy on using media within their program.

The next step focuses on the videotaping procedures. Teachers are asked to videotape themselves teaching and then undergo a series of viewing procedures recommended to them. During the first viewing, teachers are asked to take notes and then select a segment in the tape to
be analyzed. The first viewing is followed up by a second viewing whereby teachers are asked to decide on one aspect of teaching they wish to focus on. Teachers are then asked to write a transcript of one short segment of interaction they are analyzing. This transcript is to be analyzed by the teacher. Teachers are then asked to evaluate themselves and the effectiveness of their teaching, based on their perceptions from their analysis of the videotape and the transcription, using a rating scale from 1-5.

In the third viewing of the videotape, a set of questions are provided for the teachers to consider during a systematic analysis they will conduct of their teaching behaviours. Three tasks are provided for the teachers to follow during this systematic analysis. The first two tasks include the completion of two charts: 1) effective teacher behaviour and 2) ineffective teacher behaviour. The third task suggests a follow-up videotape after one or two weeks, evaluating the same aspect of teaching. Once again, they are asked to evaluate their effectiveness of that particular teaching behaviour by using a rating scale from 1-5.

A video evaluation checklist is provided as a reference to ensure that the teachers are aware of each of the steps that are suggested in the process of self-evaluation. A comment sheet is also provided for the teacher to write down any comments, questions or concerns during their experience that they can later share with the researcher.

Procedures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Technical considerations (camera setup and operation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethical considerations (consent forms)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1: A Summary of the Video Self-Evaluation Package

3.2.3 Consent To Conduct Research

3.2.3.1 Administrative Consent

I submitted a formal request in writing to the Toronto Catholic District School Board regarding my intended research. This request included the details of my research and the authorization sought to engage instructors employed by the TCDSB in the case study and the use
of the Video Self-Evaluation Framework being completed by members of the Adult ESL division of the TCDSB. Authorization to engage in this case study was granted by the administrative personnel of the Adult Education Division of the Continuing Education Department of the TCDSB, namely, the Senior Manager and Program Consultants involved in Teacher Self-Evaluation research and activities prior to commencing any research activity.

3.2.3.2 Learner Consent

I provided all teacher participants with Information Release Forms to be signed by each learner in the classroom that would be videotaped. It is a standard form distributed by the TCDSB granting them permission by the learners to use any form of media within the classroom. I modified this form, with permission from the TCDSB for the purpose of this research, informing learners that the videotape would be used only for educational, information or training purposes.

3.2.4 Selection of Research Participants

I approached ten instructors to participate in this study: eight instructors agreed and two declined. The two instructors who decided not to participate have been teaching ESL for over ten years. One instructor declined immediately. The second instructor initially agreed to participate in the research. Upon reviewing my initial package including a consent form which outlined the expectations of the teachers and the initial questionnaire, she declined participation, stating that she believed that a great deal of the learners in her classroom would not agree to being videotaped for political and religious reasons. Although it was not stated by the teacher,
there may have been a reluctance to participate upon realizing the time that would be required to engage in this research, including the self-evaluation process and the research process of completing questionnaires and attending interview sessions. I arrived at this conclusion because she was aware of the videotaping procedure upon my initial request for her participation. At that time, she did not express these concerns.

All of the participating instructors signed consent forms informing them of a Code of Confidentiality and the right to terminate their involvement in the research at any time. They were clearly informed of the terms of their involvement within the research, including: completion of a preliminary questionnaire; a preliminary interview; engagement in self-evaluation of their teaching practices; a follow-up questionnaire and a follow-up interview subsequent to the process of self-evaluation. In order to ensure confidentiality, each instructor was provided with a code identified by an alphabetical symbol; this study does not mention the teaching location nor any other details that may reveal their identities. All of the completed questionnaires remained confidential with the researcher and will subsequently be destroyed. The interviews were held in private, in empty classrooms or other rooms within their teaching locations and were audiotaped with the permission of each instructor participant.

All of the participants in this research are employed by the Toronto Catholic District School board in a variety of capacities and contexts. All instructors teach adult ESL ranging from literacy to TOEFL. The participants in this research include eight instructors, two males and six females. They are representative of a diversity of ethnicities: two are of Canadian descent; two are of European descent; one is from Southeast Asia; one is from the Middle East; one is from Eastern Europe and; one is from the Pacific Rim. English is the native language for
five out of the eight instructors; for the other three instructors, English is the second language. More detailed description of each instructor has been included in Table 1 (p. 49) in order to provide background information that may prove useful in the interpretation of the feedback given by each instructor.

3.2.5 Researcher Role

Throughout the research, I made myself available to instructors at any time to discuss any questions, concerns or comments that were raised. This communication was arranged primarily by telephone and in some cases in person; this communication was in addition to scheduled interviews.

I conducted the transportation and setup of the videocamera. It was my responsibility to ensure that the videocamera and tripod were set up correctly without any obstruction and to ensure that the instructor had a clear understanding of its operation. In some cases, instructors were asked to assume responsibility for dismantling the camera and tripod and to store it in a safe place or to carry it home. Members of the Board asked that the videocamera not be stored at the teaching location. It was the responsibility of the instructor to bring it home if necessary, for fear of theft.

I distributed the preliminary questionnaire and the post-questionnaire by mail. Both questionnaires were returned to me by mail. I conducted the preliminary interview and the post interview at the teaching site of each instructor.
3.2.6 Instrument Development

3.2.6.1 Preliminary Questionnaire

The Preliminary Questionnaire (Appendix A) was mailed to each participant. It consists of 15 questions to generate teachers' thinking on teacher reflection and self-evaluation, prior to engaging in self-evaluation. Questions were posed regarding their knowledge and perceptions of this process.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The questions in the first section 'Instructor Background' were included to obtain a basic description of the instructors to identify their present teaching activity and past experience in teaching adult ESL. It also asks the teacher to reflect on their teaching practices and any possible areas they may wish to explore further.

The next section contains questions that have been designed to initially probe a teacher's understanding of what reflection is and what self-evaluation is prior to engaging in the self-evaluation process. These questions attempt to gain a greater insight into whether or not teachers are able to distinguish the differences between these two terms. Furthermore, the rationale behind these questions is to determine whether or not teachers are engaging in the practice of reflection and self-evaluation on a regular basis and how they are going about it.

Teachers' perceptions regarding this process are especially imperative at this stage, to determine whether or not there is any change in their perceptions and understanding of this process, upon having engaged in self-evaluation.

The final section of the preliminary questionnaire is focused on questions pertaining to 'Video Observation' to determine the participants initial perceptions regarding this strategy to self-evaluation.
3.2.6.2 The Preliminary Questionnaire and the TCDSB

In the early development stages of the preliminary questionnaire, I gave a draft copy to the consultants of the TCDSB working on self-evaluation initiatives for feedback. Upon viewing the questionnaire and providing constructive feedback, the consultants expressed interest in mailing out a copy of this questionnaire to all ESL instructors employed by the TCDSB (approximately 300). In order to have the questionnaire ready for the next upcoming mailing, it did not leave a great deal of time for editing the questionnaire to suit a general population of teachers not participating in this research. Only minor modifications were incorporated, especially to ensure anonymity. The questionnaire was placed in a large mailing containing various notices and a newsletter. Unfortunately, the details of the questionnaire, regarding its purpose and the instructions regarding its completion and return were included in the middle of a multi-page newsletter. A return envelope was not included. Instructions were given to send the completed questionnaires to a school location whereby all consultants and the senior manager have scheduled meetings, marked for my attention.

Only six questionnaires out of approximately 300, were returned. Upon discussing this low turnout with the consultants, in hindsight, we agreed that this may have resulted for a variety of reasons. First of all, the board members and I agreed that returning a questionnaire of this personal nature to an administrative location may have generated feelings of concern with regard to anonymity and the possibility of one’s identity being revealed. This could have been a threat to teachers, especially since the questions revealed information regarding teachers’ practices and their perceptions regarding professional development. It was also suggested by some of the
consultants that the instructors may have found the questions on the questionnaire to be too open-ended and therefore they may have decided not to complete it for that reason.

I believe there were additional factors that may have contributed to a low response rate. The request by the members of the Board to mail out the preliminary questionnaire to all instructors was unforeseen in my study. The request was presented in a short period of time that did not permit the appropriate changes to the question format that would suit a general population of teachers. Furthermore, I believe that this questionnaire needed to be placed in a separate mailing, to ensure proper attention to it and a return envelope should have been provided to every instructor with the researcher’s personal return address to ensure confidentiality and to encourage instructors to respond more openly. The low response rate meant that the data were of no use for the present study.

3.2.6.3 Post-Questionnaire

Questionnaire II was used as a follow-up to the self-evaluation process. I mailed it to each of the participants. It consists of 32 questions and was designed to obtain a great deal of feedback from the participants, upon having engaged in self-evaluation of their teaching practices (Appendix B). The contents of this questionnaire were also categorized into three sections.

The first section, ‘Instructor Background’ probed a little further into each instructor’s background. The data yielded from these questions provides useful information when analyzing the data regarding personal and professional aspects of each participant’s life that may affect
their responses in the questionnaire and the interview and their overall feedback regarding this process of self-evaluation.

The second section, 'Reflection and Self-Evaluation', contains questions identical to the first questionnaire. The purpose of this repetition is to see whether or not there has been a change in teachers’ professional development practices, their understanding of self-evaluation and their perceptions of it.

The next section, 'The Self-Evaluation/Video Observation Process', is divided into two subsections: the self-evaluation process as an overall process in teacher development and video observation as one strategy in self-evaluation. This division of questions attempts to assist the participants in organizing their thoughts and responses according to the subheading, trying to ensure that the questions are not ambiguous. This also aided the researcher in the categorization of the responses.

The first subsection is focused on the self-evaluation process. The questions have been designed to obtain brief yet clear responses regarding their experience with self-evaluation. The questions in the questionnaire provide the participant with multiple choices as opposed to open-ended questions. These were elaborated upon during the follow-up interview.

The second subsection is focused specifically on video observation. These questions form an inquiry into the teacher’s experience with self-evaluation through the use of a videocamera and subsequent observation of his/her teaching. The rationale of these questions is to obtain an understanding of teachers’ perceptions regarding their experiences of this process and their feelings regarding it.
The final section, ‘Self-Evaluation/Video Observation Package’, is comprised of questions that are directed towards the actual package used during their participation in this research. The rationale behind these questions is to acquire specific feedback about the teachers’ perceptions of this package and how it influenced their self-evaluation process. It will also provide the authors of the package with valuable feedback to consider regarding its content.

3.2.7 Preliminary Interview

Upon receiving the preliminary questionnaires in the mail, each participant was asked to complete it and to return it to me within a specific period of time. Upon receiving these completed questionnaires in the mail, I arranged interviews with each participant to obtain more in-depth information from them regarding their responses on the questionnaire. I read the responses on each of the questionnaires prior to each interview. Participants were interviewed individually in a private location within their teaching context. Each interview took place over a 45-60 minute period. A set of interview questions did not exist for this interview. Instead, it was my goal to base the interview on the completed preliminary questionnaire submitted by the participant. Although the questions directed to each of the participants followed the same format as those of the preliminary questionnaire, the participants were encouraged to answer with more open-ended, in-depth responses. During this interview, instructors also received orientation regarding the self-evaluation/video observation package and instruction on the technical operation of the videocamera.

Each participant was given an orientation of the package during the first interview, at which time they could pose any questions regarding its content. This package contained: the
participant consent form; the learner consent form and the self-evaluation package. They were also informed that they could contact the researcher at any time during the research with any questions or comments.

3.2.8 The Self-Evaluation Process

Initial expectations regarding the timing of this research process suggested that upon the first videotaping, the participants would analyze their tapes, implement any necessary changes and videotape themselves a second time, two weeks later, to determine whether or not there were any changes (as suggested in the self-evaluation package). This suggestion proved to be a challenge. Only one of the participants followed the suggestion exactly. There was great variability in timing with the other seven participants, ranging from three weeks to eleven weeks. There were many factors contributing to these large gaps in timing. In some cases, teachers were not ready to videotape themselves in such a short time period. The process of scheduling interviews was also problematic due to teachers’ busy schedules, and communication to coordinate these tapings was often hampered. Finally, the arrival of the December holiday season also resulted in delayed follow-up videorecordings.

3.2.9 Post-Interview

I mailed out the second questionnaire to all participants after they participated in the video self-evaluation process. A specific time deadline was given for the return of the completed questionnaires by mail. Upon receiving the completed post-questionnaires from all of the participants, I arranged a follow-up interview to generate further feedback from the
instructors. The interview questions were developed in advance of the interview. However, prior to each interview, I carefully read the instructor’s responses on Questionnaire II to determine the need for any further questions that may yield responses that would be useful for this study. I interviewed each participant individually in a private location within his/her teaching context. The duration of each interview was approximately 60-90 minutes. The aim of this interview was to obtain more in-depth responses to questions posed on the post-questionnaire and to gain a greater understanding of the participants’ perceptions of their experience with self-evaluation. The questions for this interview were semi-structured. The questions were carefully designed to allow the participant to reflect on his/her experience and provide the desired feedback related directly to the questions posed for the purpose of this research.

3.2.10 Acknowledgement to All Participants

All participants received an acknowledgement letter on OISE letterhead, regarding their participation in this research. The TCDSB also generously donated eight books (a variety of teaching resources) to be distributed to each teacher who engaged in this research; each teacher received a book that was suited to the level or type of class they were teaching.
4. FINDINGS

4.1 Overview of the Findings

The findings generated by the research were the result of data analysis that occurred simultaneously during data collection from the preliminary and post questionnaires as well as from the discussions during the preliminary and post interviews. This ongoing analysis was a significant factor in the development of the post questionnaire because it became evident that personal teacher variables appeared to be significant factors in determining the perceptions of the teachers and the outcomes they experience as a result of the self-evaluation process. Consequently, the post questionnaire was designed to include additional questions regarding a teacher’s background criteria that may assist in the analysis of the findings in the research. Upon completing the case study, the data were organized and categorized according to the regularities of the responses and the recurrent patterns. Themes were developed as a result of the recurring regularities in the responses.

The findings revealed a few recurring themes that will be highlighted in the following chapter. These themes are reflective of what the majority of the teachers responded to questions on the questionnaires and in the discussions during the interviewing process. These themes include:

- the belief in self-evaluation as a benefit in teacher development that results in awareness-raising of one’s teaching practices.
- the feeling that the process of self-evaluation through video observation requires a great deal of time.
- the need for training in self-evaluation.
the need for ongoing support from their teaching context for self-evaluation to be effective.

the wish to experiment with alternative strategies to self-evaluation, with video observation as one of many possibilities; reflection-on-action is preferred.

A table has been provided summarizing significant information regarding the background of each instructor who participated in the research. This table will be referred to throughout the discussion.

Note: Each participant teacher is labelled A-H.

All of those characteristics representative of each teacher, have been marked by an “X”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th># of Years Teaching ESL</th>
<th>Teaching ESL Per Week</th>
<th># of Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Teaching ESL</th>
<th>Other Jobs/Activities</th>
<th># of Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Previous Training in Self-Evaluation</th>
<th>Engaged in Self-Evaluation of In-service Teaching Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Part-time X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Instructor Background
This chapter begins with an analysis of the Video Self-Evaluation Package and the teacher participants' feedback regarding its strengths and limitations. It will also include my own observations on the package and its use. This analysis is followed by an analysis of the responses on the first and second questionnaires as well as the preliminary and post interviews by addressing each of the research questions posed in Chapter One.

4.1.1 The Video Self-Evaluation Process and the TCDSB Study

I was initially interested in the TCDSB program consultants' interest in teacher self-evaluation which originated with an awareness of the lack of tools for ESL teachers to engage in self-evaluation. As noted earlier, this awareness resulted in the development of a "Self-Evaluation Manual" for teachers that was recently edited and published into a book. I believed this to be a progressive action taken by the Board in promoting a more autonomous approach to the evaluation process of teachers. I was especially interested in how other teachers felt about self-evaluation as a self-development initiative. Although the manual was very comprehensive, I believed its inclusion of tasks and checklists for teachers to complete was very useful. I decided to focus my research on the instructors employed by the board, utilizing this framework developed by the program consultants, in the self-evaluation process.

The consultants, however, were specifically interested in video observation as a strategy in self-evaluation and purchased a video camera for the teachers to utilize. It was at this time that the Board suggested that I focus my research on video self-evaluation so that they could receive feedback from teachers on this process, with specific reference to the framework they
had developed. Initial discussions with the consultants did not involve the possibility of using video in the self-evaluation process included in my research. Essentially, video self-evaluation was in the early stages of being encouraged among all ESL instructors. Invitations to instructors to participate in this process continue to be sent periodically.

I was admittedly concerned with the responses I might receive when approaching potential participants for my research. I was not sure how they would receive the idea of videotaping themselves in the classroom. I was also concerned about my responsibility for the management of the videocamera and its transportation during this study, as well as ensuring its return to the Board in its original condition.

4.1.1.1 Perceptions of the Video Self-Evaluation Package

The next step involved the Video Self-Evaluation Package that was to be provided to all of my participants. The contents of this package were in the editing process by the consultants. They asked me to provide feedback on the package as they finalized all of the editing. My comments were primarily based on the format and presentation that would simplify the process for teachers into clear steps and language they could easily identify with, acknowledging that not all teachers have received comprehensive ESL teacher education.

My immediate reaction to this package was that it would be instrumental in guiding teachers through the self-evaluation process by providing a structured format to follow. I was concerned however, about the number of tasks involved in the package. I was worried that the teachers might have found it too lengthy.
The perceptions of the participants regarding the content of the package varied. Overall, all of the participants found the package to be useful and effective in the self-evaluation process. It provided them with a structure to follow throughout. However, they also provided their own recommendations regarding the package and how it could be modified to meet their needs better. These recommendations along with my own are summarized below.

The content of the package begins with a guideline of the technical aspects of videotaping that should be taken into consideration prior to taping oneself. Although the participants found these to be useful, only one of the participants had past experience in the operation of a videocamera. Therefore, six out of eight participants recommended that the Board provide formal training in the correct operation of a video camera for effective results in the self-evaluation process.

In the first step, teachers are immediately guided in the viewing procedures upon videotaping themselves. Perhaps some suggestions could have been provided regarding the length of time one might consider taping themselves, so that he/or she does not spend hours afterwards viewing the videotape. It was suggested by participant B that the length of the videotaping time be limited to approximately 30 minutes.

The second step focuses on the viewing procedures recommended to teachers. It is stressed that these procedures are based on analyzing, in detail, only one teaching area. Four out of the eight participants felt that focusing on only one teaching behaviour at a time was not enough. They suggested the possibility of working on two areas of teaching simultaneously. This step is a crucial one because teachers make the important decision regarding which area of teaching to consider for self-evaluation. When viewing their tapes, teachers were immediately
concerned with their body language and physical appearance. Participant C decided that the use of hand gestures was an area of weakness for her and therefore chose to focus on this for self-evaluation. Nonverbal communication is certainly an important aspect of teaching that is significant to many teachers. This was clearly evident from the responses of the teacher participants. It would be useful to remind teachers not to focus only on physical criteria such as facial actions or other body gestures but rather on specific teaching methodology that has been carefully provided in a video observation checklist to assist teachers in this process. Furthermore, the video self-evaluation package could include reference to nonverbal communication and how to prepare teachers psychologically to accept their physical presence on the videotape during the observation process.

During the first viewing of the videotape, teachers are instructed to take notes while they observe their teaching on tape. They are asked to note any differences between what they initially perceived their teaching to be like on the day that was videotaped and what they actually observed on the tape. For this viewing procedure to be effective, it is important to advise teachers to view their videotape immediately and not to delay this process. Otherwise, teachers’ perceptions regarding their teaching on that particular day will be blurred. This recommendation should be included in the package. Teachers are then asked to select a segment of the tape for more detailed analysis and to consider in greater depth the differences between their initial perceptions and their observations.

The first viewing is followed up by a second viewing, where teachers are asked to select one aspect of teaching they wish to focus on. An observation checklist is provided for them to
assist in this process. Following this decision, teachers can decide whether or not to re-analyze the whole segment they chose or to focus on a shorter sub-segment within.

Teachers are then asked to write a transcript of one short segment of interaction they are analyzing. This transcript is then to be analyzed by the instructor and evaluated by using a rating scale from 1-5. Many of the participants did not find this useful. In fact, three out of eight participants did not complete this task. Participant G stated that she was not evaluating any form of interaction, therefore, she did not believe it was applicable to her. Participant E felt that it was too time consuming and Participant F did not provide a reason.

A third viewing of the videotape is then recommended with a set of questions for the teachers to consider during a systematic analysis they will conduct of their teaching behaviours. Three tasks are provided for the teachers to follow during this systematic analysis. The first task suggests that the teacher select an effective teaching behaviour and to analyze it. A chart is included for the teacher to use in this process. The second task asks the teacher to select an ineffective teaching behaviour and to create an action plan to implement changes in their teaching actions. Participants D and F did not complete these tasks. Participant D stated that she forgot to complete these charts. Participant F decided to use other methods, such as taking notes instead.

The third task suggests a follow-up videotape of a classroom session after one or two weeks, evaluating the same aspect of teaching. Upon viewing this tape, teachers are asked to determine to what extent their teaching behaviour has improved by evaluating themselves on a scale from 1-5. The timing between each videorecording varied among the participants. This was due to several factors. In general, it was difficult to arrange dropping off the camera to each
of the participants. They either did not respond immediately to telephone requests due to their busy schedules, or we could not coordinate the timing between both of our schedules to be precisely one or two weeks between each recording as suggested in the package. Furthermore, the holiday season was also approaching. As a result, the timing between the first and second videorecording varied from two weeks to eleven weeks.

There were also varying opinions among the participants regarding an ideal time period between each taping. Five out of the eight participants suggested that the videorecordings should occur within one or two weeks of each other. Two participants suggested a one month period between videorecordings, stating that when the gap is bigger, you can see more of a difference. One participant suggested that there should be a two or three month period between recordings so that one has enough time to make any necessary instructional changes. It was also suggested by some of the participants that additional videorecordings be included in the self-evaluation process. They felt that two were not enough. Participant G noted that “although it would be very time consuming to tape yourself four or five times in the same area of teaching, you would get a better general picture”.

Participant F did not engage in a second videorecording because he felt that the nature of his classroom did not encourage a communicative approach and that was something he felt that he wanted to improve. Therefore, he decided not to videotape himself a second time. He stated, however, “if a teacher is willing to videotape themselves on a regular basis, perhaps once every month or every two weeks would be beneficial…it’s time consuming but they might benefit from it”.
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A video evaluation checklist is provided as a reference to ensure that the teachers are aware of each of the steps that are suggested in the process of self-evaluation. A comment sheet is also provided for the teachers to write down any comments, questions or concerns during their experiences that they can later share with the researcher. Most of the participants did not make use of this comment sheet. They did, however, reflect on the charts they completed and on the responses from the questionnaires they completed regarding their experiences.

An important detail that was not mentioned in the package, is that teachers can be flexible in how they carry out the steps suggested to them. However, for effective self-evaluation to occur, it is assumed that the teachers follow this package as precisely as possible.

The participants' perceptions regarding the video self-evaluation package were not surprising. Overall, they felt that the package was an effective tool. It was structured and guided them throughout the process. This was instrumental in carrying out the self-evaluation process. However, they also found that the package included too many tasks and it was therefore time consuming. Their recommendations included omitting some of the tasks or making them optional, such as the transcription task, and ensuring that videorecordings of classroom sessions are not lengthy, in order to reduce viewing time.

Time was a significant part of the discussions among all of the participants. They admitted that their schedules are busy and that it is difficult finding the time to engage in such a process, despite the known benefits. Most of the participants felt that video self-evaluation was perhaps not an ideal process for them due to the responsibility of the videocamera and the length of time to engage in this process. When the participants were asked on the second questionnaire whether or not they would consider engaging in self-evaluation again sometime in the future, six
out of the eight participants said yes and two said no, citing as reasons that they were too busy, needed training, or felt embarrassed and that “it’s not mandatory”. During the follow-up interview, however, most of the participants admitted that they would probably not consider video self-evaluation again. In fact, only participant H stated that she would engage in this process again in the near future. The new group of “non-repeaters” cited problems regarding camera transportation, storage and responsibility. This response came in spite of the fact that during the research, I was responsible for most of the camera setup, transportation and accountability of the video camera belonging to the TCDSB. Most instructors felt that this simplified the process for them.

Although most of the teachers did not think they would pursue video self-evaluation as an option, they did express an interest in other strategies for self-evaluation. These will be discussed in the findings from each of the research questions to follow the summary of the preceding discussion of the Video Self-Evaluation Package.

4.1.1.2 Implications for Redesigning the Video Self-Evaluation Package for Teachers

In summarizing the feedback of the Video Self-Evaluation Package from the participant teachers and my own observations, it is clear that the systematic steps in this process although useful, take a significant amount of time to complete and are very likely to be perceived by teachers as lengthy. Teachers are aware of the benefits, but, due to their busy schedules, they believe that they do not have enough time for this form of self-evaluation. Teaching, lesson planning and preparation occupies a great deal of their time as well as other personal commitments (see Table 1).
With regard to the content of the package, it is suggested that teachers be made aware of the flexibility of the tasks involved to ensure that they do not immediately perceive the process to be too overwhelming for them to complete. Therefore, a process that is clearly flexible with optional tasks would ensure a greater response. Most of the teachers agreed that some form of training is necessary with regard to the technical considerations involved in the videorecording process to ensure optimal recording coverage. Teachers also expressed a need for training in the entire process of self-evaluation, especially with regard to analytical techniques when observing and evaluating one's teaching. Finally, teachers should be informed that in order for the viewing of the tapes to be effective, they should be viewed immediately upon recording their teaching, otherwise, teachers perceptions of what actually occurred on the day of recording become blurred. As noted above, (pp. 49, 50 & 53) additional instructions are required to ensure appropriate use.

4.1.2 Teachers' Initial Perceptions

The teachers' initial perceptions of self-evaluation were interpreted through the analysis of the preliminary questionnaire and the preliminary interview completed by each participant in this study. Overall, the teachers' initial perceptions of the process of self-evaluation were positive for both novice and experienced teachers. Responses on the preliminary questionnaires and discussions from the preliminary interviews indicated that participants were enthusiastic and generally interested in trying this process of self-development. Participants A, C, E, F, G and H stated that they were enthusiastic. Participant F also stated that he was not entirely sure at the time, but felt more inclined to say that he was enthusiastic. Only one of the participants,
participant H, reported engaging in self-evaluation of her current teaching practices (see Table 1). Participants B and D indicated that they were not sure about their perceptions of this process. They were willing however, to experiment with it and take part in this research. Some of the participants also expressed minimal feelings of nervousness with the idea of being videotaped, unsure of what they might discover during the observation stage.

The perceptions of the two teachers who declined to participate were not obtained. One may assume that the decision not to participate suggests that they did not feel the same level of interest or enthusiasm as the teachers who agreed. Both instructors were experienced, having worked in the ESL profession for over ten years.

Analysis of the questionnaires and interviews also resulted in the finding that teachers were not able to distinguish a difference between the active process of reflection and the systematic process of self-evaluation. Definitions of self-evaluation yielded responses that included: recalling my lesson for the day, thinking about how I can improve, and similar comments mirroring the process of reflection. The fact that teachers were not able to distinguish the difference between reflection and self-evaluation reinforces Airasian and Gullickson’s (1997) reference to the many misconceptions or generalizations in past and present research that have developed several terminologies in reference to self-evaluation along with a variety of definitions. They state clearly that “the process of reflection of one’s teaching practices, asking questions, and so forth is not self-evaluation. Self-evaluation occurs only when decisions about one’s practice are made as a result of reflections and questions and interpretation” (p. 3). Aside from the misconceptions in the research, another reason teachers may not be aware of the difference between reflection and self-evaluation is due to the lack of formal training in self-
evaluation received by the majority of the participants. Five out of the eight participants stated that they had never received any training in self-evaluation at either the pre-service or in-service level. Participants E, G and H reported previous training in self-evaluation at the pre-service level (see Table 1).

4.1.3 Teachers’ Concerns Regarding the Strengths and Weaknesses of Self-Evaluation

Prior to engaging in this program of self-evaluation, the teachers expressed few concerns, highlighting the strengths of self-evaluation mainly. Various responses on the preliminary questionnaires and the preliminary interviews indicated that teachers perceived self-evaluation as a process that would raise teachers’ awareness of their effectiveness as teachers, improve teaching practices resulting in improved learner outcomes, give teachers control over their own evaluation process and reinforcement their perceptions of their teaching. Teachers’ initial concerns focussed primarily on two possibilities: the over-correction of teaching behaviours or the possibility of being insufficiently critical enough to identify areas of weakness.

Upon engaging in self-evaluation, teachers became aware of additional concerns that they had not previously expressed. The first realization was that to engage in self-evaluation would require a great deal of available time in their schedules. As noted above, they felt that they did not have the time in their busy teaching schedules to engage in this form of teacher development. For example, when asked what he thought the most significant weakness was, Teacher G responded:

“Time consuming. Just that it was one more thing that I had to think about in addition to all of this teaching and preparation that I normally do. My schedule is
so hectic. I'm sorry, I don't mean to sound negative. It was helpful. I'm glad I did it. Even just having the questionnaire in my bag, I just didn't think I could find the two minutes to work on it."

This issue of time was especially significant in the implementation of a strategy of video observation. This strategy required additional time for camera setup and the timely observation process of viewing the videotape afterwards. Engaging in video self-evaluation increased their busy work schedules as a result of the taping process and the subsequent observation and analysis. The participants reported teaching hours ranging from 9 to 32 per week. This did not include lesson planning time. Most teachers also engaged in other activities or jobs ranging between 3-10 hours per week (see Table 1). Participant H did not feel that the time required for video self-evaluation was a significant factor in her life because she does not have any children or other commitments. She teaches 31 hours per week.

Another concern expressed by teachers was that they did not have enough training. A majority of the teachers felt that they needed the appropriate training regarding the technical aspects of operating a video camera and training on observational and analytical techniques of the videotape. Teacher F noted:

"Video self-evaluation requires training. I think what I really mean is that it requires understanding of what a video camera does to a person, understanding that when you film something for a period of time, that it's a static pose and doesn't allow the dynamics of the room. The camera is static and focuses on one point of view of the classroom the whole time and that does not provide the
existing dynamic that’s in the class. Because the teacher circulates, they go
behind the students, they go around the class, they interact, they mingle, the
students do the same things and the camera is not going to pick up the nuances of
all that, and you have to learn how to watch a video like that.”

Although teachers recognized new concerns they were not previously aware of or had given any
consideration to, they still acknowledged their original perceptions that self-evaluation is an
instrumental process in teacher professional self-development.

4.1.4 Teacher Modifications to Reported Teaching Activities

Most teachers indicated that they modified their reported teaching activities, upon
engaging in self-evaluation. Teacher B stated that she is now more conscious of giving clearer
instructions. Teacher C has noted a modification to her body position in relation to the learners,
especially when writing on the board, she stated:

“With regard to writing on the board, my instruction has changed. Before, when
writing on the board, I used to write on it and face while explaining and covering
half of the words. Therefore, in the classroom my voice is not being projected to
them, it’s being lost. But I learned to write on the board first, then explain it.”

Teacher D now incorporates more learner feedback into each of her lessons, to assist her
with her own evaluation. She seeks more input and participation from them. She finds this
approach to be more effective for herself and for her learners. Teacher E noted,

“I am conscious about the fact that I speak a little faster than I should.”

Therefore, she has slowed the pace of her lesson, to better accommodate her learners.
Teacher F discovered that he spoke too much in the classroom. He stated,

“In looking at the tape, I felt that I was talking too much and that I could afford a little bit more of a dynamic range in my classroom, a little more engagement of the students. After videotaping myself, I have tried to do more communicative work within the limitations I have (multi-level class). Sometimes I am able to do more communicative work when the level balances out.”

Participant F has tried to speak less in the classroom. He has a goal to shift from a primarily teacher-centred methodology to one that is more communicative.

Teacher H has changed her approach towards her learners by not pushing them as hard as she did. She reported,

“I am more comfortable with how I work with students, I am not pushing them so hard, but I like to give them challenging exercises. I now try to balance exercises from easy to difficult. I think this has had an effect on the students.”

Teacher A and Teacher G did not report on significant modifications to their reported teaching activities, stating that change takes time. They felt they needed more time to adjust their teaching practices to meet these changes consistently and successfully.

These modifications declared by the participants in this research may not be long term modifications. Whether or not teachers will continue to improve in their identified area of weakness will probably be determined by their continuity of reflective activities and ongoing self-evaluation that will reinforce the decisions they make about the necessary improvements required in their teaching. According to Clark (1992), “to develop ourselves as professionals we
must plan, select, sketch, make errors, and rearrange the familiar furniture of the mind. We must design ourselves, and continue to revise, redesign, and learn from experience” (p. 77).

4.1.5 Teachers’ Perceptions of Outcomes for Themselves

As a result of engaging in the program of self-evaluation, and the subsequent modifications to their reported teaching activities, the teachers have noted significant outcomes for themselves in both their professional and personal life. Professionally speaking, the teachers felt that they were more aware and enlightened about their teaching practices. As noted by Nunan and Lamb (1996), this systematic process of reflection was a means of feedback for teachers, generating their thoughts on classroom processes and the means to set goals and strive toward more effective teaching and professional growth. Participant A noted that engaging in video self-evaluation has confirmed his beliefs about his practices, with regard to the areas of weakness he has perceived. He attributes this confirmation to having been able to observe it on videotape. Participant B identified improved organizational skills. She stated:

“With my lesson planning, it helped me organize my tasks better. It also helped make me more aware of the objectives of my lesson so that now I ask myself more often, okay, what do I want the students to achieve by the end of this lesson and how am I going to do that? How am I going to get there? What task is relevant, what task is not? By being more organized, I am being more aware of my students’ needs.”

In addition, Teacher B noticed changes in her personal life. Upon engaging in self-evaluation, she noted gains in her level of confidence. She stated:
"The professional is very much tied with the personal. So just being assured that the work that I was doing overall is okay. So it helped motivate me more and in the personal life, motivation and confidence are important to me."

Teacher D noted that overall, it has encouraged her to engage in more recall of the classroom events and subsequently altering her lesson plans to accommodate the changes that she believes are necessary for an effective class.

Teacher F openly noted some positive aspects about his teaching. He stated:

"The only thing I noticed is that I did appreciate some of the things I did too. I looked at some things and I said, 'yeah, that's good that I do that'... I am communicative, I mean understandable and can relate with my students, and that's something I appreciated about myself. I think that people might be more inclined to look at the bad things."

Due to the video observation strategy used in this program of self-evaluation, one teacher focussed her self-evaluation on her physical appearance and bodily gestures instead of a teaching behaviour upon viewing the first videotape. She was surprised and uncomfortable with her bodily gestures that she felt may have distracted her learners. Various teachers observed undesirable characteristics about themselves, such as problems with their weight and inappropriate gestures and actions as well. Some teachers reported that this made it difficult for them initially to continue the observation process. They stated that it took some time for them to overcome these initial feelings of discomfort.
4.1.6 Teachers' Perceptions of Outcomes for the Learners

Many of the teachers did not identify any significant outcomes for their learners, upon carrying out self-evaluation of their teaching practices. This was due primarily to their focus on their own teaching activity, which was the intended focus of this research. It was also due to the continuous intake of new learners within their program, along with sporadic attendance from other learners. Teacher D noticed an increased level of participation from the learners in the class and Teacher G observed some individual improvements in some of her learners.

4.1.7 Changes in Teachers' Perceptions Toward Self-Evaluation

I have already indicated additional concerns that teachers have addressed in this program of self-evaluation upon having engaged in this process. These concerns included: the time involved to carry it out and the necessary training needed. I, the researcher, also discussed these technical considerations with them, to ensure they were adequately prepared to successfully videotape their classroom.

During discussions with the participants, all of them did not claim to have changed their perceptions regarding self-evaluation. However, they did not express the same level of enthusiasm that they did prior to this research. Participants B and C identified areas of weakness they were not previously aware of, such as the amount of time and dedication involved in this process. They were also aware of the risk teachers may face in identifying too many weaknesses in their teaching. They suggested that teachers remember to focus on their teaching strengths as well.
All but one teacher, participant H, admitted that they would not engage in this process of self-evaluation again, using video observation as a primary strategy. Most teachers expressed an interest in resuming the process of reflection, by recalling the day’s events and writing notes on lesson plans, in other words, reflection-on-action (Schon, 1987). There was also a preference expressed for self-evaluation strategies that involved the completion of checklists (self-reporting).
5. CONCLUSIONS

5.1 Lessons Drawn about Self-Evaluation in Order to Improve its Effectiveness

Many lessons could be drawn from this research on teacher self-evaluation to improve its effectiveness when implemented within an Adult ESL program or any educational program. The most instrumental information has been derived by the feedback from the teachers themselves. I have summarized the most significant comments and suggestions made by the teachers in Figure 2.

The teacher participants expressed an interest in the idea of self-development in their teaching practices. The idea of an independent and autonomous form of evaluation was perceived by the teachers to be a benefit initially, however, upon engaging in this process, they discovered some limitations. First of all, the length of time involved in the self-evaluation process was a significant concern. The teachers schedules were already consumed with several teaching hours, time required for lesson planning, along with other personal commitments. If time could be allotted in their teaching schedules for self-evaluation, they would continue to do it.

What the teachers were expressing was a need for contextual support. This is supported by various authors who have identified the necessity for positive environmental conditions that include contextual support for teacher growth and development (Cole 1997; Hargreaves & Fullan 1992; Kremer-Hayon 1993; Peterson & Comeaux 1990; Scriven 1994). If the workplace encourages reflection and self-evaluation activities, then teachers are more likely to pursue them. Finally, teachers still want supervisory evaluation to be a part of the evaluation process.

Teachers were not comfortable basing the analysis of their teaching effectiveness solely on their
own evaluation feedback. Teachers felt that they needed additional feedback from their supervisors. Several teachers also suggested peer evaluation as an additional element in the overall evaluation process. This need for additional feedback in the evaluation process is important, after all, self-evaluation doesn’t replace the evaluation process, it complements it (Airasian & Gullickson 1997; Kremer-Hayon 1993).

Many of the teacher participants expressed a need for formal training in self-evaluation in order for it to be effective. Only three out of the eight participants had received some previous training in self-evaluation (see Table 1). They highlighted a need for training in the technical aspects of video self-evaluation as well as training in the overall self-evaluation process including the identification of teaching behaviours and the analysis process. Kremer-Hayon (1993) supports the need for funding of self-evaluation initiatives by providing in-service training. Formal training in self-evaluation could provide teachers with alternative strategies in self-evaluation. The teacher participants expressed an interest in self-reporting strategies and peer evaluation.

Note: This teacher feedback is a summary of the major themes that arose as a result of this research. This feedback has not been presented in any particular order of significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Feedback Regarding the Effective Implementation of a Program of Self-Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Time Factor and Contextual Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teachers need time within their teaching schedules to carry out self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-evaluation should be encouraged in the workplace, however, it should be a voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Teachers need support from their working contexts to engage in self-evaluation: this includes the provisions for time, materials (checklists for example) and consultation.

**Strategies and Procedures**

- Preference for self-reporting strategies because they are easier to complete and less time-consuming.
- An overall preference for reflection-on-action of teaching practices (less time-consuming).
- Combine self-evaluation with another evaluation strategy, such as: peer evaluation; supervisory evaluation; evaluation by a friend or family member and; feedback from learners.
- Differing perceptions on how many teaching behaviours to focus on in the self-evaluation process (1-3).

**Training**

- Teachers need some form of training on how to effectively self-evaluate; guidelines and checklists would be helpful; administer workshops within the TCDSB for both part-time and full-time teachers that provide hands-on training.
- For video observation, teachers need to be psychologically prepared for the viewing process (get past weight concerns).
- Regarding an effective video observation and analysis process, include: 1. Training in the technical aspects of operating a video camera and 2. Observational and analytical procedures when viewing the videotape.

**Video Self-Evaluation Package**

- A structured format such as this package is ideal during self-evaluation; it serves as a guideline for teachers to follow.
- Differing opinions about the number of recordings and the time intervals between each recording, dependent on teacher needs.
- The tasks should be optional and flexible. *(For example: omit the transcription task unless you are evaluating teacher-student interaction)*

Figure 2: A Summary of Teacher Feedback

### 5.2 Discussion of the Findings

The findings from this case study are significant to the fields of research in second language education and teacher education. These findings suggest that for a program of self-evaluation to be successfully implemented within a program, contextual support is a necessary
condition. Contextual support is important for several reasons. First of all, teachers need time in their schedules to carry out self-evaluation. Therefore, support from the workplace is required to make the necessary provisions for an allotment of time for self-evaluation activities so that teachers can go beyond reflection to a more systematic process of evaluating themselves. However, for teaching supervisors to support this idea, they must believe in and encourage teacher self-evaluation as an essential component in the growth and development of teachers. In the TCDSB the wish to provide this support is evident, as the senior personnel continue to encourage self-evaluation practices of their instructors, especially with the recent purchase of a videocamera to ensure the opportunity for instructors. But provisions for additional time in teachers' instructional schedules has not occurred, which means that teachers must engage in self-evaluation during their own time. Unless specific provision is made to increase time for evaluation as part of salaried activities, teacher utilization of video-based self-evaluation appears highly unlikely.

Another necessary condition for the implementation of a program of self-evaluation is to ensure that ESL teachers are provided with the necessary in-service training in their working contexts. Furthermore, pre-service education programs should include a more comprehensive program of teacher development initiatives that include self-evaluation activities. This training should ensure that teachers are informed of the distinction between engaging in reflection of their teaching practices and the systematic process of self-evaluation. This distinction, however, needs to be clarified in the current literature on second language teacher education and literature on general teacher education.
Finally, when implementing a program of self-evaluation, teachers need to be provided with a package that is flexible in its application and presents options for the teachers to consider when undergoing self-evaluation. These options should include alternative strategies that teachers can employ, such as self-reporting strategies and peer observation.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

Limitations in case study research are generally inevitable. In this case study, some limitations were taken into consideration. These will be discussed briefly.

The case study was limited to only eight teachers within the Toronto Catholic School Board. This may not be recognized as generalizable to the rest of the ESL teaching population. Furthermore, each of the teachers who participated in this research either volunteered to do so or had a relationship to the researcher as a former or recent colleague.

Another limitation arose as instructors were providing feedback on a program of self-evaluation that was developed by the consultants within the TCDSB. These consultants are responsible for the supervisory evaluation of instructors. Therefore, the participating instructors in this research may have felt somewhat hesitant to reply more openly about their feelings and perceptions, for fear of discovery despite assurances from myself, the researcher, that their identity would not be revealed.

There was variability in timing between the two tapings and subsequent replies on questionnaires and interviews. This timing may have prevented the participant from accurately recalling their experience and true feelings at the time of their experience with self-evaluation.

Finally, due to the naturalistic and interpretative nature of qualitative research, the data
analysis process was based on researcher interpretation of the findings. It may be argued that this interpretation may be susceptible to subjectivity and/or bias on the part of the researcher.

5.4 Reflection

This data shows the importance of giving teachers a voice to describe their experiences and to express their needs and concerns with regard to their own professional development. Their feedback can provide program developers, teacher educators and administrators with the necessary information they need to encourage and facilitate the process of self-evaluation within a program and to ensure its success. It provides the opportunity for improvement of already existing programs of self-evaluation through the suggestions provided by the participants of this research and information that is instrumental for the development of new programs. After all, in order to ensure quality within educational contexts, teachers need to be equipped with the necessary skills, contextual support and motivation for self-development to ensure a continual process of reflection and evaluation of their teaching practices.

Within the educational contexts, the necessary provisions need to be in place to ensure the opportunity for teacher development. These provisions ideally, would include training in self-evaluation, the allotment of time to carry out this process, and on-going support to address teachers’ needs and concerns.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

Further research on teacher self-evaluation could form inquiries into the pre-service programs in ESL teacher education, to obtain an understanding of the content and extent of
teacher development within these programs. Ideally, professional self-development should begin at the initial stage of a teacher's training to foster a positive attitude and whereby teachers can obtain the necessary tools and skills to engage in self-evaluation of their teaching practices at both the pre-service and in-service stage of their teaching career.

Furthermore, additional research into the teaching contexts that are conducive to self-evaluation initiatives as a part of teacher professional development, warrants an investigation of the conditions that foster successful self-evaluation practices of the teachers.
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Appendix A: Preliminary Questionnaire

Self-Evaluation/Video Observation Questionnaire

Participant _____

Please answer the following questions by placing a checkmark ✓ beside your response or filling in the blanks accordingly.

INSTRUCTOR BACKGROUND
CLASS TYPE/LEVEL: ____________________________

1. How long have you been teaching English as a Second Language to adults? ____________

2. How long have you been teaching the same level? ____________ Other levels? ____________

3. Did you attend the Professional Development Day Workshop on Self-Evaluation in February 1998? YES NO

4. What areas of teaching would you like to explore further? Please place a checkmark ✓ beside all of those which apply to you.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT
- Classroom Setup
- Voice Projection and Control
- Body Language
- Teacher’s Position and Movement in Class
- Use and Distribution of Materials and Aids
- Lesson Transitions
- Pacing and Timing
- Student Participation
- Student-Teacher Rapport

CLASSROOM INTERACTION:
- Teacher Talk
- Student Talk
- Student Interaction with Teacher/Student-Student Interaction
- Student Individual Work
- Pair Work
- Group Work
- Teacher Questions/Student Responses
- Giving Instructions

PROCEDURES:
- Feedback and Correction
- Other: ____________________________

REFLECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION

5. A. How often do you reflect on your teaching practices? ✓ Always ✓ Frequently ✓ Sometimes ✓ Never

B. How do you reflect? ✓ Journal ✓ Written notes ✓ Mental notes ✓ Other: ____________________________

6. In the context of teaching, what does reflection mean to you?

______________________________________________________________________________

7. Was self-evaluation part of your teacher training? ✓ YES ✓ NO

8. Have you ever engaged in self-evaluation as part of your teaching practices (not including teacher training)? ✓ YES ✓ NO

9. What do you understand self-evaluation to mean?

______________________________________________________________________________
10. How do you feel about self-evaluation?

☐ Enthusiastic  ☐ Not Sure  ☐ Nervous  ☐ Not Interested  ☐ Other: _______________________

If you have any concerns, please describe the general type of concern.

__________________________________________________________________________________________

11. What are your perceptions about the strengths and weaknesses of self-evaluation?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

12. In your opinion, how might reflection and self-evaluation assist you towards more effective teaching?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

VIDEO OBSERVATION

13. Have you ever videotaped yourself teaching in the classroom?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO

If yes, what was the purpose?  (Explain briefly)

__________________________________________________________________________________________

If no, would you like to?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO

14. How do you feel about videotaping yourself while you are teaching?

☐ Enthusiastic  ☐ Not Sure  ☐ Nervous  ☐ Not Interested  ☐ Other: _______________________

If you have any concerns, please describe the general type of concern.

__________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Do you have any questions or concerns about participating in this research project? If yes, please state your general question or concern here.

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.  
Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.
Appendix B: Post-Questionnaire

Self-Evaluation/Video Observation Questionnaire II

Participant ____

Please answer the following questions by placing a checkmark ✓ beside your response or filling in the blanks accordingly.

INSTRUCTOR BACKGROUND

CLASS TYPE/LEVEL: ___________________________ Number of students: _________

1. How long have you been teaching the same class type/level? ________________

2. Are you presently teaching: part-time full-time

3. How many hours per week are you teaching this class type/level? ____________

4. Are you currently teaching adult ESL in any other program? YES NO
   If yes, please list the programs: __________________________________________
   How many hours per week? ________________

5. Do you currently hold any other jobs aside from teaching adult ESL? YES NO
   If yes, please list the jobs: _______________________________________________
   How many hours per week? ________________

6. a. Are you involved in any other activities on a regular basis aside from teaching?
   - courses
   - training
   - volunteer work
   - other __________________________

   b. If yes, how many hours per week? ________________

7. Do you consider your current teaching position in adult ESL to be your
   - primary occupation
   - secondary occupation

8. Do you drive to your teaching location(s)? YES NO
   If no, are you driven to your teaching location on a regular basis? YES NO

9. What areas of teaching would you like to explore further? Please place a checkmark ✓ beside all of those which apply to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>CLASSROOM INTERACTION:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Classroom Setup</td>
<td>□ Teacher Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Voice Projection and Control</td>
<td>□ Student Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Body Language</td>
<td>□ Student Interaction with Teacher/Student-Student Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Teacher’s Position and Movement in Class</td>
<td>□ Student Individual Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Use and Distribution of Materials and Aids</td>
<td>□ Pair Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Lesson Transitions</td>
<td>□ Group Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Pacing and Timing</td>
<td>□ Teacher Questions/Student Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Student Participation</td>
<td>□ Giving Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Student-Teacher Rapport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROCEDURES:
\- Feedback and Correction
\- Other: ________________________

REFLECTION AND SELF-EVALUATION

10. A. How often do you reflect on your teaching practices?  
   \- Always \- Frequently \- Sometimes \- Never

   B. How do you reflect?  
   \- Journal \- Written notes \- Mental notes \- Other: ________________

11. What do you understand self-evaluation to mean?  

12. How do you feel about self-evaluation?  
   \- Enthusiastic \- Not Sure \- Nervous \- Not Interested \- Other: ________________

If you have any concerns, please describe the general type of concern.  

13. In your opinion, how might reflection and self-evaluation assist you towards more effective teaching?  

THE SELF-EVALUATION/VIDEO OBSERVATION PROCESS

Part A: Self-Evaluation Process

14. What are your perceptions about the strengths and weaknesses of self-evaluation?  
   (Check all of those which apply to you)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved organization in teaching</td>
<td>requires organization and preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved teaching practices</td>
<td>requires dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners improved</td>
<td>requires training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independence (personal evaluation)</td>
<td>other ________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: ___________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What area of teaching did you select for improvement in this self-evaluation process?  

16. Did you notice any changes in your selected area of teaching upon having engaged in this self-evaluation process?  
   \- Many \- A few \- None

   Please describe briefly.  

17. Did you notice any changes in your general teaching practices upon having engaged in this self-evaluation process?  
   \- Many \- A few \- None
18. Did you notice any changes in your learners' outcomes upon having engaged in this self-evaluation process? (Example: improvements in their learning)
   - [ ] Many
   - [ ] A few
   - [ ] None

19. Overall, how would you evaluate your experience with self-evaluation?
   - [ ] Very useful
   - [ ] Useful
   - [ ] Somewhat useful

**Part B Video Observation**

20. How did you feel while you were videotaping yourself in your classroom?
   - [ ] Excited
   - [ ] Relaxed
   - [ ] Nervous
   - [ ] No reaction

21. How did your learners appear while you were videotaping the classroom?
   - [ ] Excited
   - [ ] Relaxed
   - [ ] Nervous
   - [ ] No reaction

22. Did you experience any difficulty during the videotaping process?  
    - [ ] YES  
    - [ ] NO
    If yes, please explain briefly.

23. What was your initial feeling upon having viewed the first videotape?

24. How did you feel upon having viewed the second videotape?

25. Do you own a video camera?  
    - [ ] YES  
    - [ ] NO
    If yes, would you consider using it in your classroom for future self-evaluation?  
    - [ ] YES  
    - [ ] NO

26. How would you evaluate your experience with the process of video observation for the purpose of self-evaluation?
   - [ ] Very effective
   - [ ] Effective
   - [ ] Somewhat effective
   - [ ] Not effective

27. Would you engage in Video Self-Evaluation again in the future?  
    - [ ] YES  
    - [ ] NO
    If you answered no, what factors would prevent you from doing so? (Please check all those which apply)
    - [ ] too busy
    - [ ] technical reasons
    - [ ] not interested
    - [ ] didn't find it useful
    - [ ] lack of training in carrying this process out
    - [ ] not mandatory in the teaching profession
    - [ ] other

28. Would you consider engaging in self-evaluation via another method?  
    - [ ] YES  
    - [ ] NO
    (For example, checklists to replace video observation)

**SELF-EVALUATION/VIDEO OBSERVATION PACKAGE**

29. How would you evaluate the self-evaluation/video observation package you used throughout this process?
   - [ ] Very Useful
   - [ ] Useful
   - [ ] Somewhat Useful
   - [ ] Not Useful
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30. What part of the self-evaluation/video observation process suggested in the package, did you complete? 
(Please check all off those which apply)

1st viewing
☐ taking notes

2nd viewing
☐ transcription

3rd viewing (a systematic analysis) including:
☐ Task 1 (chart) - effective teacher behaviour
☐ Task 2 (chart) - ineffective teacher behaviour
☐ Task 3 follow-up videotaping and evaluation

31. If you did not complete a certain part of the self-evaluation observation process, what was the reason?
☐ the process was too time consuming
☐ the process was confusing
☐ not enough detail/explanation on the process was provided
☐ not interested in the process
☐ other: ______________________

32. Do you have any suggestions for the authors of this package to improve the effectiveness of its content for future self-evaluation/video observation purposes?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.
Appendix C: Video Self-Evaluation Package

Video Self-Evaluation
VIDEO SELF-EVALUATION: SEE YOURSELF AS OTHERS SEE YOU

"That can’t be me!"

Self-evaluation through video/audio recording offers, by far, the most objective illustration of your teaching skills. Supervisors, colleagues or students can provide you with feedback or comments related to your teaching, but nothing is more dramatic than the effect of your supervisory self watching or listening to your teaching self. Audio or video recording of lessons is believed to be the most reliable and accurate account of what is actually happening in the classroom.

1. TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF VIDEOTAPING

1. Explain to your students the purpose of the video-taping exercise. Obtain their permission to be videotaped the day before (ask them to sign the consent forms if that is a requirement in your program).
2. Position the camera at the side of the class, away from windows, rather than at the back to allow for view of both learners and the teacher. Do not point camera at windows.
3. Start with a few trial runs to find the most convenient camera position for best picture, sound, and view of most of the class.
4. For stability and safety, place the camera on a tripod. To ensure a smooth start, you can press the record button several minutes prior to the beginning of your lesson.
5. Remember that it will take your students and yourself several minutes to "forget about the camera" and act naturally.
6. A stationary camera, in most instances, is going to show only part of the classroom, and therefore most teachers find that they need a camera operator to get a view of the whole class. It is important that the camera operator not be a stranger in the class. The most effective way of dealing with this aspect is to have students take turns being the camera operator. To do that, the camera can first be used in the classroom as a prop to teach giving instructions on operating the equipment. This can be a highly interactive and communicative class with a real-world task of instructing a classmate on using the video camera. After a class like this, all the students in class will be able to video-tape the class or instruct a classmate to do so.
7. Video-tape logical segments of your class.

(Developed by Galli, Cabaj and Nikolic, 1998)

2. VIEWING PROCEDURES

There are many possible procedures that could be followed when undertaking evaluation through video recording. The method suggested here is based on analysing, in detail, one teaching area only. The procedure itself could best be compared to the procedure of conducting a listening activity in the classroom, during which the listener is given a different task for each listening, and the complexity of tasks increases with each new round of listening.

2.1. FIRST VIEWING

The first viewing can only be dedicated to determining how different the lesson is from what you had perceived while you were teaching. It may shed light on the elements of your teaching that you were not really cognizant of: students’ and your body language, reactions, teaching procedures, etc.

1. View the recording(s) with a single objective in mind - to get a general idea of what has been taped.
2. Select a segment that will be analysed and try to respond to the question: "How does my perception of what happened in the classroom differ from what I can see on the tape?" If you wish, you may take notes. The quotes that follow have been written during the first viewing by some instructors in our program (names have been changed):

Anne: "I watched my tape till two o’clock one night - it was so interesting I simply could not stop watching it. Among other things I noticed that I was interacting much more with students on one side of the classroom (I had not realized that before), so I decided it needed to be corrected."

Tina: "The language that I use when I teach seems to be a bit too informal."

Bob: "I shouldn’t drink coffee while I teach. It looks so unprofessional."

2.2. SECOND VIEWING

1. Make a decision related to which aspect of teaching you want to focus on (each recorded segment usually lends itself to the analysis of at least one particular aspect). The video observation checklist that follows can assist you in doing so. Place a checkmark ✓ next to the area that you would like to work on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOM SETUP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOICE PROJECTION AND CONTROL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BODY LANGUAGE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER'S POSITION AND MOVEMENT IN CLASS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE AND DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS AND AIDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESSON TRANSITIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACING AND TIMING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT PARTICIPATION:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT-TEACHER RAPPORT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(CLASSROOM INTERACTION: Teacher talk
Student talk
Student interaction with teacher / Student-student interaction
Student individual work
Pair work
Group work
Teacher questions/student responses
Giving instructions

PROCEDURES:
FEEDBACK AND CORRECTION:

(Developed by Galli, Cabaj and Nikolic, 1998)

2. Determine whether you still need to analyse the whole segment you have selected or you can focus on a shorter sub-segment within the one that you have just watched.
3. Write a transcript of at least one short segment of interaction you are analysing. It may look like the one below:

S1: Her father, a widower, has quite a few debts. *(Struggling with pronunciation while reading)*
T: O K. Debts. Now here you have a silent b... Does anyone know who a widower is?
S2: No wife...
S3: Whose wife...
T: Whose wife died.
S4: Is it same for husband or wife?
Ss: *(students' voices heard - trying to explain to each other what the difference is)*
T: Then she is a widow. So, a man is a widower and a woman is a widow.
Ss: *(nodding) Uhh.
T: *(Reading again)* He has quite a few debts. When we say "quite a few", what do we mean?
S2: Lot of...
S1: Lots...
T: Probably lots...

4. Analyse the transcript in terms of how appropriate you assess your actions, keeping in mind your group of learners and their needs. Then determine what your overall impression of your skills pertaining to the particular aspect of teaching that you are working on is.

Typescripts of classroom interaction seem to reveal considerably more than viewing, especially if you are analysing any interaction-related aspect of teaching, such as teacher-talk time, teacher questions, learner responses, wait time, instructions, etc.

A. If you were an observer or a supervisor, how effective would you rate your skill at that aspect on a scale 1-5 (5 being very effective)?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

B. From the point of view of a student participating in that particular class, would the rating be the same? If you were one of the students, how meaningful would you rate your lesson (5 being very meaningful)?

\[
\begin{array}{c}
5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

2.3. THIRD VIEWING

Conduct a systematic analysis of your actions by following tasks 1-3 below, with the objective to identify what teacher behaviours trigger positive or negative learner behaviours. Base your analysis on several key questions:

- What could have been done differently?
- What impact would a different decision or action (a counter-action) have had on your lesson or on class communication?
- What conclusions may be drawn from this hypothesis?
- What is the action plan, based on your conclusions?

In addition, think in terms of the appropriateness of your actions, the impact they had on classroom work or learners and the implication of possible counter-actions.

**TASK 1**: The ultimate goal of video evaluation is to increase effective teacher behaviours and decrease the ineffective ones. Analyse an effective teacher behaviour in your sample recording the way it has been done in the example following:
The length of segment analysed: 
4 minutes
The teaching aspect analysed: 
Giving instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>How many times?</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I issued clear and concise instructions for the task.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were on task right away without asking any additional questions.</td>
<td>What are the characteristics of clear and concise instructions? - I waited for everyone's attention - I supported my instructions with visual clues - I checked whether students understood what was expected of them by asking them to repeat it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK 2:** Determine what teaching behaviour you would like to alter and create an action plan for implementing these changes. Analyse an ineffective teacher behaviour in your sample recording the way it has been done in the example below. What is it that you need to do in order to turn a negative behaviour into a positive one?

The length of segment analysed: 
15 minutes
The teaching aspect analysed: 
Classroom interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>How many times?</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Result: What impact did the action have on your lesson?</th>
<th>Hypothesis: What impact would a different decision or action (a counter-action) have had on your lesson?</th>
<th>Action plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I interrupted (&quot;cut off&quot;) my students as they were speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I was eager to assist them with the language items that they lacked. I wanted them to know that their teacher is always there to help them.</td>
<td>Because of my action, these students could not express themselves fully.</td>
<td>Their responses would have been longer and more elaborate. There would have been a better balance of teacher and student talk time. Students would have felt that I was genuinely interested in their responses.</td>
<td>I'll try to concentrate more on it while interacting with students, and try to give them a reasonable amount of time to respond. I'll videotape myself again and focus on this aspect as I view it, to check whether there is any improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK 3:** As a follow-up, video tape yourself after one or two weeks and evaluate the same aspect of teaching. Determine to what extent you have improved the teacher behaviour you have worked on. Draw conclusions related to:

- a) how the two evaluations compare
- b) changes that have been implemented

If you were an observer or a supervisor, how effective would you rate your skill at that aspect this time?

**Very effective** 5 4 3 2 1
Please use this form to record any comments, questions or concerns you may have throughout this project.
Appendix D: Interview References

Examples of interview transcriptions. These references have been included in Chapter 4.

L = Researcher

ABCDEFGH = Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Tapescript of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March 23, 1999 | Participant B | L: How has self-evaluation impacted your teaching?  
B: With regard to writing on the board, my instruction has changed. Before, when writing on the board, I used to write on it and face while explaining and covering half of the words. Therefore, in the classroom my voice is not being projected to them, it’s being lost. But I learned to write on the board first, then explain it. |
| March 23, 1999 | Participant C | L: How has self-evaluation impacted your teaching?  
C: With my lesson planning, it helped me organize my tasks better. It also helped make me more aware of the objectives of my lesson so that now I ask myself more often, “okay, what do I want the students to achieve by the end of this lesson and how am I going to do that? How am I going to get there? What task is relevant, what task is not? By being more organized, I am being more aware of my students’ needs.  
L: Upon engaging in video self-evaluation, have you noted any significant changes in yourself (either within or outside of the classroom context)?  
C: The professional is very much tied with the personal. So just being assured that the work that I was doing overall is okay. So it helped motivate me more and in the personal life, motivation and confidence. |
| April 11, 1999 |             | L: Upon engaging in self-evaluation, have you noted any significant changes in yourself (either within or outside of the classroom context)? |
F: The only thing I noticed is that I did appreciate some of the things I did too. I looked at some things and I said, ‘yeah, that’s good that I do that’... I am communicative, I mean understandable and can relate with my students, and that’s something I appreciated about myself. I think that people might be more inclined to look at the bad things.

April 11, 1999

L: Did you have any concerns with the program of self-evaluation?

F: Video self-evaluation requires training. I think what I really mean is that it requires understanding what a videocamera does to a person, understanding how when you film something for a period of time, that it’s a static pose and doesn’t allow the dynamics of the room. The camera is static and focuses on one point of view of the classroom the whole time and that does not provide the existing dynamic that’s in the class. Because the teacher circulates, they go behind the students, they go around the class, they interact, they mingle, the students do the same things and the camera is not going to pick up the nuances of all that, and you have to learn how to watch a video like that.