

Applying Adaptive Comparative Judgement to videos as an indicator of 'At Risk' teaching performance

Ruth Elizabeth Geer

University of South Australia

The quality of students entering initial teacher education programs is being criticised in the media and political arenas with the Teacher Education Ministerial Advisory Group identifying rigorous selection as a key priority. In general, students are chosen on academic achievement which may not necessarily be an accurate measure of who will become successful teachers. Teacher education institutions are seeking effective and sustainable strategies for selecting students who may become exceptional teachers, while also giving reliable judgements on who may require additional support. The first actual opportunity for screening occurs in vivo when preservice teachers undertake their professional experience placements which may be considered as too late.

With effective communication seen as an essential skill for good teaching, the production of a short video was seen as a tool to identify preservice teachers who struggle to clearly express themselves and thus may be 'At Risk' on their placement. The use of an adaptive comparative judgement ranking system was explored as a possible approach to rank preservice teachers providing an indicator of future teaching performance. Adaptive Comparative Judgement, which was derived from Thurstone's (1927) discovery that people are unreliable when making absolute judgements but are more dependable for relative judgements, requires educators to compare the work of two students deciding which is better. From many such comparisons a ranking scale is created showing the relative quality of students' performance.

The study describes a number of processes that were used in the research design to explore how a brief video by first year Master of Teaching (Secondary) preservice teachers might be used to identify those who may require additional support to be successful or who may be unsuited to the teaching profession. Preservice teachers were asked to prepare a one and a half minute video of a talk that they would present to 14 year olds on "things you can do to help you with your learning". Using the Adaptive Comparative Judgement web-based program, a group of six teacher educators compared 83 videos. Many comparisons of the videos to determine their preference for one of two videos in a pair, based on the criteria of who was best at communicating their ideas in a clear, concise and well sequenced manner using appropriate language. A high reliability in excess of 0.93 was achieved with each video being judged between eleven and thirteen times. Since this was the first time the software had been used, the videos were judged by the same educators a second time based on the criteria of whose talk was more likely to engage and interest the learner. The findings are being analysed to determine whether there is any correlation between the two rankings and to ascertain the importance of identifying appropriate criteria.

This presentation will discuss whether the findings of this investigative study have been effective in identifying 'At Risk' preservice teachers. The video rankings will further be analysed against their performance in their three professional experience placements. Finally, conclusions will be drawn on the predictive use of videos for this particular cohort of preservice teachers in identifying potential teaching performance. Further research on other cohorts is currently underway to further ascertain reliability of videos as an indicator of 'At Risk' teaching performance.

References

Thurstone, L. L. (1927). A law of comparative judgment. *Psychological Review*, 34, 273–286

Geer, R.E. (2015). Applying Adaptive Comparative Judgement to videos as an indicator of 'At Risk' teaching performance. In T. Reiners, B.R. von Kinsky, D. Gibson, V. Chang, L. Irving, & K. Clarke (Eds.), *Globally connected, digitally enabled*. Proceedings ascilite 2015 in Perth (pp. 726-727). <https://doi.org/10.14742/apubs.2015.1032>

Note: All published papers are refereed, having undergone a double-blind peer-review process.



The author(s) assign a Creative Commons by attribution licence enabling others to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon their work, even commercially, as long as credit is given to the author(s) for the original creation.