

**Teacher Evaluation and Effectiveness in Hong Kong:  
Issues and Challenges**

**LEE John Chi Kin  
LAM Wing Po  
LI Yuk Yung**

**The Chinese University of Hong Kong**

## Abstract

This article first provides an overview of teacher effectiveness and evaluation in Hong Kong. Several studies related to classroom environment and teacher behavior in selected subjects are referenced, as are recent studies of teachers' instructional leadership. Finally, the preliminary use of the Revised Classroom Observation Instrument (RCOI) from the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study in three secondary schools is reported. The results from using the RCOI in Hong Kong indicate that some items may be irrelevant in the Hong Kong context (e.g., physical characteristics), while more items may be needed to reflect good teaching in Hong Kong (e.g., questioning skills). In addition, the potential use of teacher profiles to drive staff development and school improvement is explored.

Correspondence: Professor John Chi-kin Lee c/o Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, New Territories, Hong Kong. Email: [jcklee@cuhk.edu.hk](mailto:jcklee@cuhk.edu.hk)

### Acknowledgement

This paper utilizes data derived from the Accelerated Schools for Quality Education Project supported by the Quality Education Fund. The authors would like to thank the Quality Education Fund for supporting the project and Professor Charles Teddlie for his expert guidance on the use of RCOI in a pilot study in Hong Kong. In addition, the authors would like to thank Professors Charles Teddlie and Chad Ellett for their advice on improving the quality of this article.

# Teacher Evaluation and Effectiveness in Hong Kong<sup>1</sup>: Issues and Challenges

LEE John Chi Kin, LAM Wing Po and LI Yuk Yung  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

## INTRODUCTION

More than two decades ago, the fields of school effectiveness research (SER) and teacher effectiveness research (TER) developed separately with little overlap and integration. Recently, there has been an advocacy for merging and linking the two fields (Creemers and Reezigt, 1996; Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000), as indicated in the following quote:

...the USA was the only country to have extensively utilized classroom observations to generate teacher effects data within the context of SER...in the future, there should be an increased emphasis on the utilization of classroom observation data in the development of school improvement plans. (Teddlie and Reynolds (2000, p.317)

Compared with the USA (which has a long history of teacher appraisal), teacher evaluation was hardly an agenda item in educational policy and practice in Hong Kong in the 1980s. The Advisory Inspectorate Division of the Education Department (now called the Quality Assurance Division of the Education and Manpower Bureau) was mainly responsible for both the supervision and appraisal of school teachers as well as the monitoring of teaching quality. Even in the early 1990s, teacher appraisal was not commonly practiced in local schools (Mo, Connors & McCormick, 1998). With publication of the *Education Commission Report No. 5* (Education Commission, 1992), the importance of the quality of teachers was recognized. Moreover, the introduction of the School Management Initiative (SMI) in 1991 (Education and Manpower Branch and Education Department, 1991) recognized the need for teacher appraisal as part of a comprehensive school reform policy (Walker & Dimmock, 2000). Though a handbook on *Staff Appraisal in Schools* (Advisory Committee on the School Management Initiative, 1992) was issued, it was primarily based on a traditional approach to supervision, and some teachers were skeptical of the function of the appraisal system (Walker & Dimmock, 2000, p.160). Because of the limited number of schools joining the SMI, the impact of introducing teacher appraisal across the school system has been limited.

Hong Kong schools tend to display some commonality through their shared East Asian culture of schooling. This culture highlights students' hard work, effort and perseverance, and prizes academic excellence. The role of a teacher emphasizes the teacher's authority as well as the students' obedience to—and respect for—their teacher.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Editor's note.** This special issue of the *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* compares the relationships among different educational practices and research traditions (e.g., teacher evaluation, SER) in different countries. Hong Kong became a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China in 1997 after a 150 year plus history as a colony of the United Kingdom. As this article indicates, the pedagogy practiced in Hong Kong is an offspring of Chinese pedagogy (Marton, 2000).

Most classrooms in the 1980s and early 1990s tended to be overcrowded. Classroom activities focused on the maintenance of classroom order and the efficiency with which knowledge was transmitted, and little time was devoted to group and individual activities (Lee, 2000). In the late 1990s, quality education in schools emerged as a policy item, and there were concerns about student performance decline (Cheng and Tsui, 1996). Since the sovereignty change in 1997, the development of measures related to teacher evaluation and the professional development of teachers has been emphasized. The Education Commission (1997) issued the report entitled *Quality School Education*, which advocated “a fair and open performance appraisal system for principals and teachers” (p.39).

Aided schools in Hong Kong are not used to having a formal and rigorous staff appraisal system. In the past, a subject-trained teacher was assumed to possess the necessary teaching abilities. However, the society has been shifting from providing compulsory education to focusing more on educational quality. Recently, the Curriculum Development Council (2001) issued a document, *Learning to Learn*, which points the way forward in curriculum development. The new curriculum reform, on the one hand, emphasizes the cultivation of generic student skills and the use of diverse teaching strategies. On the other hand, it calls for changes in the role of teachers within the school. Teachers have to cope with these changes through continual professional development inasmuch as they no longer can depend on their previous academic qualifications alone (Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB), 2003a).

It was not until the introduction of the School Based Management approach in Hong Kong that School Management Committees (SMCs) were asked to set up such staff appraisal systems. In the consultation document on School Based Management, the committee wrote:

Subject to approval by the SMC, where appropriate, the school will decide its own personnel policies, including the establishment, mix of staff, recruitment, deployment, professional development, rewards and compensation, performance management, and dismissal. (Advisory Committee on School-based Management, 2000, p.6)

Recently, schools were

...reminded that they should put in place a fair and open Staff Appraisal System before the end of the 2001-2002 school year with a view to enhancing the professional development of staff. The management expectations and assessment criteria should be made known to teachers beforehand. (Education Department, 2000a)

To implement the recommendations of the Education Commission, the School-based Management Section of the Education Department in May 2000 (now under the School Development Division of the Education and Manpower Bureau) began organizing a series of sharing sessions entitled “How to Establish a Teacher Appraisal System” with school principals and teachers. In these sharing sessions, speakers quite often discussed ways in which teachers and principals can lessen the anxieties and the possible negative side effects brought about by teacher observation, which is regarded as one of the

essential components of the teacher appraisal system. These speakers first introduce the appraisal system by helping teachers feel at ease with it. They do this through collegial lesson planning and peer observation. In such “warm up” sessions, peers learn to appreciate each other’s strengths and recognize their own weaknesses before being appraised by the principal or department head (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003a).

There have been only a few SER studies in Hong Kong (e.g., Cheng, 1996; Lo *et al.*, 1997; Lee, *et al.* 2001) but even fewer studies have attempted to establish the link between teacher evaluation and SER. This is to some extent congruent with the trend of most countries reported in this Special Issue that there has been a lack of integration of the school and teacher effectiveness literatures (Teddle, Stringfield, & Burdett, this issue). As school improvement has become more prevalent (e.g., Lee, 2001), there has been an increasing need for both school reform researchers and practitioners to put the teacher and school effectiveness knowledge bases to use enhancing school development.

In the People’s Republic of China, education professionals also regard teacher evaluation as crucial in raising teacher and overall school quality. However, in practice, teacher evaluation has not been very effective in achieving what is expected. Traditionally, teacher evaluation has focused on the following four domains. Together, they make up a total score of 100, as illustrated by a case school selected by Ying & Fan (2001):

- Morality (political inclination), scores 10;
- Diligence (attendance), scores 5;
- Abilities (workload, preparation, teaching performance, assignments, research), scores 45; and
- Student performance (academic subjects, non-academic subjects/activities), scores 40.

Ying and Fan contend that these domains do not match current trends in educational development. Moreover, the evaluation system is not systematic and scientific, as reflected by a lack of reference points and inappropriate quantification. In practice, the teacher evaluation outcomes involve simply meeting procedural requirements without enhancing the professional development of teachers and improving the quality of education.

Ying and Fan further contend that, in order to break from the limitations of this traditional system, the new system should (a) adhere to three basic principles and (b) strike an appropriate balance in the three pairs of relationships. The three basic principles are:

- holistic evaluation to cover all tasks and all clients,
- dynamic evaluation to reflect the change or relative improvement in the teacher’s performance, and
- integrating views from different persons (especially teacher subject groups).

This article will be divided into three parts. Part One provides an overview of teacher effectiveness and evaluation in Hong Kong. Part Two will cover the literature related to classroom environment and teacher behavior in selected subjects. The discussion will include recent studies of teachers’ instructional leadership in Hong Kong, as well as the

use of RCOI from the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study (Teddlie and Stringfield, 1993) in three secondary schools. In addition, selected practices that are related to teacher evaluation will be discussed. Part Three discusses issues related to the improvement of future teacher evaluation research and practice in the local setting.

## PART ONE: AN OVERVIEW OF TEACHER EVALUATION IN HONG KONG

This part provides an overview of teacher evaluation in Hong Kong. The policy context and related issues on implementation of teacher evaluation at the school level are first discussed. Examples of teacher appraisal and language proficiency assessment for teachers at the system level are then highlighted.

### *Policy context and current thrusts of teacher evaluation and effectiveness in Hong Kong*

For appraising the teaching labor force, Tam (1992) identified six areas of teacher evaluation: evaluation of pre-service teachers, state-controlled and peer-controlled licensure, in-service new staff selection, professional development, and staff appraisal. With regard to pre-service teacher evaluation, Lee and Wong (1996, 1997) found that the majority of student teachers still held traditional quantitative conceptions of teaching and learning. Additionally, more than half of the pre-service teachers in the study primarily engaged in technical reflection that focused on subject matter/content knowledge, pedagogical methods, and curriculum as content (instead of learner characteristics, teaching contexts, and educational goals).

There have been attempts to use portfolios in initial teacher education in order to enhance teacher's self-evaluation and reflective practice (Klenowski, 1998). Stimpson *et al.* (2000) conducted the QUEST (Quality Enhancement of Supervising Teaching) project, partly to establish a framework for supervisory skills development. These researchers also hoped to identify what student teachers perceive as supportive supervision and to describe the problems they have encountered in existing teaching practices.

With regard to licensure, only registered or permitted teachers are allowed to teach in a Hong Kong school. Registered teachers must possess an approved teaching qualification and/or approved teaching experience, as spelled out in the Education Ordinance. Permitted teachers generally should possess one or more Hong Kong Certificates of Education in an aggregate of five separate subjects, including Chinese Language or English Language [at Grade E or a higher grade \(Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003b\)](#).

### *Implementation of teacher evaluation at the school level*

There are three school-level teacher evaluation mechanisms: recruitment and selection of new staff (whose purpose is diagnostic-selective), professional development (whose purpose is diagnostic-formative), and in-service staff appraisal (with the goal of assessing performance output). Iwanicki (1990) stressed that teacher evaluation should be linked closely with staff development and school improvement and that all three components should work together for enhancing school effectiveness. To achieve this, teacher evaluation should include objectives of accountability, professional growth, school improvement, and selection. This echoes partly the theoretical links among TER, SER,

teacher evaluation, staff development, and teacher/school development (Teddlie, Stringfield, & Burdett, this issue).

In contrast, a study by Walker and Cheng (1996) found that Hong Kong primary school administrators tended to emphasize the need for hardware and technical support, and to downplay the importance of professional development, in school improvement. Lo (2001) concurred, indicating that teacher development was not the central concern in reform efforts in Hong Kong. He also contended that teachers in general lacked the much needed professional time and opportunities for reflecting on their work and effecting change initiatives.

In a recent study focusing on Hong Kong educators' opinions toward classroom observation, roughly 66% of respondents reported that "principal observes teachers" was the most common pattern practiced in their school. In contrast, roughly 29% of respondents reported that "teachers observe one another" (Lam, 2001). The study also demonstrated that those educators who perceive that *staff appraisal* is more important tended to be more reluctant to welcome observers into their classroom than were educators who perceived that *staff development* is more important. Three major difficulties were identified: (a) pressure felt by teachers; (b) lack of time; and (c) lack of understanding and experience in classroom observation.

In another study, Ngan and Lee (2000) found that primary school teachers' receptivity to peer teaching observation was associated with two sets of variables. On the one hand, teachers' receptivity was positively associated with (a) school support, (b) perceived non-monetary cost and benefits, (c) practicality, and (d) other support. On the other hand, teachers' receptivity was also positively associated with school cultural elements such as (a) collegiality, (b) professional values, (c) mutual empowerment, and (d) transformational leadership.

#### *Teacher effectiveness evaluated in staff appraisal system*

With regard to teacher evaluation, a differentiation is usually made between professional duties / responsibilities and actual teaching practices (in the classroom). The Education and Manpower Bureau website (2003c) presents appraisal forms used at seven different schools. This section describes similarities and differences among the forms used at these schools.

Since schools design their own appraisal system, there is a variation in the forms' focus and purpose. School appraisal forms tend to include a comprehensive review of the teacher's performance in such areas as administration, guidance, discipline, and extracurricular activities, thus emphasizing behaviors other than teaching performance. The proportion of the appraisal system dedicated to actual teaching practice is therefore limited. For instance, the teaching performance at one school (School A) is assessed through the information presented in Table 1.

The appraisal form developed by another school (School B) has more items, and teachers are appraised on a scale of 1 to 8. A third school (School C) uses a 6-point scale, and

includes generic skills such as the power of oral and written expression and technology skills. The number of items on the first three teacher performance scales varies. What the scales have in common is that the evaluation of teaching performance is restricted to broadly stated items, with few details regarding assessment standards. Moreover, the scales on the Education and Manpower Bureau web site are exclusively quantitative measures. Additionally, every scale includes appraisal items about the handling of assignments, which may not be directly related to teacher classroom behavior. (See Tables 2 and 3.)

The final four schools include attach more comprehensive classroom observation reports, thereby indicating that these schools place more emphasis on classroom assessment. Major areas for observation are further subdivided to provide more specifics, rather than just giving a general summary of teacher performance. Moreover, these forms include qualitative sections for commenting further on the items and for putting forth suggestions to address the main objective of teacher development. Furthermore, one of these four schools (School D) seems to view the appraisal as having teacher development objectives, and titles its form "*Staff Development Appraisal*". Classroom climate is not treated as a separate major category but has been incorporated in sub-items under classroom management. (See Table 4.)

In summary, after examining all appraisal forms available on the Education and Manpower Bureau web site, it seems that actual classroom teaching practices do not receive a particularly strong emphasis as compared to the professional duties performed by teachers. Moreover, one may wonder whether the criteria names alone are adequate for teachers and their appraisers to understand what the assessment involves. Hopefully, the appraisal forms were uploaded to the web site for brainstorming and sharing purposes, and can be appropriately adapted to make them more comprehensive, informative, and user-friendly.

#### *Language Proficiency Assessment for Teachers at the System Level*

The Education and Manpower Bureau allows schools much leeway in designing their own teacher appraisal systems. Conversely, the 2001 mandate on language proficiency assessment for teachers teaching English and Putonghua (the official language in the People's Republic of China) has a much higher and more structured profile, despite teacher opposition. The Education and Manpower Bureau reassures teachers that the Language Proficiency Requirement is not about "re-licensing", yet schools are responsible for ensuring that (a) their teachers' performance is up to a minimally acceptable level, and (b) language teachers demonstrate a minimum acceptable level in language proficiency (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003d).

Teachers are expected to meet the language proficiency requirement before the end of August 2006. The policy reflects the will of the government to ensure that all language teachers possess at least basic language proficiency in order to promote teaching and enhance the quality of education. The English proficiency assessment consists of five areas: (a) reading, (b) writing, (c) listening, (d) speaking, and (e) classroom language assessment. With regard to classroom language, the assessment guideline (unlike the teacher appraisal forms illustrated in Tables 1-4) includes detailed explanatory notes on

the following four criteria (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003e): (a) With Appropriate Grammar; (b) With Appropriate Pronunciation, Stress and Intonation; (c) The Language of Interaction in Eliciting, Responding, and Providing Feedback; and (d) The Language of Interaction in Presenting, Giving Instructions, and Signaling.

Each of these criteria is assessed on a five-point scale, with detailed descriptors. Two “grammatical accuracy” descriptors are presented in Figure 1 by way of illustration. Since the assessment exercise has just started (2001), it will take some time for the Education and Manpower Bureau to evaluate whether the initiative is improving the overall quality of language education.

## PART TWO: RECENT STUDIES OF TEACHER EVALUATION RESEARCH AND PRACTICE IN HONG KONG

This part presents the literature related to SER and TER and practice, as well as research related to teaching strategies, classroom environment, and instructional analysis. Recent findings from two studies—one, on the instructional leadership of teachers, the other on the assessment of teacher evaluation (using the RCOI) – are also discussed.

### *Current status of school effectiveness and TER and practice*

The volume of SER in Hong Kong has increased greatly since the mid 1980s. A number of empirical studies and large-scale research projects have been conducted in order to investigate various factors related to the effectiveness of Hong Kong schools, including leadership, teacher effectiveness, environmental characteristics, organizational culture, and school change (Cheng, 1996). In the area of TER, Chan and Cheng (1993) investigated principal perceptions of instructional leadership through a study involving 700 teachers from 60 secondary schools. They also explored the relationship between principals’ instructional leadership and teachers’ affective and attitudinal outcomes in terms of teachers’ sense of efficacy, sense of community, and professional interest. They found that instructional leadership functions were significantly related to teachers’ affective and attitudinal outcomes. Among various instructional functions, promoting instructional improvement and professional development were the most significant predictors. Moreover, parental support was found to be an important contextual variable that accounts for much of the variance in teachers’ affective and attitudinal outcomes.

Lo *et al.* (1997) undertook a major study into the effectiveness of the Hong Kong secondary school system. In that study, teacher effectiveness was investigated in terms of: (a) teachers’ instructional leadership; (b) modes of instruction; (c) teacher attitudes towards work; (d) teacher efficacy in teaching, and (e) teacher stress in work. To study instructional leadership, the researchers utilized an instrument adapted from Hallinger and Murphy’s inventory (1985) and Chan’s (1992) 12 dimensions of instructional leadership. They found that teachers ascribed more importance to providing incentives for individual students, providing incentives for academic achievement, and enforcing academic standards, while placing less emphasis on coordinating curriculum and instruction, encouraging participation in decision-making, and maintaining high visibility.

According to Lo and his colleagues, secondary students believed that teachers were more concerned with encouraging participation in decision-making, monitoring student progress, and providing incentives for individual students. The students also believed that teachers place less emphasis on framing instructional goals, coordinating curriculum and instruction, protecting instructional time, enforcing academic standards, and providing incentives for academic achievement. While teachers and students appear to have achieved a common agreement on the importance of providing incentives for individual students in instructional leadership, their views were otherwise contradictory. For instance, teachers and students disagreed on the importance of encouraging participation in decision-making or enforcing academic standards. Their views also diverged on the relative importance of dimensions of instructional leadership.

A recent study on the implementation of the Accelerated Schools for Quality Education Project (ASQEP) in Hong Kong also used an instrument adapted from Lo *et al.*'s (1997) study (Lo, 2001; Lee, 2001; Lee *et al.*, 2002). Their study of student and teacher perceptions of secondary teachers' instructional leadership yielded the following findings. (See Table 5)

- Both teachers and students believed that teachers tend to place more emphasis on providing incentives for individual students and relatively less emphasis on encouraging participation in decision-making.
- There seemed to be more differentiation in scores among different aspects of instructional leadership from the teacher's perspective. For example, providing incentives for academic achievement, monitoring student progress, supervising and evaluating instruction were more prevalent phenomena in the classroom while coordinating curriculum and instruction tended to be neglected.
- With regard to student perspectives, they believed that teachers emphasize providing incentives for academic achievement, monitoring student progress, supervising and evaluating instruction, and promoting students' initiatives. Framing instructional goals was perceived as the least important aspect of instructional leadership.

There are consistent findings (e.g., Lo *et al.*, 1997; Lee, 2001) concerning the prevalence of providing incentives for individual students and the relative de-emphasis of framing instructional goals (as perceived by students). The former refers to the recognition of good performance and positive contributions by students and the provision of rewards accordingly. The latter refers to ensuring students' understanding of the academic goals established through appropriate assessment or other measures and assisting students to develop attainable academic goals. The relatively low scores in aspects of instructional leadership such as *encouraging participation in decision-making* (perceived by teachers and students) and *coordinating curriculum and instruction* (perceived by teachers) in the Lee (2001) study deserve attention. It seems that a "teacher-centered" teaching approach emerges from Hong Kong research (Lo, 2001, p.89).

Another recent study on primary school effectiveness in Hong Kong revealed that more- and the less effective school differed on a number of dimensions (Cheng, Cheung & Tam, 2002):

- More effective schools have higher achievement in Chinese language, English language and mathematics achievement than do less effective schools.
- With regard to classroom climate, more effective schools are characterized by close affiliation, good classroom order and organization, good teacher support, and strong teacher control. In contrast, less effective schools have relatively distant affiliation, weaker classroom order and organization, moderate teacher support, and moderate teacher control.

Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that both more effective and less effective schools are characterized by the same standard curriculum delivery, teacher-centered teaching methods, and moderate competition in classroom climate. In addition, teachers tend to display dominant position power and weak reward power in both types of schools.

*Classroom environment and instructional analysis*

This section explores studies related to classroom environment and instructional analysis. Cheng and Tsui (1996, 1998) advocate the concept of teacher effectiveness, and suggest that there are multiple levels and domains of both teacher and student performance. This multidimensional approach may encourage a shift away from one-dimensional assessment, thereby yielding better insights into both teacher and school performance. According to these researchers, teacher evaluation activities that draw upon information from teacher performance, student learning experience, and learning outcomes can facilitate the development of teacher competence.

A study of primary students' perceptions of classroom environment found that some students described their language classrooms as enjoyable, having games and activities such as drawing pictures and searching for information (Lee *et al.*, 1999). Additionally, students welcomed competent teaching (e.g., clear explanations), which enhances their learning. With regard to school-wide implementation of Target Oriented Curriculum (TOC), Lee and his colleagues found that the prevalent classroom organization involves whole class teaching. Group work and individual work are comparatively rare. Research also shows that the predominant form of classroom interaction is teacher-centered instruction in which teachers question pupils (Morris *et al.*, 1996). Mok and Ko (2000) analyzed nearly two hundred lessons in the TOC Evaluation Project's case study schools. The results indicated that lessons are usually structured in the following form: a teacher-led whole-class discussion with a focus on a specific theme, or the completion of a learning task or worksheet by individual pupils or groups. A lesson might thus have a flexible combination of whole-class, group, or individual learning activities. Nonetheless, classroom interaction was still very much teacher-controlled (Mok and Ko, 2000, p.185).

Several studies have focused on classroom instructional activities (e.g., analysis of routines followed in the classrooms). Siu and Siu (1988), for example, analyzed the instructional routine of six teachers who had similar instructional routines and the general sequence involved:

- (1) writing the title of the lesson board;
- (2) giving relevant examples for the concept;
- (3) prompting the knowledge and experience of the learners;
- (4) relating examples to concept;

- (5) stating the definition according to the essential attributes;
- (6) giving more examples / non-examples for learners to identify / confirm the concept attributes;
- (7) giving learners some time to raise their queries; and
- (8) consolidating the concept by restating the definition according to the essential attributes (Siu and Siu, 1988, p.73)

Tam (1997) used the “teaching acts model” to compare novice and experienced teachers’ instructional routines, which were made up of teaching steps and teaching acts. These teachers were observed, videotaped, and interviewed. In addition, two self-designed instruments were used to evaluate their instructional activities. The researchers found, on the one hand, that both novice and experienced teachers routinely utilized exposition, the textbook and the chalkboard. Furthermore, the instructional routines of both novice and experienced teachers were driven by content progress rather than student behavior. On the other hand, the routines of experienced teachers differed from those of novice teachers in a number of ways. Experienced teachers presented content in smaller parts, asked more questions, and displayed better management skills, such as being more firm and assertive in teaching. Novice teachers tended to adopt a more *laissez-faire* style.

Lee (1999) analyzed the instructional routines used by teachers in delivering elementary Chinese lessons, based on four raters’ evaluations of videotape recordings. He found that expert teachers used more routines than novice teachers in teaching. In the area of exposition techniques, the expert teacher tended to use pictures, word cards and tape recordings to help students learn. Students of the expert teachers maintained an orderly environment while engaging in games. The expert teacher also used songs to help enhance student interest and engagement in learning. In the area of exchange of teaching and learning, expert teachers encouraged students to answer questions, tell stories, and make presentations. Moreover, the expert teacher used activities to help reinforce student learning of word shapes and to encourage them to practice, as well.

The Quality Assurance inspections of roughly 40-50 primary, secondary, and special schools in 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 (Education Department, 2000b, 2001) revealed three common, major teacher weaknesses in “class teaching”: (a) adoption of a teacher-centered approach resulting in inadequate teacher-pupil interaction; (b) lack of variety in teaching strategies and suitable learning activities, especially those catering to learner differences; and (c) questioning techniques not effective enough to invite active pupil discussion and to inspire higher-order thinking. (Education Department, 2000, p.15; 2001, p.16) The inspections also revealed weaknesses in the area of “pupil learning” (e.g., many students were found to be too passive in learning and/or unable to pursue self-learning on their own.)

*Examples of practices that value and integrate teacher evaluation policy to enhance school effectiveness*

Lam, Yim and Lam (1999, 2002) undertook an action research project to help two schools (one primary and one secondary) develop a lesson observation culture with peer support. The first step in the process involved a workshop (utilizing the Environment,

People and Self problem analysis method) that was conducted to help teachers reflect on (a) the difficulties of and (b) the strategies for promoting lesson observation in their schools. Teachers were then advised to be aware of two factors conducive to lesson observation: (a) the school as a caring community; and (b) the extent to which teachers value growth and learning rather than merely emphasizing performance.

The researchers used the Instructional Environment System developed by Ysseldyke and Christenson (1993), which consisted of 12 components. After the workshop, the schools started lesson observations, each round of which typically involved more than 10 teachers from four to five subject areas. Finally a session was conducted to review and evaluate the lesson observation project. Responses were generally favorable. Other specific findings are summarized below.

- Teacher acceptance of the lesson observation project was positively associated with variables of teacher commitment and sense of belonging to school, extent of peer support in school, and school environment conducive to peer support.
- Teacher goal orientation was associated with teacher acceptance of the lesson observation project. If the teachers' goal orientation tended to be learning-oriented, they tended to be positive in their evaluation of the lesson observation activities with peer support. If teachers' goal orientation tended to be performance-oriented, they were less positive in their support of these activities.

#### *Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness Using the RCOI*

A review of studies on school effectiveness in Hong Kong revealed that there had been few empirical studies focusing on curriculum and teaching methods as well as using classroom observation instruments (e.g., Cheng, 1997). In a recent study on school effectiveness (Lee *et al.*, 2001), a pilot study using the RCOI (Teddlie, 1999) was conducted in three secondary schools in Hong Kong. Roughly 20-24 lessons were observed at each school over the space of two to four days. The classes covered both major subjects (e.g., language and mathematics) and others (e.g., science, social and commercial subjects).

The three secondary schools differed in student intake and context. One school (Y) draws its intake mainly from the high ability strata, while the other two schools (X and Z) draw their students from the low ability strata. Schools X and Z are located in different contexts. The former is located in a public housing estate in an urban area and had been a "practical school" with classes only up to year 9 in the 1960s. School Z is located in a very remote fishing community, away from the urban center. These three schools also differed from one another in size and age range. What these three schools have in common is a short history. School X was established in the early 1960s, while Schools Z and Y were founded in the 1970s and the 1980s, respectively:

Of the three main areas of classroom observation (*management, instruction, and climate*), *management* was rated highest by the observers across all three schools. (See Table 6). In fact, the four attributes under the management area were the most highly-rated items of the 14 RCOI attributes for all three schools. On the whole, the least variation was found in *overall time on task*. At school Y, teachers tended to be tolerant and did not

immediately scold noisy students. They kept the students' attention, however, by asking them questions. By comparison, some teachers at School Z took immediate measures to monitor and keep the learning environment under "perfect control" This over-emphasis on control might explain the overall low time-on-task for those lessons.

Though observers gave high-ratings to management items, they gave consistently low ratings to the *physical characteristics of classrooms* (C14). These low ratings were found at all three schools, and are typical of the majority of Hong Kong secondary classrooms. Due to an inadequate number of secondary classrooms, a "floating class" system has been adopted, and there is no base room for a class. Apart from the display board at the back of the classroom, classrooms are rarely equipped with extra cabinets or shelves. As a result, the classroom might not have space to exhibit student work or to display themes.

As for the other three classroom climate variables, *high teacher expectations for student achievement* (C11) was consistently rated lower than the other two attributes. Again, this pattern was consistent across all three schools. The highest teacher expectations were found at School Y, which had a high ability intake, while the lowest was at the rural School Z. The senior management at School Z reported that one of the school's main aims focused on "taming" the "wild students," applying strict discipline, and teaching students proper manners and acceptable behavior. Presumably, such an orientation might influence the teachers' expectations for academic achievement, as well.

According to summary data for the three schools, the greatest variation in teacher performance occurred in the area of *instruction*. The overall mean ratings for the six instruction attributes fell between 1.98 and 2.28. Despite the overall lower mean ratings for the individual attributes, there was greater individual variance in teacher performance in this area, as reflected by larger standard deviations.

Variable I6 (*independent student practice*) had the largest standard deviation of any instructional item, and it also had the lowest rating in that area. This low rating was not surprising since other studies have indicated that teachers in Hong Kong are more inclined toward the teacher-centered mode of teaching, and leave a smaller proportion of time for individual student practice. There was some variation, however, in the degree to which teachers provided opportunities for individual practice to high-ability, as opposed to low-ability students. The school ratings on this variable were as follows: School Y (2.46), School X (2.10), and School Z (1.58). In Hong Kong, teachers who work with lower ability students tend to spend more time lecturing students than on letting students practice on their own. At School Z, not much class work was assigned to students, not even in Mathematics, where students are normally given time for individual practice.

It appears that schools that serve high ability students tend to strive for academic excellence and are inclined towards performance-based strategies. The traditional approach to teaching (i.e., "chalk and talk") appears to be more efficient and effective for guaranteeing good performance on public examinations than other approaches that introduce a variety of teaching techniques (Reynolds, Muijs, & Treharne, this issue). On the other hand, teachers who work with lower ability students want to increase student

motivation and feel that utilizing a variety of teaching techniques can help accomplish this end. This depends, however, on school context factors such as class size and resource availability.

In the case of School Z, the school is handicapped by its small size—a problem that is further exacerbated by the school's need to reduce the number of classes (and thereby reduce the number of teachers) due to declines in enrollment. School Z found it difficult to locate teachers with subject training across the curriculum. This, in turn, exerted more demands on non-subject trained teachers, who had to enhance their subject expertise and acquire a variety of teaching techniques.

### PART THREE: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The literature review, plus results from the research summarized in the last section (the ASQEP and RCOI studies) suggest that teacher evaluation research and practice in Hong Kong are characterized by certain salient features.

- Staff appraisal systems and the use of peer observation in schools are still in development. Teacher evaluation seems to place more emphasis on professional duties / responsibilities than on actual classroom teaching practices.
- Teacher-centered strategies and pedagogy still dominate in the classroom.
- There seems to be greater emphasis on providing incentives for individual students and relatively lesser emphasis on coordinating curriculum and instruction.
- There is a relatively large variation among schools in the area of instruction, particularly concerning independent student practice, questioning skills, and teacher expectations for student achievement.

These features provide some implications for conducting future research in the areas of teacher evaluation and practice in Hong Kong.

#### *Key issues in linking teacher evaluation and school improvement*

This article reveals that there is little linkage between teacher evaluation and SER in Hong Kong. To strengthen the linkage between these two components, we recommend that policy changes be made at the system level, and that organizational and cultural changes be made at the school level.

#### *Policy changes*

As discussed in Part Two, teacher appraisal forms (on the Education and Manpower Bureau web page) place too little emphasis on the evaluation of classroom teacher behavior. The current trend is for teachers to be evaluated in other areas (e.g., personal characteristics, administrative ability), which may not directly impact the quality of teaching. It is unfortunate that the current appraisal system is aimed more toward identifying candidates for promotion to administrative posts, rather than recognizing teachers who have high proficiency in teaching.

When members of the public were invited to give their opinion to the recommendations contained in Education Commission Report No. 7,

... there were suggestions that teachers should be considered for

promotion to higher ranks on the basis of their contribution to teaching alone, and that functional and administrative duties should not be taken into account.” (Education Commission, 1997, p.39)

Such suggestions indicate that teaching quality has not been treated as an important attribute in teacher evaluation in comparison to administrative or functional team duties. A promotion system that rewards teachers who demonstrate excellence in teaching might lead to a re-orientation of teacher appraisal toward more emphasis on teacher effectiveness at the classroom level. There is a need to explore the development of performance-based evaluation or developmental teacher evaluation systems for the purposes of teacher evaluation (e.g., Harris, 1986; Valentine, 1992).

Moreover, in view of the new curriculum reform and prevailing teacher-centered pedagogy, Hong Kong appears to need teacher evaluation systems that are more learner-centered. For example, the assessment indicators from the Professional Assessment and Comprehensive Evaluation System (PACES) in Florida provide self-assessment strategies for professional growth such as: assessment, communication, continuous improvement, critical thinking, diversity, ethics, human development, knowledge of subject matter, learning environments, planning, role of teacher, and technology (Ellett, 2001).

#### *Organizational and cultural changes*

Walker and Dimmock (2000) suggest that the Hong Kong appraisal system needs to separate developmental and judgmental appraisal. For developmental appraisal, teachers agreed that lesson observations enhance teaching quality. Teachers are more supportive of lesson observation if their goal orientation is more learner-oriented than performance-oriented.

According to Lam, Yim, and Lam (1999), teachers would be less supportive of classroom lesson observation if the main objective were for appraisal purposes. Though peer observation can promote communication among colleagues, teachers invariably perceive this to be some sort of appraisal, whether it is top-down or bottom-up. Teachers feel more comfortable if observers have absolutely no relationship to the appraisal system.

Researchers conducting recent SER in Hong Kong (Lee *et al.* 2001) encountered little resistance from teachers toward classroom observation. Providing data-driven constructive feedback can be a practical method for enhancing teaching quality, especially if outside observers have subject matter and professional expertise. For judgmental appraisal, Walker and Dimmock (2000) also point out that outside appraisers may be more suitable to give feedback, even if it is negative:

Whereas the Chinese are reluctant to provide feedback that may lead to confrontation or a loss of face, they appear willing to receive such feedback through a third party (p.174).

With regard to the results from the RCOI pilot study, improvement appears needed in the following areas: (a) independent student practice; (b) teacher using a variety of teaching techniques; (c) high teacher expectations for student achievement; and (d) physical

characteristics of the room

Researchers have attempted to use data from teacher observation systems (e.g., the Virgilio Teacher Behavior Inventory) to generate profiles that could then guide staff development and school improvement plans (e.g., Teddlie & Meza, 1999). School improvement programs may use these data to generate teaching profiles at several levels (e.g., grade, department, inexperienced teachers only). For example, schools can use these profiles to generate the following activities (based on Teddlie & Meza, 1999):

- Demonstration lessons may be arranged using a variety of teaching techniques, that target inexperienced or new teachers in areas of teaching weakness;
- Teachers could be encouraged to undertake peer observation of experienced, effective teachers. They could also be encouraged to analyze or code data collected in their own classroom based on audiotapes or videotapes
- Videotapes of effective teaching practices could be presented to teachers seeking improvement and better consensus on classroom behavior.
- External consultants could be solicited to provide support for enhancing the overall quality of instruction.

*Key items in a research agenda for improving teacher evaluation in Hong Kong*

*Adapting the RCOI for the Hong Kong Context*

There has been discussion about whether TER variables are “transferable” across a variety of settings, thereby potentially serving as the basis for cross-country comparisons (e.g., Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). On the whole, most RCOI variables made sense in the local Hong Kong context; however, some of these variables were not very applicable across levels of schooling. For instance, C14 (the *physical characteristics of the room* noted in Table 6), is irrelevant to many local secondary schools, since teachers have no base room. However, the variable would make sense in some primary schools that adopt the activity approach to teaching and learning. In these schools (where students learn in their base room), teachers may try to decorate the classroom to facilitate learning, thereby making it relevant to evaluate the physical characteristics of the classroom.

The examination-oriented cultures of some Hong Kong schools local settings make some RCOI items less frequently observable. It is common for teachers to have test and revision sessions during normal class periods in order to prepare students for examinations. Therefore, observers occasionally come across lessons that have been allocated for revision purposes such that variable I5 (*teacher presents new materials*) must be scored “1” due to the absence of any new material being presented.

The comparatively crowded secondary school classrooms in Hong Kong make it less possible for teachers to conduct lessons using a *variety of teaching techniques* (I9). This is especially the case in prestigious schools that have to accommodate 45 or more students in rooms designed to hold just 40. Activities like group discussion, debate, and project-based learning (that require special seating arrangements and multi-media support) may only work in special rooms, which are more spacious and well equipped.

Moreover, low scores on I9 (*teacher uses a variety of teaching techniques*) does not necessarily indicate that teachers in Hong Kong lack pedagogical competence. The policy of “streaming” secondary students into two groups (i.e., EMI students with English as the medium of instruction and CMI students with Chinese as the medium of instruction) could possibly influence a teacher’s classroom strategies. About a quarter of Hong Kong secondary schools are in the EMI stream. In these schools, students may find it more feasible to listen to their teachers’ instructions while jotting down notes in English, since many of them are not as capable of effective oral communication. Teachers could have some reservations about conducting interactive activities (e.g., group discussion, class presentations), preferring to use the more unidirectional mode of *chalk and talk* teaching.

The use of question and answer techniques is very important in Hong Kong, due to the examination oriented culture and other factors. The quality of the questions and the way that teachers handle student responses is very important, and these factors in turn can make lessons more thought provoking. The techniques that teachers use to arouse the curiosity of their students and to enhance their motivation levels are also very important.

Thus, the RCOI might need to be modified in order to capture important aspects of the Chinese classroom. To account for the importance of questioning techniques in Hong Kong, it might be desirable to more heavily weight and/or subdivide I8 on the RCOI (*teacher demonstrate skills in questioning/answering questions*) into more items for further differentiation. Some of the following suggestions are based on items found on the Virgilio Teacher Behavior Inventory (Teddlie, Virgilio, and Oescher, 1990):

- Other items might include “Teacher uses a high frequency of questions. He/she uses appropriate wait time between questions and answers.” and “Teacher directs questions to many students or engages students in active discussion. He/she encourages students to raise and answer questions.” These new items suggest that there are classroom scenarios where the teacher should interact with more students even in relatively large classes. These items also echo previous literature (Lee, 1999) that expert teachers tend to encourage students to answer questions and facilitate their taking part in discussion.
- Another new item might be “Teachers regularly ask higher-order questions to stimulate student thinking”. This echoes the previously referenced Quality Assurance Inspection’s comment (Education Department, 2001) that teacher’s questioning may not be effective enough to inspire higher-order thinking.
- Other new items might include: “Teacher asks timed questions; teacher anticipates student’s reactions; teacher responds appropriately to students’ questions; teacher probes further when responses are incorrect.” These items reflect teachers’ careful lesson planning and competence in addressing individual differences.

These additional items could serve as a yardstick for assessing behaviors in Hong Kong classrooms, as well as providing directions for improving these classroom processes.

#### *Future directions for teacher evaluation and SER*

“Good” teaching in the Chinese context is seen as a repetitive, teacher-dominated script from a western (i.e., Western Europe and North American) viewpoint. The following elements nonetheless exist (Biggs & Watkins, 2001, p.285):

1. *Concentrated listening*: students listen intently, and participate actively (this may be perceived as “covert activity”);
2. *Vicarious learning*: the teachers interact with only a few students in large classes;
3. *Careful planning, timed questioning, and associated activity*; and
4. *Learner-trained learning*: students learn stage-setting routines that allow teachers to change activities without interruption.

Some scholars have concluded that Chinese students learn to do *different things* (finding different solutions, focusing on different aspects) *to the same thing* (the problem of the day) while their American counterparts learn to do *the same thing* (applying the same method of solution) *to different things* (the problems they keep practicing) (Mok, *et al.* 2001, p.177). Future teacher evaluation and SER should pay more attention to these different aspects of “good” or “effective” teaching across different cultures.

Cheng, Cheung and Tam’s (2002) recent SER case studies concluded that both more effective and less effective schools had similar teacher-centered teaching methods. This raises two tentative propositions for possible future inquiry.

- (a) There may be subtle differences in instructional routines (e.g., in terms of exposition clarity and quality of questioning techniques) and in their consistency over time between and within teachers. These may account for variance in school effectiveness in the Hong Kong context. This is aligned with Creemers, Scheerens and Reynolds (2000, p.287) view that teacher behavior “has an independent contribution to effectiveness”. In addition, consistency in individual teacher behavior over time may have an influence on variation in school effectiveness (Reynolds and Teddlie, 2000).
- (b) When SER employs multiple outcome measures (e.g., “learning to learn” skills, affective outcomes), there may be smaller variance between Hong Kong schools, as compared to the variance reported on academic achievement. This proposition is based on the assumption that teacher-centered methods may have more direct influence on academic outcomes than on knowledge acquisition skills or affective outcomes.

While research (e.g., Lee, *et al.* 2002) confirms that classroom practice in Hong Kong is teacher-centered, change in the Chinese pedagogical system should be undertaken with caution. Some scholars such as Ference Marton (2000, p.288) argue that:

Chinese pedagogical practice(s)...have been characterized by in-depth studies of the object of learning, very often through discussions about the same specific objects of learning with colleagues, and by thorough planning of the lesson including the anticipation of student reactions...the pedagogy practiced in Hong Kong is surely an offspring of Chinese pedagogy, the oldest and maybe the most efficient pedagogy (in its more advanced forms) of which we know. Developing this pedagogy further seems to be a much better idea than doing away with it.

Future studies on school and teacher effectiveness may investigate the effectiveness of student-centered pedagogy in Hong Kong classrooms on the one hand and identify different forms of effective Chinese pedagogy for enhancing school effectiveness on the

other.

## REFERENCES

- Advisory Committee on the School Management Initiative (1992). *Staff appraisal in schools*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Education Department.
- Advisory Committee on School-based Management (2000). *Transforming schools into dynamic and accountable professional learning communities*. Hong Kong: Printing Department.
- Biggs, J.B., & Watkins, D.A. (2001). Insights into teaching the Chinese learner. In D.A. Watkins and J.B. Biggs (Eds.), *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives* (pp.277-300). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.
- Chan, Y.C. (1992). *A study of principal's instructional leadership in Hong Kong secondary schools*. Unpublished master's thesis, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Chan, Y.C., & Cheng, Y.C. (1993). A study of principal's instructional leadership in Hong Kong secondary schools. *Educational Research Journal*, 8, 55-67.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1996). *The pursuit of school effectiveness: Research, management and policy*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research.
- Cheng, Y.C. (1997). A framework of indicators of education quality in Hong Kong primary schools: Development and application. In Hongwei Meng, Yiquan Zhou and Yihua Fang (Eds.), *School based indicators of effectiveness: Experiences and practices in APEC members* (pp.207-249). China: Guangxi Normal University Press.
- Cheng, Y.C., & Tsui, K.T. (1996). Total teacher effectiveness: New conception and improvement. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 10(6), 7-17.
- Cheng, Y.C., & Tsui, K.T. (1998). Research on total teacher effectiveness: conception strategies. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 12(1), 39-47.
- Cheng, Y.C., Cheung, W.M., & Tam, W.M. (2002). The Pacific Rim and Australia – Hong Kong. In D. Reynolds, B. Creemers, S. Stringfield, C. Teddlie and E. Schaffer *World class schools: International perspectives on school effectiveness* (pp.138-155). London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Creemers, B.P.M., & Reezigt, G.J. (1996). School level conditions affecting the effectiveness of instruction. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 7(3), 197-228.

- Creemers, B.M., Scheerens, J., & Reynolds, D. (2000). Theory development in SER. In C. Teddlie and D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The international handbook of SER* (pp.283-298). London: Falmer press.
- Curriculum Development Council (2001). *Learning to learn: Life-long learning and whole-person development*. Hong Kong: Printing Department.
- Education Commission (1992). *Education Commission report No. 5*. Hong Kong: The Government Printer.
- Education Commission (1997). *Education Commission report No. 7: Quality school education*. Hong Kong: The Government Printer.
- Education Department (2000a). Education Department Administration Circular No. 49/2000.  
<http://www.emb.gov.hk/circular/data/admc/AD00049E.pdf>
- Education Department (2000b). *Quality assurance inspection annual report 1999/2000*. Hong Kong: Printing Department.
- Education Department (2001). *Quality assurance inspection annual report 2000/2001*. Hong Kong: Printing Department.
- Education and Manpower Bureau (2003a). *School-based Management: staff appraisal system, experience-sharing sessions on staff appraisal system*.  
[http://www.emb.gov.hk/ednewhp/school/sbm/main/english/tra\\_downe.htm](http://www.emb.gov.hk/ednewhp/school/sbm/main/english/tra_downe.htm)
- Education and Manpower Bureau (2003b). *Teachers: teacher registration*.  
[http://www.emb.gov.hk/ednewhp/teacher/teacher\\_registration/english/home.htm](http://www.emb.gov.hk/ednewhp/teacher/teacher_registration/english/home.htm)
- Education and Manpower Bureau (2003c). Examples of teacher appraisal forms (in Chinese)  
<http://www.emb.gov.hk/ednewhp/school/sbm/main/chinese/stappex.htm>
- Education and Manpower Bureau (2003d). *Language proficiency requirement for teachers: Q & A*.  
<http://www.emb.gov.hk/aid/chinese/english%20v/link/teacher/qa.htm>
- Education and Manpower Bureau (2003e). *Classroom language assessment*.  
[http://www.emb.gov.hk/aid/chinese/english%20v/link/teacher/eng/lang\\_tech/prof\\_ass6.pdf](http://www.emb.gov.hk/aid/chinese/english%20v/link/teacher/eng/lang_tech/prof_ass6.pdf)
- Education & Manpower Branch & Education Department (1991). *The School Management Initiative: Setting the framework for quality in Hong Kong schools*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

- Ellett, C.D. (2001). *Cross reference of the Florida accomplished and professional practices with required assessment indicators of the PACES*.  
<http://paces.dadeschools.net/PDF%20Docs/accpracreq.pdf>
- Harris, B. (1986). *Developmental teacher evaluation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86, 217-247.
- Iwanicki, E.F. (1990). Teacher evaluation for school improvement. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teacher* (pp.158-174). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Klenowski, V. (1998). *Guidelines for portfolio use in initial teacher education. Paper series in education*. Hong Kong: Centre for Research and International Collaboration, Hong Kong Institute of Education.
- Lam, S.F., Yim, P.S., & Lam, W.H. (1999). *Peer coaching in classroom observation*. Hong Kong: Education Convergence (in Chinese)
- Lam, S.F. (2001). Educators' opinions on classroom observation as a practice of staff development and appraisal. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 161-173.
- Lam, S.F., Yim, P.S., & Lam, T.W.H. (2002). Transforming school culture: can true collaboration be initiated? *Educational Research*, 44(2), 181-195.
- Lee, J.C.K. (2000). Teacher receptivity to curriculum change in the implementation stage: the case of environmental education in Hong Kong. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(1), 95-115.
- Lee, C.K.J. (2001, May). *Accelerated schools for quality education: Initial experiences of school change*. Keynote paper delivered at the International Conference "Rejuvenating Schools through Partnerships" co-organized by the Centre for the University & School Partnership, Faculty of Education and the Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, 22-24 May.
- Lee, C.K.J., Chiu, C.S., Wong, H.W., Chan, P.L., Leung, C.W., & Poon L.M. (1999). Primary students' perceptions of classroom environments: A Hong Kong perspective. *Educational Practice and Theory*, 21(1), 109-127.
- Lee, C.K.J., & Wong, K.M.P. (1996). Preservice teachers' perceptions of reflective teaching: An exploratory study of level of reflectivity. *Journal of Basic Education*, 6(1 & 2), 79-90.
- Lee, C.K.J., & Wong, K.M.P. (1997). Student teachers' perceptions of teaching and

- learning: An exploratory study of the level of reflectivity. *Educational Research Journal*, 12(2), 180-189.
- Lee, J.C.K., Chung, Y.P., Lo, L.N.K., Wong, H.W., Tsang, W.K., Dimmock, C., Walker, A.D., Pang, N.S.K., Cheung, W.C., Ma, W.H.T., Tang, Y.N., Ko, R.M.L., Lee, F.L.M., Lai, M.H. and others (2001). *Study on the effectiveness of public-sector secondary schools (Phase 2)*. Hong Kong: The Centre for University and School Partnership and Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Lee, J.C.K., Chung, S.Y.P., Lo, L.N.K., Wong, H.W., Chiu, C.S., Ho, E.S.C., Leung, A.S.M., Pang, N.S.K., Sze, P.M.M., Walker, A. & Xiao, J. (2002). *The Accelerated Schools for Quality Education Project final report*. Hong Kong: Faculty of Education and the Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Lee, F.L. (1999). Instructional routines in elementary Chinese lessons. *Journal of Basic Education*, 9(1), 35-52 (in Chinese).
- Lo, N.K., Tsang, W.K., Chung, C.M., Chung Y.P., Sze, M.M., Ho, S.C., & Ho, M.K. (1997). *A survey of the effectiveness of Hong Kong secondary school system: Final report of Earmarked Grant Research Project*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Educational Research, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Lo, L.N.K. (2001). Teachers and teacher development in the currents of educational reform. *Journal of Basic Education*, 10(2)/11(1), 73-100.
- Marton, F. (2000). Afterword – The lived curriculum. In B. Adamson, T. Kwan and K.K. Chan (Eds.), *Changing the curriculum: The impact of reform on primary schooling in Hong Kong* (pp.277-292). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Mo, K.W., Connors, R., & McCormick, R. (1998). Teacher appraisal in Hong Kong self-managing secondary schools: factors for effective practices. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(1), 19-42.
- Mok, I.A.C., & Ko, P.Y. (2000). Beyond labels – teacher-centred and pupil-centred activities. In B. Adamson, T. Kwan and K.K. Chan (Eds.), *Changing the curriculum: The impact of reform on primary schooling in Hong Kong* (pp.175-193). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Mok, I., Chik, P.M., Ko, P.Y., Kwan, T., Lo, M.L., Marton, F., Ng D.F.P., Pang, M.F., Runesson, U., & Szeto, L.H. (2001). Solving the paradox of the Chinese teacher. In D.A. Watkins and J.B. Biggs (Eds.), *Teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives* (pp.161-179). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, The University of Hong Kong.

- Morris, P., Adamson, R., Au, M.L., Chan, K.K., Chan, W.Y., Ko, P.Y., Lai, W.A., Lo, M.L., Morris, E., Ng, F.P., Ng, Y.Y., Wong, W.M., & Wong, P.H. (1996). *Target oriented curriculum evaluation project: Interim report*. Hong Kong: In-service Teacher Education Program, Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong.
- Ngan, M.Y., & Lee, C.K.J. (2000, September). *A study of the relationships between the receptivity of teachers and the school cultural changing on the contexts of the curriculum changes in Hong Kong*. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Edinburgh, Scotland, 20-23 September.
- Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (2000). The future agenda for SER. In C. Teddlie and D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The international handbook of SER* (pp.322-343). London: Falmer press.
- Siu, L.P.T., & Siu, P.K. (1988). Instructional routine analysis in the teaching of Economics. *Educational Research Journal*, 3, 66-74.
- Stimpson, P., Lopez-Real, F., Bunton, D., Chan, D.W-K., Sivan, A., & Williams, M. (2000). *Better supervision better teaching: A handbook for teaching practice supervisors*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Tam, P.T.K. (1992). Quality control mechanisms for appraising the teaching labour force. *Educational Research Journal*, 20(1), 25-35.
- Tam, P.T.K. (1997). Novice and experienced teachers' instructional activities in the classroom. *Educational Research Journal*, 12(1), 36-50.
- Teddlie, C. (1999, September). *Preliminary notes on the revision of classroom observation instrument*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Teddlie, C., & Meza, Jr., J. (1999). Using informal and formal measures to create classroom profiles. In H.J. Freiberg (Ed.), *School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments* (pp.48-64). London: Falmer Press.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). SER and the social and behavioural sciences. In C. Teddlie and D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The international handbook of SER* (pp.301-321). London: Falmer press.
- Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools do make a difference: Lessons learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Teddlie, C., Virgilio, I., and Oescher, J. (1990). Development and validation of the Virgilio Teacher Behavior Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 50 (2), 421-430.
- Valentine, J.W. (1992). *Principles and practices for effective teacher evaluation*. Boston:

Allyn and Bacon.

Walker, A., & Cheng, Y.C. (1996). Professional development in Hong Kong primary schools: Beliefs, practices and change. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22(2), 197-212.

Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (2000). One size fits all? Teacher appraisal in a Chinese culture. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(2), 155-178.

Ying, P.C. & Fan, G.R. (2001). Research on traditional case of teachers-evaluating patterns --- on the disadvantage of traditional pattern of teachers' evaluation and study of a new pattern. *Theory and Practice of Education*, 2(3), 22-25.

Ysseldyke, J., & Christenson, S. (1993). *The instructional environment system-II*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

**Table 1: Teaching Performance Dimensions at School A**

Teaching performance	A	B	C	D
Teaching effectiveness				
Communicating with students				
Classroom management				
Guidance outside classroom				
Handling of assignment (design, marking, etc.)				
Standard of setting test and examination papers				

(Note : A - Excellent; B - Good; C - Up to standard; D - Below standard)

**Table 2: Teaching Performance Dimensions at School B**

Teaching performance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Lesson well prepared								
Well sequenced and systematic teaching								
Content clearly presented								
Can arouse interest of students								
Can maintain orderly classroom discipline								
Appropriate quantity of assignment to students								
Assignments marked with care								
Examination paper set with care								
Willing to take training for curriculum development								

(Note: 1 – very unsatisfied ----- 8 – very satisfied)

**Table 3: Teaching Performance Dimensions at School C**

Teaching Performance	A	B	C	D	E	F
Classroom Management						
Treatment of pupils (care, respect, fair)						
Quality of work						
Teaching effectiveness ( <i>use resources appropriately to improve student performance</i> )						
Knowledge of subject						
Power of Oral expression						
Written expression						
Using information technology						
Marking						

(Note: A – very satisfied ----- F – very unsatisfied)

Table 4: Teaching Performance Dimensions at School D

	Appraisal Items	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Improvement Required	NA	Comments
<b>1.</b>	<b>Preparation</b>						
a.	Relevance of content						
b.	Suitability of content						
c.	Organization of content						
<b>2.</b>	<b>Teaching Process</b>						
a.	Introduction & motivation						
b.	Presentation & explanation						
c.	Pupil participation in class						
d.	Planned ending						
e.	Achievement of objectives						
<b>3.</b>	<b>Teaching Skills</b>						
a.	Voice & speech						
b.	Two-way verbal communication						
c.	Non-verbal communication						
d.	Use of chalkboard / A-V aids						
e.	Use of relevant examples / cues						
f.	Prompt feedback / reinforcement						
g.	Overall control of lesson						
<b>4.</b>	<b>Classroom Management</b>						
a.	Class atmosphere / discipline						
b.	Handling of misbehavior						
c.	Attention to individual needs						
d.	Teacher alertness						
e.	Attitude to pupils						

**Overall Comments and Suggestions:**

Table 5: Summary Statistics for Instructional Leadership Factors in a Study of Secondary Schools

	Mean score (teacher) 24 ASP schools (N=1234)	Mean score (student) 24 ASP schools (N=13948)
<b>Framing Instructional Goals</b>	3.81	3.22
<b>Communicating Instructional Goals</b>	3.85	3.27
<b>Supervising and Evaluating Instruction</b>	4.05	3.41
<b>Coordinating Curriculum and Instruction</b>	<u>3.42</u>	<u>3.19</u>
<b>Monitoring Student Progress</b>	4.03	3.43
<b>Promoting Student's Learning Initiatives</b>	3.91	3.40
<b>Encouraging Participation in Decision-making</b>	3.61	3.29
<b>Providing Incentives for Individual Students</b>	<u>4.37</u>	<u>3.69</u>
<b>Providing Incentives for Academic Achievement</b>	4.00	3.35

Scoring from 1 (Seldom Right) to 5 (All Right)  
  : Highest scoring factor for year 1999-2000  
  : Lowest scoring factor for year 1999-2000

Note: The data was extracted from the database of the ASQEP led by Lee *et al.* (2002). Some data were reported in a recent paper by Lo (2001).

Table 6: Scores from Classroom Observations in Three Secondary Schools in Hong Kong (cite the study)

Code	Attribute	All		Sch X		Sch Y		Sch Z		Mean diff
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Management										
M1	Overall Time-on-Task	2.76	0.45	2.76	0.44	2.88	0.33	2.68	0.53	0.21
M2	Number of interruptions minimal during the observation	2.82	0.46	2.79	0.41	2.88	0.43	2.80	0.52	0.09
M3	Few discipline problems	2.77	0.51	2.72	0.45	2.88	0.43	2.73	0.60	0.16
M4	Teacher continuously monitors the classroom	2.68	0.53	2.59	0.63	2.92	0.27	2.60	0.55	0.34
Instruction										
15	Teacher presents new material (new content and skills)	2.53	0.54	2.50	0.51	2.76	0.44	2.40	0.59	0.36
16	Independent student practice	1.98	0.81	2.10	0.77	2.46	0.65	1.58	0.75	0.89
17	Teacher reviews and summarizes materials	2.26	0.73	2.14	0.80	2.46	0.65	2.20	0.72	0.32
18	Teacher demonstrates skill in questioning/answering questions	2.28	0.65	2.17	0.66	2.62	0.50	2.15	0.66	0.47
19	Teacher uses a variety of teaching techniques	2.03	0.67	2.21	0.79	2.12	0.52	1.85	0.63	0.37
I10	Teacher provides opportunities for all students to be involved	2.28	0.66	2.38	0.73	2.42	0.58	2.13	0.65	0.30
Climate										
C11	Overall high teacher expectations for student achievement	2.11	0.65	2.11	0.57	2.38	0.64	1.93	0.66	0.46
C12	Teacher provides appropriate academic reinforcement or feedback	2.29	0.63	2.32	0.67	2.42	0.58	2.18	0.64	0.25
C13	Class has a friendly ambience (seems like a friendly place)	2.56	0.58	2.59	0.63	2.46	0.51	2.60	0.59	0.14
C14	Physical characteristics of the room	1.21	0.45	1.35	0.49	1.08	0.28	1.18	0.48	0.28

- The attributes are rated on a scale of 1 to 3. Negative evidence only is coded 1; positive evidence only is coded 3; and contradictory evidence is coded 2.
- Mean diff: Maximum (X,Y, Z) – Minimum (X,Y,Z)

Figure 1. Descriptors of grammatical accuracy on classroom language assessment. (5-point scale) (Education and Manpower Bureau, 2003e)

- |  |
|--|
| <p>5: Grammatical structures are almost invariably accurate, with extremely limited, if any, occurrences of inappropriate expressions. Any 'mistakes' that occur can be categorized as 'slips' rather than systematic errors.</p> <p>1: Most utterances contain grammatical errors, causing comprehension to break down completely at times. Access to basic structures is clearly inadequate and communication is often impeded. Self-monitoring and self-correction never occur. No attempts are made at reformulation..</p> |
|--|