Evaluation on
"Quality Thematic Network (QTN) on Drama in Education"

The Fourth Report (2011-2012)

Submitted by

Anna Hui, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

William Ho

Research Assistant

Department of Applied Social Studies

City University of Hong Kong

To

Ming Ri Institute of Arts Education

August 31, 2012

Abstract

In the previous four years, "Quality Thematic Network (QTN) on Drama in Education" (QEF) has provide professional training on Drama in Education (DiE) to kindergarten and primary school teachers with an aim to strengthen teachers' competency on facilitating students' learning and development of creativity. The objective of this study was to develop an assessment tool for practitioners to evaluate the teachers' effectiveness on implementing DiE in achieving teaching objectives in classroom. The development of this assessment tool is based on the Bloom's Taxonomy (1956) and The Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). Data was collected from cross-sectional samples with a longitudinal approach. About 236 teachers and 705 students from 27 kindergartens, 23 primary school and 1 SEN school took part in the study. Instruments included a teacher questionnaire, a story telling task for students and classroom vignette recorded in classroom trials. Satisfactory reliability coefficients of the assessment tools were obtained. Correlations between teachers' expectation on DiE and their performance in teaching class and students' verbal creativity partially supported that the assessment tools were valid to evaluate the effectiveness of DiE in Hong Kong education context. Note to implementation and future research were also discussed.

在過去的四年，優質教育基金 (QEF) 主題網絡：戲劇教育計劃 (QTN) 積極引入戲劇教學法以提升老師的教學能力及發展學生的創造力。本年度研究的目標是設計一套適用於「戲劇教學法」的評核工具，以幫助老師評估課堂運用的戲劇教學技巧，如何達到教學目標。 這套評核工具特別以 布魯姆的教學目標分類法 (The Bloom's Taxonomy, 1956) 及修改版教學目標分類法 (The Revised Taxonomy; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001) 作為藍本，以配合香港教育的特色。這套評核工具包括由老師填寫問卷、提供戲劇教學法的實踐教學片段及教案；並隨機挑選實驗班的同學進行看圖講故事測試。為測試這個評核工具在統計學上的有效度，本研究採用前、後測試模式，以自願參與形式邀請參與計劃 。最終成功收到 236 位老師及 705 位學生，分別來自 27 間幼稚園、23 間小學及 1 間特殊學校提供資料作研究用途。經評審老師們上、下學期的戲劇教學法實踐片段及

進行數據研究，這套評核工具的效度理想。老師對戲劇教學法的預期及老師課堂以戲劇教學法達到教學目標的表現有正向的相關；這關係亦能在學生講故事的創造力反映出來。此等數據足以支持這套評核工具能有效地評核老師們使用戲劇教學法達到預定的教學目標的表現。最後，這份報告亦會討論使用這套評核工具時要注意的事項。

1. Introduction

1.1 Advantages of Drama in Education

'Creative drama for young children inherently offers effective means for enhancing *all* areas of children's development' (Szecsi, 2008, p.120). The assertion is believed and supported by educators probably because of the encouraging research findings accumulated over years. Some aspects facilitated by Drama-in-Education (DiE) among children includes social and language development, symbolic thinking, problem solving, literacy skills, emotional expressivity, large and fine motor skills and so on (Szecsi, 2008), leading them to all-round development.

Besides helping with the acquisition of mother or foreign languages, drama pedagogy has attracted much research attention concerning her effectiveness in teaching science subjects. A Turkish experimental study (Çokadar & Yılmaz, 2010) was conducted throughout an academic year, comparing the performances in a general science course between two classes in which creative drama-based and traditional instruction were implemented respectively. Students were randomly assigned to either class and were taught by the same experienced teacher. The results showed that two classes were significantly different in terms of academic achievement in the subject and median of the attitudes toward science. Contrasted to the control group, the experimental group achieved greater improvements in scientific conceptions and showed a more positive attitude towards the subject after treatment. Dorion (2009) also suggested that mime and role play could be employed as mediums of teaching abstract scientific concepts and used in subjects such as Chemistry, Biology, and Physics.

As students being promoted to the university, creative drama still plays a role in their education. A single group pre- and post-test experimental design was employed in Adıgüzel and Timuçin's (2010). A group of volunteer university students were invited to participate in creative drama sessions teaching developmental and learning theories in the field of Educational Psychology, and were asked to complete an achievement test before and after the workshops. Their performances were enhanced, proving drama pedagogy could be implemented in all levels of formal education. Another interesting study employing an action research approach achieved one step forward to discuss the idea of 'drama as examination' in university curriculum (Silius-Ahonen & Gustavson, 2011). Students were required to read articles about health promotion and prepare a drama to convey the materials to the audience. Participants reflected that the acting was meaningful while a truly deep and reflective learning process was facilitated, contrasted with traditional forms of examination.

Besides learning effectiveness in academic subjects, drama enhances development of other aspects among students. In a study conducted in lower socio-economic area of New Zealand (Baskerville, 2011), storytelling was proven a culturally inclusive approach, which successfully promoted cultural harmony in classroom. Among 24 students aged 13 to 14 participated in this study, they reported belonging to as many as six cultural ethnicities. In the drama class, students were asked to tell personal stories and write some reflections for each narrative they listened to. It was revealed that students' empathy, compassion, tolerance and respect for difference were fostered after the workshops. When the society is longing for promoting inclusiveness and harmony, drama and storytelling in classroom may contribute to nurturing younger generations since they are small.

It is not surprising that creative drama instruction facilitated children's creativity development (Yeh, 2008). The study involved 116 Taiwanese preschool children aged 4 to over 6, whose classes were distinguished into high-, medium- and low-level groups according to the extent to which drama instruction was implemented. Drama pedagogy significantly impacted children's creativity, in terms of novelty and usefulness. High-level group outperformed medium- and low-level groups (ps < .01), while medium-level group outperformed low-level group (p < .001). In another Taiwanese study (Lin Y. , 2010) drama was found related to qualities of possibility thinking, such as imagination, independent thinking and risk-taking, representing some sort of everyday creativity. The results were promising and suggested that drama instruction was helpful in enhancing Chinese children's creativity.

A recent study taken place in Hong Kong invited a total of 68 students from primary 1 to 4 to share their experiences of learning Chinese Language and General Studies through drama pedagogy (Chan, 2009). Most of them suggested a close link between drama education and learning General Studies, in a sense that they can acquire new knowledge and gain deeper understanding of the issues. They could 'experience' the economic hardship in the old days, such as daily life of farmers and water shortage in 1970s! However, they were not that aware of the impact of drama pedagogy in the subject of Chinese Language. The lessons were viewed as more serious and rigid, compared with General Studies. Some students 'complained' that they could not learn any new words in these sessions, though some were quite delighted to become confident speakers because of the training. The study reminded the educational sector that despite persuading empirical findings about the value of drama pedagogy, students themselves may not be aware of the 'usefulness' of it. Merging drama education into existing curriculum

could be a challenging task, given that 'spoon-fed education' had been prevailing for years and students may get too used to it, ignoring other modes of learning.

1.2 Teachers' concern on implementing DiE

It is conceivable that literature about drama training mainly focuses on to what extent can it affect students. On the contrary, research of drama impact on effectiveness of teachers is rather limited. One drama instruction program developed by the Department of Theatre and Dance at The University of Texas is called Drama for Schools (DFS). This program values teacher's active and independent role in participation of drama training. Throughout the training sessions, teachers perceived that they were developing much authentic teaching strategies for students to understand, to demonstrate, and to apply knowledge in an advanced manner (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009). Dawson, Cawthon, and Baker (2011) documented feedbacks from teachers on their own changes after the completion of DFS. Teachers learnt to adjust their teaching style by adding more elements of enjoyment, social factors and open discussion. Most importantly, teachers turned their philosophy of "Me Teaching" to "Student Learning", together with deepening relationship with students, to promote active learning of students that engage them developing higher-order thinking skills such as reflection.

Drama training also provides enrichments of additional qualities, which are beneficial to delivery of instruction. For example, Ozdemir and Cakmak (2008) examined the effect of a 12-weeks drama course on creativity of 78 prospective teachers. All round significant advancements of creativity were observed by comparing their pre-test and post-test scores. Another study with similar design indicated that drama education could increase emotional intelligence as well as social skills in student teachers (Ozdemir, 2003, as cited in Ozdemir & Cakmak, 2008). These skills are fostered by drama exercise whose nature as continual reconstruction of mental pictures

and enacting upon reality, which in turn stimulates creative and functional instruction to bring enjoyment towards students (Toivanen, Antikainen, & Ruismaki, 2009).

Despite of its potential for wider application, application of drama training on education has not yet become a well-accepted idea for teachers. According to a survey in drama class, prospective teachers tended to agree with the effectiveness but still not determined to apply drama (Gonen & Veziroglu, 2010). There was a clue to explain that underlying rationale offered by the survey that teachers were afraid of losing authority if they choose such an interactive approach with students. In fact, this lack of self-efficacy in their attitudes might merely a matter of insufficient in accomplishing successful experience, which leading to lowered positive expectation of drama education (Toivanen, Antikainen, & Ruismaki, 2009). In another study, Kerekes and King (2010) investigated four prospective teachers who voluntarily planned and administered drama classes to public schools. In Asian contexts, teachers were also facing dilemma when implementing drama education techniques into lessons, for instance, conventional classrooms in Taiwan (Lin Y. , 2010). On the one hand, teachers showed their capability to set stages to facilitate sixth-grade (11-12 years old) pupils' creativity and possibility thinking through implementing drama techniques. However, on the other hand, pupils reflected that teachers' role in responsible to pupils' needs or dereliction of teachers' duty to maintain order and to cultivate moral values became blurred, which led them uncomfortable and less confident without feedbacks from teachers on their own decisions. Beyond facing the change of teaching approach from a monological to dialogical, in Hong Kong education contexts, teachers also face problems in tight curriculum, big class in a small classroom between demands of transformation and accountability (Tam, 2010). As a result of extensive arrangements of teachers' collaborated drama planning, repeatedly considerations about balancing teaching curriculums and students'

needs, and of accumulation of successful experience, teachers' expectancies and their sense of teaching efficacy become crucial factors to the effectiveness of implementing DiE in classrooms, especially pupils are still in the initial stage learning to be autonomous learners.

Since there are various factors in the contexts altering teachers' performance on implementing DiE techniques in classes, the objective of this research is to set up a set of self-assessment tool for practitioners in the practice of evaluation of the effectiveness of DiE on teachers' creative teaching techniques and students' expression and gain through learning through drama. The psychometric properties of the assessment tools were examined with a cross-sectional and longitudinal sample of teachers and students participating in drama education.

1.3 Bloom's Taxonomy, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Pupils' Creative Performance assessment tools to QTN teachers

Bloom's Taxonomy and Revised Bloom's Taxonomy.   Outcome Based Education has aimed at developing learners' competence under clear teaching objectives and assessing through students' performance as evidence (Andrich, 2002). In his review of the correlations between Outcomes Based Education and Bloom's Taxonomy, amongst similarities and differences, both ascertain the role of the teacher as a facilitator and gatekeeper to student's learning, especially in preschool and elementary education.

Bloom's Taxonomy has become one of the most well established and extensively applied models in education globally as a curriculum development guideline of educational objectives and assessments since post World War II era (Athanassiou & McNett, 2003). The initial version (Blooms, 1956) classified educational objectives into three major domains as cognitive (knowledge based), affective (attitudinal based) and psychomotor (skill based). Each domain is

then divided into hierarchical level, from which is intended that each level incorporates the level before it. For each of the domains, the hierarchy is divided into five or six levels. In the cognitive domain, the hierarchy is divided into knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The affective domain is divided into receiving, responding, valuing, organization and internalization. Lastly, the psychomotor domain, the hierarchy is classified as perception, set, guided response, mechanism, and complex overt response. The major merit of the taxonomy is to give a way to express qualitatively the different kinds of intellectual, affective and psychomotor skills and abilities. By classifying each domain into a single hierarchy level, the taxonomy provides a concise model to assist educators to classify objectives over different subjects across different areas.

Anderson and Krathwohl (2001) further improved The Taxonomy from single dimensional into two-dimensional classifications. The major differences of The Revised Bloom's Taxonomy is to classify intended learning outcomes in terms of "(a) some subject matter content and (b) a description of what is to be done with or to that content" (Krathwohl, 2002, p. 213). The first dimension classifies cognitive knowledge as factual (basic elements), conceptual (interrelationships among elements), procedural (how to do) and metacognitive (knowledge of cognition). The second dimension focuses on stating each objective starting with a verb form instead of noun aspects as the original version, to emphasize on the cognitive process required to each objective. Each cognitive dimension is categorized as remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluation, and create. Revised Bloom's Taxonomy provides a broader dimension to classify the multi-dimensional aspect of teaching objectives and activities in a clear, concise, and visual representation and in a less rigid way as the original Taxonomy.

Revised Bloom's Taxonomy are widely adapted as evaluation tools and conceptual frameworks for developing teaching objectives (Ari, 2011; Nasstrom, 2009;), assessment tools to evaluate pupils (Gillies & Ashman, 1998), assessing pre-service teachers' planning skills (Bumen, 2007) and also assessing attitudes toward teaching creative strategies (Clayburn, Ervay, & Albrecht, 2012). Considered that key objectives from Curriculum Development Council (2001) emphasized on nurturing affective and psychomotor knowledge in preschool and primary curriculum, such as coordination of basic motor skills, appreciate cultural art and their environment and develop aesthetic sensitivity, this research adapted both Revised Bloom's Taxonomy (knowledge domain) and The Original Taxonomy (affective knowledge and psychomotor knowledge) as the framework to evaluate teachers' expectations on implementing DiE techniques into classes and the teaching outcomes from QTN participated schools.

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) As mentioned in previous section, the effectiveness of implementing DiE (or other new pedagogy) in class depends on teachers' perceptions of students as learners, their change of role and identity from conventional teacher to a facilitator, and implantation of new strategies (Dawson, Cawthon, & Baker, 2011). Summarized from this model, Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) takes a decisive role, which refers to the teachers' capabilities of organizing and executing instructional strategies, classroom management and facilitating student engagement. TSES is also a construct broadly adapted in educational research. The factor analysis results also explained that teacher self-efficacy for literacy instruction contributed to overall TSES. For in-service secondary school teachers in Hong Kong (Chan D. , 2008), perceived practical abilities were the best and significant predictor to TSES-18 items, except teaching highly able students. In a study of Turkish teacher on creative drama teaching adapting self-reporting approach on perceived

efficacy of implementation creative drama method and TSES for bachelor students from classroom teaching and pre-school teaching (Kaya, 2010), differences were only found independently on demographic differences in department enrolling, class and gender but correlations or mean differences between two variables were not analyzed. Another SEM modeling from Mohamadi and Asadzadeh (2011) found that teachers' sense of efficacy in student engagement and classroom management were significant moderators facilitating high school student achievement.

To conclude, Bloom's Taxonomy is a well-developed and widely-recognized tool to assess the effectiveness implementing DiE techniques in classes for both lesson planning and evaluation of teaching outcomes. Moreover, as supported by Mohamadi and Asadzadeh (2011), TSES would also be used to evaluate pupils' creative performance. To examine the psychometric properties of the assessment tools in a cross-sectional and multi-dimensional perspective, we hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 1: Teachers' course expectations on implementing DiE techniques in class was positively correlated and varied with teachers' performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve teaching objectives in class;

Hypothesis 2: Upon the experience accommodated of practice class in Term A, there would be a positive difference for participated teachers on their expectations and performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve teaching objectives in Term B; and

Hypothesis 3: Teachers' Sense of Self-efficacy (TSES) would correlate positively with pupils' creative performance on storytelling.

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants and procedure

The data of the present analyses are derived from the Term A and Term B data of a longitudinal study on teachers' effectiveness on implementing DiE techniques in enhancing teachers to achieve their teaching objectives and students to achieve their creative outcomes.

The first part is a quantitative study for QTN teachers. They were invited to fill in a pretest questionnaire before their implementation of drama in education class in the first term of the current school year 2011-2012. They were then invited to submit their posttest questionnaire after their second practice in the second term. There were a total of 236 teachers submitted the pretest questionnaire from 27 kindergartens, 23 primary schools and 1 school for special educational need (SEN) children, including 209 female teachers and 27 male teachers. For the posttest questionnaires, there were a total of 164 teachers submitted the posttest questionnaires from 23 kindergartens, 18 primary schools and 1 SEN school, including 146 female teachers and 18 male teachers. Based on the pre-test participants 51.2% (121) teachers have been teaching for 6 to 15 years. 66.5% (155 teachers) have participated in drama in education workshops up to 20 hours.

The second part of the study is an analysis of how teachers' implemented DiE techniques achieved the intended teaching objectives. Upon completion of analysis, there were a total of 131 teachers submitted their video recording for Term A class practice from 20 kindergartens, 12 primary schools and 1 SEN school, including 118 female teachers and 13 male teachers. For the Term B, 89 teachers submitted their class practice video clips from 13 kindergartens and 12 primary schools and 1 SEN school, included 77 female teachers and 12 male teachers. Teaching

performance was evaluated by a checklist developed based on The Bloom's Taxonomy and The Revised Taxonomy. Every teaching performance was inter-rated by a chief rater and assistant raters to take the average score of the performance.

Participants of the third part of the study include a total of 705 students in the QTN classes taking part voluntarily in a storytelling task to assess their verbal creativity from April to July 2012, 26 kindergartens (174 girls and 162 boys), 19 primary schools (176 girls and 178 boys) and 1 SEN schools (7 girls and 8 boys). Students' scores were then aggregated into school-based scores for analysis.

2.2 Instrument

The research instrument was developed based on Bloom's Taxonomy, The Revised Taxonomy and Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) to measure teachers' expectations on implementing DiE techniques and the effectiveness in classes to achieve teaching objectives and how the TSES was correlated with students' creative performance. The data was collected through three different sources: subjective teacher questionnaire, objective teaching evaluation and objective students' storytelling test.

2.2.1 Teacher questionnaire

Teachers' expectation on DiE   The first part was to measure teachers' expectations of implementing DiE techniques in classed, which was assessed in both Term A and Term B. It was developed by adapting from Bolin, Khramtsova and Saarnio (2005). The original scale was to measure the university students' affective outcome, evaluation of course outcomes, cognitive journal outcomes and course expectations on journal writing. Only sixteen out of original twenty-two items from the original scales was adapted by rephrasing "journal writing" and "this

class" to "drama in education". The DiE expectation scale also consists of 4 factors: affective outcomes (5 items, e.g. Drama in education has helped student to better understand their feelings); evaluations of course outcomes (4 items, e.g. Drama in education has helped me in my own personal life); cognitive outcomes (3 items, e.g. Drama in education has motivated student to study) and course expectation (4 items, e.g. Drama in education would teach student things relevant to their current personal life). Items were rated in a 5-point Likert-scale (from 1 = very disagree to 5 = very agree) in both pre- and post-test. In contrast to the original scale, even though only sixteen out of twenty-two items were adapted and modified, the subscale reliability held similar strength as the original scale. Table 1 lists the comparison of reliability in Cronbach's Alpha between the original scales and the DiE expectation scale.

Table 1

Reliability comparisons of Bolin, Khramtsova and Saarnio (2005) scale and DiE Expectation Scale

	n	Components			
		Affective outcome	Evaluation of outcome	Cognitive outcome	Expectation
Bolin, Khramtsova and Saarnio (2005) α	172	.94	.87	.86	.78
Term A α	236	.85	.76	.78	.81
Term B α	164	.88	.83	.82	.83

Teachers' Sense of Self-efficacy (TSES)   Another scale adapted in the present study was 12-item short form Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), which was

used in Term B. The scale consists of three-4-item subscales: self-efficacy for classroom

management (e.g. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?), student

engagement (e.g. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?)

and instructional strategies (e.g. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your

classroom?). Items were rated in a 9-point scale (from 1 = never to 9 = always). In compared

with the reliability in this research with the initial stage, the overall reliability in this study

retained a similar level (α = .90), whereas the subscale reliability was slight lower than the

original but still within a satisfactory level (classroom management α = .78; student engagement

α = .73; and instructional strategies α = .84). For data analysis, teachers' scores were aggregated

to form school-based scores for analysis.

2.2.2 Teaching evaluation by practitioner

Teaching Assessment scale under Bloom's Taxonomy and The Revised Taxonomy   Based

on the broad coverage of intended learning outcomes stated in Learning to Learn (2001), this

research adapted a complementary approach of The Bloom's Taxonomy (Blooms, 1956) and The

Revised Taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). The teaching evaluation scale was also

developed in quantitative approach and consisted of 34 items. Teaching objectives were first

classified into three domains as The Bloom's Taxonomy as: knowledge, affective and

psychomotor. But for knowledge (cognitive) domain, it was classified as factual, conceptual,

procedural and metacognitive based on The Revised Taxonomy, instead of The Original

Taxonomy. In each knowledge (cognitive) domain, it was further classified into a four 6-item

subscales to measure whether teacher could facilitate students to remember, understand, apply,

analyze, evaluate and create. The affective domain was measured in a 5-item subscale whether

teachers could facilitate students to receive, respond, value, organize and internalize from the attitudinal or emotional objectives. Lastly, the psychomotor domain was measured in a 5-item subscale whether teachers could facilitate students to perceive, set, guide their response, coordinate and completely manipulate the skill. Inter-rater reliability was used. Raters first studied the teaching plans and classified each objective into any of the domains and sub-domains. Then, s(he) gave scores of teachers' performance based on teachers' demonstration of DiE techniques and students' feedbacks in classes. Scores were finally calculated by averaging to get the mean scores from the two raters. A chief rater rated all practice class recordings in Term A and Term B submitted from participated teachers. All the practice class recordings were then relayed to one of trained second raters to complete inter-rating. The inter-rater reliability of each domain of cognitive knowledge was as below: factual knowledge (Overall α = .893; Term A α = .877; Term B α = .844), conceptual knowledge (Overall α = .867; Term A α = .883; Term B α = .852), procedural knowledge (Overall α = nil; Term A α = .914; Term B α = nil) and meta-cognitive knowledge (Overall α = .685; Term A α = .855; Term B α = .899). Subject to raters' classification, there was only 1 procedural knowledge classified and rated on the evaluation scales in Term B, the reliability of overall cognitive knowledge could not be calculated. The reliability of affective domain was (Overall α = .828; Term A α = .865; Term B α = .924) and the reliability of psychomotor domain was (Overall α = .895; Term A α = .860; Term B α = .902). Moreover, there were also correlations across various domains and knowledge. Affective domain was positively correlated to overall cognitive domain (r (122) = .516, p < .01), factual knowledge (r (113) = .308, p < .01), conceptual knowledge (r (120) = .569, p < .001), procedural knowledge (r (21) = .502, p < .05), and meta-cognitive knowledge (r (86) = .347, p < .01). Finally psychomotor domain was positively correlated to overall cognitive domain (r (96)

= .447, p < .001), factual knowledge (r (85) = .446, p < .001), conceptual knowledge (r (94)

= .344, p < .01) and affective domain (r (84) = .331, p < .01). High inter-rater reliability

coefficients and moderately strong correlations had indicated that the assessment tool was a

reliable tool to evaluate teachers' performance on implementing DiE in classroom. The tool was

also a valid tool useful to discriminate objectives in different domains.

2.2.3 Storytelling test for student

Story Telling Test (STT; (Hui & Lau, 2006)   The STT was conducted by an experience

researcher and trained research assistants in Term B who disguised her(him)self as a volunteer

from an organization called "The Story Kingdom". Each student was presented with an unseen

picture and was asked to tell a story about the picture. In this test, participated students were

provided 3 minutes for preview and 5 minutes to create their story. They were allowed to

continue until finished if their storytelling was over five minutes. The storytelling process was

digital-recorded and then evaluated by two raters independently in accordance to 10 criteria, of

which the first 9 criteria are the same for kindergarten and primary school students: relevancy to

the story, ability to describe the story, ability to organize the story, ability to express, ability to

show emotions and speak in an audible tone, ability to add in conversations, ability to include

humorous elements, ability to include creative elements, and ability to identify problems and find

relevant solutions. For the last criterion, kindergarten students were assessed on whether they

were able to give a relevant name to their story, and primary school students were assessed on

whether appropriate vocabularies were used. Each criterion was rated on a four-point scale (from

1, lowest, to 4, highest). A mean score was calculated for all the criteria for further data analysis.

3. Results

The objective of this research was to compile a multi-dimensional assessment tool for practitioners to assess the effectiveness of DiE on teachers' creative teaching techniques and students' expression and gain while their learning through drama. As stated in previous section, high reliability level on teacher questionnaire and teaching evaluation initially evidenced that the internal consistency of this tool. Further analysis was conducted in three-facets to assess the psychometric evidence supporting the conceptual constructs of the assessment tools.

3.1 Evaluations on teachers' expectation and class performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve teaching objectives

3.1.1 Correlations between teachers' expectation and class performance

Table 2 demonstrated means, standard deviations, and pairwise correlation matrix of overall teachers' expectations and performance of implementing DiE to achieve various teaching objectives. Teacher overall expectation on implementing DiE techniques in classes was positively correlated to achievements on teaching metacognitive knowledge ($r(103) = .190$, $p = .055$). Expectation of affective outcomes was positively and correlated to teaching meta-cognitive knowledge with marginal significance ($r(103) = .190$, $p = .054$). Evaluation of course outcomes was positively correlated to teaching affective domain ($r(122) = .187$, $p < .05$). Finally, expectation of cognitive outcomes was positively correlated to teaching meta-cognitive knowledge ($r(103) = .201$, $p < .05$) with significance and positively correlated to teaching overall cognitive domain ($r(148) = .157$, $p = .056$). Some of the teachers' expectations were positively correlated to their performance on implementing DiE techniques in classes to achieve

their teaching objectives. Hypothesis 1 was further analyzed by independent T-test to measure group difference on expectations against their performance.

3.1.2 Evaluation of the condition of teachers' expectation and class performance

A series of independent-samples t-tests were then conducted to compare teachers' performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve various teaching objectives in classes and teachers' expectations on DiE conditions, results with significance were shown in Table 3. Firstly, teachers' overall expectations was divided by two groups based on mean split (M = 3.886, SD = .436), where high expectation group scored higher or equal to mean value and the low expectation group scored lower than mean value. There was a difference with significance in high expectation group (M = 3.236, SD = .661) and low expectation group (M = 2.881, SD = .674), $t(101) = 2.678$, $p < 0.010$ to the DiE performance in teaching mega-cognitive knowledge in classes. There was also a marginal significant difference in high expectation group (M = 3.019, SD = .826) and low expectation group (M = 2.729, SD = .822); $t(120) = 1.911$, $p = .058$ to the DiE performance in teaching affective domain in classes. For the differences between teachers' expectations and their performance, we also conducted independent-samples t-tests based on data collected in Term A and Term B respectively. Results with significance were indicated in Table 4. In Term A, overall expectation was divided by mean split (M = 3.863, SD = .493), where high expectation group scored higher or equal to mean value and the low expectation group scored lower than mean value. There was a significant difference in high overall expectation (M = 3.336, SD = .697) and low overall expectation (M = 3.026, SD = .609); $t(126) = 2.634$, $p < .01$ to the DiE performance in teaching overall cognitive domains. There was a also significant difference in high expectations (M = 3.353, SD = .821) and low expectation group (M = 3.0371, SD = .765);

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Pairwise Correlation Matrix of Overall Teachers' Expectations and Performance of Implementing DiE to Achieve Various Teaching Objectives

	M	SD		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Overall expectation	3.8863	.43603	r	1											
			Sig.												
			N	235											
2. Affective outcome	3.9687	.44057	r	.935**	1										
			Sig.	.000											
			N	235	235										
3. Evaluation	3.7473	.50781	r	.911**	.798**	1									
			Sig.	.000	.000										
			N	235	235	235									
4. Cognitive outcome	3.9780	.48468	r	.853**	.741**	.675**	1								
			Sig.	.000	.000	.000									
			N	235	235	235	235								
5. Expectation	3.8515	.48641	r	.939**	.832**	.816**	.767**	1							
			Sig.	.000	.000	.000	.000								
			N	234	234	234	234	234							
6. Bloom's Cognitive Domain	3.1002	.61393	r	.151	.132	.136	.157	.145	1						
			Sig.	.068	.110	.099	.056	.080							
			N	148	148	148	148	147	148						
7. Factual knowledge	3.2024	.69338	r	.094	.067	.082	.132	.092	.846**	1					
			Sig.	.283	.446	.346	.129	.292	.000						
			N	133	133	133	133	132	133	133					
8. Conceptual knowledge	3.1185	.74107	r	.126	.100	.127	.091	.125	.897**	.671**	1				
			Sig.	.134	.232	.128	.277	.134	.000	.000					
			N	144	144	144	144	144	144	130	144				
9. Procedural knowledge	3.0145	.83130	r	-.010	-.041	.007	-.065	.047	.757**	.526**	.590**	1			
			Sig.	.962	.845	.972	.756	.822	.000	.007	.002				
			N	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25			
10. Meta-cognitive knowledge	3.0809	.68664	r	.190	.190	.181	.201*	.118	.569**	.088	.283**	.548*	1		
			Sig.	.055	.054	.068	.042	.234	.000	.406	.004	.028			
			N	103	103	103	103	103	103	92	100	16	103		
11. Affective domain	2.8977	.83331	r	.169	.158	.187*	.131	.124	.516**	.308**	.569**	.502*	.347**	1	
			Sig.	.062	.081	.039	.150	.172	.000	.001	.000	.020	.001		
			N	122	122	122	122	122	122	113	120	21	86	122	
12. Psycho-motor Domain	2.7943	.73082	r	.080	.020	.056	.168	.078	.447**	.446**	.344**	.331	.215	.331**	1
			Sig.	.440	.848	.590	.102	.453	.000	.000	.001	.227	.076	.002	
			N	96	96	96	96	96	96	85	94	15	69	84	96

Note. * p < .050, ** p < .010

t(119) = 2.149, p < .05 in DiE performance in teaching conceptual knowledge. Significant

differences were also found in high expectation group (M = 3.212, SD = .751) and low

expectation group (M = 2.849, SE = .708); t(77) = 2.173, p <.05 in teaching meta-cognitive

knowledge. Significant difference was found in high expectation group (M = 3.280, SD

= .880) and low expectation group (M = 2.769, SD = .853); t(95) = 2.808, p < .01 in teaching

affective domain. Finally, significant differences was found in high expectation group (M =

3.128, SD = .663) and low expectation group (M = 2.747, SD = .736); t(75) = 2.356, p < .05

in teaching psychomotor domain. However, in Term B, no significant difference was found

in high expectation group and low expectation group in DiE performance in achieving

teaching objectives of the knowledge in all domains.

In short, teachers' overall expectation in DiE techniques was positively correlated

with achieving the major dimensions of teaching objectives. Hypothesis 1 was partially

supported.

Table 3.
*Independent t-Test finding about the teachers' overall expectation on DiE and the
performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve various teaching objectives in
classes*

Domains or knowledge	n	High expectation (M >= 3.886)		Low expectation (M < 3.886)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Cognitive Domain	148	3.164	.628	3.021	.591	1.408	.161
Factual knowledge	133	3.226	.738	3.170	.631	.463	.644
Conceptual knowledge	144	3.187	.769	3.033	.701	1.239	.218
Procedural knowledge	25	3.083	.778	2.951	.905	.390	.700
Meta-cognitive knowledge	103	3.236	.661	2.881	.674	2.678	.009
Affective Domain	122	3.019	.826	2.729	.822	1.911	.058
Psychomotor Domain	96	2.858	.750	2.683	.692	1.128	.262

Table 4a

Independent t-Test finding about the teachers' expectation in Term A on DiE and the performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve various teaching objectives in classes

Domains or knowledge	n	High expectation In Term A (M >= 3.863)		Low expectation In Term A (M < 3.863)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Cognitive Domain	128	3.336	.697	3.026	.609	2.634	.009
Factual knowledge	111	3.415	.755	3.226	.664	1.362	.176
Conceptual knowledge	121	3.353	.821	3.037	.765	2.149	.034
Procedure knowledge	21	3.003	.955	2.985	.790	.048	.962
Meta-cognitive knowledge	79	3.212	.751	2.849	.708	2.173	.033
Affective domain	97	3.280	.880	2.769	.853	2.808	.006
Psychomotor knowledge	77	3.128	.663	2.747	.736	2.356	.021

Table 4b

Independent t-Test finding about the teachers' expectation in Term B on DiE and the performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve various teaching objectives in classes

Domains or knowledge	n	High expectation In Term B (M >= 3.948)		Low expectation In Term B (M < 3.948)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Cognitive Domain	69	3.108	.471	3.204	.541	-.793	.431
Factual knowledge	51	3.073	.614	3.228	.597	-.866	.391
Conceptual knowledge	61	3.105	.622	3.142	.538	-.248	.805
Procedure	1	3.667	Nil	Nil	Nil	n.a.	n.a.
Meta-cognitive knowledge	46	3.171	.606	3.203	.648	-.176	.861

Affective Domain	52	2.822	.733	2.670	.735	.726	.471
Psychomotor Domain	39	2.396	.819	2.520	.641	-.499	.621

3.2 Evaluation on teachers' performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve teaching objectives during the school year, 2011 to 2012

A series of paired-samples t-tests were conducted to compare the mean differences of teachers' performance on implementing DiE techniques to achieve various teaching objectives in Term A and Term B respectively, as presented in Table 5. Firstly there was a significant difference in teachers' performance in achieving objectives in affective domains in Term A (M= 3.182, SD = .662) and achieving objectives in affective domains in Term B (M = 2.761, SD = .784); t(40) = 2.427, p < .05. Moreover, there was also a significant difference in teachers' performance in achieving objectives in psychomotor domains in Term A (M = 3.000, SD = .623) and Term B (M = 2.550, SD = .707); t(27) = 3.337, p < .01. Teachers' performance in Term A was higher than their performance in Term B and paired t-test for performance in achieving objectives in other domains were over p < .05. Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

3.3 Evaluation of the effect on teachers' sense of efficacy on students' creative performance

3.3.1 Effect on teachers' sense of efficacy on students' storytelling competence

To compare for the difference of teachers' sense of efficacy on students' creative performance, a series of independent-samples t-tests were then conducted, as demonstrated in Table 7. Firstly, overall teachers' sense of efficacy was divided by M = 6.850, SD = .456, where high TSES group scored higher or equal to mean value and the low TSES group scored lower than the mean value. There was a significant difference in students' verbal creativity between

Table 5

Differences Between Teachers' Performance on implementing DiE Techniques in Achieving Teaching Objectives in Term A and Term B

Domains or knowledge	Term A		Term B		*df*	*t*	*p*
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*			
Cognitive Domain	3.254	.658	3.211	.481	69	.510	.611
Factual knowledge	3.308	.789	3.258	.543	45	.453	.653
Conceptual knowledge	3.306	.753	3.222	.482	52	.818	.417
Procedural knowledge	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Meta-cognitive knowledge	2.990	.728	3.217	.634	32	-1.566	.127
Affective Domain	3.182	.6620	2.761	.784	40	2.427	.020
Psychomotor Domain	3.000	.6230	2.550	.707	27	3.337	.002

high TSES group (M = 1.855, SD = .355) and low TSES group (M = 1.631, SD = .293); t(37) = 2.126, p < .05. We further analyzed to measure the conditions of TSES factors on students' creative performance. Teachers' efficacy on instructional strategies (TSES-IS) was divided by two groups based on M = 6.772, SD = .470, where high TSES-IS group scored higher or equal to mean value and the low TSES-IS group scored lower than mean value. Results in Table 8 showed that there was a difference with significance in high TSES-IS group (M = 3.430, SD = .194) to TSES-IS group (M = 3.267, SD = .257); t(37) = 2.264, p < .05 to expression.

Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was partially accepted whether teachers' overall sense of efficacy had an effect on students' verbal creativity in storytelling and teachers' efficacy on instructional strategies had an effect on students' expression capacity of storytelling.

Table 7

Independent t-Test finding about the overall TSES to students' creative performance

Criteria	n	High overall TSES (M >= 6.850)		Low overall TSES (M < 6.850)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Overall STT	39	2.076	.265	1.942	.270	1.560	.127
Theme	39	2.823	.478	2.579	.482	1.585	.122
Description	39	2.050	.134	2.016	.089	.917	.365
Structure	39	2.715	.794	2.345	.792	1.454	.154
Expression	39	3.420	.235	3.287	.221	1.810	.078
Title	33	2.694	.234	2.464	.513	1.672	.104
Voice	39	2.007	.305	1.819	.308	1.911	.064
Emotion	39	1.531	.219	1.496	.256	.458	.650
Dialogue	39	1.528	.395	1.485	.397	.339	.737
Humorous	39	1.170	.151	1.162	.139	.163	.871
Creative	39	1.855	.355	1.631	.293	2.126	.040
Solution	39	1.233	.155	1.181	.185	.948	.349

Table 8a

Independent t-Test finding about the TSES-Class Management (CM) to students' creative performance

Criteria	n	High TSES-CM (M >= 7.023)		Low TSES-CM (M < 7.023)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Overall STT	39	2.014	.266	2.015	.286	- .007	.994
Theme	39	2.727	.485	2.692	.507	.224	.824
Description	39	2.061	.143	2.006	.069	1.506	.140
Structure	39	2.557	.786	2.532	.845	.096	.924
Expression	39	3.389	.234	3.327	.239	.821	.417
Title	33	2.537	.518	2.625	.271	- .620	.540
Voice	39	1.910	.289	1.931	.352	- .210	.835
Emotion	39	1.487	.187	1.545	.280	- .761	.452
Dialogue	39	1.502	.395	1.515	.399	- .101	.920
Humorous	39	1.145	.144	1.189	.144	- .940	.353
Creative	39	1.791	.371	1.710	.315	.729	.470
Solution	39	1.214	.149	1.203	.192	.209	.836

Table 8b

Independent t-Test finding about the TSES-Student Engagement (SE) to students' creative performance

Criteria	n	High TSES-SE (M >= 6.754)		Low TSES-SE (M < 6.754)		t	p
		M	SD	M	SD		
Overall STT	39	2.031	.270	2.000	.281	.365	.717
Theme	39	2.762	.494	2.661	.493	.635	.529
Description	39	2.021	.107	2.047	.124	- .702	.487
Structure	39	2.628	.808	2.465	.814	.630	.533
Expression	39	3.381	.245	3.338	.229	.572	.571
Title	33	2.627	.249	2.545	.505	.572	.571
Voice	39	1.951	.318	1.891	.322	.592	.557
Emotion	39	1.526	.255	1.504	.221	.281	.780
Dialogue	39	1.496	.409	1.520	.384	- .194	.847
Humorous	39	1.150	.137	1.182	.152	- .672	.506
Creative	39	1.752	.335	1.751	.358	.005	.996
Solution	39	1.239	.156	1.180	.181	1.076	.289

Table 8c

Independent t-Test finding about the TSES-Instructional Strategy (IS) to students' creative performance

Criteria	*n*	High TSES-IS (M >= 6.772)		Low TSES-IS (M < 6.72)		*t*	*p*
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Overall STT	39	2.045	.296	1.975	.241	.788	.436
Theme	39	2.745	.524	2.665	.453	.504	.618
Description	39	2.047	.126	2.018	.101	.797	.431
Structure	39	2.645	.876	2.414	.705	.886	.381
Expression	39	3.430	.194	3.267	.257	2.264	.030
Title	33	2.582	.295	2.583	.533	- .009	.993
Voice	39	1.963	.341	1.865	.283	.960	.343
Emotion	39	1.507	.236	1.526	.242	- .238	.813
Dialogue	39	1.540	.470	1.467	.267	.576	.568
Humorous	39	1.153	.151	1.183	.137	- .636	.529
Creative	39	1.773	.364	1.723	.323	.444	.659
Solution	39	1.235	.174	1.175	.161	1.087	.284

4. Discussion

This research stemmed from development of a set of self-assessment tool for practitioners in the practice of evaluation of the effectiveness of Drama in education. As evidence supported, the assessment tool which combined both the Bloom's Taxonomy and the Revised Taxonomy serves as a reliable and valid tool for use in the context of the outcome based curriculum for both preschool and primary education in Hong Kong. The tool covers knowledge dimensions including cognitive processing; affective and attitudinal; and psychomotor skills. In reviewing the psychometric properties in this research, high reliability

is achieved in this New Bloom DiE assessment. This new adaptation of this composite approach of The Bloom's Taxonomy and The Revised Taxonomy is innovative in educational psychology research. It may contribute as a new input from the Bloom's Taxonomy to meet the needs of outcome base education in the 21st Century. Moreover, the significant correlations between teachers' expectation on evaluations of course outcomes and cognitive outcomes with achieving metacognitive knowledge and knowledge in affective domain respectively, together with the group difference on overall expectations reflected the uniqueness and merit of DiE that facilitates teachers to set up a stage in the classroom to let students engage in the learning context. This is also supported by Verriour (2001) that DiE stimulates students' reflective thinking and so as enhance growth in understanding of abstract concepts of human experiences. The significant results of overall TSES, especially instructional strategies on students' storytelling competence in creativity and expression was also a concrete evidence that DiE have a positive effect on enhancing student verbal creativity.

As a note to practitioners, when implementing this assessment tool in practice, the positive and moderate correlations across means from cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains reflected that teaching objectives were conceptually overlapped between knowledge domains. For instance, from one of the teaching objectives teaching kindergarten students about sunrise and sun set, this objective covers a natural phenomenon (factual knowledge) and concept of time (conceptual knowledge). Users are recommended to measure teaching objectives repeatedly by diversified and appropriate perspectives.

However, in educational psychology perspectives, there were some limitations in this research. The expected results of rejecting Hypothesis 2 was mismatching against Term A and Term B research materials. Indeed, teachers in Term B are especially busy and stressful.

They had to be in a hurry to teach students the entire designed curriculum, help students in preparing for examination and assessing examination papers, administration of new student enrollment, and so on. They may be one of the reasons that the attrition rate was high and fewer questionnaires were returned in Term B.

As a conclusion to this research report, the adoption of cross-sectional analysis has already been another concrete evidence of this assessment tool is feasible to assess both teachers from kindergarten and primary schools for their performance on implementing DiE techniques. In view of inadequate teaching objectives to measure the psychometric properties of procedural knowledge under cognitive domain, research in next phrase should also involve secondary school teachers, especially teachers teaching Liberal Studies or Integrated Science, to participate in this program.

References

Adiguzel, H., & Timucin, E. (2010). The effect of creative drama on student achievement in the instruciton of some development and learning theories. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences , 9*, 1741-1746.

Anderson, L., & Krathwohl, D. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition.* New York: Longman.

Andrich, D. (2002). A framework relating outcomes based education and the taxonomy of educational objectives. *Studies in Educaiton Evaluation , 28*, 35-59.

Ari, A. (2011). Finding acceptance Bloom's Revised Cognitive Taxonomy on the international stage and in Turket . *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice , 11* (2), 767-772.

Athanassiou, N., & McNett, J. (2003). Critical thinking in the management classroom: Bloom's Taxonomy as a learning tool. *Journal of Management Education , 27*, 533-555.

Baskerville, D. (2011). Developing cohesion and building positive relationships through storytelling in a culturally diverse New Zealand classroom. *Teaching and Teacher Education , 27*, 107-115.

Blooms, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educatiional objectives.* New York: David McKay.

Bolin, A., Khramtsova, I., & Saarnio, D. (2005). Using student journals to stimulate authentic learning: Balancing Bloom's cognitive and affective domains. *Teaching of Psychology , 32* (3), 154-159.

Bumen, N. (2007). Effects of the original versus Revised Bloom's Taxonomy on lesson

planning skills: A Turkish study among pre-service teachers. *Review of Education ,

53*, 439-455.

Cawthon, S., & Dawson, K. (2009). Drama for schools: Impact of a drama-based professional

development program on teacher self-efficacy and authentic instruciton. *Youth and

Theatre Journal , 23*, 144-161.

Chan, D. (2008). Teacher self-efficacy and successful intelligence among Chinese secondary

school teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology , 28* (7), 735-746.

Chan, Y. (2009). In their own words: How do students relate drama pedagogy to their

learning in curriculum subjects? *RiDE: The Journal of Applied Theatre and

Performance , 14*, 191-209.

Clayburn, C., Ervay, S., & Albrecht, N. (2012). Attitudes of American teachers preparing to

become administrators toward teaching creative strategies. *Creative Education , 3* (1),

24-29.

Cokadar, H., & Yilmaz, G. (2010). Teaching ecosystem and matter cycles with creative

drama activities. *Journal of Science Education and Technology , 19*, 80-89.

Dawson, K., Cawthon, S., & Baker, S. (2011). Drama for Schools: teacher change in an

applied theatre professional development model. *Research in Drama Education: The

Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance , 16*, 313-335.

Dorion, K. (2009). Science through Drama: A multiple case exploration of the characteristics

of drama activities used in secondary science lessons. *International Journal of

Science Education , 31*, 2247-2270.

Eccles, J. (2005). Subjective task value and the Eccles et al. model of achievement-reltated

   choices. In A. Elliot, & C. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of Competence and Motivation*

   (pp. 105-121). New York, NY: Guilford.

Gillies, R., & Ashman, A. (1998). Behavior and interactions of children in cooperative

   groups in lower and middle elementary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology ,*

   90 (4), 746-757.

Gonen, M., & Veziroglu, M. (2010). An analysis of the knowledge level of prospective

   teachers who have taken drama classes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences , 2*,

   5566-5572.

Hui, A., & Lau, S. (2006). Drama education: A touch of the creative mind and

   communicative-expressive ability of elementary school children in Hong Kong.

   Thinking Skills and Creativity , 1, 34-40.

Kaya, N. (2010). Examination on self-efficacy of the pre-service teachers of classroom

   teacher and pre-school teacher according to creative drama method. *Procedia Social*

   and Behavioral Sciences , 2, 4533-4539.

Kerekes, J., & King, K. (2010). The king's carpet: Drama play in teacher education.

   International Journal of Instruction , 3, 39-60.

Krathwohl, D. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice ,*

   41 (4), 212-218.

(2001). *Learning to learn: The way forward in curriculum development.* Curriculum

   Development Counsil. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

Lin, Y. (2010). Drama and possibility thinking - Taiwan pupils' perspectives regarding creative pedagogy in drama. *Thinking Skills and Creativity* , *5*, 108-119.

Mohamadi, F., & Asadzadeh, H. (2011). Testing the mediating role of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs in the relationship between sources of efficacy inforamtion and students achievement. *Asia Pacific Education Review* , 1-7.

Nasstrom, G. (2009). Interpretation of standards with Bloom's revised taxonomy: a comparison of teachers and assessment experts. *International Journal of Resrearch & Method in Education* , *32* (1), 39-51.

Ozdemir, L. (2003). *Yaratici Drama Dersinin Duygusal Zeka Gelisimine Etkisi (The effect of creative drama on development on emotional intelligence).* Bursa: Uludag Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Ozdemir, S., & Cakmak, A. (2008). The effect of drama education of prospective teachers creativity. *International Journal of Instruciton* , *1*, 13-30.

Podlozny, A. (2000). Strengthening verbal skills through the use of classroom drama: a clear link. *Journal of Aesthetic Education* , *34*, 239-275.

Silius-Ahonen, E., & Gustavson, M. (2011). To learn and not to learn - That is the question. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* , *29*, 809-818.

Szecsi, T. (2008). Creative drama in preschool curriculum: Teaching strategies implemented in Hungary. *Childhood Education* , *85*, 120-124.

Tam, P.-c. (2010). Appropriating drama pedagogy: learning from the local practices in Hong Kong. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* , *18*, 309-329.

Toivanen, T., Antikainen, L., & Ruismaki, H. (2009). Teacher's perceptions of factors determining the success or failure of drama lessons. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences , 45*, 555-565.

Toivanen, T., Komulainen, K., & Ruismaki, H. (2011). Drama educaiton and improvisation as a resource of teacher students creativity. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences , 12*, 60-69.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education , 17*, 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' self-efficacy beliefs: Potential sources at play. *Teaching and Teacher Education , 27*, 751-761.

Verriour, P. (2001). Face to face: Negotiating meaning through drama. *Theory into Practice , 24*, 181-186.

Yeh, Y. (2008). Age, emotion regulation strategies, temperament, creative drama, and preschoolers' creativity. *The Journal of Creative Behavior , 42*, 131-149.

優質教育基金撥款的 『戲劇教育學校網絡』計劃 － 教學法研究

甲部：請填寫以下個人和機構基本資料，於提交 貴校 課堂錄像時填妥並一併交回。

敬請務必填寫身份證頭四位數字與學校名稱,這對於進行前後測配對相當重要，多謝合作。

日期：_____

1. *身份證首四位數字: _____ 　　　性別： ○ 女 　 ○ 男

2. 現時服務的學校: 　　○ 學前機構 　　○ 小學 　　　○ 特殊學校

　　*學校名稱: _____

3. 教學年資: 　　○ 1 至 2 年 　　○ 3 至 5 年 　　○ 6 至 10 年

　　　　　　　　○ 11 至 15 年 　　○ 16 至 20 年 　　○ 21 年以上

4. 你在「10/11 年度優質教育基金主題學校網絡:戲劇教育」的參與程度:

　　○ 參與工作坊及實踐 　　○ 只參與工作坊 　　○ 沒有參與工作坊及實踐

5. 曾接受戲劇教學培訓的時數:

　　○ 1至5小時 　　○ 6至10小時 　　○ 11至15小時 　　○ 16 至 20 小時

　　○ 21至25小時 　　○ 26至30小時 　　○ 30小時以上 　　○ 從未

6. 是否戲劇實驗班老師? 　　○ 是 　　○ 否 　　任教科目:_____

7. 請依據貴學校所釐定的課堂計劃將會採用的話戲劇教學技巧，在下列有關的圓圈塗黑。(可選擇多於一項)

　　○　Teacher in Role 老師入戲　　　　○　Role Play 角色扮演

　　○　Still Image 定格圖畫　　　　　　○　Hot－Seating 如坐針氈

　　○　Forum Theatre 論壇劇場　　　　　○　Role on the Wall 牆上的角色

　　○　Mantle of the Expert 專家的外衣　○　Story-telling 說故事

　　○　Questioning Skill 提問技巧　　　　○　其他 (請註明)_____

□　所採用的教案編號及名稱：

.

_____

乙部：請根據你的實際情況及真實感受，圈出最能代表你的答案。

	1	2	3	4		5			
	非常 不同意	不同意	中立	同意		非常 同意			

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	戲劇教學法能幫助學生了解自己的感覺。	1	2	3	4	5
2.	戲劇教學法可以令學生成為更快樂的學習者。	1	2	3	4	5
3.	戲劇教學法鼓勵學生提升學習表現。	1	2	3	4	5
4.	戲劇教學法給學生一個舒緩課堂壓力的空間。	1	2	3	4	5
5.	戲劇教學法幫助學生成長。	1	2	3	4	5
6.	戲劇教學法可幫助老師的個人成長。	1	2	3	4	5
7.	戲劇教學法令學生改變對事物的想法。	1	2	3	4	5
8.	戲劇教學法增進學生之間互相了解。	1	2	3	4	5
9.	戲劇教學課堂令學生成為更好的人。	1	2	3	4	5
10.	戲劇教學法鼓勵學生學習更多有關課堂上所討論的內容。	1	2	3	4	5
11.	戲劇教學法幫助學生記憶課堂內容。	1	2	3	4	5
12.	戲劇教學法鼓勵學生主動學習。	1	2	3	4	5

13.	這一次戲劇教學課堂能捉進學生將來的學習。	1	2	3	4	5
14.	戲劇教學法提升學生上課的意慾。	1	2	3	4	5
15.	戲劇教學法可以教授與日常生活有關的東西。	1	2	3	4	5
16.	戲劇教學法能有助學生發展將來的專業。	1	2	3	4	5

丙部：老師的自我效能感

不同的老師會因應學生的行為表現而使用不同的課堂指導及課室管理技巧。你對自己的指導及管理技巧有什麼看法？請圈出一個最合適的答案。(1=沒有； 9=很多)

		1···		5···			9		
		沒有	很少	一些		不少		很多	

1.	你能控制課室內的破壞性行為嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	你能激發學習興趣低落的學生學習嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	你能讓學生相信他們在家課上會表現良好嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4.	你能幫助學生建立重視學習的價值得嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5.	你為學生精心編制好問題的能力有多少？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6.	你能讓學生遵守班規嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7.	你能讓一位具破壞力或吵鬧的學生安靜下來嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8.	你能為每組學生建立一套適用的班級管理系統嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9.	你運用多元評量方式的能力有多少？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10.	當學生學習上有困擾時，你能提供不同的解釋或例題的能力有多少？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11.	你會協助家長來幫助他們的孩子在學校表現良好嗎？	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

12.	你在課堂上運用不同教學策略的能力有多少？	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

~問卷完，多謝閣下的參與。~

優質教育基金撥款的 『戲劇教育學校網絡』計劃

教學內容演繹評審問卷

ASSESSED BY (HELPER): _____

甲部：請填寫以下機構和個人基本資料

1. 學校資料：   ○ 學前機構   ○ 小學   ○ 特殊學校

    學校電話號碼： _____

2. 老師的身份證首四位數字： _____   性別: ○ 女 ○ 男

    任教班別： _____ 科目： _____

    教學片段編號： _____

    拍攝日期： _____

    所採用的教案名稱： _____

第一部份：知識領域 (The cognitive process domain)

A. 事實性知識 (Factual knowledge) 的表達及提問

關於事實知識的教學目的

1. _____

2._____

3._____

4._____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 幫助**同學們記憶**				1	2	3	4	5
2. 協助同學們明白				1	2	3	4	5
3. 鼓勵同學們應用				1	2	3	4	5
4. 鼓勵同學們進行分析				1	2	3	4	5
5. 鼓勵同學們評估				1	2	3	4	5
6. 鼓勵同學們創作				1	2	3	4	5

B. 概念性知識範圍 (Conceptual knowledge) 表達及提問

關於概念性知識的教學目的

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 幫助**同學們記憶**				1	2	3	4	5
2. 協助同學們明白				1	2	3	4	5
3. 鼓勵同學們應用				1	2	3	4	5
4. 鼓勵同學們進行分析				1	2	3	4	5
5. 鼓勵同學們評估				1	2	3	4	5
6. 鼓勵同學們創作				1	2	3	4	5

C. 步驟性知識範圍 (Procedural knowledge) 表達及提問

關於步驟性知識的教學目的

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 幫助**同學們記憶**				1	2	3	4	5
2. 協助同學們明白				1	2	3	4	5
3. 鼓勵同學們應用				1	2	3	4	5
4. 鼓勵同學們進行分析				1	2	3	4	5
5. 鼓勵同學們評估				1	2	3	4	5
6. 鼓勵同學們創作				1	2	3	4	5

D. 後認知知識範圍 (Meta-cognitive knowledge) 表達及提問

關於後認知知識的教學目的

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 幫助**同學們記憶**				1	2	3	4	5
2. 協助同學們明白				1	2	3	4	5
3. 鼓勵同學們應用				1	2	3	4	5
4. 鼓勵同學們進行分析				1	2	3	4	5
5. 鼓勵同學們評估				1	2	3	4	5
6. 鼓勵同學們創作				1	2	3	4	5

第二部份： 情意領域 (Affective Domain) 表達及提問

關於情意領域的教學目的

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 喚起**同學們有關的情意**				1	2	3	4	5
2. 提示同學們對有關情意的反應				1	2	3	4	5
3. 協助同學們評價有關反應				1	2	3	4	5
4. 鼓勵同學們分析及重新組織				1	2	3	4	5
5. 總結及內觀建立				1	2	3	4	5

第三部份： 技巧掌握範疇 (Affective Domain) 表達及提問 (1 = 缺乏… 5 = 充份)

關於教授技巧的教學目的

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

1 = 缺乏	2 = 少許	3 = 普通	4 = 尚可	5 = 充份				
1. 老師示範有關技巧				1	2	3	4	5
2. 講解如何掌握技巧				1	2	3	4	5
3. 協助同學們精準有關技巧				1	2	3	4	5
4. 協助同學們協調有關技巧				1	2	3	4	5
5. 協助同學們完全掌握有關技巧				1	2	3	4	5