



Effects of internships on self-perceived competencies and didactic skills of prospective religion teachers

Carina Caruso, Christian Harteis, & Jan Woppowa, Paderborn University

Quantitative research question

Do students' self reports of competencies differ at the beginning and the end of their internship?

Quantitative data

- Summer term 2015: Pre test (cohort II)
- Winter term 2015/16: Post test (cohort II) & Pre test (cohort III)
- Summer term 2016: Post test (cohort III) & Pre test (cohort IV)
- Winter term 2016/17: Post test (cohort IV)

Quantitative analyses

- Differences between pre and post data
- Closed questionnaire: Longitudinal pre-post-design
- Convenience sample ($N = 63$. Students of theology. Cohort II, III, IV. Paderborn University)
- Self-reports of competence:
 - Standards of the protestant church (2009)
 - Standards of the North Rine-Westfalian Ministry of Schools and Further Education (2010)
- Competence modeling:
 - German Bishops' Conference (2010)
 - Interviews with students of theology
 - Religious educational team
- Pilot test: Bachelor of arts and cohort I
- Explorative factor analysis / two-sided t -test and Wilcoxon signed-rank test

Quantitative results

Subject-specific self reports of competence

- Proper development (7 items, $\alpha = .87$): $M_1 = 3.91$ ($SD = 0.79$), $M_2 = 4.41$ ($SD = 0.69$), $T = -5.66$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.68$.
- Reflexive basic attitude (4 items, $\alpha = .74$): $M_1 = 3.87$ ($SD = 0.74$), $M_2 = 3.81$ ($SD = 0.86$), $T < 1$, $n.s.$
- Testing and putting teaching to practice (2 items, $\alpha = .90$): $M_1 = 3.92$ ($SD = 0.90$), $M_2 = 4.50$ ($SD = 0.88$), $Z = -4.13$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.701$.
- Use of media (3 items, $\alpha = .76$): $M_1 = 3.43$ ($SD = 0.97$), $M_2 = 3.99$ ($SD = 0.99$), $T = -4.16$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.603$.

Interdisciplinary self reports of competence

- Planning of teaching (6 items, $\alpha = .79$): $M_1 = 4.17$ ($SD = 0.65$), $M_2 = 4.41$ ($SD = 0.58$). $T = -2.90$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.394$.
- Acting in a goal-oriented way (5 items, $\alpha = .81$): $M_1 = 4.03$ ($SD = 0.71$), $M_2 = 4.30$ ($SD = 0.60$), $Z = -3.09$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.360$.

Beliefs:

- No significant differences between pre and post data.

Qualitative research question

Do students consider pedagogical and didactic aspects at the end of their internship (during planning, conducting and reflecting teaching)?

Qualitative data

- Winter term 2015/16: Ct I, Ct II, Gt I, Gt II, Gt V (cohort II)
- Summer term 2016: Ct III, Ct IV, Gt III, Gt IV (cohort III)

(Ct: Consultation concerning teaching. Gt: General feedback and reflection talk.)

Qualitative analyses

Conversation analyses

- Convenience sample ($N = 9$)
- Participatory observation of obligatory feedback talks as part of the internships:
 - Consultation concerning teaching ($N = 4$)
 - General feedback and reflection talks ($N = 5$)
- Summarised content analyses
- Deductive categories (Baumert & Kunter, 2011)
- Inductive categories

Qualitative results (selection)

Didactic aspects

All prospective teachers:

- Designed an open and productive learning atmosphere
- Initiated student participation in lessons

Three out of four prospective teachers:

- Neglected students' learning progress
- Did not formulate goal-oriented tasks
- Did not choose functional media

Pedagogical aspects

All prospective teachers:

- Acted in the role of teacher
- Established relationships with the students

Organizational aspects

- There was not a discussion of subject-specific issues
- There was no provided adequate support

Integration of the results of both approaches: Parallel design

(Creswell & Plano Clark 2011)

Subject-specific self reports of competence

- Reflexive basic attitude: Qualitative data show that students do not receive (systematical) support. During the feedback talks they are not asked to provide arguments for their teaching behavior. Consultations do not aim at relating theory and practice.
- Use of media: Qualitative data show that students are not able to use media although their self reports indicate an increase in media competence at the end of the internships.

Interdisciplinary self reports of competence

- The planning of teaching: Qualitative data show that students succeed in planning lessons (putting up phases of lessons, guaranteeing the transparency of the teaching process).
- Acting in goal-oriented way: Qualitative data show an ambivalent result (three out of four prospective teachers do not formulate goal-oriented tasks and do not choose functional media; two out of four prospective teachers show a functional start of the lesson and choose conclusive methods).

Literature

- Baumert, J. & Kunter, M. (2011). Das Kompetenzmodell von COACTIV [The competence model of COACTIV]. In M. Kunter et al. (Eds.), *Professionelle Kompetenz von Lehrkräften. Ergebnisse des Forschungsprogramms COACTIV* (pp. 29–53). Münster, Waxmann.
- Kirchenamt der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (2009). *Theologisch-Religionspädagogische Kompetenz. Professionelle Kompetenzen und Standards für die Religionslehrerausbildung* [Theological-religious education competence. Professional competencies and standards for teacher training].
- Creswell, J.W. & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- Ministerium für Schule und Weiterbildung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (2010). *Rahmenkonzeption zur strukturellen und inhaltlichen Ausgestaltung des Praxissemesters im lehramtsbezogenen Masterstudiengang* [Framework for the structural and content-related design of the practical semester in the teaching-related Master's program].
- Sekretariat der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz (2010). *Kirchliche Anforderungen an die Religionslehrerbildung* [Church requirements for religious teacher education].

Contact: Carina Caruso, ccaruso@upb.de (Germany)