



National Center for **Research** on  
**Rural** Education (R<sup>2</sup>Ed)

---

R<sup>2</sup>Ed Working Paper 2014-14

# Development and Validation of an Instrument to Measure Teacher Knowledge of Inquiry

Gwen Nugent, Jon Pedersen, Greg Welch, & Jim Bovaird

**December, 2014**

<sup>1</sup>Development of this working paper was completed at the National Center for Research on Rural Education (R<sup>2</sup>Ed), funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Educational Sciences (R305C090022). The paper was presented originally by the authors at the 2011 annual conference for the National Association of Research in Science Teaching. The statements made herein are those of the developers and are not meant to represent opinions or policies of the funding agency.

**R<sup>2</sup>Ed working papers are available online at [r2ed.unl.edu/resources\\_workingpapers.shtml](http://r2ed.unl.edu/resources_workingpapers.shtml)**

**Recommended citation:**

Nugent, G., Pedersen, J., Welch, G., & Bovaird, J. (2014). Development and Validation of an Instrument to Measure Teacher Knowledge of Inquiry (R<sup>2</sup>Ed Working Paper No. 2014-14). Retrieved from the National Center for Research on Rural Education: [r2ed.unl.edu](http://r2ed.unl.edu)

## Introduction

A 19-item multiple-choice instrument was developed to measure elementary teacher knowledge of a) scientific inquiry, b) classroom inquiry, and c) inquiry pedagogical content knowledge. The scientific inquiry questions address scientists' practice of inquiry and the nature of science; the classroom inquiry questions focus on the essential features of classroom inquiry (NRC, 2000), and the pedagogical content knowledge questions use brief teaching scenarios as a context for teachers to identify appropriate inquiry-based teaching approaches.

## Development Process

The development process began with a comprehensive review of existing teacher inquiry knowledge instruments, with the intention of using an existing assessment. When a suitable questionnaire could not be located, the decision was made to develop a new instrument. However, we used questions from two federally funded projects<sup>1</sup> in addition to developing new questions.<sup>1</sup>

To guide the development process, a table of specifications was developed identifying underlying constructs and concepts for the initial 23-question assessment (Table 1).

The instrument was first tested with pre-service teachers enrolled in a science education methods course. Nineteen pre-service teachers completed the assessment and participated in a focus group session to identify confusing questions. Based on this input, wording of questions and response choices were revised.

## Psychometric Analysis

The revised instrument was pilot tested with 164 teachers from two Midwestern states. Classical test theory and item response theory analyses (using BILOG-MG) were used to guide selection of items. Classical discrimination was calculated as the difference between the top and bottom 25% of participants in proportion of correct responses to each item. IRT difficulty/item location was calculated as the "b" parameter from a 2-parameter logistic model. IRT discrimination is the "a" parameter from a 2-parameter logistic model.

## Results and Discussion

Selection of a final set of items required balancing content coverage as specified in the table of specifications, potential cognitive load on teachers, and psychometric properties. In order to reduce the length of the test several items had to be omitted, which in turn negatively impacted the alpha level. Table 2 shows key statistics for the final 19 items. These retained items yielded moderate internal consistency ( $\alpha = .54$ ) with wide variability in item difficulty (.09 - .91).

---

<sup>1</sup>Pedagogical content knowledge questions were drawn from Schuster, Cobern, Schwartz, Velom, & Applegate. *Assessing Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Inquiry Science Teaching*, NSF Award 0512596. Other questions were drawn from Doll, Bruning, Horn, & PytlikZillig. *Evolving Inquiry: An Experimental Test of a Science Instruction Model for Teachers in Rural, Culturally Diverse Schools*. U. S. Department of Education grant R305M050309.

The item analysis and deletion process resulted in changing the appropriateness of the instrument from 2 standard deviations (SD) below average to 1.5 SD below average knowledge/ability and increased the breadth of applicability (Figure 1). It is important to note, however, that some questions were revised for the final version of the instrument and these statistics do not reflect the impact of these changes.

### **Use of Instrument**

The instrument has been used in a national survey of elementary school teachers as a means of assessing teacher knowledge of inquiry. Results show that teachers ( $n = 142$ ) scored 56% correct on the entire instrument, with 48% correct on the scientific inquiry questions; 63% correct on the classroom inquiry questions, and 55% on the pedagogical content knowledge questions. The difficulty level ranged from .05 to .91. Teacher knowledge is also being used in path analyses investigating the potential influence of various characteristics of professional development (e.g. contact hours, delivery format, training strategies, and level of collaborative participation) on teachers' inquiry knowledge, perceptions, and instructional practice and moderating effects of context and teacher variables (Glover & Nugent, 2013).

### **References**

- National Research Council (2000). *Inquiry and the National Science Education Standards: A Guide for Teaching and Learning*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
- Glover, T., & Nugent, G. (2013, April). The influence of rural professional development characteristics on teacher-perceived knowledge and practice. Presentation at Connect-Inform-Advance Conference of the National Center for Research on Rural Education, Omaha, NE.

Table 1

*Table of Specifications and Items*


---

| <u>Topic</u>   | <u>Question #</u>            |
|--|------------------------------|
| What is scientific inquiry?  | 4, 8, 16, 18, 20, 22         |
| What is classroom inquiry?   | 1, 9, 10, 6                  |
| Engaging in scientifically oriented questions                            | 17, 14a                      |
| Giving priority to evidence  | 2, 14b, 14c                  |
| Formulating explanations based on evidence                               | 14d, 19                      |
| Connecting explanations to scientific knowledge                          | 3                            |
| Inquiry pedagogy: What should teachers do in an inquiry-based classroom? | 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 23 |

---

Table 2

*Psychometric Statistics for Retained Items*


---

Science Inquiry Instructional Knowledge Measure (N = 164)

| Item | <u>Difficulty/Item Location</u> |        | <u>Discrimination</u>       |       | Corrected<br>Item-Total<br>Correlation |
|------|---------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|-------|--|
|      | Mean                            | IRT    | Classical<br>Discrimination | IRT   |  |
| 1    | .683                            | -1.060 | .071                        | 0.494 | .213                                   |
| 2    | .592                            | -0.622 | .093                        | 0.389 | .198                                   |
| 4    | .524                            | -0.477 | .128                        | 0.327 | .180                                   |
| 5    | .561                            | -0.766 | .109                        | 0.433 | .108                                   |
| 7    | .622                            | 3.288  | .078                        | 0.473 | .209                                   |
| 8    | .762                            | 0.295  | .064                        | 0.366 | -.060                                  |
| 10   | .085                            | -2.366 | .357                        | 0.465 | .098                                   |
| 11   | .457                            | -1.775 | .160                        | 0.664 | .143                                   |
| 12   | .524                            | -3.054 | .163                        | 0.444 | .268                                   |
| 14a  | .842                            | -1.421 | .022                        | 0.438 | .154                                   |
| 14c  | .835                            | -2.420 | .037                        | 0.675 | .238                                   |
| 14d  | .890                            | -0.387 | .027                        | 0.424 | .095                                   |
| 15   | .592                            | -0.728 | .113                        | 0.347 | .278                                   |
| 18   | .720                            | -0.766 | .042                        | 0.433 | .149                                   |
| 19   | .689                            | -2.694 | .123                        | 0.265 | .278                                   |
| 20   | .909                            | 3.288  | .014                        | 0.473 | .163                                   |
| 21   | .561                            | 0.295  | .142                        | 0.366 | .209                                   |
| 22   | .598                            | -0.134 | .061                        | 0.558 | .115                                   |
| 23   | .842                            | -2.366 | .029                        | 0.465 | .317                                   |

---

**Figure 1.** *IRT scale information function*