DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 410   SP 005 377

AUTHOR   Takanishi-Knowles, Ruby
TITLE   Collaboration Between Educational Researchers and
                School Personnel: Some Reflections and Proposals for
                Reducing the Research-to-Practice Gap.
INSTITUTION   Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research
                and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY   National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
                Task Force on Lab. and Center Transition.
PUB DATE   Feb 73
CONTRACT   OEC-6-10-078
NOTE   46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                American Educational Research Association, New
                Orleans, Louisiana, February 26, 1973

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Educational Research; *Educational Researchers;
                *Research Methodology; *School Personnel; *Teaching
                Experience

ABSTRACT
        This paper explores the potentialities for
collaboration between educational researchers and school personnel. A
set of principles is offered as a guide for attempts to reduce the
research-to-practice gap. The implementation of these principles is
discussed within the context of a Teacher Feedback workshop which was
conducted as a development activity of an ongoing research project.
Finally, a proposal for the structure and process of a collaboration
effort is outlined. A 23-item bibliography and appendixes concerning
the Teacher Feedback Workshop are included. (Author)

COLLABORATION BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS

AND SCHOOL PERSONNEL:

Some Reflections and Proposals for Reducing

the Research-to-Practice Gap

Ruby Takanishi-Knowles

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

School of Education

Stanford University

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

February 26, 1973

New Orleans, Louisiana

Educational researchers are encountering teacher and administrator skepticism toward proposed research with increasing frequency. These critics claim that professors of education are too far removed from the realities of the classroom to offer any helpful suggestions to practitioners. In addition, it is said that research tends to state what everyone already knows in a language that no one understands. Researchers counter by deploring teachers' lack of an analytic approach to their work and by pointing out their defensiveness regarding their teaching effectiveness.

Fortunately, the research-to-practice gap is not as wide as I have portrayed it. Within the collective bargaining process, teachers are beginning to demand not only increased salaries, but also a greater voice in changes in educational programs (Rapp, Dunson, and Ensign, 1971). Teachers are expressing the idea that they possess an expertise which is valuable in the planning of reform. They also argue that they are responsible for providing learning experiences for students and hence, expect to be involved in the process of linking instructional aims to proposed changes.

Educational researchers are also going through a period of reorientation. Following an era of heavy federal funding for regional laboratories and research and development centers, some researchers are facing the fact that their endeavors have had little impact on the work of teachers in classrooms. The problem is not that the centers and laboratories failed to do significant research, but that the "trickle-down" theory of educational reform

(Bailey, 1971) has flopped.

An alternative research methodology which takes seriously these past and emerging experiences can be formulated. The basic premise of this methodology is that educational research should be conducted jointly by researchers and practitioners to produce findings that are both theoretically and practically relevant.

This paper explores the potentialities for collaboration between educational researchers and school personnel. A set of principles is offered as a guide for attempts to reduce the research-to-practice gap. The implementation of these principles is discussed within the context of a Teacher Feedback Workshop which was conducted as a development activity of an on-going research project. Finally, a proposal for the structure and process of a collaboration effort is outlined.

THREE PRINCIPLES FOR REDUCING THE RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE GAP

The following principles are offered as a preliminary attempt to specify conditions for reducing the research-to-practice gap.

Principle I: Communication of research results to teachers is a complex process which integrally involves the individual's feelings of competence.

Researchers have not dealt seriously with the complex problems of communication of research results to teachers who are participating in research projects. Findings of educational research - especially those which relate to teaching - have implications for

the individual's self-esteem and behavior change. Hence, it is
not merely a dissemination problem.

Sieber's (1972) discussion of the image of the educational
practitioner as 'the rational man' is especially relevant to
Principle I. The practitioner is conceived as a person who bases
decisions for change on the best information available concerning
alternative courses of action. The focus of change is certain
intellective processes. The only obstacle to change is ignorance.
Thus, Sieber describes the Rational Man. "He needs only to be in-
formed about the best method for teaching reading to second graders,
the best textbooks on American History, the best techniques for
improving children's mental health, or the most up-to-date pre-
packaged course on mathematics, chemistry, or biology. If so
informed, he will change his mind about his current practices,
he will experience an intellectual awakening (p. 364).

The typical channel of influence is one-way communication
through the printed word, lectures, and films. There are two
limitations to this approach. First, teachers typically do not
read the research literature. Lazarsfeld and Sieber (1964)
found in a national survey of elementary school teachers that
only one percent read the Journal of Educational Psychology, the
Review of Educational Research, or the IEA-Research Bulletin.
None of the publications which the teachers read regularly were
listed in America's Educational Press as information sources about

research. Second, teachers do not have the time to sift through
the journals, nor have they been trained with sufficient technical
competence to evaluate findings and their potential practical ap-
plications.

Many findings of research may be packaged, field-tested, and
disseminated with accompanying explanatory literature. However,
findings which affect individuals' beliefs, esteem, and attachment
to practical skills can be difficult to accept. Thus, there is a
special need for persons who have the sensitivity and creativity
to communicate search findings in ways which will produce posi-
tive consequences for teachers and their students. This need has
been recognized by the U.S. Office of Education, which has pre-
viously relied on print and electronic dissemination channels as a
means of educational change. U.S.O.E. is now planning teams of
educational extension agents who will provide linkages between
researchers and practitioners.

Principle II. Direct teacher participation is essential for
planning and carrying out changes in their own teaching.

Theory and research from group dynamics provide a rich base
for developing strategies for the involvement of teachers in
planning their own changes in teaching. Research on participation
in decision making indicates that persons are more committed to
and more likely to carry out decisions in which they have been
involved (Cartwright, 1968, Lewin, 1947).

The rationale for participation in the research endeavor is
been described by Mann and Likert (1952). They suggest that per-
sonal involvement decreases the barriers to the utilization of the
data, while increasing the probability that the results will be
understood and emotionally accepted. Involvement also yields
motivation to apply the results to the individual's situation.

There is some evidence that teachers tend to accept and to
regard as valuable those in-service programs which are planned
with their involvement (Childress, 1965). Dutton and Hammond
(1966) compared two methods of in-service training for mathematics
teachers. The first method (I) used a college professor of
mathematics to give weekly lectures on selected concepts for
eight weeks. Teachers were expected to do readings and complete
assignments. In an equivalent group of teachers (III), district
staff members, along with teachers, assessed individual weaknesses
and designed individualized programs to help each teacher with his
specific problems. At the end of eight w . ., teachers in Method
II achieved greater gains in teacher attitude toward and knowledge
of mathematical concepts than those in Method I. Although there
are some minor methodological problems in this study, the findings
indicate that in-service training which involves teachers in the
assessment of their own needs, and plans for individualized train-
ing can have positive consequences for their teaching.

This principle operates most clearly in the concept of the
British teacher center (Bailey, 1971). These centers are based

on the tenet that fundamental educational reform will come only
through those who have the basic educational responsibility -
the teachers. Furthermore, teachers will take reform seriously
only when they have been responsible for defining their own
educational problems and receiving help on their own terms.
In England and Wales, there are approximately 500 centers, over
half of which are staffed with full-time leaders.

Principle III: Attention to individual differences in
research on teaching increases the probability that
results will have practical value.

Practitioners have repeatedly pointed to their personal
styles of teaching or 'bag of tricks" as an explanation for
successful classroom teaching (McCauley, 1972 Marram, 1971).
Researchers in the organization of teaching have outlined reasons
for the great variability among teachers in instructional
activities (Bidwell, 1965; Lortie, 1969). There is no standard
body of knowledge and skills which is transmitted in teacher
training programs. Once teachers enter the classroom, there are
limits on collegial interaction. Except for possibly the open-
plan school or teaming, teachers rarely observe their peers at
work (Meyer, Cohen, et. al., 1972).

However, researchers on teaching have tended to ignore
individual variations in teacher behavior. In his review of
teacher variability within and between special curriculum pro-
grams, Rosenshine (1970) notes that there are few existing studies

dealing with this problem. Furthermore, the generalizability of
the results is limited by the small numb r of teachers involved
in the studies and the disparity of the observational systems used.

The line of analysis of individual differences which is
suggested by Sidman (1960) has promise for linking research and
practical applications. Sidman (1960) postulates that subject
variability is derived from differences in the functional relations
between a behavior and its controlling conditions for each person.
Thus, the shape of a curve based on group data may indicate that a
specific behavior increases as some independent variable increases.
However, examination of the individual data indicates that each
subject reacts maximally at different values of the independent
variable. In cases like this, application of group results to
individual persons may be erroneous. Furthermore, when we are
suggesting changes in individual behavior, group results can be
simply misleading.

In communicating with teachers about their own behavior and
its effect on students, the individual data analysis suggested by
Sidman (1960) has potentially useful consequences. Teachers can
use their results as a basis for confronting what they are doing,
and how they might plan for changes in their behavior. They can
make these decisions on relationships found for their own behavior,
not on generalized relationships which may not apply to them.

In summary, three general principles need to be considered
in reducing the research-to-practice gap. (1) communication of

research results to teachers is a complex process which integrally involves the individual's feelings of competence. (2) Direct teacher involvement is essential for planning and carrying out changes in their own teaching. (3) Attention to individual differences in research on teaching increases the probability that results will have practical value.

An attempt was made to implement these principles at a workshop for teachers participating in a research project of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching (SCRDT). Several projects in the Teaching in Low-Income Areas Program of the Stanford Center have begun to develop procedures for communicating research results to school personnel. The procedures which are described in this paper pertain to Project 3C - Student Engagement: Classroom Settings.[1] (See list of footnotes on page 16 of this paper.)

AN ATTEMPT TO REDUCE THE RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE GAP

Background

The project originated in the concern for student engagement in learning in low-income area schools.[2] From the practical application perspective, student engagement is one of the crucial problems facing teachers. Without students' interest and involvement, learning cannot occur.[3] From the perspective of research on teaching, teacher motivational techniques have not been the focus of much research attention (Maehr and Sjogen, 1971; Rosenshine and Furst, 1971).

We began by examining teacher strategies which are related
to high levels of student attention, involvement, or engagement
in classroom learning. Twenty-four teachers from nine schools in
the Mid-Peninsula and San Jose, California area volunteered to
participate in the research during the school year 1971-1972.
The teachers and students were observed at five different times
during the school year - September, October, November, February,
and April-May. When the teachers were recruited for the study,
we contracted with them to provide a workshop at the end of the
observations which would report findings up to that point.

The Teacher Feedback Workshop

On May 6, 1972, the Teacher Feedback Workshop was conduc ted
at Stanford University. Twenty-one out of the twenty-four sample
teachers participated in the day-long workshop. The morning session
covered the aims and procedures of the project. Detailed des-
criptions of the observation instruments were also presented. A
report of findings based on analysis of group data was presented
to provide a context for understanding the individual data analysis
which was given to teachers in the afternoon sessions. The morning
discussions centered around issues which would be relevant to
teachers regarding their own behavior:

1. How much of the time during classroom observations are
   students engaged?
   How much of the time during classroom observations are
   students disengaged?
   Note: In the individual feedback sessions, these questions

become translated: How much of the time during class-
room observations are my students engaged? How much of
the time are they disengaged in my classroom?

2. What strategies do teachers use?

3. Which strategies are most frequently used?
   Which strategies do teachers use least?

4. How can student engagement and disengagement be related to
   specific teacher strategies?

5. What is the Engagement Impact Score (EIS)?

6. Which specific teacher strategies appear to have the most
   impact on student engagement?

7. Which specific teacher strategies appear to have the least
   impact on student engagement?

8. How important are these group findings for your own teaching
   behavior?

Results were presented in non-technical language with a heavy
reliance on graphics to illustrate specific points. The purpose
of this mode of presentation was to facilitate teacher involvement
with the information by making them realize that the data dealt
with their own teaching situation.

As a result of the morning sessions, all of the teachers
reported that they had received an adequate picture of the project
and its goals.[4] Some teachers stated that the presentation of
group data had provided them with the concepts and information
with which to approach feedback about their own behavior.

In the afternoon sessions, all teachers received individualized feedback from trained feedbackers. Procedures had been developed by the project staff to utilize videotapes as a means for discussing individual data analysis based on classroom observations (See Appendix II). The three principles, which were discussed earlier in this paper, were applied to the planning and implementation of the individualized feedback sessions.

First, communication of research results to individual teachers involves the person's feelings of competence and has implications for behavior change. Hence, all feedbackers were dealing with a potentially ego-threatening situation. The videotapes were used to start the teacher to look at her/his behavior. Hence, the first videotape segment was used for 'cosmetic effect" in which the teacher viewed her/his teaching without comments on strategies. During this period, feedbackers were instructed to be supportive and reassuring, and to encourage the teacher to express her/his observations of what was going on in the classroom. An attempt was made to create a supportive climate in which the consequences of individual behavior could be discussed.

During the individualized feedback sessions, the discussion centered around the analysis of individual teacher data. Teachers had been asked before coming to the workshop what kinds of information they wanted from the feedback sessions. The teachers' responses formed an additional basis for "individualization" of the feedback. Group analysis was available for purposes of comparison

if the teacher desired however, the focus of in

individual teacher. Questions covered for group an...   ...ages

9-10 of this paper) were applied to individual data   e.g., what

strategies do you use most often? What strategies do you use

least? Which specific strategies appear to have the most impact

on student engagement on students in your class? Which specific

strategies have the least impact on student engagement in your

class? Individual data analysis was especially relevant in this

case, because preliminary examination of individual versus group

patterns indicated a wide range of variability in the impact of

specific teacher behaviors on student engagement. For this

particular project, feedback to teachers based on group results,

would have been erroneous and misleading.

Furthermore, the presentation of individual data analysis

provided the teacher with an information base about her behavior

and its consequences from which to make decisions about change.

By use of the videotape, the teacher's strategies which had high

and low engagement impact on students were identified. The

teacher's attention was drawn to the students' reactions to her

own behavior. In the last segment, the teacher, herself, was

asked to point out her strategies and note their effects on the

students' engagement.

During the individualized feedback sessions, the feedbackers

refrained from making any prescriptions regarding changes in teacher

behavior. During a preliminary data analysis state in our project

prescriptions to teachers would have to be premature. More important,

the goal was to start teachers planning changes in their own
behavior, based on a knowledge base derived from observation
in their classrooms. Thus, the responsibility for determining
the direction of change was placed decisively upon the teacher.
The objective impartiality of the feedbacker and of the data
presentation helped teachers to approach the findings in a con-
structive manner. Together with the feedbacker, the teacher
explored different interpretations of the data and pieced to-
gether a pattern satisfactory to her.

There is some evidence from teachers' responses to a question-
naire that the findings presented at the workshop will have
positive consequences for their teaching behavior. Sixteen out of
the seventeen teachers who answered the questionnaire reported they
had learned something new about their teaching. Twelve of the
teachers thought that they should change some of the ways they teach,
and sixteen said results and discussions in the workshop could really
help teachers change their teaching behavior. Sixteen of the
teachers thought that the results will be useful to classroom
teachers in general, and all replied that they believed educational
research can produce knowledge useful to teachers.

In summary, the Teacher Feedback Workshop was effective in
reducing the research-to-practice credibility gap. This evidence
gives the principles presented in this paper some validity. In-
formal teacher response to the workshop supported these conclusions.
In their thank-you letters to the staff, teachers pointed to the

'special, individual attention which they received', 'the opportunity to receive feedback as "a valuable aspect of the study", to the fact that 'you didn't tell us what   '' e everyone else seems to), but gave us some basis for ....   our own decisions.' Finally, one teacher wrote, "I know your project is designed to improve teaching, not just study it, so now I am working to apply what I learned Saturday. I thank you, and my pupils thank you!"

The Teacher Feedback Workshop was a <u>beginning</u> attempt by one project at the SCRDT to reduce the research-to-practice credibility gap. Much of what we have accomplished will be of potential usefulness in development of feedback procedures for other research projects. Some suggestions for improving our relationships with school personnel emerge from our present activities. These will be discussed in the concluding section of this paper.

A PRC

RESEA

rese

searc

of te

victi

of ts

actio

longe

cipa

which

accou

insti

Atten

speci

patie

into

attit

utili

signi

integ

and o

REDUCING THE RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE GAP IN EDUCATIONAL

ing proposal emerges fro**** current involvement with

velopment wor****   ****   experiences as a re-

is worked with school personnel to improve the quality

l learning. The proposals are based on the firm con-

th the quality of education research and the quality

nend upon a reciprocal and continual process of inter-

researchers and practitioners. School personnel no

passive subjects of research, but can be active parti-

rstanding and hopefully changing the conditions under

and learning presently occur.

oration process should be structured on take into

portant organizational requirements: (1) The need to

se the process to assure continuity and renewal. (2)

is authority st ture of school organizations or

le need for administrative sanction and partici-

beration. The incorporation of these requirements

erative process recognizes that it is not merely

isomes an change which is the problem in the

knowledge, organizational constraints also pose

riews.

ational aspect of the collaborative process is

formalization of relationships between researchers

onnel. The collaborative process should be organized

to

mai

mut

an

rel

cel

cr:

you

bei

po

te

ta

wh

of

th

ta

vi

ar

th

Qu

vi

Th

re

se

r a Research Advisory Council in which joint decision-
change of ideas can occur. Contracts which state
sibilities and obligations between the researchers
aff can also serve to formalize the collaborative
and its reciprocal character.
ation by the school staff should be included from the
research activities. In this connection, a frequent
research by administrators is "You come to us after
find the problem. Next time, let's talk about it
gin." The Research Advisory Council would be com-
archers, school personnel from all levels of the
administrative system, and community people. Represen-
ifferent roles among the school staff recognizes a
roach to educational research - the need to be aware
le variables and their interactions as they relate to
problem under investigation. The cross-role represen-
izes that all participants possess knowledge which is
 analysis and interpretation.
a council could serve as an area where research problems
d, alternative research strategies are considered, and
of instrumentation and data analysis are questioned.[5]
bias are especially crucial when researchers are working
ons who differ from them in ethnic-cultural backgrounds.
recess of exchange, step in instrumentation may be
important issues which are not recognized by the re-
be incorporated in the design. Group and shared

decision-making processes are likely to strengthen commitment to the research efforts and to future utilization of the findings.

Finally, engagement in the collaborative process signifies a long-term commitment on the part of researchers to deal with the realities and problems of school systems. In the process, the researcher places himself in a position of vulnerability (Goulet, 1971) with the school personnel. In the process of exchange with school personnel, the researcher opens himself up to the questioning of his theories and assumptions, methodology, and interpretation of problems. This vulnerability is essential for the development of collaboration between educational researchers and school personnel.

These suggestions are offered as general and preliminary statements, for if we take this discussion seriously, patterns of collaboration will emerge once we, as researchers, start to bridge the research-to-practice gap. There is no more specific proposal then "Let us begin."

LIST OF FOOTNOTES

[1]Project 3C was under the direction of Robert D. Hess and Ruby Takanishi-Knowles with the collaboration of research assistants Ann Bouie, Kalei Inn, Anne Norton, and Terry Taylor. Technical support staff included Janet Weston, Administrative Assistant, Secretaries Joan Huff and Jean Ziebron, Observer and Data Processing Team - Marsha Alper, Barry Dietz, Mary Lee Thomson, and Lucy Williams. Susan Hurwitz and Gerry Mercadante assisted during Spring, 1972.

The Project could not have been carried out without the collaboration of all these people, and others not mentioned here.

[2]A description of the first year of this research will be published by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching - Robert D. Hess and Ruby Takanishi-Knowles. Teacher Strategies and Student Engagement in Low-Income Area Schools. Stanford, California: Research and Development Memorandum No. (in press).

[3]Student engagement is assumed to be highly related to measures of student achievement. Several recent studies using behavior-based measures provide good support for this assumption (Cobb, 1972, Lahderne, 1968, Meyers, et. al., 1968).

[4]Annegret Harnischfeger and Frederick Hess conducted an evaluation of the Teacher Feedback Workshop. Their complete

report is included in Appendix I.

[5]Two books, which discuss action research methodology with teachers, provide case studies of the collaborative process. (Corey, 1953; Schumsky, 1953).

REFERENCES

Bailey, Stephen K. Teachers' Centers: A British First,
Delta Kappan, 1971, 146-149.

Bidwell, C. The School as a Formal Organization, In J. March
(Ed.), Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Cartwright, D. The Nature of Group Cohesiveness. In D.Cartwright
and A. Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory,
(3rd Ed.). New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Childress, J.R. Inservice Education of Teachers. In R.L. Ebel
(Ed.), Encyclopedia of Education Research. (4th Ed.) New
York: Macmillan, 1969.

Cobb, J.A. Relationship of Discrete Classroom Behaviors to Fourth-
grade Academic Achievement, Journal of Education Psychology,
1972, 63, 74-80.

Corey, S. Action Research to Improve School Practices. New York:
Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University,
1953.

Dutton, W.H. & Hammond, H.R. Two In-service Math Programs for
Elementary School Teachers, California Journal of Education
Research, 1966, 27, 63-67.

Goulet, D. An Ethical Model for the Study of Values. Harvard
Educational Review, 1971, 41, 205-227.

Lahaderne, H. Attitudinal and Intellectual Correlates of Attention:
A Study of Four Sixth-grade Classrooms, Journal of Educational
Psychology, 1968, 59, 320-324.

Lazarsfeld, P.F. & Sieber, S.D. Organizing Educational Research.
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Lewin, K. Group Decision and Social Change. In Readings in Social
Psychology, T. Newcomb and E. Hartley (Eds.) New York: Holt,
1947.

Lortie, D.C. The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School
Teaching. In A. Etzioni (Ed.) The Semi-professions and their
Organization. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Maehr, M.L. & Sjogren, D.B. Atkinson's Theory of Achievement Motivation:
First Step Toward a Theory of Academic Motivation. Review of
Educational Research, 1970, 40, 279-300.

Mann, F. & Likert, R. The Need for Research on the Communication
of Research on the Communication of Research Results, Human
Organization, 1952, 11, 15-19.

Marram, G. Visibility of Work in the Educational Process: Evaluation
and Authority for Nurses in Hospitals and Teachers in Open and
Closed Schools. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford
University, 1971.

McCauley, B. Evaluation and Authority in Alternative and Public
Schools, Technical Report No. 23, Stanford, Stanford Center for
Research and Development in Teaching, 1972.

Meyer, J., Cohen, E.G., Brunetti, F., Molnar S., and Lueders-Salmon, E.
The Impact of the Open-space School upon Teacher Influence and
Autonomy: The Effects of an Organizational Innovation. Technical
Report No. 21, Stanford: Stanford Center for Research and Develop-
ment in Teaching, 1972.

Meyers, C.E., Attwell, A.A. & Orpet, R.E.   Prediction of Fifth-grade
Achievement from Kindergarten Test and Testing Data, Educational
and Psychological Measurement, 1968, 28, 457-463.

Rosenshine, B. Evaluation of Classroom Instruction, Review of Educa-
tional Research, 1970, 40, 279-300.

Rosenshine, B. & Furst, N.   Research on Teacher Performance Criteria.
In B. O. Smith (Ed.), Research on Teacher Education: A Symposium.
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Schumsky, A. The Action Research Way of Learning. New York: Teachers
College, Columbia University, 1958.

Sidman, M. Tactics of Scientific Research: Evaluating Experimental
Data in Psychology. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Sieber, S.D. Images of the Practitioner and Strategies of Educational
Change. Sociology of Education, 1972, 4, 362-385.

APPENDIX I.

Report on Teacher Feedback Workshop

REPORT ON WORKSHOP OF

Project 3C: Student Engagement: Classroom Settings
        Teaching Students from Low-Income Areas

May 6, 1972

by

Annegret Harnischfeger and Frederick Ross

Stanford University
Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

I. THE TASK OF THIS REPORT

When the research staff of 3C first contacted the teachers in order to invite them to participate in the   ject, they emphasized their plan to give "feedback" to the teachers, that is to report the findings to the teachers.

The workshop on May 6, 1972 was set up to report preliminary findings to the teachers who participated in the project. But its function was not only one of dissemination: the staff of 3C was also interested in getting comments on their work which would improve future research.

The authors of this report, who were not directly involved in the 3C Project, were asked to evaluate the workshop. We would like to point out that this report is not an evaluation of the project or the planning of the workshop, but only of the workshop itself and the teacher's participation in the project.

We assume that the reader of this report is familiar with the 3C Pro- ject. We, therefore, give no project description.

II. THE RATIONALE FOR THE EVALUATION

One major goal of the 3C Project is to make research relevant to the teacher's daily work. As one consequence, the staff expended much effort at dissemination of information about the project and its results.

The evaluation is mainly concerned with the following questions:

1. Were the preliminary findings presented in a way that was under-
standable to teachers?

2. Could the findings have consequences in the daily work of the
individual teacher?

3. Are the teachers' comments likely to improve future research of
the kind presented?

4. Was the working relationship between the staff and the teachers
supportive of future field research?

We prepared a questionnaire for the teachers which helped us in answering these questions. Besides this, we talked with many teachers dur- ing the workshop and attended all large group meetings. The questionnaire was given to the teachers at the end of the "feedback" sessions. All teachers still present at this time (17) answered the questionnaire.

III. ATTENDANCE

The workshop was attended by 21 out of a total of 24 teachers who par- ticipated in the project. These teachers were located at nine different schools. Two out of the nine principals attended the morning sessions.

IV. ORGANIZATION OF THE WORKSHOP

As can be seen from the schedule (see Appendix A), in the morning ses-
sions the project, its instruments, and its preliminary group findings were
presented while in the afternoon sessions individual findings were presented
including an analysis of videotaped classroom observation. Group discussions
were held in which teachers commented on the project and their individual
teaching experiences.

One observation was that the workshop was very well organized. Time
and room planning were excellent. This has to be mentioned because individual
afternoon sessions which needed many rooms and changes of location really re-
quired thorough planning and a feeling of responsibility from all staff members.

V. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

During the morning sessions of the workshop the project, its instruments,
and its preliminary findings were presented by members of the staff. Special
attention was given by the staff to the dissemination function of these sessions.

In our opinion, the presentations were given in a clear nontechnical
language. The audience understood the main points and were thus able to comment
on the project and its findings in an effective way. Several questions raised
and comments given seemed to be relevant for consideration in future research of
this kind. A little confusion was caused by the percentage definition of strat-
egies used which the teachers had to estimate during one session. Absolute
numbers instead of percentages might have been easier to estimate. The teachers
obviously enjoyed their participation in the sessions. The comments we got
after the sessions showed their great interest and understanding.

Seven of the 17 teachers who answered the questionnaire[1] pointed out (I.5)
that they now understood the goals of the project differently than at the time
they decided to participate, although this would not have changed their decision.
Three teachers would have liked more detailed information before they decided
to participate. Most of the teachers (11) got all information needed to agree
to participate. However, most of the teachers were not in favor of a workshop
prior to the observations (I.6).

Those who would have liked a workshop pointed out that they would have
liked to know more about the specific goals of the observations in order to plan
their teaching around them and in order to feel more familiar with the whole
situation, especially in the first observation period (II.2).

The need for more information is also expressed in the teacher's prefer-
ence for a workshop after the first observation period. About half of the
teachers felt a need to discuss their experiences with other participating

---

[1]The results of the questionnaire are given in Appendix B.

teachers. Many teachers told us during the workshop that they would have preferred a "feedback" session earlier.

All teachers who answered the questionnaire said that they got a rounded picture of the program and its specific goals (III.1). Most of them felt that this information would be of interest to other teachers who have not participated in the project (III.2), although their estimates of other teachers' attendance in the morning sessions had only an average of 30 percent however ranging from "0" to "100" (III.4). This low attendance rate might be the reason that about half of the teachers suggested not to invite other teachers (III.3) to this kind of workshop.

The teachers were somewhat more critical about the presentation of the individual findings in the afternoon. We expected this, because the individual use of strategies and their relation to student's engagement was not always favorable and it is somewhat more difficult to accept unfavorable individual results. Thus, although fourteen out of 17 teachers felt that the materials presented had good examples of their teaching behavior, one teacher felt the material was unrepresentative of her teaching style, one teacher found the material unclear, one too concentrated, and three teachers were claiming incompleteness (IV.3).

The authors did not attend the individual afternoon sessions. The members of the staff who presented the individual findings later reported that the teachers' reactions were very different depending more on the individual personality than on the findings, and that they needed a more in-depth understanding of the characteristics of each teacher before a really effective individual "feedback" session can be run. On the whole, fourteen out of 17 teachers said that most or all of the findings of the project were consistent with their personal knowledge and experiences.

For the future, the staff might consider a workshop for detailed information immediately after the first observation period. The method of informing individually before the observation period seemed to satisfy most of the teachers. The interest for more detailed information which some teachers expressed would have to be considered in the light of equal information for all teachers participating in the project in the future. For the presentation of the individual results even more personalized methods might be developed, in order to avoid dissatisfaction of those teachers whose results are less favorable.

VI. CONSEQUENCES OF FINDINGS FOR THE TEACHERS' DAILY WORK

The results of the questionnaire seem to indicate that the findings presented at the workshop will have definite consequences for most of the teachers participating in the workshop. Sixteen of the 17 said that they had learned something new about their teaching (IV.4). Twelve of the 17 teachers think that they should change some of the ways they teach (IV.5), and sixteen of the 17 teachers felt that results and discussions like those of the workshop could really help teachers change their teaching behaviors (IV.6) but they pointed out that immediate "feedback" after each observation is preferable in order to gain insight into their classroom behaviors when it is still fresh in their memory.

The teachers' comments on the project in general further indicate
that they saw the findings as having definite utility for the classroom
teacher. Sixteen of the 17 teachers responding thought that the results of
the project will be useful to classroom teachers in general (V.2), and all
of the teachers indicated they believed educational research can produce
knowledge helpful to teachers (V.4).

VII. TEACHERS' COMMENTS ON IMPROVEMENT ON THIS KIND OF RESEARCH IN THE FUTURE

Nearly all of the teachers seemed to have some constructive criticism
about aspects of the project, especially in relation to those areas of the
project dealing with teacher strategies. About a third of the teachers thought
that all strategies chosen are highly important in teaching. Nearly a third
was uncertain about this and another third felt that some important strategies
are missing (III.5). Among strategies which the teachers considered to be
important and which were not included in the project were the following: group-
ing of students in the classroom, types of reinforcement, interrelations of
different strategies, positive and negative aspects (III.6).

The teachers were less critical concerning the students' engagement
instrument (III.7). Here we asked for typical ways teachers are aware of
students' interest and engagement in the learning task. Most often the teachers
answered that they assess students' engagement by the types of questions they
raise (III.8).

A special problem in the classroom observation was the videotaped
sessions. Disruption in nearly all classes occurred because of the bulkiness
and extensiveness of the equipment. If there is no solution to the problem of
bulky equipment then, the teacher proposed, a more frequent practice is neces-
sary before the observation would start, in order to observe "usual" classroom
behavior.

The members of the staff stated they learned something more about the
strategies, especially the necessity to disentangle the positive and negative
aspect of strategies. We were told that the staff is looking for a solution
to the videotape problem.

VIII. WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TEACHERS AND THE STAFF

The teachers were asked several questions which helped us to assess their
experiences and opinions about the working relationship with the 3C staff. One
main indicator that shows the good relationship is the teachers' workshop
attendance. Out of the total of twenty-four teacher· who pa· 'cipated in the
project, twenty-one teachers and two principals (~·'   9) attended the workshop.

Looking back at the period of recruitment of the teachers, from the
seventeen teachers who answered the questionnaire, twelve felt invited and five
felt urged to participate (I.1). Those teachers who felt urged pointed out
that this was not on the part of the research staff, but on the school side.
One teacher felt "obligated to return a favor from a fellow teacher" whom she
had asked to participate in another program. The positive comments ranged from

why shouldn't I be observed on to bei.
and feeling thrilled at the opportunit:
to participate.

-d to see profits on both sides
ticipate. No teacher felt pressed

We asked the teachers to estima-
ject if we had invited all teachers in or
estimates ranged from 10 to 100 percen. of
about 60 percent. This figure does not
account that the teachers got some some
main person for the research staff was
convinced that the project was of imper
some of the teachers was obviously due
Fourteen of the 17 teachers discussed t..
principal, seven of these only with him,
any advice. None of the teachers who wer
project.

e of participation in the pro-
.ools (I.2). The teachers'
:cipation with an average of
be too high if we take into
.heir participation. Surely, the
..ly the principal who had to be
-o teaching. The participation of
- "urging" by the principal.
-tion of participation with their
two teachers did not look for
.d refused to participate in the

The question if the teachers wou.. .-- observers coming into their
classrooms unannounced gave us informatio.   r the relationship between the
teachers and the observers. Eleven out of / teachers would not mind. This is
an unexpected high number and indicates w- ' --d relationships between the
teachers and the observers. This fin---- --- confirmed during the workshop,
where we observed a very friendly rel------- between teachers and observers.
It is interesting that except one all ------- who did mind unannounced
observers were feeling urged to part----- +- the project. The teachers felt
free to comment and ask questions. --- -- -fternoon group sessions seemed
to suffer partly from shyness on the ---- - -e teachers. This is probably
due to mainly two reasons:

1. Differently from the morn----   ---- no material was presented.
   They were pure discussion ---- --.

2. The teachers seemed to be ------- to participate because they
   perceived the discussion le---- to be such an "expert" on the
   topic under discussion. This --- a--in differe-- from the morning
   sessions, where except for the intr-duction all presentations were
   given by staff members.

For the future the staff might consider to have a non-professor as a
group leader. We think that some materials like specific instruments or find-
ings would result in a freer discussion.

At the end of the workshop day very many teachers expressed that the
day was unexpectedly interesting and pleasant. Sixteen of the seventeen teachers
who were still present indicated their i-· ·-t to participate in this kind of
project in the future.

... ... ersity

Stanford Center ... ... and Development in Teaching

Project 30 Stu... ... ement: Classroom Settings
Teaching ... for Low-Income Areas

... ... RESEARCH FI... ...

... ... WORKSHOP*

... ... May 6 1972
resi... ... ... Union Room 27...

...30 - ... ... Coffee an... ...

... - 9:1... Welcome ... G... Orientation - Robert ... Hess

9:15 - 9:30 Project ... tie... and Rationale - Ruby Knowles

...30 - 10:30 Explanat... ... ...ervation Instruments ...ed in

Proje... ...ent ...strument - Terry D. Taylor
Proje... Te... ...er Instrument - Anne Morton

... ... 10:45 Coffee ...eak

...45 12:00 Present...... of General Findings Based on all Teachers

Teacher S...ries Associated with Student
Engagement ... Classrooms - Mary Lee Thomson

12:00 - 1:45 Lunch ... ...morial Union, Room 275

...45 - 4:00 Individualize ...dback Sessions**

Videotape Viewin... and Feedback - Cubberley,
Stanf... ...hool of Education
Group I - Cu...... Hall 1:45-2:45
...... Memorial Union ...om 274, 3:00-... ...

Group II - ...... Memorial Union ...om 2... 1:45-2:45
.... 3:00-4:00

... - 5:00 Social ... ...morial Union,
Small ....om 2...2

*The mornin... session will be ...taped.

**For explanat... see page ...

Explanation of Division of Groups I and II

Teachers will be divided into Group I and Group II for the afternoon session. Group I will receive individual feedback at Cubberley Hall from 1:45 - 2:45 P.M. During this time, Group II will remain at Tresidder to discuss the project with Dr. Hess and other members of the staff and to give feedback to them about the project.

Group II will receive individual feedback from 3:00 - 4:00 P.M. at Cubberley Hall. During this time Group I will return to Tresidder for discussions with Dr. Hess and the staff.

You have been assigned to Group_____

The staff member who will give you individual feedback is

_____.

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching

Project 3C: Student Engagement: Classroom Settings
Teaching Students from Low-Income Areas

Workshop May 6, 1972

Teachers' Experiences with and Opinions on the Project

As we pointed out when the research staff first contacted you, one major
goal of this project is to make research relevant to the teacher's daily
work.

Today's workshop has four central objectives:

—— We want to report to you the preliminary findings.

—— We would like to know if your experiences with this project will
have an impact on your daily work.

—— We would like to know how you evaluate your participation in the
project and get comments on its improvement.

—— We would like to have your comments on the working relationship
between the staff and you so that we may evaluate our own efforts as
well as make future research more useful to teachers.

Please help us by responding to the following questions so that we may
improve our work and increase the direct relevance of educational research
to the educational process.

I.   THE PRE-OBSERVATION PHASE

I.1   What were your feelings when you were asked to participate
in the project?

        ___ I felt pressed to participate

        ___ I felt urged to participate

        ___ I felt invited to participate

        ___ I felt (Please specify):_____

I.2   In your opinion, if every teacher in your school were asked
to participate, what percentage of your colleagues would agree?

        ___ percent

I.3   Before you agreed to participate did you discuss this matter with

        yes no

        ___ ___ your colleagues

        ___ ___ your principal

        ___ ___ persons in the district administration

        ___ ___ your students

        ___ ___ other (Please specify):_____

        _____

I.4   Looking back on the contract you and the research staff agreed
upon, do you think it was

        yes no

        ___ ___ appropriate

        ___ ___ unbalanced

        ___ ___ incomplete

        ___ ___ other (Please specify):_____

        _____

I.5   Looking at the project now, did you get enough information about
it, before you decided to participate?

        ___ I would have liked more detailed information,

            specifically on_____

        _____

        ___ I understand the goals of the project differently
now than at the time I decided to participate.

        ___ I got all information needed to make the decision
to participate before I agreed.

I.6   Would you have preferred a workshop for detailed information
on the project for all teachers participating in the project
<u>before</u> the observation started?

         ___ no

         ___ yes

I.7   Did you inform the students' parents before the first observation?

         ___ no

         ___ yes

I.7.1   If yes in the previous question (I.7): how did you inform the
parents?

         ___ note to parents

         ___ asked students to report at home

         ___ meeting of parents

         ___ other (please specify):_____

         _____

I.8   How many parents objected to the classroom observation?

         _____

II.   **CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR**

II.1   Would you have appreciated a workshop session after the first
observation round, in order to talk about your experiences and
compare them with those of other teachers?

         ___ no

         ___ yes

II.2   How did you feel about the first classroom observation?

         yes no

         ___ ___ I behaved differently than usual in the first
session.

         ___ ___ My class behaved differently than usual in the
first session.

II.2.1   If yes for the class' behavior:

         ___ ___ My students were less involved in their work
than usual.

         ___ ___ My students were more attentive to the lesson
than usual.

II.3   In the following observation periods - excluding the videotaped sessions -

      <u>yes</u>   <u>no</u>

      ___ ___ I felt that my teaching behavior was as usual.

      ___ ___ I felt that my class behaved as usual.

II.4   Did you feel disrupted in your teaching by the videotaping?

         ___ yes, very much

         ___ yes, a little

         ___ no

II.4.1   If yes in the previous question (II.4): Could you point out the main reasons for your teaching being disrupted?

_____

_____

_____

II.5   Did you feel that your students were disrupted by the videotaping?

         ___ yes, very much

         ___ yes, a little

         ___ no

II.6   Do you have proposals for improving the videotape sessions?

_____

_____

_____

II.7   In general, how did your students feel about the observations?

         ___ On the whole, they did not seem to be affected.

         ___ They seemed to be very interested in being observed.

         ___ Their comments indicated that they felt proud of being selected for participation.

II.8   How did your students like the videotaping sessions? (Please, choose one answer.)

         ___ They did not seem to be affected.

         ___ They seemed to be very interested in the videotaping.

         ___ They did not like the videotaped sessions.

II.9   Would you mind observers coming into your classroom unannounced?

         ___ yes

         ___ no

III.   GENERAL ORIENTATION AND PRESENTATION OF GENERAL FINDINGS
       IN THE WORKSHOP (Morning Session)

III.1   . Did the morning session today provide you with information
       that gave you a rounded picture of the program and the
       specific goals of this project?

          ___ no

          ___ partly

          ___ yes

III.1.1   If no or partly in previous question (III.1):
       Were the presentations

         ___ incomplete

         ___ too technical

         ___ too concentrated

         ___ unclear?

III.2   Do you think the information presented in the morning would be
       of interest to other teachers who have not participated in the
       project?

         ___ no

         ___ probably not

         ___ I am not certain

         ___ probably yes

         ___ definitely yes

III.3   Would you suggest that we invite all teachers from your school
       for a general presentation of this kind?

         ___ no

         ___ yes

III.4   In your opinion, what percentage of your colleagues might have
       attended the morning session, if we would have invited all
       teachers of your school?

           ___ percent

III.5   Do you think that the teachers' strategies chosen for investi-
       gation in the project are the most important ones for involving
       students in classroom learning?

         ___ I think some important strategies are missing.

         ___ Many strategies seem to me to be irrelevant.

         ___ Some strategies seem to be unimportant in teaching.

         ___ I think that all strategies chosen are highly
            important in teaching.

         ___ I am uncertain about this.

III.6 Can you think of important strategies which we have omitted?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

_____

III.7 Do you think that the student engagement instrument measures the most important behaviors characteristic of student engagement in a learning task?

___ no

___ probably not

___ I am not certain

___ probably yes

___ definitely yes

III.8 Could you name some typical ways teachers are aware of students' interest and engagement in the learning task?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

IV. PRESENTATION OF VIDEOTAPED SESSIONS AND INDIVIDUAL FINDINGS IN THE WORKSHOP (Afternoon Session)

IV.1 Did you have a chance to ask all of the questions you wanted?

___ no

___ yes

IV.2 Were the answers to your questions complete enough?

___ no

___ only some

___ yes

IV.3 Was the material presented to you in the individual afternoon session today

yes no

___ ___ incomplete

___ ___ too concentrated

___ ___ unclear?

___ ___ not representative of your teaching style

___ ___ good example(s) of your teaching behavior?

IV.4   Did you learn something new about your own teaching in the afternoon session?

      ___ no

      ___ I am not sure about this

      ___ yes, a little

      ___ yes, very much

IV.5   As a result of the workshop, do you think that you should change some of the ways in which you teach your classes?

      ___ no

      ___ probably not

      ___ I am uncertain

      ___ probably yes

      ___ definitely yes

IV.6   In your opinion, could classroom observation of the kind presented and individual discussions like those in today's afternoon session help teachers change their teaching style?

      ___ no

      ___ probably not

      ___ I am uncertain

      ___ probably yes

      ___ definitely yes

V.   PROJECT IN GENERAL

V.1   Do you think that more communication among participating teachers would have resulted in more commitment to the project?

      ___ no

      ___ probably not

      ___ I am uncertain

      ___ probably yes

      ___ yes, definitely

V.2   Do you think that this project can produce knowledge which will be useful to teachers in the classroom?

      ___ no

      ___ probably not

      ___ I am uncertain

      ___ probably yes

      ___ definitely yes

V.3   Are the findings of the project consistent with your personal knowledge and experiences?

         ____   no

         ____   some of them

         ____   most of them

         ____   yes

         ____   I am uncertain

V.4   Do you think that educational research can produce knowledge which is useful to teaching and learning in the classroom?

         ____   no

         ____   I am uncertain

         ____   yes

V.5   Would you like to participate further in this kind of project in a more intensive working relationship with the staff in the future?

         ____   no

         ____   yes

If yes, please write your name and address on the attached paper. Use separate envelope because of anonymity.

Thank you for your support of our work.

APPENDIX II.

Guidelines for the Utilization of Videotape
in Feedback to Teachers

Teacher Feedback Workshop

Guidelines for the Utilisation of Videotape in Feedback to
Teachers

Ruby Takanishi Knowles
Betty Diets

Project 3C: Student Engagement: Classroom Settings
Teaching Students from Low-Income Areas

Teacher Feedback Workshop

Guidelines for the Utilization of Videotape in Feedback to Teachers

I. Preparation for Providing Videotape Feedback

A. Videotape Segments

1. There will be approximately 13 minutes of teacher video-
   tape segments available for viewing.

   a. 3 min. - Cosmetic Effects

   b. 5 min. - 1st Videotape Segment

   c. 5 min. - 2nd Videotape Segment

      Note· The segment for "Cosmetic Effect" will

      immediately precede the first five-minute

      tape.

2. Become well acquainted with all of your teacher's video-
   tape segments. Be prepared to identify most of her
   strategies. Know which strategies are exhibited in
   the tape segment; know where ones are not, (particular-
   ly if they are this teacher's most or least engaging
   strategies).

B. Check the date (day, time) of the videotape, and subject
   matter being taught.

C. Become throughly acquainted with available data and analysis
   for your teacher. Talk to the observers who have seen this
   teacher in class. They may have some comments which can be
   helpful in approaching the teacher.

II. The Videotape Feedback Session

A. Short Orientation to Session

1. Inform the teacher what you have planned for the half
    hour videotape feedback session. Stress that this is
    an opportunity to look at at her videotape, and that
    non-videotape-related questions can be discussed after-
    wards. (If you are in a group which receives individual
    non-videotape feedback first, this point may not apply.)

2. Tell teacher how the videotape segments were selected
    (some common problems which were avoided: technical
    difficulties, teacher not on film, students blocking
    camera, etc.)

3. Keep your orientation brief.

4. Start viewing the tape as soon as possible.

B. Cosmetic Effect Segment

1. This segment is used for the teacher to acclimate
    herself to being on videotape.

    a. Ask teacher if she's ever been videotaped before.
        Try to reassure her if needed.

    b. Give teacher an opportunity to verbalize her
        feelings about viewing herself.

    c. Don't comment on strategies during this segment
        unless the teacher asks you to do so, i.e.,
        direct most of your comments toward responding
        to her comments and feelings. Again, try to re-

assure her if necessary. (e.g., people tend to
look fatter on tapes, as well as pale without make-
up, etc.)

C. First 5-Minute Segment

1. Briefly refresh teacher on definitions of strategies
upon which you have decided to focus. Have her individual
profile available for her to see.

a. Define the strategies which she uses most often.

b. Define those which are most engaging for her.

c. Define those which are least engaging for her.

2. Re-start tape and comment on strategies, pointing them
out as they're observed.

a. Point out positive strategies first .

b. Pinpoint tape segments where there is a mix of
negative and positive strategies.

c. Pick out one strategy that has the highest level
of engagement for this teacher. (If needed, stup
the tape and show that part again.)

d. Draw teacher's attention to the reactions of the
students around her, especially in response to
her behavior.

e. Be sure to conclude tape segment by pointing out
positive strategies for her.

f. Ask the teacher if she would like to review any part
of the segment.

3. Stop tape to discuss what teacher has seen.

   a. Review her strategies and their impact upon the students.

   b. Ask the teacher for any comments or questions.

   c. Request that _she_ try to point out her strategies during next segment of time.

4. Start tape of second segment.

   a. Have the teacher point out strategies with as little assistance as possible.

   b. Again, have her note reactions of students around her.

   c. _Reinforce_ the teacher (smile, nod, "Yes!") when she identifies the appropriate strategy.

5. Conclude the session - Closure

   a. After the second 5-minute segment, ask the teacher if she would like to re-view any part of the segment.

   b. Give her the opportunity to comment or ask questions.

   c. _Conclude_ or _Summarize_ the session by noting her strategies you both have seen, and their impact on the students.

   d. Inform her that she can come back at a later date to view her tape more intensively

e. If there is time, get her to express her feelings
about the videotape feedback session.

f. Be prepared to leave the video room promptly so that
the next people can start.

Note Feedback to Betty and/or Ruby regarding the adequacy of these
guidelines will be welcomed.