

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# U·M·I

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**Order Number 9211496**

**A qualitative study of the experiences and perceptions of  
classroom teachers involved in a staff development project**

**Riley, Kevin Michael, Ed.D.**

**The University of Nebraska - Lincoln, 1991**

**U·M·I**  
300 N. Zeeb Rd.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM  
TEACHERS INVOLVED IN A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

by

Kevin M. Riley

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of  
The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska  
In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements  
For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Interdepartmental Area of Administration,  
Curriculum and Instruction

Under the Supervision of Professor L. James Walter

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 1991

DISSERTATION TITLE

A Qualitative Study of the Experiences and Perceptions of

Classroom Teachers Involved in a Staff Development Project

BY

Kevin M. Riley

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

APPROVED

DATE

*L. James Walter*

*11/25/91*

Signature

L. James Walter

Typed Name

Signature

Ronald Joekel

Typed Name

*Sidney L. Hahn*

*11/25/91*

Signature

Sidney Hahn

Typed Name

Signature

Robert Egbert

Typed Name

*Robert O'Reilly*

*11/25/91*

Signature

Robert O'Reilly

Typed Name

Signature

Typed Name

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF THE EXPERIENCES AND PERCEPTIONS OF CLASSROOM  
TEACHERS INVOLVED IN A STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Kevin M. Riley, Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 1991

Advisor: L. James Walter

The purpose of this study was to provide an accurate description of the experiences and perceptions of a group of classroom teachers who were involved in a district-wide staff development project.

Using a qualitative case study approach, six classroom teachers were selected from a suburban school district to act as informants. Each informant was interviewed four times over an eighteen-month period. The informants were observed in the classroom setting for an entire class period and were instructed to keep a personal journal of their feelings and perceptions during the staff development project.

The findings of the study were:

1. Each of the informants felt the Instructional Awareness project had an impact on his or her questioning skills. They felt the project had helped them improve their wait-time behaviors, eliminate annoying verbal habits, help them become better monitors of student progress, and become more self-evaluative of their teaching.

2. Three major qualities that characterized the Instructional Awareness project were identified. The three qualities were: the workshops conducted by the consultant, the videotaping of each informant's teaching, and the post-conferences with the consultant.

3. As the case studies were reviewed, a number of major themes were detected. Ten themes were identified because they were important to the informants and, therefore, frequently mentioned in the case studies. The themes were as follows: (a) initial reactions, (b) the consultant, (c) ITIP, (d) the coding, (e) immediate feedback, (f) the goal setting--improvement of instruction, (g) student outcomes, (h) the journals, (i) final impressions, and (j) advice for the future.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank my dear wife, Mary, for her never-ending love and support. She has played a significant role in my undergraduate and graduate work. I am forever in her debt.

I wish to thank my parents, Tom and Bette Riley, for the life and direction they have given me.

I wish to thank my wife's parents, Joe and Dorothy Randazzo, for their support of and interest in my education.

I wish to express my love and pride concerning my children, Mikaela and Tom. They have fulfilled my dreams.

I wish to thank my advisor, Dr. Jim Walter, for his direction, persistence, and patience.

Finally, I wish to thank my former teacher and coach, Jerry Mosser. He taught me to believe in myself.

K.M.R.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Focus of the Study. . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	2
Research Questions. . . . .	2
Limitations and Delimitations . . . . .	2
Definition of Terms . . . . .	3
Significance of the Study . . . . .	4
The Research Site . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE. . . . .	7
Process-Product Research. . . . .	7
Staff Development . . . . .	8
Change Processes. . . . .	13
Review of Research Studies Using Qualitative Research Methodology. . . . .	17
Summary . . . . .	21
III. THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT . . . . .	23
Sequence of Events. . . . .	25
January 1990: First Workshop with the Consultant. . . . .	25
January through May 1990: First Video- taping Cycle. . . . .	26
March 1990: Second Workshop with the Consultant. . . . .	26
August 1990: Third Workshop with the Consultant. . . . .	27
August through December 1990: Second Videotaping Cycle . . . . .	28
January 1991: Fourth Workshop with the Consultant. . . . .	29
January through May 1991: Third Video- taping Cycle. . . . .	30
IV. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	32
The Five Axioms . . . . .	32
The Fourteen Characteristics. . . . .	33
The Fit of the Naturalistic Paradigm to the Study .	35
Data Collection Procedures. . . . .	38
Interviewing. . . . .	39

CHAPTER	PAGE
Observations . . . . .	41
Collection of Documents . . . . .	41
Data Analysis Procedures . . . . .	43
Criteria for Trustworthiness . . . . .	44
V.    PRESENTATION OF THE CASE STUDIES . . . . .	46
Margaret Janacek . . . . .	46
Terrence Johnson . . . . .	63
Alan Joseph . . . . .	79
Cynthia Kelly . . . . .	90
Helen Kristiansen . . . . .	105
Patrick Rogers . . . . .	120
VI.   SUMMARY OF THE CASE STUDIES . . . . .	134
Research Questions . . . . .	136
Research Question One . . . . .	136
Research Question Two . . . . .	141
Research Question Three . . . . .	159
Conclusions . . . . .	171
REFERENCES . . . . .	175
APPENDIX A - Interview Questions . . . . .	180
APPENDIX B - TAS Statistical Code . . . . .	184

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Time of Workshops and Videotaping Cycles during the Instructional Awareness Project. . . . .	31
2	Timeline of Data Collection Events during the Instructional Awareness Project. . . . .	42

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Focus of the Study

Staff development activities for classroom teachers have become commonplace in school districts across the country. A major theme of these activities is to improve the quality of classroom instruction and the achievement and learning capacity of students (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987). While the effectiveness of these activities has been the subject of much debate by researchers, the practice of planning, organizing, and implementing them appears to have taken a foothold as a means of training and re-training teachers.

The purpose of this study was to provide an accurate description of the experiences and perceptions a group of classroom teachers had while involved in a district-wide staff development project. Using a qualitative case study approach, six classroom teachers were selected from a suburban school district to provide the researcher with information. Data were gathered through interviews, observations, and a review of documents. The data were then analyzed to formulate an accurate description of the experiences and perceptions. The data were also analyzed to identify common themes that recurred regularly in the case studies.

### Statement of the Problem

What are the experiences and perceptions of a group of teachers while being involved in a district-wide staff development project?

### Research Questions

1. What impact has the district-wide staff development project had on the teachers involved in the study?
2. Which qualities of the district-wide staff development project influenced (positively or negatively) the teachers involved in the study?
3. Are there any common themes that can be identified from the experiences and perceptions of the six teachers involved in the study?

### Limitations and Delimitations

There are a number of limitations in case study research. Qualitative case studies can oversimplify results to the point that they are misleading to the reader (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). Case studies are also limited to the skills, integrity, and sensitivity of the investigator (Riley, 1963). Another limitation of qualitative case study research is that the findings are not generalizable in the experimental sense. A limitation of this particular study was that it included only six teachers.

### Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms were used throughout the study.

Consultant. A consultant is one who offers business, professional, or expert advice for a fee. For the purpose of this study, the consultant was the state university professor who conducted the instructional awareness staff development project.

Descriptive. Descriptive means that the end product of a case study is a rich, "thick" description of the phenomenon under study. Thick description in an anthropological term that means a complete, literal interpretation of an incident or entity being studied (Merriam, 1988).

Informant. A reflective person who is willing and able to verbalize the meanings, values, or standards of his or her community (Edgerton & Langness, 1974). For the purpose of this study, the informants were the six classroom teachers.

Instructional Awareness. The title of the district-wide staff development project the six teachers experienced. The project trained administrators and teachers to analyze and improve classroom discussion, questioning skills, and verbal and non-verbal behaviors.

Naturalistic inquiry. An investigation that requires the researcher to observe, intuit, and sense what is occurring in a natural setting (Merriam, 1988). The paradigm of naturalistic inquiry has been described by Lincoln and Guba (1985) and is used as the organizational basis from which this study progressed. A complete definition

of naturalistic inquiry appears in the chapter on methodology.

Qualitative case studies. Studies in which the aim is to uncover the interaction of significant factors characteristic of a single phenomenon, such as a program, an event, a person, a process, an institution, or a social group. The decision to focus on a qualitative case study stems from the fact that the design is chosen precisely because researchers are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing (Merriam, 1988).

Staff development. A process designed to foster personal and professional growth for individuals within a respectful, supportive, and positive organizational climate having as its ultimate aim better learning for students and continuous, responsible self-renewal for educators and schools (Dillon-Peterson, 1981).

### Significance of the Study

Staff development programs have become common occurrences in school districts across the country as a means of improving classroom instruction and student outcomes. One facet of this movement has developed from the process/product research of the past twenty years, which concluded that teacher behaviors do, in fact, affect student outcomes. Therefore, the classroom teacher has become the central focus of these programs.

This study can be significant to researchers and practitioners alike. While much research has been done to determine the effectiveness of staff development programs, few studies have been done that



seek to identify in descriptive terminology the experiences and perceptions of the central figures involved in them. This study, by describing the thoughts and feelings of classroom teachers during their involvement in a district-wide staff development project, may provide for educators a more accurate picture than they currently have.

Ultimately, this study could give educators a better understanding of the experiences and perceptions of classroom teachers. This information can then be used to improve the planning, organization, and implementation of future staff development efforts.

#### The Research Site

A junior-senior high school was the site in which the study was conducted. At the time of the study the school served students in grades seven through twelve. The enrollment was 420 students, and thirty full-time and one part-time classroom teachers were assigned to the building.

The student body was 99.8 percent Caucasian. The curricular program for the junior high student was exploratory in nature, while the senior high student selected from a college preparatory, a general preparatory, or a vocational program of study. Approximately 70 percent of the graduates pursued a post-secondary program. The dropout rate for the entire secondary school population, for the preceding five years, had been less than one student per year.

The teaching staff was comprised of professionals who had

two to thirty years of experience. Sixty percent of the staff members worked with both junior and senior high students. One hundred percent of the full-time staff members worked with students as an activity sponsor or coach. Over half the staff had earned a master's degree in education. Eleven staff members had been recipients of local and state teaching awards.

According to the 1990 census, the city had a population of approximately 2,500, and the school district had a population of approximately 3,800.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature for this study includes a review of process-product research, research on staff development, and research on the change process. The chapter concludes with a review of research studies and unpublished dissertations, similar in scope to this study, in which qualitative research methodology was employed.

#### Process-Product Research

Numerous staff development activities have been born out of the process-product research of the past twenty years. A few of the research studies in this area were done by Brophy and Evertson (1974), Good and Grouws (1975), Rosenshine (1971), Rosenshine and Furst (1973), and Stallings and Kaskowitz (1974). Their research has given the field of education some relatively clear information linking teacher behavior to student achievement.

This research has progressed from a collection of disappointing and inconsistent findings to a small but well-established knowledge base that includes several successful field experiments (Good & Brophy, 1987). Although there are not any specific teacher behaviors that can be generically applied to all circumstances or situations, the research has directed the profession to focus on the function of teacher behavior as a means of improving student outcomes.

Hunter (1990) believed that this core of research-based

knowledge, unique to the practice of teaching, finally identifies teaching as a real profession. She went on to say that a major criterion of a "profession" is that its practitioners never stop learning better ways of providing service for their clients. Continuous examination and modification of practice is essential to professional growth (Hunter, 1990).

### Staff Development

Until as recently as fifteen years ago, very few school districts acknowledged their responsibility for the academic, social, or clinical health of their personnel. Teachers' knowledge of subject matter and instructional practices was limited to their admittedly weak pre-service education experiences (Joyce, 1990).

This recognized deficiency has formulated action. Today, staff development is a living component of the educational system in this country. Staff development has grown unevenly, but it is now established (Joyce, 1990).

The first major, nationwide substantive movement was developed by Madeline Hunter. Her model of teaching called "Instructional Theory into Practice" has been the focus of staff development programs in countless school districts across the country. Her model organized the process-product research into a practical and useful method of teaching. The nationwide acceptance of her work not only provided a framework of teaching technique, but also provided direction for staff development personnel (Joyce, 1990).

Trying to keep abreast of the rapidly growing research on staff development is nearly an impossible task (Wade, 1984). Wade said, "Even if one has the time to keep up, the results reported are often speculative, contradictory, and confusing." Loucks and Melle (1982) concluded that most staff development reports are simply statements of participant satisfaction, which are then used to determine the success of the program.

Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) have done extensive research to date on the topic of staff development. They have, over the past ten years, accumulated a file of staff development research with two purposes in mind: (1) to organize the literature to facilitate cumulative research by permitting current studies to build on previous ones, and (2) to assess the research to locate those areas where the findings are firm enough to provide working hypotheses for program design.

Since the intent of staff development is to improve student outcomes, the programs designed for this purpose must give teachers the information and an opportunity to change and improve their teaching techniques. The file accumulated by Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) has permitted the development of hypotheses about how teachers acquire teaching skills and strategies. The research to date, however, on the issue of how teachers incorporate new teaching skills into their repertoire and transfer them into practice is quite small.

McNeil (1971) and Pambookian (1976) pointed out that teachers are most likely to transfer theory into practice by changing behavior, when provided with information that shows a discrepancy between what they want to do and what they are doing. Therefore, teachers must be provided with feedback on the teaching process to be more effective at the practice of teaching. More specifically, teachers need to know what transpires in their classrooms and what the product of class time utilization is in terms of student outcomes (Mortensen, Bonnstetter, & Wandzilak, 1990).

The process of providing teachers with feedback must be based on the most complete, accurate, and relevant information that can be obtained (Medley, Coker, & Soar, 1984). These authors have recommended the best way to obtain accurate information on teacher performance is through the use of specifically trained and disinterested observers, carefully constructed schedules to help them record what they observe, and the most sophisticated techniques and technology available for extracting relevant information from the records.

From their research, Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981, 1982) have concluded that program design is an integral issue in the attempt to help teachers acquire new teaching skills and techniques. They concluded there are five training components which need to be included in every staff development activity: presentation of material, demonstration of skills, practice, feedback, and coaching. The research findings on their conclusions were significant. Where information-only training was used, the average effect size on

knowledge acquisition was modest. When presentations, demonstrations, and opportunities for practice and feedback were combined, the effect on measures of knowledge averages was significant (Showers, Joyce, & Bennett, 1987).

The subject of transfer is not as simple. Only a dozen or so studies have been conducted in the past ten years that include the issue of transfer or, more specifically, the incorporation of a new teaching skill or technique into the everyday repertoire of the classroom teacher. Showers, Joyce, and Bennett (1987) found that teachers need sustained practice over a period of time to effectively transfer new knowledge and skill into the classroom. They believed a teacher must use the new strategy 25 times before all of the conditions for transfer are met.

A disturbing, but not surprising, finding in Showers, Joyce, and Bennett's (1987) research

. . . confirmed the complaints of teachers, principals, and central office personnel that only a small proportion of staff development programs combine the necessary components to develop skill or engender the follow-up that sustains practice to the point of transfer.

The failure of school districts to develop staff development programs within the proper framework and design has eroded teachers' interest and commitment to such programs.

Many teachers express frustration with staff development activities because the apparent underlying assumption is that staff members will immediately absorb the research base and conceptual framework of whatever model is being presented and be able to integrate

the new knowledge into their teaching repertoires (Brandt, 1990). This frustration is magnified by the common practice by school districts across the country of "jumping on the new bandwagon" every year (Arrendondo & Block, 1990).

These problems are not new. Referring to the cyclical nature of staff development programs in response to educational innovations, Cogan (1973) observed years ago:

It is evident that these boom and bust sequences tend to reduce teachers to a cynicism that saps their commitment to professional improvement. What is needed is a more careful long-term planning for longer phases of their school efforts. Teachers need programs rather than fads and episodes.

Hall and Hord (1987) believed that much of teacher frustration lies in the fact that all too frequently staff development facilitators ignore the change process research. Despite differences in context and format, most staff development programs share a common purpose: to bring about change (Guskey, 1985). Educators generally agree that the three major outcomes of effective staff development programs are changes in (1) teachers' beliefs and attitudes, (2) teachers' instructional practices, and (3) students' learning outcomes (Griffin, 1983).

Hall and Hord stated that understanding the point of view of the participants in the change process is critical. They believed there is a personal side to change that is frequently ignored and that without understanding where the clients "are," only through chance will the interventions made by change facilitators address the needs of innovation users and nonusers.



### Change Processes

One reason that change processes are not successful, and that many worthwhile actions meant to support change are rejected by the participants, is that interventions are not made at appropriate times, places, or in ways perceived by the clients as relevant (Hall & Hord, 1987). All too often policymakers believe that change occurs on a particular date, when in fact the process can take a minimum of two to three years (Red & Shainline, 1987).

Hall and Hord (1987) believed that much that will occur during a change process can be anticipated. They contended there are many predictable events and happenings, and the informed facilitator can plan interventions accordingly. These beliefs came from the conceptual framework known as the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), originally developed in 1973 (Hall, Wallace, & Dossett, 1973).

One of the strengths of the concerns-based approach is that it emphasizes, first of all, understanding teacher attitudes and skills so that support activities, such as staff development, coaching, and provision of materials, can be directly related to what teachers perceive they need. Historically, teachers have all too often been provided with workshops, materials, and other resources based on the needs of others rather than on an understanding of teachers' needs (Hall & Hord, 1987).

School reformers have contended that teachers pass through phases or stages as they experience change. The earliest descriptions were made in 1947, when Kurt Lewin talked about the stages of change

during his studies on group interaction (Lieberman & Miller, 1984). Lewin stated there appeared to be three stages of change as groups are introduced to new ways of behaving. The three stages are unfreezing, changing, and refreezing.

Lewin's descriptions spoke to an initial period (unfreezing) where people are threatened by new ideas or confronted with different ways of looking at what they do. This is a period of great discomfort, where much support is needed to help people receive new ideas. The second stage (changing) is characterized by participating in new ways of doing things. The third stage (refreezing) attempts to lock the ideas into one's repertoire (Lieberman & Miller, 1984).

Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973), in their Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), contended that teachers can experience seven phases while going through the change process; they referred to them as Stages of Concern. The seven phases are: (0) Awareness, (1) Informational, (2) Personal, (3) Management, (4) Consequence, (5) Collaboration, and (6) Refocusing.

Hall, Wallace, and Dossett (1973) defined Stage 0, Awareness, as the period where there is little concern about or involvement with the innovation. Stage 1, Informational, is reflective of a general awareness of the innovation and an interest in learning more details about it. During Stage 2, Personal, the individual is uncertain of the demands of the innovation, his or her own adequacy to meet those demands, and his or her role with the innovation. During Stage 3, Management, attention is focused on the processes

and tasks of using the innovation and the best use of information and resources. During Stage 4, Consequence, attention focuses on impact of the innovation on students in the teacher's immediate sphere of influence. During Stage 5, Collaboration, the focus is on coordination and cooperation with others regarding use of the innovation. The focus during Stage 6, Refocusing, is on exploration of more universal benefits from the innovation, including the possibility of major changes or replacement with a more powerful alternative.

At the beginning of the change process, the typical nonuser has concerns that are relatively high in the first three stages. The nonusers are typically more concerned about gaining information about the change (Stage 1) and about how change will affect them personally (Stage 2). As they begin to use the new program or innovation, Stage 3 (Management) concerns become more intense. When teachers become experienced and skilled with an innovation, the tendency is for concerns in Stages 0, 1, 2, and 3 to decrease in intensity, while those in Stages 4, 5, and 6 become more intense (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1979).

Red and Shainline (1987) contended that change is very personal and complex. They believed that teachers make decisions based on their beliefs about instruction and learning which, in turn, influence their use of any program or set of materials. Hall, George, and Rutherford (1979) had similar findings. They believed that, depending on personal make-up, knowledge, and experience, each person perceives and mentally contends with a given issue differently. One teacher

might see an intervention as threatening, while another sees it as rewarding.

Red and Shainline (1987), from their involvement in a particular staff development program being implemented in a large school district, found that by the second week each teacher faced a different instructional dilemma. They also found that although teachers politely considered and even accepted their solutions, the results looked different in each classroom.

Reactions to staff development efforts also are affected by each individual's personal development. Levine (1985) conducted research on adult development and identified three age related phases of adult growth: early adulthood, middle adulthood, and late adulthood.

Early adulthood spans from the late teens through the twenties. During this period, young adults experiment with a variety of roles and relationships. In many cases, young adults are not yet prepared to make definite choices; yet they have energy, enthusiasm, and a sense of adventure. Idealism, characteristic of young adults, is particularly well-suited to the development and implementation of new ideas and skills (Levine, 1985).

Middle adulthood spans from the thirties through the forties. During this period, becoming established in the workplace is a central objective. Individuals in middle adulthood want to advance their careers and to assume some degree of authority. They want to share their experiences and to serve as mentors to younger colleagues (Levine, 1985)

Late adulthood spans from the age of forty-five to retirement. At this time, adults gradually refocus their energies. They look back over the years to see what has been left out of their lives and try to incorporate missing elements. For most men and career women, this is often a time for giving fuller expression to the nurturing sides of themselves (Levine, 1985).

Hall and Hord (1987) contended that if beginning teachers have different problems and satisfactions than experienced teachers, clearly the teacher education experiences each group receives should be different. Fuller (1969) stated that beginning teachers are concerned about classroom control, their own content adequacy, the situations in which they teach, and about evaluations by their supervisors, pupils, and of their pupils by themselves. Gabriel (1957) found that experienced teachers reported slow progress of students as a major issue. For satisfaction, experienced teachers frequently brought up the success of former pupils, while inexperienced teachers brought up holidays and praise from inspectors.

#### Review of Research Studies Using Qualitative Research Methodology

In relation to this particular study, which attempted to describe the experiences and perceptions of a group of teachers as they were involved in a district-wide staff development program, using qualitative case study research techniques, the body of related research was quite small. Showers (1983) and Sparks (1983), in separate studies, interviewed teachers they trained to gain a deeper understanding

of how changes in teaching occur.

Sparks (1983) examined interviews, questionnaires, observation data, and field notes for five teachers who made exceptional improvements in classroom management and active instruction, and five teachers who made no improvements. Sparks concluded that the improvers demonstrated a high level of self-expectations, and the non-improvers demonstrated a low level of self-expectations for themselves and their students.

Showers (1983) used teacher interviews, observations of and conversations with teachers involved in her Models of Teaching training to investigate the problems of transfer. She found the major problem teachers had with the models was knowing when to use them. This problem was then magnified as teachers tried to write objectives to fit the model and then fit the model into their curriculum. This cognitive task proved to be too complex for some teachers.

Using qualitative research, Showers (1983) and Sparks(1983) have tried to describe how changes in teaching occur. Other researchers have also recently begun to focus on the experiences, perceptions, and attitudes teachers have while being involved in staff development programs.

Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, and Hall (1987) followed the activities of a school district assistant superintendent for instruction as she embarked on an "effective teaching" staff development project. The assistant superintendent was responsible for the school improvement effort.

When talking with teachers, well into the project, the assistant superintendent found them disinterested in how the project was serving students. Instead, the teachers had questions about whether written lesson plans were required and, if so, in what format, and when and how they would be evaluated in the teacher appraisal system (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

Burchett (1989) conducted a study of the personnel perceptions of a collaborative school-based staff development approach. The purpose of the study was to examine the efficacy of the collaborative school-based staff development approach in terms of the process, comparison to other schools, and the product (staff development plans). Data were generated from structured interviews with teachers and principals.

Findings from the study indicated that the process of the collaborative approach to school-based staff development was generally perceived as having much potential and favored over the traditional approach to staff development. Nevertheless, there was considerable dissatisfaction about the design and delivery of the course. Many recommendations for improvement of the collaborative approach were made by the course organizers, teachers, and principals (Burchett, 1989).

Frame (1989) conducted a qualitative case study to examine teachers' perceptions of a school-based staff development program. The purpose of the study was to determine to what degree participating teachers perceived that they made changes in their instructional behavior. Data were collected from thirteen teachers through individual

interviews, classroom observations, and participant responses to information sheets and the Stages of Concern Questionnaire.

Findings from the study indicated that teachers' perceptions of the district level program format were based on conversations with other teachers rather than on direct experience. The teachers perceived that the project helped them become "better" teachers, but they did not identify specific behaviors that were changed or improved. Teachers also reported that their perceptions of the content of the staff development program were more positive at the end of the program, while their perceptions of the delivery process of the program remained negative.

Butt (1989) conducted a qualitative case study of the experience of four middle school physical education teachers during a collaborative action research staff development project. Specifically, the research explored (1) the teachers' perceptions about various aspects of their teaching before, during, and after their involvement with the project, (2) the teachers' expressions of instructional autonomy and any modifications to that during their involvement in the project, (3) the teachers' opinions of collaborative action research as a vehicle for improving instructional practices, and (4) the results of the teachers' collaborative action research projects. Data were collected through interviews, transcribed tapes of workshops and work sessions, and work logs. In analyzing the data, the researcher sought to discover themes and patterns. Eleven themes emerged from the data.

Butt (1989) concluded: (1) the teachers all experienced an



increase in their understanding of their instructional practices; (2) all teachers reported being more conscious of their decision-making practices; (3) action research was reported by all teachers as a useful vehicle for improving their instruction; (4) an increase in instructional autonomy was experienced in varying degrees by all four teachers; (5) three teachers were able to change their teaching to varying degrees; and (6) all teachers developed a sense of becoming an agent of their own change (Butt, 1989).

Burchett (1989) and Butt (1989) asked teachers to assess the effectiveness of the collaborative action research approach to staff development, and Frame (1989) attempted to assess the degree of teachers' perceived change in teaching behavior while being involved in a staff development project. The ensuing study focused simply on what six teachers experienced and perceived when they were required to be involved in a district-wide staff development project.

### Summary

In summarizing the principles from the review of the literature, numerous staff development activities have been born out of the process-product research of the past twenty years. This research has directed the profession to focus on the function of teacher behavior as a means of improving student outcomes.

Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981, 1982) have done extensive research on the topic of staff development. They have concluded that program design plays an integral role in the acquisition of new teaching

skills and techniques. They recommended that five training components be included in every staff development activity. The five training components are: presentation of material, demonstration of skills, practice, feedback, and coaching.

Research on teacher attitudes toward staff development activities has uncovered a high degree of teacher frustration. Hall and Hord (1987) believed that much of this frustration lies in the fact that all too frequently staff development facilitators ignore the change process research. They believed there is a personal side to change that is frequently ignored, and that without understanding where the clients "are," only through chance will the interventions made by the staff development facilitators address the needs of innovation users and nonusers. Their findings have been organized and compiled into a conceptual framework known as the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM).

Numerous quantitative studies have been done on staff development activities. Recently, studies using qualitative research methodology have started to appear. The qualitative approach has been selected for this study, which focused on the experience and perceptions of a group of six teachers involved in a district-wide staff development project. The staff development project in which the six teachers were involved is described in Chapter III.

## CHAPTER III

### THE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

To understand the methodology chapter of this study and the ensuing case studies, the reader needs some information about the staff development project in which the six classroom teachers were involved. This chapter gives such a description.

The purpose of the staff development project was to improve the quality of classroom instruction. The major objectives of the project were to train administrators and teachers to analyze and improve classroom discussions, questioning skills, verbal and non-verbal behaviors, and monitoring of student progress.

The project was entitled "Instructional Awareness" and was done with the assistance of a consultant from the state university system. The consultant's responsibilities were to educate the 60 members of the K-12 staff on the many aspects of process-product research, demonstrate the related teaching techniques, give teachers an opportunity to practice the techniques, and give teachers complete and accurate feedback.

The consultant conducted a series of four workshops for the purpose of explaining the process-product research pertaining to group discussion, teacher talk, cognitive levels of questioning, probing questions, wait time, and active student participation. During the workshops, the consultant demonstrated the research-based teaching techniques so teachers could observe.

An interactive analysis software program was available to

provide feedback to classroom teachers regarding their instructional behaviors. The software program was called the Training and Assessment System (TAS). The computer program was developed by Compass Software Systems of Scottsdale, Arizona. Crow and Buckley (1988) described this program as a "blueprint of teacher behavior." The consultant spent time during workshops informing the staff of its capabilities.

Following the workshop on the teaching techniques and the introduction of the TAS system, the teachers began making videotapes of their teaching. The videotapes were sent to the consultant for coding, using the TAS system and the coding file specially designed for the school's faculty. The coding file and a composite example of the coded results appear in Appendix B. The consultant then conducted post-conferences with each teacher to explain the coded results. From these conferences, each teacher developed personal goals for improving the quality of instruction in his or her classroom. This was done three times over an eighteen-month period, with each videotape activating the entire cycle over again.

This staff development project was not designed as an evaluation of teaching but a means of generating extensive and accurate data so teachers could make informed decisions about their teaching. Ultimately, by experiencing a series of videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycles, teachers had an opportunity to become self-evaluative of their teaching.

### Sequence of Events

Listed below is a description of the sequence of events that occurred during the Instructional Awareness project.

#### January 1990: First Workshop with the Consultant

The first workshop occurred on Friday, January 12, 1990, and began at 9:00 a.m. The first semester had ended the day before, and this was a teacher workday. Some male staff members sat at the back of the room with their arms folded. Initially there was not much teacher involvement. Once the consultant began his work, the staff became involved, and the male teachers leaned forward in their chairs and began to show an interest.

At the initial workshop, the consultant focused on the process-product research associated with effective teaching. He instructed staff that teacher behaviors such as the amount of teacher-centered talk, student-centered talk, cognitive level of questions, and wait time after questions were asked had a direct effect on student outcomes. He also introduced the TAS system to the staff and explained how it was to be used. He instructed each staff member to videotape a fifteen-minute segment of his or her teaching and submit it to him. Using the TAS system, he then coded each teacher behavior and classroom occurrence observed during the taping. He completed the first workshop by telling staff members he would return with the coded information and conduct a post-conference with each of them concerning the results. From the information shared during the post-conference, the teachers

would then develop a personal goal for improving their teaching. The workshop lasted one hour.

#### January through May 1990: First Videotaping Cycle

During this period, each staff member submitted a fifteen-minute segment of his or her teaching to the consultant for coding. A number of teachers expressed a concern that a fifteen-minute segment could not accurately capture their teaching behaviors. Some teachers experienced technical difficulties with the video and sound equipment. Everyone, however, submitted his or her tape on time. Two months passed between the videotaping and the post-conferencing. When the coding was complete, the consultant met individually with each of the teachers, and a goal was established for the improvement of his or her teaching.

#### March 1990: Second Workshop with the Consultant

The second workshop occurred on Thursday, March 22, 1990, and began at 8:15 a.m. Time was set aside for the workshop by having students report to school one and one-half hours later than normal. The staff appeared to be interested as the workshop began, probably because they thought they would receive the coded results of their fifteen-minute teaching segments. When they found that the coded results would not be returned, a few showed facial disgust.

During the second workshop, the consultant reviewed the process-product research shared during the first session. For this workshop, he combined the data of the first ten staff members he

coded and discussed the findings with the staff. He found that teacher-centered activities accounted for more than 70 percent of class time.

The last portion of the second workshop was devoted to giving each staff member an opportunity to experience the TAS system. He divided the staff into groups of three, with one being the teacher, one being the student, and one being the coder. The consultant had them role play a teaching episode.

#### August 1990: Third Workshop with the Consultant

The third workshop occurred on Tuesday, August 21, 1990, and began at 10:00 a.m. This took place during the teacher workdays that preceded the start of the 1990-1991 school year. The staff showed signs of passiveness at the beginning of the workshop in the form of facial expression and body language. Once the consultant began his work, the staff moved forward in their chairs and showed signs of interest.

During the third workshop, the consultant reviewed the process-product research on effective teaching. He also took time to review the entire Instructional Awareness project. He spent time identifying and demonstrating questions that were associated with the six cognitive levels. He distributed a handout that identified "key words" that could assist teachers in the planning and development of high and low level questions.

The consultant spent considerable time focusing on student outcomes. He requested that staff members not only identify their

objectives and respective teaching techniques for each lesson, but also determine what would be learned by the students and how that would be measured.

Staff members were then informed they would again videotape a segment of their teaching for coding. The segment was to last for an entire class period. The consultant requested that staff members accompany the videotape with a sheet of paper that identified the objectives for the lesson, the teaching technique employed for the lesson, and the manner in which the teacher assessed student progress. Some staff members, through facial expressions, showed signs of confusion.

#### August through December 1990: Second Videotaping Cycle

During this period, each staff member submitted a videotaped segment of his or her teaching to the consultant. Accompanying the tape was a form that identified the teacher's objectives for the lesson, the respective teaching techniques employed, and the manner in which student progress was assessed. A number of teachers had difficulty with the form and said they "weren't sure what the consultant wanted." Months passed between the videotaping and the post-conferencing. When the coding was completed, the consultant met with each staff member to explain the results. Each staff member then developed a goal for the improvement of his or her teaching.



January 1991: Fourth Workshop with the Consultant

The fourth workshop occurred on Friday, January 11, 1991, and began at 9:00 a.m. The first semester had ended the day before, and January 11 was a teacher workday. The staff appeared to be generally interested as the workshop began.

For the fourth workshop, the consultant was accompanied by two of his colleagues from the university. One of the colleagues spent considerable time informing the staff of national teaching standards that could be adopted nationally in the near future. When the consultant's colleague finished, one of the staff members raised his hand and asked, "Who are you, and what is the reason for your being here?" The colleague then introduced herself and explained her purpose.

The workshop continued with a discussion of the pros and cons of the project. Collectively, the consultant and the staff made plans for improvement. For this discussion, the staff members were told they would have choices for the third taping cycle. They could choose to again submit a videotape of their teaching, or they could be coded "live" by the consultant. They were also given the choice of post-conferencing with one of the university people, a building administrator, or both.

The consultant then reviewed the student outcomes research and asked staff members to again accompany their respective videotapes with a form that identified the objectives for the lesson, the teaching techniques employed, and the manner in which student outcomes

were assessed. He asked teachers to submit an "artifact" that would identify student progress. This "artifact" could be an example of student writing, a piece of artwork, an assignment completed during the class period, or a journal entry that was consistent with the objectives and teaching techniques employed during the lesson.

#### January through May 1991: Third Videotaping Cycle

During this period, each staff member submitted a videotape of his or her teaching. Six of the staff members chose to be coded "live" by the consultant. Accompanying the tape was a form that identified the teacher's objectives for the lesson, the teaching techniques employed, and the manner in which student progress was assessed. Some teachers expressed difficulty with the "artifact" concept. They were again unsure as to what the consultant had in mind. Each staff member, however, submitted an "artifact" to substantiate student progress. Months passed between the videotaping and the post-conferencing. When the coding was completed, each staff member conferenced with a university person or his or her respective building administrator. Goals for improvement were again set.

This chapter has attempted to give the reader information about the staff development project in which the six classroom teachers were involved. The information presented will help the reader better understand the next chapter on methodology and the ensuing case studies. To further inform the reader, a

timeline of the workshops and videotaping cycles appear in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
Time of Workshops and Videotaping Cycles during the  
Instructional Awareness Project

1990												1991				
January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May
		+					+					+				
*	*	*	*	*			*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

+ = Workshops

\* = Videotaping Cycles

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODOLOGY

The paradigm of naturalistic inquiry as defined by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is described in this chapter. Naturalistic inquiry was used as the organizational basis from which this qualitative study progressed.

A formal statement of the five axioms and descriptions of the fourteen characteristics of operational naturalistic inquiry are included in this chapter. The data collection procedure, analysis procedure, and the criteria to determine trustworthiness are also included in this chapter.

#### The Five Axioms

Axiom 1: The Nature of Reality. There are multiple constructed realities that can be studied only holistically; inquiry into these multiple realities will inevitably diverge (each inquiry raises more questions than it answers) so that prediction and control are unlikely outcomes, although some level of understanding can be achieved (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Axiom 2: The Relationship of Knower to Known. The inquirer and the "object" of inquiry interact to influence on another; knower and known are inseparable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Axiom 3: The Possibility of Generalization. The aim of inquiry is to develop an idiographic body of knowledge in the form of

"working hypotheses" that describe the individual case (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Axiom 4: The Possibility of Causal Linkages. All entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping so that it is impossible to distinguish cause from effect (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Axiom 5: The Role of Values in Inquiry. Inquiry is value-bound in at least five ways. Inquiries are influenced by the values of the inquirer, the paradigm chosen, the choice of substantive theory utilized, the values inherent in the context, and, with respect to the above inquiry, is either value resonant (reinforcing or congruent) or value dissonant (conflicting). The inquiry must exhibit congruence if it is to produce meaningful results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

#### The Fourteen Characteristics

The following are descriptions of the fourteen characteristics of operational naturalistic inquiry as stated by Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Characteristic 1: Natural setting. The study is done in the natural environment because realities cannot be separated from the contexts in which they occur.

Characteristic 2: Human instrument. The naturalist elects to use himself or herself and other humans as the primary data-gathering instruments.

Characteristic 3: Utilization of tacit knowledge. The naturalist argues for the legitimization of tacit (intuitive, felt)

knowledge in addition to propositional knowledge (knowledge expressed in language form).

Characteristic 4: Qualitative methods. Qualitative methods are chosen because they are more adaptable to dealing with multiple realities.

Characteristic 5: Purposive sampling. Informants are chosen because of their abilities to give a full array of multiple realities.

Characteristic 6: Inductive data analysis. This process is more likely to accurately express the setting and make decisions about transferability to other settings.

Characteristic 7: Grounded theory. The substantive theory emerges from the data themselves.

Characteristic 8: Emergent design. The research design emerges, flows, and unfolds, rather than being constructed pre-ordinately.

Characteristic 9: Negotiated outcomes. The meaning and interpretations of the data are negotiated with the human informants from which they are drawn.

Characteristic 10: Case study reporting mode. The case study approach is more adapted to a description of the multiple realities encountered at any given time.

Characteristic 11: Idiographic interpretation. Data are interpreted idiographically (in terms of the particulars of the case) rather than nomothetically (in terms of law-like generalizations).

Characteristic 12: Tentative application. The naturalist

is hesitant to make sweeping applications of the results because there are multiple realities.

Characteristic 13: Focus-determined boundaries. Boundaries are set on the basis of the emergent design because that allows the multiple realities to set the focus, rather than the inquirer's preconceptions.

Characteristic 14: Special criteria for trustworthiness. The conventional trustworthiness criteria of validity and reliability are replaced with criteria such as credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability.

#### The Fit of the Naturalistic Paradigm to the Study

In regard to Axiom I, this qualitative case study focused on a holistic study of six classroom teachers in their natural environment. The intent was to discover and understand their feelings and perceptions while being involved in a staff development program, without relationship to prediction or control.

In regard to Axiom II, the inquirer and informants were constantly in a state of interaction. The success of the study was totally dependent on that interaction.

In regard to Axiom III, the results of this study are not generalizable in the positivistic sense. At this point, the researcher chose to pursue a "descriptive" case study. This approach allowed the researcher to focus on "process rather than outcomes, content rather than a specific variable, and discovery rather than

confirmation" (Merriam, 1988). The approach also allowed for interpretation, evaluation, and generalization to be left to the varying perspectives of each viewer (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

In regard to Axiom IV, cause and effect were not mentioned in the context of this study. When attempting to provide a thick description of reality as the main focus, cause and effect became insignificant.

In regard to Axiom V, this study was affected by the values of the researcher, the paradigm chosen by the researcher, the values of the informants, and the environment in which they existed. There was no attempt made to produce a sterile, value-free environment.

This study also fit the characteristics of naturalistic inquiry defined by Lincoln and Guba (1985). This study occurred in the natural setting and the primary data-gathering instruments were human. The study took place at the school in which the six teachers and the researcher were employed. This decision was made so that the final description could be an accurate account of the experiences and perceptions of the people involved. The focus on experiences and perceptions required the researcher to utilize tacit knowledge and qualitative methods because of the multiple realities that existed in such a setting.

Purposive sampling was used to increase the range of data exposed. This was accomplished by the selection of six teachers from different backgrounds, personalities, curricular areas, interests, and years of experience. These six teachers were also chosen because



they each had the ability to express their thoughts clearly. (Further explanation of the selection of the six teachers can be found in the data collection portion of this chapter.) As the teachers expressed their experiences and perceptions, inductive analysis was used to describe and conclude.

Since the intent of the study was to describe, the design of the study, the theoretical framework, and the boundaries were not predetermined. The design, the grounded theory, and the boundaries emerged from the numerous interviews, observations, and document reviews.

When the data were collected, the six teachers were asked to negotiate the meaning and interpretations of the findings. This allowed each teacher the opportunity to have control over the accuracy of his or her case study report. (This is further explained in the section on data collection, which appears later in the chapter.)

The researcher's decision to describe the experiences and perceptions of the six teachers also affected the interpretation of the data, the application of the results, and the trustworthiness criteria. The data were interpreted in terms of the particulars of the case and not in terms of law-like generalizations; therefore, the conclusions can only be hesitantly applied. Trustworthiness was established by prolonged engagement, triangulation, and the development of an audit trail. (These issues are described more thoroughly later in the chapter.)

### Data Collection Procedures

The logistics of the study, the successive phases of the study, research on data collection, and the data collection procedures employed by the researcher are described in this section of the chapter.

The study took place at a junior-senior high school. Six classroom teachers were chosen for their successful experiences in the context of this school and because they were willing to assist the researcher in the study. The six informants had varied degrees of experience and were from different curricular domains. They ranged in years of experience from two years to twenty-seven years. They taught in the curricular domains of business, math, English, social studies, science, and vocational education. The researcher was the principal at the junior-senior high school at the time of the study.

Phase I of the study was conducted from January to May of 1990. During this time, the researcher and the informants met three times for orientation and overview purposes. The first meeting focused on the nature of the study, and a request for their involvement was extended. At this meeting, the informants were told of the data-gathering procedures, data analysis procedures, and the trustworthiness criteria for qualitative research.

The second meeting focused on demographic information, and the informants were asked questions regarding their opinions of staff development programs in general. They were also asked their opinions of the initial workshop of the district-wide staff development program

in general. They were also asked their opinions of the initial workshop of the district-wide staff development program in which they were involved and the first taping, post-conference, and goal setting cycles.

The third meeting focused on their opinions of the second workshop and overall procedures of the staff development program. These meetings were relatively brief, and the questions asked were largely of the "grand tour" type (Spradley, 1979). Grand tour questions ask, "tell me what you think I should know," with the objective being to obtain a feel for what should be pursued during Phase II. (All of the questions asked during interviews can be seen in Appendix A.)

Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined Phase II as the time of focused exploration. Following the review of the information gathered during Phase I, the researcher developed data collection methods for the purpose of obtaining in-depth information about the experiences and perceptions of the six informants. Phase II was conducted during the 1990-1991 school year and employed the data collection procedures of interviewing, observing, and examination of documents. These procedures are described in the following sections of this chapter.

### Interviewing

An interview is a "conversation with a purpose" (Webb & Webb, quoted in Burgess, 1982). Patton (1980) stated that interviews are conducted to find out things that cannot be observed, such as experiences, attitudes, feelings, emotions, and perceptions. The

purpose is to get "inside the head" of the person being interviewed.

Becoming a skilled interviewer takes time and practice. The researcher had nine years experience interviewing applicants for teaching and classified positions and, therefore, felt very comfortable with the process.

They key to getting good data is to ask good questions (Merriam, 1988). Patton (1980) and Strauss, Schatzman, Bucher, and Sabshin (1981) identified categories of questions that were used by the researcher in this study. Patton (1980) listed six kinds of questions that were used to get different types of information from the informants. They were experience/behavior questions, opinion/value questions, feeling questions, knowledge questions, sensory questions, and background/demographic questions.

Strauss et al. (1981) identified four major categories of questions in their research that were also used by the researcher. The four categories included hypothetical questions, ideal questions, devil's advocate questions, and interpretive questions. The researcher reviewed these categories prior to each interview, along with the statement of the problem and the research questions identified in Chapter I.

The first interview during Phase II was held in November, 1990, with the second occurring in May of 1991. Both interviews lasted approximately 50 minutes. Questions were written and asked clearly and in a style familiar to the informants. Leading questions were avoided.

During the interviews, the data were recorded in two ways. First, the interviews were tape-recorded, and, secondly, the researcher took notes on a legal-sized pad. After the interviews, the researcher transcribed the tapes, word for word.

### Observations

Just as casual conversation with someone differs from interviewing, so too does routine observation differ from research observation (Merriam, 1988). During research observation, Merriam (1988) recommended observing the setting, the participants, their activities, and their interactions with others.

In this study, the researcher observed the actual classroom activities of each informant. Each informant was observed formally in the classroom setting for an entire class period. The purpose of the observation was to accurately describe the activities that occurred in the classroom, in order to help the reader better understand each informant.

Recording the observation was done in two ways. First, the researcher wrote a narrative of the observation. Secondly, the researcher, immediately after the observation, reflected on the classroom occurrences and wrote additional comments. All notes were then reviewed, and the researcher wrote a descriptive account of the observation.

### Collection of Documents

The type of document used in this study was completed in

the form of a personal journal. Each informant was asked to keep a journal of his or her feelings, perceptions, reactions, and opinions of the Instructional Awareness project. The informants were instructed to enter any thoughts that pertained to the staff development project and any experiences they had while trying to implement the teaching techniques. They were asked to make entries whenever they felt it was necessary. This terminated Phase II of the study.

The timeline of data collection events, in reference to the staff development project, is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
Timeline of Data Collection Events during  
the Instructional Awareness Project

1990												1991				
January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May
+	*	+	*	*			+	*	*	*	*	+	*	*	*	*
*	#	*	✓	✓			*	*	*	✓	*	*	*	*	*	*
								•	•	•	•	•	•	•	∇	•

- + = Workshops
- \* = Videotaping Cycles
- # = First Informational Meeting with Informants
- ✓ = Interviews
- ∇ = Observations
- = Journal Entries

Lincoln and Guba (1985) defined Phase III as the "member check" phase. The data obtained during Phase II, using data analysis procedures, were written in case study form and returned to the informants for review and verification. This was done to obtain confirmation that the case study had captured the experiences and perceptions of each informant. Each informant read and returned his or her respective case studies; three of the informants had some minor revisions for the researcher. The case studies appear in Chapter V.

#### Data Analysis Procedures

In this section of the chapter, the data analysis procedures utilized in this study are described.

Merriam (1988) stated that data collection and data analysis are a simultaneous activity. Analysis commences with the initial interview, observation, or document review. Emerging insights, hunches, and tentative hypotheses direct the next phase of data collection, which in turn leads to a refinement or reformulation of one's questions. The interactive nature of the process leads the researcher to the development of believable and trustworthy findings.

Data analysis is the process of making sense of one's data (Merriam, 1988). The goal of data analysis is to develop conclusions and generalizations based upon a preponderance of data (Taylor & Bogden, 1984). For the purposes of this study, the researcher organized all the information obtained during the data collection period. Patton (1980) called this the case record.

During the data analysis phase of this study, the researcher followed directions given by Goetz and LeCompte (1984). The first step was to review the original research proposal. This allowed the researcher to review the starting point of the study and the audience for which the study was originally intended.

The second step was to read through all the data several times. While reading, the researcher wrote notes, comments, and observations. Goetz and LeCompte (1984) believed that these notes, comments, and observations "serve to isolate the initially most striking, if not ultimately most important, aspects of the study."

The third step was to keep a separate list of major themes which "cut across much of the data" (Merriam, 1988). During this step, the researcher looked for recurring regularities in the data. This step has been described as a means of developing conceptual categories that describe the findings of the data to the reader. The researcher initially found twenty-two such themes during the data analysis process. Through further review, the number was reduced to ten.

The final step of the study was to answer the research questions. This was done in a descriptive manner and appears in Chapter VI.

### Criteria for Trustworthiness

The issue of trustworthiness of cases is of paramount importance to a qualitative case study researcher. As the positivist deals with the issues of validity and reliability, the naturalist must



deal with credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For the purposes of the study, trustworthiness was achieved by (1) prolonged engagement, (2) triangulation, and (3) the development of an audit trail.

The study was conducted over an eighteen-month period. Triangulation was achieved by the number of interviews, observations, and journal entries conducted during this time. Member checks were also incorporated into the study so that the informants could review the findings before they were reported. Finally, an audit trail was constructed so that persons outside the study could assess the quality of work. The results of each interview, observation, and each journal entry were coded for easy access and were logged in the order in which they appeared in the case studies.

## CHAPTER V

### PRESENTATION OF THE CASE STUDIES

In this chapter, a case study is presented for each teacher who acted as an informant. The case studies provide the rich description that is characteristic of qualitative research. To fully understand the experiences and perceptions of the informants, one should read each of the six case studies. One can also review Chapter VI for the summaries and themes identified during the data-analysis phase.

The case studies are presented in alphabetical order. As guaranteed by the researcher, the real names of the informants were kept confidential. The pseudonyms are: (1) Margaret Janacek, (2) Terrence Johnson, (3) Alan Joseph, (4) Cynthia Kelly, (5) Helen Kristiansen, and (6) Patrick Rogers.

#### Margaret Janacek

Margaret had taught English for twenty years, the last fourteen at her present school. Prior to that she taught for three years at Westerburg and three years at Porthill. While her children were small, she did some substitute teaching.

Margaret always wanted to be a teacher. As a small child at play, she was always the "teacher." She became a teacher because she enjoyed working with kids and wanted to have a positive effect on the lives of young people. Through teaching she felt she could assist

her students as they matured and influence them to be better people. She also felt by teaching English she would be giving her students skills they would use throughout their lifetimes.

Margaret stated she got along well with her students because she understood "where they were coming from." She enjoyed the daily contact with her students. She described her greatest reward as having former students return to school to tell her thank you for all she taught them. Seeing them become doctors and lawyers, and knowing she "helped them somewhere along the line," was very satisfying. Margaret also stated she enjoyed teaching because she learned daily. Whether learning something about her teaching, her curriculum, or her students, these ongoing occurrences kept things fresh.

When asked what she liked least about teaching, Margaret responded, "If I had a lot of them I wouldn't be here." She did say, however, that students who refused help, or to admit they needed help, frustrated her. This then translated into a larger frustration with those students who did not finish school. Margaret felt if students failed to finish school, teachers, as a school, had failed. Another frustration that Margaret stated was the amount of paperwork English teachers had to deal with.

Margaret added that extra-duty assignments were also a source of frustration for teachers. Early in her career, she was contracted to be the Pep Club sponsor for 30 girls. She was gone from home five to six nights per week for two years because of this assignment; she resigned at the first opportunity.

Margaret described herself as someone who had difficulty giving in to new ideas. She had experimented with new techniques and often found they were not as effective as what she had been doing for twenty years. One of the "new" ideas with which she had difficulty was the idea that English teachers need not read and correct each student writing assignment. She felt if she assigned it, the assignment should be reviewed and returned.

During her free time, Margaret liked to sew and read. She loved to read novels and short stories. She also enjoyed music. She played the piano and accordion. She played the organ at church for six years. She expressed numerous times that although she enjoyed these things she had very little time to do them.

When asked what she thought she would be doing in five years, Margaret responded, "Since my son is going to medical school in the East, I hope to still be here. That is if the school will have me, and things are still going well." She went on to say that as long as she was not harming the students, she would remain a teacher. The minute she felt burned-out, however, she would leave.

During the 1990-91 school year, Margaret taught all of the senior English classes. She taught Advanced Placement English, College Preparatory English 12, English 12, Creative Writing, and Vocabulary Development. She supervised a ninth-grade study hall and had one planning period. She acted as student council sponsor, which she had done for the past twelve years. When asked, she stated her student council responsibilities required five to six additional hours

of her time each week.

### Observational Analysis of Margaret Janacek's Classroom

When asked to describe her classroom, Margaret said she did not run a rigid classroom. She liked to use humor to "loosen things up," although her students questioned her sense of humor. She developed an atmosphere of mutual respect, where students could enjoy themselves. She said an observer would probably find her asking questions to promote discussion. The observer would see the students as responsive, productive, and well-behaved learners.

The researcher observed one of Margaret's Vocabulary Development classes. The class began with a review of yesterday's material. Margaret told the students to listen closely as she identified each vocabulary word, since many would be on the up-coming exam. She directed one student, who had recently failed an exam, to come in for a re-take.

Margaret then began discussing each of the vocabulary words. The words were either antonyms or synonyms. As she identified each word, she continuously asked questions. The students responded quickly and were often correct. Each student in the class responded numerous times. The students and the teacher appeared to be very relaxed.

After the review of antonyms and synonyms, Margaret began reviewing other vocabulary words for which the students would be responsible. This portion of the lesson proceeded in the same manner as the first, in that each student was involved and productive.

She ended the lesson by introducing a few new vocabulary words. The lesson lasted the entire 50 minutes.

Margaret's classroom had numerous novels, encyclopedias, dictionaries, thesauruses, and alternate instructional materials that could be found on bookshelves that surrounded the room. The walls were covered with posters and photographs from the movie "The Odyssey." Also of note was a "Writing Style" poster and a catalog of topics that could be located on the Dialog modem. Information for student council members was also posted.

First Interview: April 1990

When asked what her opinion of staff development programs, in general, was, Margaret replied, "The majority of them have not been productive for the majority of the staff." She believed that in-service/staff development days were looked upon as days off.

Margaret said speakers who tried to force their philosophy on others tended to be the worst. She felt she was already set in her philosophies, and no one was going to change them. She referred to an Eastern Nemaha Conference In-Service Day speaker as a disaster because of this approach; she felt this early morning disaster set the tone for the entire day.

There had been a few bright spots over the years, however. At the same Eastern Nemaha Conference In-Service Day, time was set aside so teachers from their chosen disciplines could meet to discuss curriculum and instruction issues. She said these meetings had been very beneficial because they allowed teachers to talk to each

other about common problems in their respective areas. She added, "It's not a bunch of philosophy; we get down to the nitty-gritty."

Margaret also stated she liked Madeline Hunter's Instructional Theory into Practice (ITIP) program. She said it brought out things she had been taught, such as Bloom's taxonomy. Reviewing the taxonomy made her take a good look at her questioning skills.

When asked how she felt when informed of the Instructional Awareness project the school district was about to begin, she said, "I was pretty positive about it." She stated at this time that every teacher should have an open mind to suggestions, especially from someone who was considered an expert in the field. She said she expected the university consultant to be helpful and give the staff some specific suggestions on questioning techniques.

Following the university consultant's initial workshop in January of 1990, Margaret felt overwhelmed with the amount of information that was shared. Her impression was that the university consultant had a lot of material to cover and wanted to get through it quickly. She also got the impression the consultant was unsure of his role. She brought up the fact that numerous times, during the workshop, he said, "I don't know where we are going with this . . . ." Margaret then posed this question, "If he doesn't know and we don't know, then what is this going to accomplish?"

Margaret became very negative when she was told to make a fifteen-minute videotape of her teaching and submit it to the consultant for coding. She felt this way because she had never liked

to see herself on video. The idea of videotaping had her "up-tight."

The idea of meeting with the consultant after the videotape was coded posed no problem for Margaret. In fact, she was interested in finding out what he had to say and if his thoughts matched hers. She wondered if he would pick up on the fact that she said "OK" a lot.

When asked about the second workshop given by the university consultant in March of 1990, Margaret had a number of thoughts. She was disappointed the consultant did not have everyone's tape coded. Her question was, "If I have to have my tape in by a certain date, why isn't it coded by now?" The consultant explained he had not received the tapes in time to get them all coded.

When she was put in a group with two other teachers to experiment with the coding, she said it turned out to be a disaster. One of the members of the group asked a very demeaning question, and the session went downhill from there. She said her group did not take it very seriously. She added, however, "The fact that we were trying to familiarize ourselves with the coding before our post-conferences with the consultant was beneficial."

#### Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred following the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle. Margaret was very positive following the post-conference with the consultant. She said the information he gave her was very beneficial. While they were reviewing



the coding, the consultant remarked that he felt he could go a little "farther" with Margaret, and they began identifying different series of responses and how many repetitions occurred.

Margaret felt the post-conference was very concise and to the point; she said the consultant "definitely knows what he is doing." She also complimented the TAS system and how it was able to identify entire series of responses. The consultant informed Margaret there was nothing at this point he saw on the tape or the code that concerned him. Margaret was initially concerned about the number of times she said "OK," but the consultant said he did not see that as a concern. The consultant qualified the statement by saying, "Right now, your students see it as a confirmation and acceptance of their answer and not as a denial."

Margaret felt the coded results were an accurate description of her teaching segment. She said the coding identified the level of questioning that she intended; the coding also showed the students were thinking and responding at a higher level. She interjected at this time that she was amazed the consultant could remember the questions she asked that day.

The goal Margaret set for herself was to stop repeating student answers. She thought she was training the students to listen only to her and not to each other. She had tried in the past to make her students aware of this, but had not yet succeeded. She said she was going to work at it. She closed by again saying the post-conference/goal-setting session was very positive.

Third Interview: November 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle. When asked about the third workshop, Margaret said she felt uneasy for the consultant. She thought this uneasiness stemmed from the resistance the consultant was experiencing with some staff members. She observed him to be very unsure of himself during this workshop. In her opinion, his anxiety made everyone in the room anxious. She also felt uneasy, because, in her opinion, he had helped her as a teacher.

When asked about the goal she set for herself after the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle, Margaret hesitated. She said one of her goals was to stop saying "OK," and to raise her questions to the higher cognitive levels. Later in the interview she said her major goal was to stop repeating student responses.

Margaret had problems with the actual taping of her teaching segment. Because of the open-concept design at the school, noise from adjoining rooms could be disruptive. Margaret experienced this problem the day she taped. The tape was picking up the voice of the teacher in one of the adjoining rooms; therefore, it was difficult for the consultant to code. In fact, the consultant could not pick up Margaret's voice very well, nor could he hear the responses from her students. Because of this problem, the consultant stopped coding twenty-six minutes into the forty-five-minute segment.

All was not lost, however. During the post-conference, Margaret and the consultant were able to decipher some things from the tape. For example, there was not one "OK" in the entire segment. She was also able to determine that the questions she had asked were at the higher cognitive levels, and her wait-time had increased. Because of the level of questioning and increased wait-time, Margaret felt her students, during the segment, were "having to think."

Another thing that was obvious from the taped segment was that Margaret had a tendency to teach to one side of the classroom. She noted the consultant picked up on this as they watched the tape. She said she had not noticed the tendency before. The consultant informed her that this was a common teacher behavior.

When asked what goal she set for herself, Margaret responded, "We talked about ways of improving the quality of the tape." She added that the consultant was just as frustrated with the tape as she was. The consultant thought that wearing a portable microphone would help. Margaret stated, however, that other staff members had tried this, and student responses were still unclear.

In regard to her teaching behaviors, Margaret set a few goals. The first was to rearrange the seating order so she was not directing everything to just one side of the classroom. Margaret felt this would allow her to include the entire class in discussion and call on students whom she knew had the answer but were reluctant to speak. Margaret also said she was interested in improving the manner in which she sequenced her questions. The example she gave was "asking a lower-level question, getting an answer, and then moving

to a higher-level question."

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had any effect on her teaching behavior, to this point, Margaret responded by saying she thought it had. The most significant change she had noticed was in her questioning and wait-time behaviors. She added that prior to this project she would ask a question and then repeat it three or four times, without giving the students a chance to respond. She also referred to the eradication of "OK" from her speech pattern as an improvement. Another habit that she observed herself doing was "chomping" on gum as she spoke to her students. This project had helped her to eliminate that habit also. Overall, she felt the project had made her more aware of the types of questions she asked, whom she asked, how long to wait, and when to re-state a question. She felt she was no longer totally dominating discussions and was involving her students more.

At the end of the third interview she reiterated that she felt the consultant was very uneasy with this project, and that it was coming across to the staff as a lack of confidence on his part. She believed some staff members would never "buy into" the project because "if he is uncomfortable with what he is doing, then how can we be comfortable with it? If he doesn't know what he is doing, then how are we supposed to know what we are doing?" She went on to say there was still some question among staff as to whether this would be used for evaluation. She explained, "Even though the administration has stated that it is not an evaluation, the staff still feels it is."

Overall, Margaret thought:

Anytime we can look at ourselves and try to improve ourselves, we should do it. Seeing ourselves through the principal's evaluation, we can either believe it or not. However, when we see ourselves, it becomes very real. Having three sons who were in sports, I know that videotaping their games helped them to see their strengths and weaknesses.

Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop session and the third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle. When asked about her perception of the fourth workshop session, Margaret responded by saying the consultant, in particular, was very nervous and insecure. She said that was a side of the consultant she had never seen before, that in the past "he was the one who had all the confidence in the world." Margaret sensed the consultant was feeling that something in the project was not working. She thought the university colleagues he brought with him were of little help, in that they appeared as though they did not know what was going on.

Margaret felt the staff was very laid back during the session and that no one benefited from the hour. She thought the staff felt worse about the project, and the time could have been used more productively by having the teachers discuss the project among themselves.

When asked what choices she made for the third taping cycle, such as whether she wanted to tape or be coded live and whether she wanted to post-conference with the consultant or her assigned administrator, Margaret replied, "I don't want the consultant in my room, coding. No matter what people say, kids are aware that he is there."

Margaret chose to continue taping as she had in the past. She chose to post-conference with her assigned administrator, because "he is the one who evaluates me; he knows me and cares about me. I'm not just a number to him. I don't need the title of university consultant to help me. I just need someone to go over the tape with me and see if they see the same things I do."

Margaret said the taping was much better this time. She said her administrator set it up, and all she had to do was turn it on. The only problem she had was that the student who was to turn the camcorder on did not do so. She said the student was playing games. She said he did it on purpose, and that it was a joke to him. Therefore, she had to tape again. This was a little stressful because Margaret did not like to worry about machines when she was trying to teach. She said, "This was an Advanced Placement class, and the students were really into the material and didn't want to bother with machines either."

Margaret said the class period that day was devoted to a discussion of Chaucer. The Travelers was the topic, and each of the students was to read about two characters, analyze the material, and share his or her perceptions with the class. She said she was testing her students' interpretive skills. At the end of class she gave her students a quiz. The quiz required higher-level cognitive thinking, in that the students were asked to choose four characters and tell why they were either positive or negative influences. The quiz was the artifact for the lesson.

Margaret got a lot out of her post-conference, although the coded tape took a long time to be returned. She said her administrator had looked at the tape, marked things of interest, and then went back to those things during the conference. She said she had not gotten that with the consultant. "We looked at one little portion of the tape and that was all." She thought the administrator was much better prepared.

As to the goal that was to have been set during the post-conference, Margaret said, "We didn't set one." In retrospect, she said she wanted to get all of her students involved in discussions. Although she believed she had improved in this area, she felt that certain students still dominated. She said this problem was one of the things she learned from the taping, and that she changed the seating order so the students who dominated were spread out. The tape showed some students still were not talking. Margaret ended by saying that involving all of her students in discussion would be her goal for next year.

### Journal Entries

The following journal entries were made during the 1990-91 school year. Some of them related directly to the Instructional Awareness project, and others did not.

Entry 1: The question of how much money is being paid to the consultant came up today. Different reactions to the consultant and the project made me wonder about the attitudes of the staff. Fall 1990

Entry 3: My administrator observed me today. Believe it or not, he is more intimidating than the videotaping. A human is still more threatening than a machine. My job is in his hands. Fall 1990.

Entry 6: Semester tests show where I failed. Why can't students learn it all? Ha Ha Winter 1991

Entry 7: D-Day is approaching. Semester tests. Students react to evaluation much like we do. Why is it so hard to take criticism? Do we all expect to be perfect? Winter 1991

Entry 8: Is the consultant incognito? What's with the beard? Change of image? I think I am doing a great job. Students and parents tell me so. The administration and my colleagues make me question my teaching abilities. I do not feel right about this. What should I change? or should I? I feel good about my accomplishments. Conflict--is it good? If feelings could not be hurt, honesty is best. Conflict is still the result. Improvement should be for the students, not the teacher. Winter 1991

Entry 11: Erase this day from my life. I lost control of my emotions and made a fool of myself. War is hard to take--all those we know--pray for their safety. War is necessary when you are dealing with a maniac. Tomorrow will be a new day! Winter 1991

Entry 17: Time to be evaluated or taped or whatever the tape does. For me, setting up the tape is a pain. If someone would just come in and take care of it for me. Winter 1991

Entry 18: This is not my day. Things all set up for me. Then the tape does not begin until 40 minutes are left in the period, when someone notices that the red light isn't flashing! Tomorrow we will try again. Winter 1991

Entry 19: Another taping done. Sometimes I wish that someone would just come in unannounced and code me. Winter 1991

Entry 21: Evaluation of my tape is completed by me. Acoustics are bad. We need an enclosed classroom to pick up all the student voices. Winter 1991

Entry 26: It has been one month since I taped. No evaluation yet. Immediate feedback is advantageous, if not necessary. Spring 1991

Entry 35: Let's face it! The video analysis is a thing of the past. We must have our taping done by February, so we can have immediate feedback. It's April 23, so far, nothing. Let us move on! Spring 1991



Entry 37: My administrator talked to me today. He said, "Let's analyze your tape," and then asked if I had it. I said, "I don't have it." Enough said-- let us cancel the project. Spring 1991

Entry 39: Had a very interesting and gratifying evaluation of my tape with my administrator. I feel he does a better job because he knows me and really cares about my teaching. Spring 1991

Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year she had, Margaret responded, "It was a very successful year." She felt the Advanced Placement course tested what she could do as a teacher, and she was happy that her students learned so much about writing and literature. She also felt good about her College Preparatory classes, because she had challenged her students more than in the past. Her lower track class was the best behaved and most motivated group she had ever had, right up until the last day.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, she responded by saying that it had improved her questioning skills. Margaret qualified this statement by referring to the coding. She said, "Look at the last coding; one-third of my questions are higher-level questions. I have also begun to probe more." She also identified an increased use of wait-time as an improvement. She could not, however, give the Instructional Awareness project total credit for the improvements. She said her administrator, when he evaluated her, remarked that her wait-time was something she needed to work on. She did say the taping helped her to stop saying "OK" so much, and it also helped her get rid of the gum.

Margaret did not think the project helped her become a better monitor of student progress. She felt she had always been good at that. She had accomplished this, in part, by keeping the students aware that she would quiz them at any time.

Margaret felt she had become more self-evaluative. She said she was her worst enemy. She recommended that it may be beneficial for the staff to review each other's tapes. She thought this could give the staff ideas about different approaches to teaching.

On the negative side, Margaret felt like the project had lasted three years. She said, "Teachers don't need an outsider coming in, and the project could have ended last year." Margaret felt the turn-around time from "when you videotaped your teaching segment to the time you post-conferenced" was too long. Margaret handed her third tape in on February 11 and did not post-conference until the end of May.

Margaret felt the Instructional Awareness project should not continue. She said it would be acceptable to continue on a voluntary basis. She thought, however, the project accomplished what it set out to do, which was to make the staff aware of the improvements they needed to make. In her opinion, it had served its purpose, and the district should move on.

If for some reason, the project were to continue, Margaret recommended it be done internally. She again cited the positive post-conference with her administrator, as the primary reason.

When asked how the administration should proceed if they

planned another long-term staff development project, Margaret said she was at a loss for an answer. She had been on a number of planning committees and found it very hard to get teachers to be honest concerning their needs. She said, "If you ask teachers what they want, most of them will not tell you what they really need, because they don't want to admit that they don't know how to do something." Margaret continued. "What you would get are things that staff was already mediocre to good at."

Another problem with planning staff development projects was the attempt made to cover all the disciplines with one "thing." Margaret stated, "All teachers are at various levels of experience, skill, and interests, and to try to hit them all with the same thing is very difficult." She recommended dividing the staff by disciplines and giving each area an opportunity to choose the direction.

In conclusion, Margaret said she did not have the answer to this problem. She added, however, that the administration knows the staff as well as they know themselves; therefore, the administration is more apt to identify those areas in which the staff needed to improve. She believed the staff would probably accept whatever the administration recommended because of the respect they had for it.

#### Terrence Johnson

Terrence had taught industrial education for the past thirty-one years. During his tenure, he had also taught physical education, driver's education, and had served as Adult Education Director for

Metro Tech Community College.

Terrence became a teacher because he was very interested in physical education, vocational education, and coaching. He delayed entering college for three years after graduating from high school, because his older brother had been drafted into the service and he had to help out on the family farm. His parents died before he finished high school.

Terrence then enlisted in the armed services. While there, he was the supervisor of a metal shop and had seven employees under him. At this point, he decided to become an industrial arts teacher.

While teaching, Terrence pursued a graduate program. He went to school for eleven summers from 1960 through 1970. He earned a master's degree and accumulated 56 hours beyond. In addition, he attended General Motors' auto mechanics training and had taken several computer courses that focused on computer-aided drafting.

Terrence had served as head basketball coach, assistant football coach, assistant track coach, and head baseball coach. He had served as the president of the teachers' association; he said, "Everyone has to have their turn."

His tenure as junior class sponsor was memorable. He told a story about the time he and the juniors were setting up for the prom. They had rented a water tank and fountain for the event and were able to get it working at 5:00 a.m., the day of the prom. When they returned later that morning, they found someone had inadvertently punctured the liner to the tank, and water had leaked out. The color

from the streamers was everywhere. They cleaned until four o'clock in the afternoon, and the prom started on schedule at six. After that episode, they never again had a fountain for the prom, and Terrence soon relinquished his position as junior class sponsor.

Terrence remembered his first-year salary as \$4,400. He took home \$279 a month. His rent was \$50 a month; electricity was \$5 a month; phone was \$3; \$50 went for food; and fuel oil for the entire year was less than \$100. This left \$50 to \$75 a month for him and his wife to spend.

In 1966, Terrence ran for city council and was elected. He remained on the council until 1969, when he "inherited" the mayor's job. He was reelected in 1972 and again in 1976. During his eleven years as mayor, he never took a vacation and missed only two meetings. He would go to the city hall offices each day after school and every day during the summer. He said he treated it like a "regular job."

During his administration, the town built a swimming pool and an extension to the treatment plant. Terrence re-wrote all city ordinances and compared it to re-writing school board policies. He decided to not seek reelection in 1980; he said his primary reason not to run was to be able to spend more time with his family.

When asked what he thought his major strength was as a teacher, Terrence replied, "My personality." He said knowledge of subject matter was not the only requirement for being a good teacher. He continued, "Teachers need to be patient, understanding, respectful of others, and good listeners." He cautioned, however, "There needs to

be a line drawn in the student-teacher relationship, so that the relationship doesn't become too friendly."

Terrence said, "I enjoy my association with students and believe this interaction is one reason that I did not go into administration." In administration, Terrence said, "You don't get to teach the whole person."

When asked what he liked least about teaching, Terrence quickly answered, "Bells." He remarked that in his area, "You just get going and then you have to put everything away." This constant jumping in and out, without finishing, annoys him more each year.

Terrence described himself as one who was constantly trying to improve his skills and knowledge. He referred to his attempts in recent years to improve his speaking skills as an example of this. He said, "Improving my ability to communicate clearly with students, using proper English, is a constant goal."

Terrence said his hobbies had changed over the years. During the first fifteen to twenty years of teaching, Terrence enjoyed wood-working and metalworking. Now, he said, "I enjoy golf and exercise." He also spent a lot of time with his grandchildren. He did some gardening, but not as much as he used to.

When asked what he thought he would be doing in five years, he laughed and said, "I will be retired." He planned on focusing on his insurance and real estate business, which he had done part-time for many years. He remarked that he had set up a retirement fund that would allow him to do just this, and he was looking forward to the

time off. He wanted to take a winter vacation, which was something that teaching prohibited him from doing.

During the 1990-91 school year, Terrence taught Diversified Occupations, Architectural Drawing, and served as the school district's adult education director. He supervised a high school study hall. Terrence served as head golf coach and senior class sponsor. He also was a VICA sponsor, a vocational education club that provides leadership opportunities and competitions for high school age students.

#### Observational Analysis of Terrence Johnson's Classroom

When asked to describe his classroom, Terrence said to "visualize a person that is standing at the front of the classroom, greeting each student as he or she arrives. It is a relaxed atmosphere in which there is no fear. You would find me talking to those students who have a problem with inferiority."

When class began, Terrence got his students' attention immediately. He said, "I inform the students of each day's lesson and try to engage them in discussion regularly."

The researcher observed Terrence's Architectural Drawing class. The class began with the distribution of a handout that would assist the students in determining the value of their house design and the manner in which an appraisal would be conducted. Terrence discussed the contents of the handout with the class.

He informed the class that there were numerous features that affect the appraisal amount. Features such as fireplaces, covered porches, brick, lot price, and the number of bathrooms were identified.

He instructed the students to identify those features that would affect the appraisal of the house designs and to begin figuring the value of their home. The students were then told to "boot up" on the computer-aided drafting software and continue their work.

As the students worked at the computers, Terrence moved from station to station assisting, directing, instructing, and questioning. He spent a significant amount of time with each student. The students who were not at the computer worked at their respective drawing tables. The class was on-task, well-behaved, and productive for the entire session.

Terrence's classroom walls were decorated with numerous architectural plans, the VICA banner, a U.S. flag, and a poster of the metric system. The observer also noticed numerous computers, a robotics device, drawing essentials, a framed model home, and numerous architectural and mechanical journals.

#### First Interview: April 1990

When asked what his opinion of staff development programs, in general, was, Terrence replied, "During the first twenty years of my teaching career, staff development was non-existent." Compared to what is considered staff development programs today, Terrence said, "I was not aware that there was anything like that around. In the past ten years, things have changed significantly."

Terrence believed that any time one had an opportunity to improve his or her performance, even in a small way, one should take



advantage of it. He went on to say he felt this way whether it concerned teaching, insurance, or any of the areas in which he was involved.

When asked how he felt when informed of the Instructional Awareness project that the school district was about to begin, he said that he thought it would be another "ITIP." He said he had mixed feelings about the project. He was not sure of the benefit.

He felt a little anxiety about being taped and, like anyone else, was concerned about trying something new. Since he had experienced so many things over the years, however, Terrence was able to keep things in perspective. He said, "Over the years, you do what you have to do and accept whatever comes out. I'm not going to make any big changes just because somebody new comes in."

Following the university consultant's initial workshop in January of 1990, Terrence remarked that a few of the teaching techniques referred to in the workshop, e.g., cognitive levels of questions, wait-time, and close proximity, bothered him a little. The reason for his discomfort was that he realized most of what he was doing in his classes was at the knowledge level.

The idea of videotaping a teaching segment did not bother Terrence. He said he would not spend any more time in preparation for the taped lesson than he would normally. He had made up his mind that "Whatever came out was going to be exactly the way in which I would have done it had I not been taping."

Terrence said he was really looking forward to meeting with

the consultant to discuss his taped segment. He said he had no idea what to expect, but that he would listen, even if it embarrassed him. He went on to say, "There have been so many changes since I had methods courses 20 years ago. We did not deal with instruction in this manner."

When asked about the second workshop given by the university consultant in March of 1990, Terrence said that some of the information given surprised him. When the consultant stated he was finding most of the higher-level questioning in the district to be at the K-3 level, Terrence was concerned. He began to assess his own teaching and commented, "Maybe it makes some sense."

When the consultant instructed the teachers to get into groups of three, Terrence experienced some difficulty with the coding. As he attempted to code the interaction between the teacher and student in his group, he had a "terrible time" distinguishing the levels of questions being asked.

#### Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred following the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Terrence said the post-conference was very informal. The consultant actually walked into his classroom while Terrence was having class and asked if they could have the conference in the back of the room. So, as the students worked on their assignments, the post-conference took place behind them.

When asked whether the coded data sheet was an accurate reflection of his teaching, Terrence responded, "probably not." The reason he gave was that the sound was not clear on the tape. He had used the power pack while taping and the power had run down; therefore, the coding could not be perfect.

The consultant pointed out that during the taped teaching segment, 70 percent of the time was teacher-directed and 30 percent was student-directed, with most work being done at the knowledge level. Terrence said he expected that. The consultant also pointed out that Terrence, in trying to clarify his questions, often rephrased them two or three times. He recommended that Terrence work on being very clear with his first question, so that he would not have to re-state it.

The goal that Terrence set for himself was to improve his discussion techniques so he could get "more student input." He believed this could be achieved by utilizing less teacher-directed instructional approaches.

#### Third Interview: November, 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Terrence did not offer much when asked about the third workshop. His only statement was, "The consultant must have felt from the staff evaluation of the project that the teachers weren't getting enough response from him during the post-conferences and that there was too much time between the videotaping and the post-conferencing."

When asked about the goal he had set after the first cycle, Terrence said that he wanted to improve the clarity of his questions so he would not have to rephrase them so often. He also added that he wanted to improve his wait-time after asking a question.

Terrence said his coded tape showed he had made improvement in these areas. He said his wait-time was better and his questions were clearer. He said he did some things for this tape that he normally would not do. For example, he wrote everything down that he wanted to do during the lesson. He said, "I have found that if you want to ask a question at the analysis level, you have to write it all out before you start."

When asked what goal he set for himself, Terrence said that he wanted to "move into the higher-level questions." He decided on this after seeing that most of his questions from the second taping were at the knowledge level. He thought this could easily be accomplished with his Architectural Drawing class, because he felt he was already in the habit of doing so. He added that he thought it would be more difficult to do so in the Diversified Occupations class because of the type of student enrolled.

Terrence agreed that the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching. He said he was more aware of his teaching techniques. He said, however, that ITIP had accomplished the same thing. He ended the interview by saying he had made up his mind to improve his teaching by working within the Instructional Awareness project and to make these improvements whether he was being taped or not.

Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop session and the third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Terrence's first recollection of the fourth workshop session was of the national teaching standards that one of the consultant's colleagues addressed. Terrence remembered making a comment to someone seated next to him, "I probably won't have to worry about national standards, because by the time they are instituted I will no longer be teaching."

He also remembered that the good points and the bad points of the project were discussed. While he sat there listening, he thought the post-conferences, from his perception, were somewhat lacking. Terrence felt the consultant could have given his tape a little more attention, and that it would have been beneficial to go through the tape together and identify concerns.

When asked what choices he made for the third taping cycle, such as whether he wanted to tape or be coded live and whether he wanted to post-conference with the consultant or his assigned administrator, Terrence replied, "It didn't really matter to me." He did offer that he thought taping live would be more accurate, but taping it himself would be more normal. As it turned out, he taped himself and met with the consultant.

Terrence's objective for his taped lesson was to "go beyond the knowledge level to applications." The students were working on a

drawing. Terrence directed them to take the knowledge-level information and apply it to solve a drawing problem. He said the problem confused a few of the students, primarily because Terrence had combined two lessons together. Terrence identified the artifact as the completed drawing.

Although Terrence thought that going through the taping cycle again was somewhat redundant, and that the value of it was limited, after completing it he said, "The cycle this semester was much more positive." He felt the reason for this was the consultant spent more time with him looking at the tape. The consultant had written down some of the questions Terrence had asked during the lesson, pointed out the weaknesses, and offered direction.

During the post-conference, Terrence did not set a goal with the consultant. Had he made one, however, it would have been "to be more specific in my instruction." He said that as he watched his tape he noticed he was being very general. He did not elaborate.

### Journal Entries

The following journal entries were made during the 1990-91 school year. Some related directly to the Instructional Awareness project, and others did not.

Entry 2: As I made my lesson plans, the thought of higher-level questions crossed my mind. Fall 1990

Entry 4: D.O. Class is still very much at the knowledge level. I hope to improve this in the future. Fall 1990

Entry 5: As I prepare to grade a major project in Drafting, I'm thinking of ways to possibly improve their level of learning. Some of the students didn't make

very good decisions on proper dimensioning techniques.  
Fall 1990

Entry 7: D.O. students have not progressed from the knowledge level. Many of the students are special education students. Winter 1990-91

Entry 8: As we are getting ready for the Xmas vacation, I am preparing my lesson plans for the up-coming semester. The thoughts I have center around how to increase student participation in learning activities. Winter 1990-91

Entry 10: The Drawing II class is now in the process of transferring theory to actual drawing. Each student is developing a preliminary home design, based on previous knowledge-level information. Students are finding it much more difficult than being presented the information on a spoon. Winter 1990-91

Entry 11: As I reflect back to the beginning of our staff development program, I personally feel that I have benefited. At least it has made me more aware of how I conduct my classes. I feel that the consultant is doing a good job, and I am feeling comfortable with him during review sessions. Winter 1990-91

Entry 12: I'm presently planning to write questions which I can use to get to a higher level of questioning. Winter 1990-91

Entry 13: As we are approaching the budget time for next year, I've been looking for materials which will help me improve my instruction. Sometimes the past methods have not been that desirable. With the conference in-service day coming up Monday, I hope to visit with other teachers and hopefully get some new ideas. Winter 1990-91

Entry 14: As I have finished reading the master teacher pamphlet about closure, I realized I have been doing the correct thing. It stated that "the higher the level of thinking required in summarizing, the more effective closure is." Winter 1990-91

Entry 15: During the in-service presentation, I realized that change is a necessary part of education. When I try something different which leads to increased learning by students, it always makes the effort worthwhile. Winter 1990-91

Entry 16: Sorry for the delay in entries! In CAD drafting, the assignment I gave required them to design and draw a garage of their choice. Had some problems. In many cases they were unable to use the computer without user friendly instructions. I may have tried to go too quickly on this assignment, without giving proper instruction.  
Spring 1991

Entry 17: This will be my final entry in the journal, so I would like to recap my feelings about the program. On the very first taping I was somewhat concerned that my techniques may not have been up to par in the questioning program. After sitting down with the consultant, my feelings were verified. It is very difficult to get beyond the knowledge level without writing down specific questions. The type of student that I work with also has an effect on the techniques.

This morning we are going to develop a contract for selling a vehicle in D.O. class. I have given them all the elements of a legal contract which they must use in developing their own contract. Hopefully they will be able to take the knowledge they have learned and apply this to the lesson.

I think this journal has also helped me think about what I have been doing in my classes and maybe even helped me improve my techniques of teaching. Spring 1991

#### Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year he had, Terrence responded, "I had an average to above average school year." He said he was satisfied with what had transpired over the last year, but that he had some ups and downs. Some of the things he taught did not go as well as he would have liked, but on the other hand he had some surprising results with some of his students.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching, he responded, "It made me aware of some things that I was doing and have known I was doing, that I probably never did much about." He said one of those things was writing down questions that require learning at a higher level. In the past he had always gone



"off the cuff." He said developing higher-level questions required a lot of thought.

Terrence felt that reviewing the tapes in the manner conducted in his last post-conference worked best for him. He also said that reviewing the coding also helped him because it showed how much time he was spending on various tasks. This, he said, helped him gain some insight.

Terrence believed he was now more aware of his questions. He was reluctant to say that he was more proficient, but added being aware should help him improve. He qualified this by referring to his wait-time. He said, "I am more aware of my wait-time. Sometimes I find myself counting to 5-6-7. Although this seems like an eternity, by waiting I hope to get a better answer."

Terrence also believed that writing in the journal was beneficial. He said that forcing himself to write things down made the project more meaningful. "If you don't write things down, it just passes by." He said the program had made him more self-evaluative.

Terrence enjoyed the university consultant. He said, "We discussed many things that were not related to the project." He believed the consultant developed good relationships between himself and his clients.

On the negative side, Terrence said that much of what was done was time consuming, without any new ideas coming through. He thought that maybe some things were covered that did not need to be. He felt the organizational structure left "much to be desired," and that

the flow of the entire program was not smooth.

Terrence said if he were rating the project on a scale of one to five, with five being the highest, he would give this program a two or a three. He again said the same could have been accomplished in much less time, and that it could have been done more efficiently.

Terrence thought the Instructional Awareness project should not continue. He felt he had gotten out of the project everything he needed to know, and it was now up to him to make the improvements. He did not think another videotaping, post-conferencing, and goal-setting cycle would accomplish much. He said, "An awareness project is just what it is, an awareness project, and it's done."

When asked how the administration should proceed if they ever planned another long-term staff development project, Terrence replied, "You should proceed very carefully." In Terrence's estimation, long-term projects are not usually taken well by staff because teachers are often overburdened with work, and "it takes time away from their subject areas."

He recommended the administration include teachers in the planning stages. As someone who had worked on the conference in-service planning committee, Terrence felt for benefits to be realized, the entire process must be a joint effort. He cautioned, however, that it was very difficult to find something that teachers would be enthusiastic about.

Alan Joseph

Alan had taught for the past twenty-six years. The first four years he taught physical education, primarily, and a few science courses. Science was his minor area, and he had become more interested in the field over the years. He decided he liked teaching science more than physical education, because at the time physical education was nothing more than "throwing out the balls." He had taught science exclusively for the past twenty-two years.

Alan became a teacher because, "[he] enjoys working with kids and watching them develop." He cited an incident in college that influenced his decision. He had done well on a science test, and his professor told him to stop in for a visit. The professor encouraged him to pursue science education.

While teaching, Alan pursued a graduate program. He received a master's degree and had accumulated 20 or 30 hours beyond. The last class in which he was enrolled was Madeline Hunter's ITIP.

Alan identified knowledge of subject matter as his major strength. He said he acquired this information over the years by taking classes, going to science conventions, and reading professional journals.

He shared that he needed to improve his understanding of, and proficiency on, the computer. He had done some computer work in class, but to date was disappointed in the software available to science teachers. He thought the software currently available was "basically at the knowledge level, and you can do that in class. There

are some good programs available, but then you are handicapped by the number of programs you have, compared to the number of students."

When asked what he enjoyed most about teaching, Alan said, "the kids." He added, "I just enjoy teaching, and until I don't like it . . . ."

When asked what he least enjoyed about teaching, he noted that he had always been straddled with a lot of preps. Alan said one year he had six preps. He taught Life Science 7, Earth Science 8, Practical Science, Physical Science, Photography, and Chemistry. Alan felt that had he been a first-year teacher at the time, he would have resigned. He also said there were other little things that teachers had to do that he was not fond of. He did not elaborate.

Alan shared that his hobbies included photography, working in the yard, and gardening. To get away, he often visited his mother, who lived in northeast Nebraska, and he spent a significant amount of time with his family.

When asked what he expected to be doing in five years, Alan said he thought he would still be teaching. He said he may not be coaching as much, but presently, he still enjoyed it.

At this point Alan interjected there was a time when he dreaded coming to work. This occurred about four years ago. During that year he questioned whether he should remain in the profession. He said it was a tough year, but by the time he had returned from Christmas break, it had worked itself out.

During the 1990-91 school year, Alan taught College Prep

Physical Science, Photography, Chemistry, and Advanced Chemistry. He coached boys and girls cross-country, boys and girls track, and eighth grade boys basketball. He said coaching required an additional twenty to thirty hours a week during track and cross-country. He arrived at school at approximately 6:30 a.m. and left at 6:00 p.m. There were some weekend meets and games. Because of this, he could often be found working in his classroom on weekends, either catching up or preparing for the next day's lessons.

#### Observational Analysis of Alan Joseph's Classroom

When asked to describe his classroom, Alan said, "I hope it's a relaxed atmosphere. We kid around a lot."

The researcher observed one of Alan's Chemistry classes. Alan began the class by informing the class of a test on Wednesday. He reminded them that the chapter dealt with solids and liquids. He drew a chemical formula on the board, and the students quickly identified the solution. He mixed the solution at his demonstration table. The two liquids became a solid, and he lit the solid. The students identified the solid as "sterno," and said that it would work well on camping trips. Alan told the class that the solid costs about twenty cents to make, but can be purchased at a department store for \$3.29. He added that this solid is often used at outdoor wedding receptions. When asked if sterno was used in the Olympic torch, Alan responded by saying, "they use compressed natural gas."

He then moved the class to a discussion of the transformation of a solid at zero degrees Celsius to a liquid at zero degrees Celsius.

He identified this transformation as fusion and told the students that if they were to become engineers, this information would be used daily. He explained how OPPD and MUD use this formula at their respective power plants.

He ended the lesson with a review of the day's concepts. He asked if there were any questions. A few students responded, and one question led to a discussion of how water softeners work, chemically. The students were attentive, involved, and communicative.

Alan's classroom looked busy. There were numerous "I love science" posters, humorous posters, and safety tips attached to the walls. The observer found many household products such as Borax, Clorox, baking soda, Scope, shaving cream, etc., surrounding the room. Laboratory equipment was neatly stacked on shelves, and Alan had many athletic team pictures attached to his front bulletin board.

#### First Interview: April 1990

When asked his opinion of staff development programs, in general, Alan said, "There have been positive ones, and there have been negative ones." He added that staff development had just occurred in the past eight to ten years. He stated that ITIP was a pleasant experience, in that it "re-awakened him, as far as teaching methodology." He questioned the merit of the conference in-service days, but admitted that he did like meeting with other teachers to share experiences and approaches.

When asked how he felt when informed of the Instructional Awareness project that the school district was about to begin, he

said he was probably negative toward it. He felt he was not properly informed.

Following the university consultant's initial workshop in January of 1990, Alan felt positive. He said he tried a few of the teaching techniques presented at the workshop in his classes. He found it difficult to wait after asking a question, because time was so short in the classroom. He tried to ask higher-level questions and found this to be difficult also.

Alan reacted negatively when he was informed that he would have to submit a fifteen-minute videotaped segment of his teaching. He decided to tape and submit an entire fifty-minute lesson. He said he did not plan anything special for the taping and was not intimidated by having the camera in the room.

Alan said he was willing to meet with the consultant for a post-conference. He added that he liked to make improvements that would be beneficial to him and his students. He qualified this by saying, "I read a lot in the science area and belong to the national science teachers organization. When I go to the national conventions, I learn so much that it is unbelievable."

When asked about the second workshop conducted by the university consultant in March of 1990, Alan said he was lost. He did not understand the coding process or the data that were shared. He thought everyone in his group shared the same feelings.

When asked if he had anything he wanted to add, Alan said, "We are a knowledge-centered society, and it is difficult for us to change. I know that I have to change, but so do the college professors,

in how they teach and what they teach. I don't know if some of those professors, who have their notes from thirty years ago, are going to do it. You need younger people."

Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred following the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Alan said that the taping and coding accurately reflected his teaching segment. He said that each day varied in what he tried to accomplish. The day of the taping, the class was working on chemistry changes and reactions, and, therefore, there was a lot of student involvement. Other days one might not find as much involvement.

Alan thought the post-conference was fine, once the consultant determined "whose sheet we were going over." He still had difficulty understanding the coding, but was able to determine that he needed to work on his wait-time. He also noticed a tendency to reword his questions.

Alan set three goals at the post-conference. The first was to stop saying "OK" so much, although the code did not pick up on it. The second was to ask higher-level questions at the appropriate time. The third was to increase wait-time. He said that last year he had a deaf student in class and, therefore, was more apt to wait. Apparently, he was not being as patient this year.

Third Interview: November 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and



second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked about the third workshop, Alan said he approached it much the same way as the first. He was negative. He said he did not know if it was just him or if others felt the same way, but he still did not know what was going on with the project.

Alan thought the consultant was more at ease for the third workshop. He said, "I think he is really trying to do well." Alan added that he was beginning to look at the project a little differently, but the coded matrix was still causing him problems. He stated, "The matrix is tough without being involved in a class with the consultant."

When asked about the goal he set after the second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle, Alan said, "I'm not sure, but I think it was to try to apply the higher-level stuff. The consultant's stuff."

Alan felt the second cycle went pretty well, although the post-conference was delayed. He did not say why. He said, "the consultant explained what we were doing and then went over the data." Alan said the consultant did not give any suggestions for improvement. He was convinced the consultant did not want to hurt anyone's feelings or step on anyone's toes, and "have someone come back mad and upset, saying this project is a bunch of hogwash."

When asked what goal he set at the post-conference, Alan stated, "We really didn't talk about it." Alan and the consultant spent most of the time talking about science. The consultant gave

him a few blocks of wood for a density unit, and Alan added, "we used them in class yesterday."

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had any effect on his teaching behavior, to this point, Alan said, "I think so. I'm trying, but I don't know if I'm accomplishing it." He said he was doing more group work in class for application purposes. He was still trying to relate chemistry to real-life, because "most of these students will not become chemists."

Alan thought he was more aware of his wait-time, but added, "that goes back to ITIP, there's carryover there." He believed the project had some effect on his questioning techniques, but not as much as it could. He thought the consultant should give examples of higher-level questions so that a base could be established. Alan also recommended the consultant begin giving suggestions. He ended the third interview by saying, "I want more feedback, ways in which I can improve, although I am aware that it is difficult to take an old-timer who's been around a long time and change them."

#### Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop session and the third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked his perception of the fourth workshop session, Alan responded by saying he was not very excited about it. He did not understand how the national teaching standards related to the Instructional Awareness project. Alan added that he was still having

difficulty understanding the coding, especially that which dealt with the questioning techniques. He remembered coming away from the workshop thinking that he needed to keep working on his questioning.

When asked what choices he made for the third taping cycle, such as whether he wanted to tape or be coded live and whether he wanted to post-conference with the consultant or his assigned administrator, Alan responded by saying, "I wanted to be taped and meet with the consultant." He chose the taping because he felt the live coding depended too much on the consultant and would cause scheduling problems. He chose the post-conference with the consultant because, "he's running the show and is more aware of what's going on."

At this point, Alan stated, "I don't think we are taping enough to get a sequence down. We have such long delays between taping and post-conferencing . . . ."

The taped segment that Alan had submitted was of a Chemistry class. The activity focused on replace/reaction occurrences in a lab setting. The students were asked to identify and describe their findings in lab report fashion. The lab report served as the artifact.

Alan said he did not get much out of the post-conference. He added, "We didn't review the tape, we went into the coding a little bit, and then we got into talking about other things." The only suggestion made by the consultant was to use a cordless microphone when taping, so that the camera picked up the audio. No goal was set.

### Journal Entries

The following journal entries were made during the 1990-91 school year. Some of them related directly to the Instructional Awareness project and others did not.

Entry 2: Read an article on the concrete sequential learner and the abstract random learner. Winter 1990-91

Entry 3: Received description of the major categories in the cognitive domain in order to develop higher-level questioning techniques. Winter 1990-91

Entry 4: Some classes still using knowledge level questioning. Trying to move toward analysis, application areas. Winter 1990-91

Entry 5: Advanced Chemistry class doing excellent in analyzing and applying data. Winter 1990-91

Entry 6: Chemistry students having a tough time moving to higher levels of questioning. Probably due to wide range of abilities in the classroom. Winter 1990-91

Entry 8: Budget time! I've been looking for materials which will help me improve my instruction, especially video disc technology. Winter 1990-91

Entry 9: Picked up some ideas from the conference in-service to be used in class. Winter 1990-91

Entry 10: Received TAS statistics of my class--still having a tough time of understanding coding system. Spring 1991

Entry 11: Applying information about science to everyday life situations--excellent student response. Spring 1991

Entry 12: Read an article on problem solving chemistry--chem students analyzed lab data. Spring 1991

Entry 13: Advanced Chemistry class handling higher level questions with little trouble. 9th grade classes struggling to get beyond the knowledge level. Spring 1991

Entry 14: Went over final TAS statistics sheet with consultant. Still confused about what report is telling me. Spring 1991

Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year he had, Alan responded by saying he was pleased and that he had "a good one." He did not elaborate.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching, he responded, "I learned a lot in regard to questioning techniques. But, I had that in ITIP also." He said there were now things he looked for when he reviewed a tape. The project required Alan to review the level of questions he was asking, and he had become more aware of the taxonomy. He consistently tried to develop analysis-level questions. He thought he had become self-evaluative.

In regard to wait-time, Alan said, "I have improved, both yes and no. I still catch myself not waiting long enough." He reiterated he had good wait-time the previous year because he had a deaf student and interpreter in the classroom.

Alan felt he had improved at monitoring student progress, but was not as good as he could be. He added, "I have always summarized information at the end of class and again at the beginning of the next day's class."

Thinking about getting taped was a negative side-effect of the project. He added that although the intentions of the project were good, too much time went by between the taping and the post-conferencing. Alan also felt there was not enough feedback given during post-conferences.

Alan felt the Instructional Awareness project should not

continue. He again said that although the intentions were good, the project got to the point where it was over-worked and beyond its limits. He did not know what other areas could be explored. He added, "What research says and what's written in textbooks doesn't always work in the classroom." He thought he would like to look into his own area to see what others were doing.

When asked how the administration should proceed if another long-term staff development project were planned, Alan recommended the administration move slowly. He said, "This project was dumped on us, without us ever being aware of what was going on." This made Alan mad, and he compared it to the no-smoking policy that was instituted a few years ago, which was also a shock to him. He said that a committee, which included teachers, should be formed for future planning.

#### Cynthia Kelly

Cynthia had taught for two years. She taught math and computer science during that time.

Cynthia did not intend to be a teacher when she began undergraduate work. Originally, she was in the field of business, but was not sure what she wanted to do. She began thinking about teaching because the "summers off appealed to me." After a few education classes, Cynthia realized that she was good at it, and became enthusiastic about teaching. She said she felt comfortable with her education.

Cynthia said, "I like watching my students grow as people. I like seeing them take a step, not only in my class but in their lives."

She said she was skilled at keeping her students' attention and that they liked coming into her classroom. She added she was able to get her students to "come up with things, because I am a good questioner and am constantly probing for more information."

Cynthia sometimes had problems becoming enthusiastic when giving the same geometry lecture three times in one day. She also disliked repeating herself over and over again to those students who missed her lectures. She said, "When you have 110 students, and five miss one lecture, you have to repeat the lecture five more times. It's crazy." She expressed a problem with being straddled with five preps this year. She said, "Teaching the upper level classes requires a lot of preparation time, especially when trying to develop new examples." She believed if she did not have the other classes, she could devote more time to the advanced ones and really improve them. Cynthia said that to have good classes one must have exciting things going on, but found it hard to do when she had five to prepare for and papers to correct from four days ago.

During her free time, Cynthia liked to read, water ski, and play volleyball. She said she liked sports and gardening. She also enjoyed flowers and had numerous plants at home.

When asked what she thought she would be doing in five years, she said she would probably be ending her teaching career. She added that it depended on when she had children. Professionally, her goal was to enter the counseling field and work with students and families.

During the 1990-91 school year, Cynthia taught Geometry, Computers I and II, Pre-Algebra, and Basic Math II. She also served

as sponsor of the cheerleading and pom-pon squads and coached freshman volleyball. She volunteered her services to the play production cast and said, "To tell the truth, this is where I am getting the most joy out of my job right now." She spent an extra fifteen to twenty hours a week working with the cast and said she learned a lot from the director. She did not enjoy the volleyball, because she found, "coming all the way down to freshman "B" level nervewracking." She only had a few players on the team and could not scrimmage. She became frustrated and did not think she did a good job.

She did express that she enjoyed her role as cheerleading and pom-pon sponsor. She said she spent about twenty hours a week on it and explained the winter sport season required her to be at school from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. three to four nights a week.

#### Observational Analysis of Cynthia Kelly's Classroom

When asked to describe her classroom, Cynthia responded, "It depends on what time you come in." She thought the first thing an observer would think was that she was one of the kids. She added, "Everybody thinks I'm a student around here." She continued, "I enjoy having fun with my students, even though some people might frown on that." She said, "That's how I pull them in."

The researcher observed one of Cynthia's Geometry classes. The class began with Cynthia saying, "Yes there were numerous problems with last night's assignment, but we did cover a lot of material yesterday. Let's go ahead and correct the assignment. As we go along, let me know which ones were difficult for you." The students



did so when they came upon problems dealing with right triangles. Cynthia reviewed the concept and a discussion ensued. Numerous times she asked if the students had any questions. She waited a long time after these questions. As she went through the story problems, she discovered the students had not done them. She told them she expected them done by Monday or they would have to stay with her until completion.

She then began reviewing for the next exam. The concepts reviewed included the intersection possibilities of secant and tangent lines. Students asked a few questions over the material, and Cynthia was patient and thorough.

She ended the class by informing the students of next week's material and then gave a homework assignment. The students worked quietly at their desks the remainder of the period.

Cynthia's classroom was colorful. On her walls, she had attached large school spirit posters, done by her "girls," and on her bulletin board had numerous "Ziggy" posters. She also had many senior graduation pictures pinned to the wall.

#### First Interview: April 1990

When asked what her opinion of staff development programs, in general, was, Cynthia responded by saying, "I think staff improvement is very important; however, when we try to group the whole staff together, you are actually hitting a small percentage of people." She clarified this by adding that it was hard to find one thing that would benefit all content areas, teaching styles, and personalities.

When asked how she felt when informed of the Instructional

Awareness project, she said that she was all for videotaping. She stated, "When you actually watch yourself, you hear what you say, you see what you do. If you are saying one word over and over, or you are teaching to one side of the room, you will see it."

Following the consultant's first workshop in January of 1990, Cynthia felt the information shared was "on target." She believed, "We don't wait long enough when we ask questions, and as a whole teachers repeat themselves a lot." She thought the consultant tried too hard and was trying to be funny. Once he relaxed, however, she was able to stop concentrating on him and focused on the material.

The idea of videotaping, as stated earlier, did not bother Cynthia. She felt that as a first-year teacher, there "is a lot to learn," and she was interested in what the tape would show. She was concerned about how her students would react to having a camera in the room. As it turned out, the students calmed down after a few minutes and class proceeded normally.

Cynthia said she was looking forward to the post-conference with the consultant. She added, "I am anxious to see my tape and find out what he saw in me and my class."

When asked about the second workshop conducted by the consultant in March of 1990, Cynthia said she was not impressed. She was disappointed that he did not have everyone's results. She felt let down. She explained he had put together the coded information on fifteen staff members, and she wondered if she were one of the fifteen. She thought, "Is it fifteen elementary teachers, fifteen English teachers, or fifteen math teachers? There is a big difference in style in those

three groups." Therefore, the data obtained from the fifteen meant little to her, and she left the workshop disappointed.

Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred following the first video-taping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Cynthia felt the post-conference went pretty well. She said the consultant seemed a little rushed. The conference took place in mid-afternoon, and Cynthia felt like the consultant was tired from meeting with teachers all day.

Cynthia did question the accuracy of the coded data sheet. She said it showed she did not give examples during that lesson. She said, "When I teach, I go right from the book. The book says, this is what you are going to do today: examples 1, 2, 3, and 4. I know I followed the book so I had to give examples."

During the post-conference, the consultant played Cynthia's tape. They found an inordinate amount of verbal habits. The glaring habit observed was Cynthia's use of "OK." She said she used "OK" to find out if her students understood the material, such as, "do you have it? OK?"

When asked what goal she set, she said she wanted to give more examples. She explained, "Students should not sit for ten minutes without an example. Maybe I should lecture for two minutes, give an example, lecture for five minutes, and give another example." Eradicating the "OK's" also came to mind as a goal.

Third Interview: November 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked about the third workshop conducted by the consultant, Cynthia thought, "Oh no, here we go again." She felt that way because she thought the consultant would again be unprepared, as at the March workshop. She said, "This jerk, he's not going to be prepared, and I don't want to waste my time with this. I could be in my room rearranging or getting prepared for the school year." She shared that when she went in, she and a few other staff members began fooling around behind the consultant's back.

Once the consultant began, Cynthia changed her mind. She said she quit goofing around and listened. She expressed a renewed interest in the project and said, "This person is good at what he does, and I realized that this project could help me. This isn't being done for him, but rather for me, and it's up to me to take advantage of it." She left the workshop "a lot less mad and grouchy."

When asked about the goal she set after the first cycle, Cynthia said, "I'm not sure, but I think it was to work on my verbal habits, such as OK, OK, OK, and um, um, um."

Cynthia did not have a smooth videotaping experience. The videotaping occurred during Homecoming time and she was very busy. She felt if she taped right away she could have it done and behind her. She wanted it to be good. She said it was hard to get a good discussion going in a math class, but she was going to try. Most of

her math classes were approached the same way every day; she reviewed something, taught something new, and then gave an assignment. If she were teaching English she thought she could get a great discussion going. She said, "In math, it's possible to discuss something, but you really have to think, and I don't do that everyday." By trying to do something special for the tape, she felt a little phony.

When she finished the taped segment, she realized that the tape did not work. She reacted by saying, "Fine, I'm not going to do this." She waited three weeks before taping again. She shared that she was being stubborn and "a brat" about the whole thing. The only reason she eventually taped was because, "the administrators will be pissed if I don't do it." She finally set up the camera the day before the tapes were due and accomplished the task. This time she did not prepare or "put on." She said, "I'm not going to be a hypocrite. I am going to give the consultant exactly what I do." She felt better about herself.

Cynthia went into the post-conference with a "chip on my shoulder." She explained, "I was thinking, this ought to be good, I didn't play along this time." She also was called into the conference on a day she had many things to do. Once she was with the consultant, things improved. She said, "I don't know how the guy does it, but he does it every time." She felt good about the conference and felt it was worth her time, because she had learned some things.

During the post-conference, she found some problems with her questioning techniques. She said her wait-time was insufficient. The reason she gave was that she was a little uncomfortable after asking a question if no one responded. She found herself repeating the question numerous times. She thought this trained her students not to listen initially. Another problem was that when students answered a question she quickly repeated it. This, she believed, trained them to listen only to her and not each other. Correcting these habits would become her goal.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, Cynthia responded by saying, "It has helped my verbal habits." She qualified this by adding that the first taping showed 100 "OK's," and the second time she had only twelve or fifteen. She also added that although she was not all the way yet, she felt she was repeating herself less. The project had made her more aware of her flaws, and she believed that was the first step toward improvement. She believed this awareness helped her catch herself when she was doing something wrong. When she was in a bad mood, however, she said, "so what, I don't care."

Cynthia felt the only downside of the project was the extra time it took. She repeated the concern she had about meeting with the consultant on a day when she had much to do. She shared some of the blame for this problem by saying, "I should have paid more attention to when he was coming. Had I known, I could have had my work done." She said she needed to keep in mind that the project was for her, and she would get as much out of it as she put in.

When asked if she had anything to add, Cynthia had a recommendation for improving the videotaping portion of the project. She said the first time she taped the camera was on her, and the second time the camera was on her students. By focusing on one or the other, she felt she was missing things. When the camera was on her, she missed what the students were doing, such as, "who was visiting with who." When the camera was focused on the students, she missed some of the annoying things she did with her hands, such as playing with her necklace and hair. She thought, "Maybe we should tape ten minutes of me and ten minutes of the students." She felt this would benefit her.

#### Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop and third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked her perception of the fourth workshop session, Cynthia said she was encouraged about the choices the staff was given for the third taping cycle. She added that she was interested in live coding because the consultant said the post-conference would immediately follow. This meant the information would be fresh in the minds of the consultant and the teacher.

Cynthia also mentioned that she found the listing of pros and cons concerning the project an interesting facet of the workshop. During the session, Cynthia expressed her dissatisfaction with the turn-around time, and her comment was listed on the board as a con. As to a pro, she stated she really liked the project because seeing

herself teach helped her, just as taping helped her become a better athlete.

When asked what choices she made for the third taping cycle, such as whether she wanted to tape or be coded live and whether she wanted to post-conference with the consultant or her assigned administrator, Cynthia said, "I chose to be taped and coded live." She chose this because she wanted to see herself and get immediate feedback.

The live coding did not work out for Cynthia. The consultant never "got back" to her as to when it would happen, so she just taped her segment and sent it in. She said she was frustrated and commented, "The consultant was not very organized." A few weeks later, Cynthia was told the consultant would be at school to do live coding, but she decided she did not want to do it again. She expressed an interest in coding live if the opportunity presented itself in the future.

It did not matter to Cynthia whether she post-conferenced with the consultant or the administrator. She said she would do either and whatever was feasible was fine with her.

When asked about the third taping cycle, Cynthia again expressed that she had no problems with taping, because all she had to do was set up the camera. She said, "To be totally honest, I don't prepare anything differently. I just do what I would do on a normal day and wait to see what comes out."

Cynthia said that the class period that day was "the same thing I do everyday in math." She handed back student notes and



homework assignments from the prior day, and they proceeded to go over them. She then introduced a new topic. Cynthia taught the students how trapezoids compare and contrast to parallelograms. She then assigned homework. As the students worked, she went from student to student, to see if they understood. The homework assignment was the artifact. Cynthia felt the lesson went very well.

Cynthia was not enthused about post-conferencing again. She said the consultant was often unorganized and in essence wasted her time. She added, "It's like, here is your handout, but I really don't remember you." When she got there, however, she felt as though the consultant had changed. She said, "The consultant knew who was coming and knew what was going on." She was not sure if the change occurred because the consultant was getting to know the staff better, if it were all fitting together, or if it were the pros and cons expressed at the last workshop. Regardless, Cynthia left the conference very pleased, thinking, "Hey, this is really working, and I am getting better."

During the post-conference, the consultant pointed out a number of valid things. Cynthia was told she had completely eliminated her habit of saying "OK." She said she could now shift her goal to another area.

Cynthia revealed that her new goal would be to ask higher-level questions. She found that most of her questions were at the knowledge level and by simply re-thinking and rephrasing she could move to the next level.

### Journal Entries

Cynthia made no entries into her journal. When asked why, she said, "most of the time, I just forgot about it." When she did think about it, she was not sure what to write. So instead of writing down the wrong things, Cynthia decided to not write anything. She said it was almost a rebellious thing, "like I don't have time for this." She felt it was a combination of being lazy, confused, and rebellious.

### Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year she had, Cynthia said, "Altogether, pretty good." She said she had a great start, rocky middle, and great finish. Cynthia was on a strong medication for seven months, beginning in September, and she said it adversely affected her moods and she became a "totally different person." She shared that she was sick all the time, and her students reacted, "where's our teacher?"

Another thing that bothered her was that she found herself having more time her second year and that she was not using it productively. Instead of improving her teaching and re-writing her tests, she decided to become stagnant. This attitude bothered her very much, and she became depressed. Once Cynthia was off the medication, she found herself "digging in and making improvements." At this point she stated, "Had I written anything in the journal, I would have said it really pays to take the extra time to make each lesson better. You feel so much better about yourself and your teaching."

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, Cynthia said, "It has had a positive effect, because when you are at the bottom, there is nowhere to go but up." She did not think that videotaping and receiving feedback on teaching could be bad for anyone. She cited the elimination of her verbal habits as one of the positive results and that she needed to move around the room more instead of standing behind the overhead. She also expressed that she was now giving more examples. Cynthia added that the consultant noticed all of these improvements and was very complimentary at the third post-conference. She was not sure if he were being honest or "just suckering me in."

Cynthia was now more aware of her questioning techniques and realized she must rephrase them. She thought her wait-time had improved, because the code said so. Cynthia thought she had become a better monitor of progress, but was cautious in giving the project sole credit for the improvement. She thought that being a second-year teacher may have had something to do with it. She did share that she began quizzing more the final quarter, and it helped her to identify those students having problems. This helped her realize the problems they were having and forced her to re-think her strategies. This paid off with higher grades for each student.

Cynthia felt the consultant's ideas were wonderful and that teachers could see improvement over time. She thought the consultant was open to suggestions, because he had asked for teacher in-put. She said, "He didn't treat us like peons and showed he cared."

On the negative side, Cynthia felt the consultant was very unorganized and time was wasted when teachers could have been doing other things. There were times when Cynthia felt like saying, "Look buddy, we have things we should be doing. You're supposed to be helping us become better teachers and so far all you've done is waste our time."

Cynthia thought the Instructional Awareness project should continue "for those who want to use it." She recommended the workshops be discontinued unless the consultant had something new to say.

When asked how the administration should proceed if another long-term staff development project were planned, Cynthia recommended giving teachers more opportunities to share ideas and practices. She felt whether such opportunities be about testing, quizzing, grading, or passing/failing students, they would be beneficial. She said staff in-put was very important, but cautioned the administration not to rely totally on teacher recommendation. She clarified this by saying, "It's not always easy to see what you need for yourself. You can think you're doing great, when actually you can improve." She recommended the administration make staff development decisions, with opportunities for teacher feedback. She concluded by saying, "We as teachers need to keep an open mind and express our feelings when necessary." She apologized for not writing in her journal.

Helen Kristiansen

Helen had taught business education classes for the past twelve years. Prior to that, she taught for three years at a high school in South Dakota.

Helen came from a line of teachers. Her mother and several of her aunts were teachers. She also enjoyed her teachers when she was in school.

Helen had a master's degree in secondary education, with an endorsement in special vocational needs. She said the endorsement helped her with the special classes she taught and also with the regular classes.

Helen described herself as organized. She knew her subject matter and read journals to find ways of presenting materials in a relevant manner. She worked hard with those students whom, "I know are having problems." She made it a point to make herself available to her students and was constantly checking to see if they knew what was going on.

Knowing what students learned in her class would be of use to them for their entire lifetimes was very gratifying to Helen. She said, "They learn their survival skills." She added that it made her feel "really good" when her special needs students finally caught on to something. She stated, "Teaching is never dull or the same thing from day to day."

When asked what she liked least about teaching, Helen stated, "Making sure that kids get their work done, people who get suspended,

and teaching extra classes for them." Helen did not like parent-teacher conferences. She explained, "The good people that come to see me are not the ones that I need to see." She would rather spend that time teaching. Hall duty was another thing Helen disliked, but she saw the need for it. Another thing that upset her was when she saw how much extra time she put in when other teachers did not.

Helen felt that sometimes she did not have the patience she should. She sometimes spent so much time tracking down kids who owed work that she could not concentrate on teaching. She said, "I don't like it when kids tell me they will be in at a certain time and then don't show up."

During her free time, Helen liked to read and do counted cross-stitch. She also liked to walk, go to movies, and spend time with her family. In the summers, Helen worked for a seed company as an area supervisor. She had done so for the past sixteen years. She trained and directed high school-age students on what to do and when to go into the fields. She said she liked doing it.

When asked what she thought she would be doing in five years, Helen said, "I'm sure that I will be teaching school." Helen said she thought about teaching all the time, even when driving to and from school. She said she still read every chapter before presenting it and had extra textbooks at home to do so. She had to tell herself that the job did not come first in her life, but it took a long time to convince herself of it.

During the 1990-91 school year, Helen taught Accounting I

and II, Keyboarding, and Special Vocational Needs. She sponsored the National Honor Society and the Future Business Leaders of America. She said FBLA took a lot more time than NHS.

#### Observational Analysis of Helen Kristiansen's Classroom

When asked to describe her classroom, Helen responded by saying it depended on what class one walked into. If an observer walked into one of her large classes, made up of underclassmen, they would find a strict atmosphere. If the observer walked into one of her smaller classes, made up of upperclassmen, they would find a less strict atmosphere. She had to keep on top of the underclassmen, whereas the upperclassmen had already had her. Once they knew her, they knew, "when it's time to work, it's time to work. When the work is done, we can sit and talk."

Helen said you would find her in front of the classroom at the overhead going over things. She said, "We will work on a few problems together, and then they will be working on their own." She added, "I like my classroom quiet; they are here to learn. Some people think that I am too strict, that I run my class like a military camp, but it's my classroom and that's the way I want it." She said she sometimes allowed her students to listen to the radio during class.

The researcher observed one of Helen's Accounting I classes. The lesson began immediately. Helen asked a review question concerning current assets. She asked the question and waited for a response. Once the correct answer was given, she repeated the answer.

After the initial review period, Helen asked the students to get out their homework. Using the overhead, she had the students compare their workbook answers to the homework questions. As the students did so, Helen began a discussion on depreciation.

After defining and discussing, she introduced the manner in which depreciation is compiled. She told the class to take the original cost of the item, minus the salvage value, to get total depreciation. She then instructed them to divide the total depreciation by the number of years. Helen then asked the question, "You now have your yearly depreciation. What do you call this?" She then waited. A student answered by calling it "straight-line depreciation."

Helen then moved the class into a short lesson on the plant asset record. She described and defined the concept. The students completed a plant asset record, using the depreciation formula. Each student completed the record. The students were allowed to borrow a calculator from Helen, as long as they had collateral. They corrected the assignment in class, and each student was required to respond.

Helen then showed the class how to figure monthly depreciation. Using the formula, the students again completed another assignment to determine book value. She asked if everyone understood. When one student replied that he did not, Helen went directly to him and explained the process thoroughly. As the other students worked, Helen moved about the room answering many questions. They then corrected the assignment.

Helen ended the lesson by asking the students to review the day's lesson with her. After the review, she gave them a



homework assignment.

The presentation was clear and well-organized. Helen taught the lesson in a sequential fashion. Her approach was businesslike, yet very friendly. The students appeared to be very comfortable and did not hesitate to ask or answer questions. The students were on task the entire period. Helen was dressed professionally, and her classroom was decorated in a bright and colorful manner.

#### First Interview: April 1990

When asked her opinion of staff development programs, in general, Helen responded by saying she usually obtained one or two beneficial things from them. She thought that trying to develop an in-service for both elementary and secondary teachers was difficult. Helen added, "When this occurs, it seems like the in-service is geared toward either the elementary or the high school."

Helen believed she gained more by taking classes, going to conventions and workshops, or just talking to other teachers. She said, "The best way to find things out is to talk to other teachers, and when you go to national conventions you can talk to teachers from all over the country." Helen shared that she also learned from reading educational journals and through her affiliations with two national organizations.

When asked how she felt when informed of the Instructional Awareness project the school district was about to begin, she said, "My first thoughts were, oh no, here we go again. Here is another project for us."

Following the university consultant's initial workshop in January of 1990, Helen was confused. She thought the consultant was cold and unsure of what to do. She said, "If the consultant doesn't know what to do, how are we to know what we are supposed to do?" She left the initial workshop wondering whether this should be pursued since no real outcomes had been set.

Helen was not enthused about videotaping a teaching segment. She said, "My first thought was, here we go again, we're back to our student-teaching experiences." She said she had taped numerous times during her undergraduate and graduate work and did not have good experiences. She added that one of her professors had set her up to be the guinea pig, and she was not pleased with that.

She did not like the idea of having the camera in her room, because she was unsure how the students would react to something foreign. She also thought the camera would make her nervous.

The idea of meeting with the consultant interested Helen. She did feel the conference was an evaluation, regardless of what the administration said. The only difference would be meeting with the consultant and not an administrator. She thought this could be good, because "Maybe I am doing something wrong that the administrator and I have not noticed before."

When asked about the second workshop conducted by the consultant in March of 1990, Helen said she felt better than she did after the first. She thought the consultant had a better idea of what to do. She enjoyed the articles the consultant handed out, but

was disappointed that all of the tapes had not been coded. She said, "We were told to have them in by a certain date . . . ." She also expressed displeasure with the group activity. She said, "I was unsure what our group of three was to do. I need clearer guidelines."

Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred after the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

In regard to the videotaping, Helen said, "I felt uncomfortable taping, because I usually walk up and down the aisles, jingling my keys and things like that. I was probably more conscious not to do those things than I was of my teaching." When the taping was completed, however, she felt it was an accurate description of her teaching.

When asked about the post-conference, Helen said she was very disappointed in the consultant. She estimated the conference lasted less than five minutes. She said the consultant was not prepared. She said, "He didn't say anything that I couldn't have gotten myself from looking at the tape and the code." She thought he should have looked at the tape and offered suggestions.

The goal Helen set at the post-conference was to stop repeating student answers. When she had time to think, however, she decided, "That's how kids learn in my room, by hearing information over and over again." She added that sometimes her students could not hear the answer and sometimes it was not worded correctly.

Therefore, Helen believed repeating was necessary.

After further review, Helen decided to make asking higher-level questions her goal. She said she would do this by asking students to draw facts together and then make business decisions based on them.

Third Interview: November 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked about the third workshop, Helen thought the consultant had figured out what the project was supposed to do. This was something she had not sensed before. She was still confused with the coding process and what it was supposed to represent.

When asked about the goal she had set after the first cycle, Helen identified the problem of repeating student responses. She restated her feelings concerning the need to repeat for her students' benefit. She said, "I don't know that you can say that repeating is bad." She then remembered she had not really set a goal.

Helen again was not impressed with the consultant during the post-conference. Helen had done her taping on September 25, and the post-conference took place on December 6. The consultant came into her classroom for the post-conference. It took place during Helen's planning period, and students were in her room working.

Helen said the consultant apologized for the long delay. The consultant could not remember what was on the tape. Helen said it had occurred so long ago that she could not remember either. The consultant gave Helen the coded printout and had circled some areas, but she did not know why. The consultant told Helen she had good

wait-time and that was the extent of the conference.

Helen did not know if the consultant was intimidated by the students working in the room, or if she were in the wrong frame of mind for a post-conference. Regardless, the post-conference was another waste of time for Helen. The consultant concluded the conference, telling Helen the project would have some wonderful, exciting things happen the next semester.

When asked what goal she had set for herself, Helen said, "I don't remember. I know he said something, but I don't think we decided on anything. No, I know we didn't set a goal." She said it was like the consultant wanted to hurry and get it over with and "scratch me off his list." She again stated her problem understanding the coding.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had any effect on her teaching, Helen said, "I think about things more, but in regard to drastically changing the way I teach, it has not." She said the information shared on wait-time and the higher levels of questioning were nothing more than a repetition of ITIP. She concluded by stating she had mixed feelings about the entire project.

#### Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop session and third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Helen was not excited about attending another workshop. She said, "Here it is, another teacher workday; I have grades to do,

and we have to go listen again." She did think the consultant was more organized for this workshop. She thought it was because two colleagues had come along. She was happy the discussion identified the problem of turn-around time between taping and post-conferencing. She hoped it could improve, but was not convinced that it would.

When asked what choices she made for the third taping cycle, such as whether she wanted to tape or be coded live and whether she wanted to post-conference with the consultant or her assigned administrator, Helen chose to tape and meet with the consultant. She chose to tape because she was not sure when the consultant would be at the school to do the live coding. Since she was going into a unit that required little teacher input, she felt there would be no point in coding live. She chose to post-conference with the consultant because, "He is the person qualified to do this, and I didn't think our administrators were familiar with the coding."

Helen still felt uncomfortable with taping. She said it flustered her. Once the taping started, however, she did fine. To tape this segment she had to really think about what her classes were doing. Helen believed that skills classes require less teacher/student verbal interaction and that posed a problem for taping.

Helen said the class that day was doing a journal activity. The activity was a cash payments and purchases journal, and it was the first time the students had done this. The students had read the chapter and completed the first drill. Helen presented the information, and the class did a few transactions with her on the overhead.

The students worked along in their workbooks. The first drill and the transactions became the artifacts. She said the tape had trouble picking up her voice.

When asked about the post-conference, Helen said, "Again we were told to have our tapes in by a certain date, and he again took forever to get them back. They said they couldn't find my tape." She said she again had trouble remembering what she had done on that day, because it had been so long ago.

The consultant had the printout ready for this conference, and this pleased Helen. She still found, however, that the coding was confusing. She said, "When you go in, the consultant puts all of these figures in front of you, like you actually understand them. We see these so seldom that we have to re-think them everytime."

During the post-conference, Helen and the consultant reviewed the tape. The consultant told her she was a master teacher and he had no suggestions for her. She was not sure if the consultant said the same thing to everybody, or if he had given others suggestions. Helen left the conference thinking that she was far from perfect and there must be things she could improve on. The conference had lasted about six minutes.

When asked if she had set a goal, Helen said she had not. The consultant told her to just keep on doing what she was doing. Helen said, "The consultant didn't say if he was coming back or what."

### Journal Entries

The following journal entries were made during the 1990-91 school year. Some related directly to the Instructional Awareness project, and some did not.

Entry 1. Chatted with the consultant today. Came into my room during my plan, to go over my tape. It has been nearly two months since I taped. I could hardly remember what I had been teaching, and the consultant couldn't remember either. Went over the printouts. The length of time we spent might have been five minutes. Not beneficial. Turn-around time needs to be faster. Maybe we should look at the tape as we discuss printouts. Fall 1990

Entry 2. Where do students get their "don't care attitude?" Fall 1990

Entry 3. Do students ever listen? Fall 1990

Entry 4. Who should teach responsibility? Parents, teachers, or both? Fall 1990

Entry 6. Why can't students get their work done on time? Sometimes I don't feel like I teach anymore because I have to monitor students so much. Go to study hall and get them, catch them after school, etc. Winter 1990-91

Entry 7. I am certainly ready for a break! Unfortunately, the same students will still owe me the same work when we come back January 2. Winter 1990-91

Entry 13. This is the fourth night in a row I have stayed after school until 5:00 or 5:30. If we are all to follow the same policies, how come no other teachers are here? Are my standards too high? Do I lower them? Am I not doing my job or are the others not doing theirs? Winter 1990-91

Entry 14. Work day! Meeting with consultant. Several good points brought up--feedback does need to be improved, viewing the tape while going over the printout would also be helpful. The consultant was more organized--maybe because the other two were here. Winter 1990-91

Entry 16. Another week like this and maybe I should look for another profession. Have a good weekend--sure when you've got semester tests to grade, grades to figure, seating charts to make, lessons to prepare, etc. 94 more days. . . . Winter 1990-91



Entry 18. A good day (much better than Friday) even if I had to send a student to the office! Winter 1990-91

Entry 33. One of our students won first place in the SLC. This is the first time in GHS history. He now can go to Anaheim CA for nationals. I never thought it would happen! Spring 1991

Entry 34. I can't believe it! All of us get to go to nationals. This makes up for the "terrible year" I've had. Spring 1991

Entry 35. I wonder what has happened to the consultant. Our tapes had to be turned in at the end of February and I haven't seem him to go over my tape. One of our suggestions was that the turn-around time had to be improved--it certainly hasn't. Spring 1991

Entry 37. I feel that some members of our staff have forgotten how to dress appropriately for school. We are professionals and should dress accordingly. I realize that we don't need to wear three piece suits, ties, etc., every day, but we shouldn't dress like students either. Spring 1991

Entry 43. Finally had my conference with the consultant today. He had the printouts run off. He seems intimidated when I'm in there. He said my wait-time was good, review was good. We watched some of the tape and discussed. He told me I was a master teacher and didn't have anything to tell me. Discussed the remote mic., the charts still confuse me. Spring 1991

Entry 45. On January 2, I started keeping track of the number of nights I had to stay after school. I stayed 60 out of 93 nights. Usually this is anywhere from 4:30 to 5:30. Spring 1991

Entry 48. I think our staff is becoming lackadaisical. Their attitude (some of them) is becoming "I don't care." Their attire is changing, no one turns things in on time. Spring 1991

#### Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year she had, Helen said, "It has been one of my most frustrating years." She added that it

was as difficult as her first year of teaching. She said there were days when she walked out, not caring if she returned. Helen had not felt that way in a long time. She said even her family and friends noticed there was something wrong with her. She identified a group of students who would not get their work in as the main source of the problem.

She also expressed concern about other staff members. She was not happy that some of them came to school consistently late and that some did not dress professionally.

Helen did say that some good things happened this past year. She referred to the student who won the state FBLA award and the trip to Anaheim for nationals. She said this highlighted things and made up for all the hours she put in.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, Helen said it had, "both positively and negatively." Negatively, she looked at the project as "just another thing we had to do." Positively she said, "It makes you think about the things you are doing in class." Helen could not say she had gotten a great deal out of the project. She added, "Maybe if I had had a different year, I would feel differently, more receptive."

Helen felt the project did make her more aware of her questioning skills. ITIP had helped her understand the cognitive levels, but the project forced her to think about each question she asked.

Helen did not feel the project had made her a better monitor of student progress. She said, "I don't think I am collecting anymore

than usual. I have always tried to look at what all the kids were doing and collect the things that I know will help me understand what they know."

Helen was not interested in continuing the Instructional Awareness project. She said the entire project could have been done better with the two administrators. She qualified this by saying, "The administrators know us, because they are around all the time. Why should we do this for the consultant? The administrators are the bosses."

If the project did continue, Helen recommended the turn-around time should improve. She thought this could be done by live taping for all staff. This would allow for a post-conference immediately following the coding. Helen also thought the code itself could be improved by either "explaining it better or simplifying it."

When asked how the administration should proceed if they were to plan another long-term staff development project, Helen said, "I don't think we should be the guinea pigs, the first ones to do something. We should wait to see if it works somewhere else before we step into it. Or, just do it with a small portion of the staff, a pilot maybe."

She ended the interview by saying, "When you first gave me the journal, I didn't want to do it. Now it's like, I wrote a lot down, although this year it's more negative than normal. I got out some frustrations in this journal."

Patrick Rogers

Patrick had taught social studies for the past three years. When Patrick started undergraduate work, business administration was his major field. During his sophomore year, he transferred to the college of education. Patrick said he enjoyed his high school experience, and this directed him toward education. Once he began his studies, he felt comfortable with his decision.

Patrick said he related well with students and that he had a good sense of humor. He enjoyed his students and liked developing ways to make them smile. Of his students, he said, "They are all so different. Some things work well on some kids, while on others they do not."

Patrick mentioned that he enjoyed the people he worked with. He said, "You don't get paid much, and if you didn't like the people you're around, that would make it tough." He felt he had fit in with the staff quickly by keeping his mouth shut and watching.

Patrick said he could not wait until he had taught five or six years so he no longer had to rely so much on the book. He said this was frustrating for him, because the students knew he was going right from the book. Patrick thought most of his learning activities were at the knowledge level. He said he felt limited and unsure of where to get new information and ideas. Patrick said, "It's depressing at times, but I'm hanging in there."

Patrick said he "checks for understanding" a lot in his classes. He did this by calling on students that did not have their hands up.

He felt this approach made his students accountable, because they never knew who he was going to call on. Patrick said, "If I have to go through this stuff, they're going with me. I don't know if that is the right attitude, but . . . ."

When asked what he liked least about teaching, Patrick answered, "the pay." He added, "People don't know how much time we put in." He also became frustrated with those students who were outlandishly bored with his class and his inability to reach them.

During his free time, Patrick enjoyed sports. He played basketball, softball, and golf. He said he loved golf and never seemed to get enough of it. He enjoyed watching sports on television, but refused to watch baseball. He and his family liked to spend time at a cabin on Lake McConaughy.

When asked what he thought he would be doing in five years, Patrick said, "More than likely, I see myself here, trying to get my master's done. Sometimes I think I'll be a teacher for awhile, and other times it's tough because of the money." He said he was having trouble putting money away and could not find the \$200 for a graduate class. He could not believe this was his third year, and he had not started on his master's yet.

During the 1990-91 school year, Patrick taught American Government and eighth grade Social Studies. He supervised a high school study hall and had one planning period. Patrick served as an assistant varsity football coach and junior varsity basketball coach. With the two coaching assignments, Patrick spent an extra

twenty hours a week during football season and twenty to thirty hours extra during basketball. This transpired from August to March. The extra commitment did not bother Patrick. He said, "To me, coaching isn't work because I enjoy it."

#### Observational Analysis of Patrick Rogers' Classroom

When asked to describe his classroom, Patrick responded by saying, "My class is structured, yet fairly loose." Patrick made sure he had plans for each day and things for his students to do. He said he knew how far he wanted to go each day and the class usually got there. At the same time, Patrick felt, "If the class gets off track a little, it won't be the end of the world."

Patrick expected his students to be on task. He said if a student were in his room, he or she would be expected to do the work. If homework were assigned and time was given at the end of class, he wanted the students working. He said he checked to make sure work was completed.

The researcher observed one of Patrick's American Government classes. The class began with Patrick instructing the students to either watch the twelve-minute Channel One news segment or review material. He informed the class that a quiz over recent material would follow the news segment.

Following the broadcast, the students were told to clear their desks. The quiz focused on the judicial branch of the federal government. Students were reminded to make certain their names were on the quizzes.

Patrick then instructed the students to open their books to section three and read. As they were reading, he told the students to identify those concepts covered previously. This took about five minutes.

When the class was done reading, Patrick asked for someone to define the term, jury. He then asked a series of questions: "What are the two types of juries? What does a Grand Jury do? Are more Grand Juries being assembled today? Why?" The class responded correctly to each question.

Patrick then asked, "Is there any new information in this section?" The students responded affirmatively. They identified the information regarding the responsibilities of citizens called for jury duty. Patrick took time to briefly describe those responsibilities.

Patrick concluded the lesson by instructing the class to read section four and do the terms and questions at the end. He added, "Complete sentences are required."

Patrick's classroom was bright and clean. Posters of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address adorned one wall. Another wall had a large collection of maps, and a third wall had off-beat humorous posters. The classroom also had numerous filing cabinets, a television, and a globe.

#### First Interview: April 1990

When asked his opinion of staff development programs, in general, Patrick said, "Most of them I have been pretty impressed with.

I feel that anything that can help me will help my teaching." He added that some of the conferences were better than others, and he enjoyed meeting with other teachers in the social studies area. He said since he was new that he was open to anything and "the more I hear, the better I'm going to be." He said he could certainly see why staff development was necessary.

When asked how he felt when informed of the Instructional Awareness project the school district was about to begin, Patrick said he thought it sounded pretty good. He thought taping was the best indicator of how a teacher was doing and added, "The tapes don't lie." He was not sure he would be happy with the results, but thought they could point him in the right direction. He was not sure if the project would be any more interesting than other projects, but believed "if it helps me, it will help my kids."

Following the university consultant's first workshop in January of 1990, Patrick said, "I didn't get much out of it, because the consultant talked about so many things." He said he kept turning to another teacher and asking, "What are we going to have to do?"

Patrick expressed he was a little apprehensive about videotaping a teaching segment. He said he did not think he would act differently during the taping, but would always be aware of the camera. He thought if he videotaped his teaching everyday, he would become comfortable in front of the camera.

The idea of post-conferencing with the consultant was fine with



Patrick. He said, "I may get my ego shot down a little bit, but then again I may have done something right." Patrick said he felt comfortable with himself and did not think the consultant would invade his privacy or respectability. He said, "I have a long way to go, and if this person can help me out more power to him."

When asked about the second workshop conducted by the consultant in March of 1990, Patrick had mixed feelings. He said he was more interested in the information concerning the high school staff and not the elementary staff. When the staff was divided into groups, Patrick felt he got nothing out of it. He thought, "Do we really need to do this?" Patrick said the coding confused him. He left the workshop bewildered, because his coding was not returned to him. He said, "I don't know if this is selfish or not, but I want to know how I did, what I need to work on, and what I'm OK with."

#### Second Interview: May 1990

The second interview occurred following the first videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

Patrick had mixed feelings about the post-conference. He shared that the consultant was in a big hurry to get to a meeting. Patrick said, "I just stuck my head in there during my planning period, and he was on his way out the door." The consultant decided to conduct the post-conference.

The post-conference began with the consultant giving the coded data sheet to Patrick to look over. Patrick said, "To tell you the truth, I had no idea what any of it meant." The consultant

picked up on this and said that since he was going to be late anyway, he would go over it with Patrick. Patrick thought the consultant felt guilty.

The goal Patrick set for himself was to ask higher-level questions. He said the lesson was a review session, and subsequently he asked a higher number of lower-level questions. He expected this and said, "I know I have to work on this." He felt his questioning would improve with time.

Patrick also felt he needed to increase wait-time following his questions. He said he found himself asking questions and then quickly rephrasing them, instead of waiting. He thought this would also be a goal.

#### Third Interview: November 1990

The third interview occurred after the third workshop and second videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked about the third workshop, Patrick had some strong feelings and recommendations for the consultant. He restated the difficulty he was having with the coding. He said he still did not understand what any of it meant. When the consultant was going over the coding, Patrick said, "I knew I would not have enough time to understand the code, so I, not unlike my students, acted like I was listening, when in fact I was not."

Patrick felt he would get much more out of the project if the consultant would give him concrete examples of what he wanted. He recommended the consultant take segments of teacher tapes that

demonstrated good questions, good follow-up etc., and show them. This would give teachers an opportunity to compare, contrast, and have something to work toward.

When asked about the goal he had set after the first cycle, Patrick said, "It had to be asking higher-level questions." He remembered the first tape and that it was a review session. He had asked many rapid-fire, short-answer questions. He said, "I do that a lot."

Patrick was not excited about taping again. He said he was not anxious to do it, but did want to get it done. Patrick said he was interested in seeing the results, because he had really focused on the higher levels of questioning. He said, "I knew it wasn't going to be fabulous, but I wanted to see if I had gone anywhere."

To Patrick's dismay, the tape did not come out. He shared, "For some reason the camera kept shutting off. I thought I had it fixed, until the student running it told me that it went off five times during the lesson." It captured nothing.

Patrick did not do another tape; the consultant was only going to be around a few more days and told him, "You can do one, but I won't be able to see it."

Patrick and the consultant did have a conference. They watched and discussed last year's tape. The consultant asked Patrick his opinion of the project so far, and they discussed what other teachers were saying about it. Patrick said they had a good conference and that it was "almost like I had done a tape."

When asked what goal he set, Patrick said he had not because there was no tape. He said, however, he wanted to get out of his book, ask higher-level questions, and challenge students to think on their own.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had any effect on his teaching, to this point, Patrick said he thought it had. He said he was more aware of his teaching, but he could not give specific examples such as, "In four out of five days this week, I accomplished this." He did say higher-level questioning and thinking were always on his mind, and he had taken last year's material one step further in some instances. Taking his students to the higher levels of thinking was not important to him before this project began, because "it wasn't a part of me yet."

At the end of the third interview, Patrick had some things to say. He said he was not sure where the project was going. In his opinion, the consultant had gotten off on the wrong foot last year by "dumping all kinds of information on us and not knowing where to go with it. I wanted to say, 'What is this? What do you want?'" Patrick said he needed the objectives to be spelled out.

Patrick again stated his problems with the coding. He said, "I don't have time to decipher the coding, and I don't even bother to look at it, because he didn't explain it well enough when I wanted to do it. When he gives me the results, I think, results of what."

Patrick also expressed a concern about the post-conferences. He said the first time the consultant was unorganized and rushed.

He did say, however, that the second conference was better, even though they had no tape. The reason for the improvement was, "I felt that he was there just for me. He seemed more sincere." Patrick concluded by saying, "If I'm going to put an effort into this, he should too. Then, maybe we'll get something out of it."

#### Fourth Interview: May 1991

The fourth interview occurred after the fourth workshop session and the third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle.

When asked his perception of the fourth workshop session, Patrick thought it was a good use of his time. He was happy the consultant asked for input from the staff concerning the project. Although Patrick did not speak out at the session, he did agree with much of what was said, both positive and negative. He was impressed that the consultant was so receptive and interested in improving the project.

When asked the choices he made for the third taping cycle, such as whether he wanted to tape or be coded live and whether he wanted to post-conference with the consultant or his assigned administrator, Patrick said he taped and met with the consultant. He really did not know why he chose that way, other than he thought he would be uncomfortable with the live coding.

Patrick said the class period that day focused on the Civil War. He had told the students to read a section and be prepared to discuss. He also instructed them to write down questions they thought were important. The questions they wrote became the artifact for

the lesson.

Patrick did not feel positive about the post-conference. He said it was not anything in particular, but "he kept throwing these stats at me, the codes, and I just kept giving him stupid looks." Patrick added, "He told me I was doing something too many times, and I thought, there are times that I do that too much and others where I have to do it."

Patrick again expressed frustration with the codes. He said, "I could look at those codes for three hundred years and not understand them." He reiterated that he wanted something more concrete. The consultant told Patrick that he was doing a lot of 5-2-5's, and he thought, "I don't know what a 5-2-5 is, and I don't want to find out. The consultant seems to think that I know the codes."

There were numerous times during the conference when Patrick looked at the consultant and thought, "Yeah, and today's Tuesday, too." The consultant did show, however, on tape, where Patrick had rephrased a question. Patrick said he appreciated that. When asked about a goal, Patrick responded, "I did not set one at that time."

### Journal Entries

The following journal entries were made during the 1990-91 school year. Some of them related directly to the Instructional Awareness project, while others did not.

Entry 1. I went completely away from the book today after I asked the first question. I tried to think of questions to take the kids to the next level on their own. Fall 1991

Entry 2. Talked to my administrator today about my test questions. They need to be clearer. He made the suggestions after he observed me. Winter 1990-91

Entry 3. Gave a quiz today, which was not oral. The students did not ask me what I exactly wanted. Winter 1990-91

Entry 4. Tried to have a debate in Government class. First and second hour were pretty tough, but seventh hour went much smoother. Winter 1990-91

Entry 5. Discussed the entire period without my book or notes--each of the three classes took off on the subject a bit differently, which was neat. My questions were not the exact same in each class. We still covered the material I wanted! Spring 1991

Entry 7. Was evaluated by my administrator today. We talked about how I could get away from the book a bit more. At times I feel comfortable with that and at times I'm a bit hesitant about it. Spring 1991

Entry 8. Talked to the consultant today--discussed my questioning habits. Saw myself with a few higher-order questions, but still need more. I'm asking too many knowledge level questions. I am seeing a little improvement, I just need to keep going. Spring 1991

#### Final Interview and Summary Questions: May 1991

When asked to describe the type of year he had, Patrick said "busy." With the birth of his first child, Trevor, and the responsibilities of football and basketball, Patrick was spent. He said he now appreciated teachers who had children, because "it is so much work." He said, however, he enjoyed the year and felt more comfortable all the time with teaching, coaching, and the kids.

When asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching, Patrick responded by saying it had. He said

he had become a better questioner. He also felt his wait-time had improved. He was cautious about giving the project full credit for these improvements. He felt there were a number of factors. Being a third-year teacher, feeling more comfortable with the environment, getting the material down, and getting help from his administrator all helped.

Patrick did not feel he had improved as a monitor of student progress. He said he had not been conscious of looking for the end result, but thought it was something he should be looking at. All of this had made Patrick self-evaluative.

Patrick felt the videotaping was beneficial to him because it allowed him to step back and look at himself. He said, "You can have people tell you that you should have done this and this, but until you see it for yourself. . . ." He said he hated the actual taping but realized it was good for him. He enjoyed reviewing the tapes.

On the negative side, Patrick was not a big fan of the coding. He said, "It was very high-tech and probably very informational, but I'd like to put all those numbers and codes aside and just talk." When the consultant did give concrete information, Patrick felt he learned, but he added, "The consultant didn't do it often enough." He went on, "I could look at my printout all day, and I wouldn't get anything out of it. It made me feel stupid."

Patrick believed the Instructional Awareness project should continue. He thought the project could be improved by allowing him



to tape himself, watch the tape with his administrator or another teacher, and "just talk teaching." Patrick was not sure if other staff members would be interested in doing it that way, but he said, "I want to get better."

When asked how the administration should proceed if another long-term staff development project was planned, Patrick said, "I'm not sure. I don't know how I would go about it." He said the hands-on approach worked well with him. He also liked the idea of meeting and discussing with other teachers. He concluded by saying, "In terms of what to tell the administration, the idea is beyond me; I'm really not sure."

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY OF THE CASE STUDIES

The purpose of this study was to provide an accurate description of the experiences and perceptions of a group of classroom teachers who were involved in a district-wide staff development project. Using a qualitative case study approach, six classroom teachers were selected from a suburban school district to act as informants.

Trustworthiness of the findings was achieved by prolonged engagement, triangulation, and the development of an audit trail. Data were gathered through interviews, observations, and a review of documents. Each informant was interviewed four times over an eighteen-month period. Total interview time averaged one hundred and fifty minutes. Each informant was observed in the classroom setting for an entire class period. Each informant was instructed to keep a personal journal of his or her feelings and perceptions during the staff development project. An audit trail was constructed during the writing of the case studies, in order for someone outside the study to assess the quality of work.

The data from the interviews, observations, and personal journal were organized, analyzed and presented in a manner consistent with descriptive case study research. Each informant reviewed his or her respective case study and was given the opportunity to add to or delete portions of the context. This completed the "member check

phase."

In this chapter, the researcher has used the generated data to respond to the research questions. The answers can be found in the case studies that precede this chapter and in the summarization that follows.

### Research Questions

#### Research Question One

What impact has the district-wide staff development project had on the teachers involved in this study?

Each informant was asked this question twice during the data collection period. The first time was during the November 1990 interview and the second time was during the May 1991 interview.

Each of the informants felt the Instructional Awareness project had an impact on their questioning skills. Five of the six felt the project had helped them improve their wait-time behaviors. Two of the informants said the project had helped them eliminate annoying verbal habits from their teaching. Three informants thought the project had helped them become better monitors of student progress, and four thought they had become more self-evaluative of their teaching.

As a way of validating the findings as they related to the first research question, the data from which the findings were taken are included below.

Margaret Janecek. When asked in November, 1990, if the project had an effect on her teaching behaviors, Margaret thought it had. The most significant change she had noticed was in her questioning and wait-time behaviors. She added that prior to the project, she would ask a question and then repeat it three or four times, without giving the students a chance to respond. She also referred to the eradication of "OK" from her speech pattern as an improvement. She thought the project had also helped her eliminate her annoying habit of "chomping" on gum when she spoke. Overall, she felt the project had made her more aware of the types of questions she asked, whom she asked, how long to wait, and when to restate. She felt she was no longer totally dominating discussions and was involving her students more.

When asked the same question in May 1991, Margaret again said it had helped her improve her questioning skills. She said, "Look at the last coding; one third of my questions are higher-level questions. I have also begun to probe more. She identified an increased use of wait-time as an improvement. She again shared that the taping had helped her stop saying "OK" and rid herself of the gum chomping habit.

Margaret did not think the project helped her become a better monitor of student progress. She felt she had always been good at that. She did feel the project had made her more self-evaluative. She said, "I am my worst enemy."

Terrence Johnson. When asked in November 1990 if the project had an effect on his teaching behaviors, Terrance thought it had. He said he was more aware of his teaching techniques. He said, however, that ITIP had done the same thing. He did not elaborate.

When asked the same question in May 1991, he again said he thought the project had influenced his teaching. He said, "It made me aware of some things that I was doing and have known I was doing that I probably never did much about." He said one of those things was writing down questions that required learning at a higher level. In the past he had always gone "off the cuff." He said developing higher-level questions required a lot of thought.

Terrence also said he was now more aware of his wait-time. He shared, "Sometimes I find myself counting to 5-6-7. Although this seems like an eternity, by waiting I hope to get a better answer." Had added that he felt he had become more self-evaluative.

Alan Joseph. When asked in November 1990, if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching, Alan said, "I think so; I'm trying, but I don't know if I'm accomplishing it." He said he was doing more group work in class for application purposes. He was still trying to relate chemistry to real-life, because "most of these students will not become chemists." He thought he was more aware of his wait-time, but added, "that goes back to ITIP; there's some carryover there." He did not feel the project had an effect on his questioning skills.

When asked the same question in May 1991, he responded, "I learned a lot in regard to my questioning techniques. But, I had that in ITIP also." Alan said the project required him to review the level of questions he was asking, and he had become more aware of the taxonomy. He consistently tried to develop analysis-level questions. He thought he had become more self-evaluative.

In regard to wait-time, Alan said, "I have improved, both yes and no. I still catch myself not waiting long enough." Alan felt he had become a better monitor of student progress, but was not yet as good as he could be. He added, "I have always summarized information at the end of class and again at the beginning of the next day's class."

Cynthia Kelly. When asked in November 1990, Cynthia thought the Instructional Awareness project had affected her teaching. She said it had helped her verbal habits. She qualified this by saying

the first taping showed 100 "OK's" and the second taping had only twelve of fifteen. She also thought she was repeating herself less.

When asked the same question in May 1991, she said, "It has had a positive effect, because when you are at the bottom, there is nowhere to go but up." She had eliminated some of her annoying verbal habits, was moving around the room more rather than standing at the overhead, and was giving more examples.

Cynthia felt she was more aware of her questioning techniques and had improved her use of wait-time. She also thought she had become a better monitor of student progress, but she was cautious in giving the project sole credit. She felt being a second-year teacher had something to do with it.

Helen Kristiansen. When asked in November 1990, if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, Helen said, "I think about things more, but in regard to drastically changing the way I teach, it has not." She said the information shared on wait-time and higher levels of questioning were nothing more than a repetition of ITIP.

When asked the same question again in May 1991, Helen said it had, "both positively and negatively." Negatively, she looked at the project as "just another thing we had to do." Positively, she said, "It makes you think about the things you are doing in class." Helen could not say she had gotten a great deal from the project. She added, "Maybe if I had had a different year I would feel differently, more receptive." Helen felt the project had made her more

aware of her questioning skills. ITIP had helped her understand the cognitive levels, but the project forced her to think about each question she asked.

Helen did not feel the project had made her a better monitor of student progress. She said, "I am not collecting anymore than usual. I have always tried to look at what all the kids were doing and collect the things that I know will help me understand what they know."

Patrick Rogers. When asked in November 1990, if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on his teaching, Patrick thought it had. He said he was more aware of his teaching, but could not give specific examples such as, "in four out of five days this week, I accomplished this." He did say higher-level questioning and thinking were always on his mind and felt he had taken last year's material one step further in some instances. Before the project had begun, taking his students to a higher level of thinking was not important to him, because "it wasn't a part of me yet."

When asked the same question again in May 1991, Patrick said the project had improved his questioning and wait-time skills. He was cautious in giving full credit to the project for the improvements. He felt there were a number of factors. Being a third-year teacher, feeling more comfortable with the environment, getting the material down, and getting help from his administrator all helped.

Patrick did not feel he had improved as a monitor of student progress. He said he had not been conscious of looking for the end



result, but believed it was something he would be looking at. All of this, Patrick felt, had made him more self-evaluative.

### Research Question Two

Which qualities of the district-wide staff development project influenced (positively or negatively) the teachers involved in the study?

The researcher identified three major qualities that characterized the Instructional Awareness project. The three qualities were: the workshops conducted by the consultant, the videotaping of each informant's teaching, and the post-conferences with the consultant.

The workshops. The consultant conducted four workshops during the project. There were mixed reactions from the informants following each of the workshop sessions.

Following the first workshop, Margaret said she was not impressed. She thought the consultant tried to cover too much material and she felt overwhelmed. Terrence felt uncomfortable because the consultant made him realize that most of what he was doing in his classes was at the knowledge level. Alan felt positive after the workshop and tried a few of the techniques presented in his own classroom. Cynthia thought the information shared was right on target in regard to questioning skills and wait-time behaviors. Helen was confused and felt the consultant was cold and unsure of what he wanted to do. Patrick did not get much out of the workshop because he thought the consultant tried to cover too many things.

After the second workshop, four of the informants commented they were disappointed that the consultant did not have the coded results of the first videotapings for each teacher.

After the third workshop, Margaret, Terrence, and Patrick had negative comments, while Alan, Cynthia, and Helen shared positive feelings. Margaret and Terrence both sensed that the consultant was unsure of himself at the third workshop because of the resistance he was experiencing with some staff members. Patrick felt the consultant had done nothing more than confuse him. Alan, however, felt the consultant was more at ease and had convinced him to look at the project differently. Cynthia thought the consultant did a good job during the workshop, and Helen thought he had finally figured out what he wanted to do with the project. She sensed a feeling of confidence from the consultant.

In regard to the fourth workshop, Margaret, Terrence, and Alan felt they benefited little. Cynthia, Helen, and Patrick were excited that the consultant had asked for input on how to improve the project and that they were given a choice as to whether they wanted to tape live or be taped and whether they wanted to post-conference with the consultant or a building administrator. Patrick felt the workshop was a good use of his time.

Videotaping. The idea of videotaping made Margaret uneasy, and she experienced a few technical difficulties, but it did help her to identify a few annoying verbal habits. The idea of videotaping did not bother Terrence. Alan reacted negatively toward

videotaping and felt it had limited potential. Cynthia was interested in videotaping because she felt it would help her improve. Cynthia also experienced technical difficulties with the videotaping. Helen was not interested in videotaping because she felt it was a return to her student teaching days. Helen felt uncomfortable each time she taped and felt she did things for the tape that she normally would not do. Patrick was not excited about taping, and he experienced some technical difficulties.

Post-conferencing. Each informant met with the consultant three times. Margaret had positive feelings about the post-conferences. She said she had very concise and to-the-point conferences with the consultant and felt he knew what he was doing. She decided to conference with her administrator for the last conference, and said she had gotten a lot out of it because the administrator had looked at the tape and marked items of interest that they discussed during the conference.

Terrence liked the idea of meeting with the consultant and said he enjoyed each conference. He said the conferences were very informal and that the consultant made some very good suggestions for improvement. Alan did not benefit much from the conferences and sensed that the consultant was afraid to give suggestions for improvement. Cynthia looked forward to the post-conferences and felt that each one went well. She stated that the last conference went exceptionally well because the consultant was well-prepared and had specific recommendations for her. Helen felt the post-conferences were evaluations

of her teaching regardless of what anyone said. None of them lasted more than five minutes, and she was given no suggestions for improvement. She felt she had wasted her time. Patrick had mixed feelings about the post-conferences. He felt the consultant was in a hurry during the first conference and little was accomplished. The second conference was beneficial. Although Patrick's tape did not come out, he and the consultant talked about the project and Patrick's teaching style. Patrick said the final post-conference was of no value, because the consultant kept referring to the code. Patrick did not understand the code and left the conference feeling confused.

As a way of validating the findings as they related to the second research question, the data from which the findings were taken are included below.

Margaret Janecek. Margaret was not impressed with the workshops conducted by the consultant. She felt the consultant tried to cover too much material during the first workshop, and she was overwhelmed. She also felt he was very unsure of the direction he wanted to go with the project. She was again disappointed with the second workshop because the consultant did not have everyone's coded results. Margaret sensed the consultant was unsure of himself during the third workshop. She thought the consultant was uneasy because of the resistance he was experiencing from some staff members.

Margaret again sensed this insecurity during the final workshop. She thought the consultant was feeling that something in the project was not working. She thought the university colleagues

he brought with him were of little help because they "didn't seem to know what was going on." She thought the staff felt worse about the project following the final workshop and that no one benefited from the hour.

Margaret at first responded negatively to the idea of videotaping a segment of her teaching. She said she did not like to see herself on video. Margaret had trouble with the actual videotaping. The first time the consultant had to stop coding halfway through the lesson because the noise from an adjoining room was so distracting. The second time she taped, the student responsible for turning on the camcorder did not do so.

On the positive side, Margaret said the videotaping helped her see that she tended to teach to one side of the room. It also made her aware that she "chomped" her gum when she spoke.

She was not happy with the time that expired from the taping to the post-conference. Her third tape was handed in February 11, and she did not post-conference until the end of May.

Margaret was very positive following the first post-conference with the consultant. She said the information he gave was beneficial and was very concise and to the point. She said, "The consultant definitely knows what he is doing." She was amazed he could remember the questions she had asked. The second post-conference was difficult because the tape had not been completed due to the noise distractions. They did have a conference, and Margaret felt they were able to accomplish some things.

For the third post-conference, Margaret chose to meet with her assigned administrator rather than the consultant. Margaret got a lot out of the post-conference because the administrator had looked at the tape, marked items of interest, and then went back to them during the conference. She thought the administrator was better prepared.

Margaret set a number of goals for improvement during the project. After the first videotaping and post-conference, Margaret decided to stop repeating student answers. She felt she was training her students to listen only to her and not each other. After the second cycle, Margaret planned to include all her students in discussion instead of teaching to one side of the room. She also planned on improving the manner in which she sequenced her questions. The example she gave was, "asking a lower-level question, getting an answer, and then moving to a higher level." Margaret did not set a goal following the third cycle.

Terrence Johnson. Terrence felt uncomfortable following the initial workshop conducted by the consultant. The reason for the discomfort was Terrence realized that most of what he was doing in his classes was at the knowledge level. Terrence was surprised by some of the information shared at the second workshop. When the consultant stated he was finding most of the higher-level questioning in the district to be at the K-3 level, Terrence was concerned. He began to assess his own teaching and remarked, "maybe it makes some sense." Terrence did not offer much when asked about the third workshop,

other than he could tell the consultant was aware "that the teachers weren't getting enough response from him during the post-conferences and there was too much time between the taping and the conferences." Nothing in the final workshop was of interest to Terrence.

The idea of videotaping did not bother Terrence. He said he would not spend any more time preparing for the taped lesson than he would normally. He had made up his mind that, "Whatever came out was going to be exactly the way in which I would have done it had I not been taping."

During the second cycle, Terrence did some things for the tape he normally would not do. For example, he wrote everything down that he wanted to do during the lesson. He said, "I have found that if you want to ask a question at the analysis level, you have to write it all out before you start." Terrence thought going through the videotaping cycle the third time was redundant and the value of it was limited.

Terrence liked the idea of meeting with the consultant. He said he had no idea what to expect, but that he would listen, even if it embarrassed him. The first post-conference was very informal, with the consultant walking into one of Terrence's classes. The conference took place at the rear of the room. The consultant pointed out that Terrence spent 70 percent of the taped segment talking, with most of the work being done at the knowledge level. Terrence also learned that in trying to clarify his questions, he often rephrased them two or three times. The consultant recommended

that Terrence work on being very clear with his first question so he would not have to restate. The second post-conference showed Terrence had made improvements in these areas. He said his questions were much clearer because he had written them out before the lesson.

Terrence said the final post-conference was very positive. He said the consultant spent more time with him looking at the tape. The consultant had written down some of the questions Terrence had asked during the lesson, pointed out the weaknesses, and offered direction.

Terrence set a few goals for improvement during the project. Following the first videotaping and post-conference cycle, Terrence wanted to improve his discussion techniques so he could get more student input. He wanted to improve the clarity of his questions. After the second cycle, Terrence's goal was to move into the higher levels of thinking. Terrence did not set a goal following the third cycle.

Alan Joseph. Alan felt positive following the first workshop. He said he tried a few of the teaching techniques presented at the workshop. He found it difficult to wait after asking a question, because time was so short in the classroom. He tried to ask higher-level questions and found this to be difficult also. Alan was not as impressed with the second workshop. He said he was lost. He did not understand the coding process or the data that were shared.

Alan said he felt negative going into the third workshop, because he still did not know what was going on with the project. He



said, however, the consultant was much more at ease during the third workshop and thought the consultant was trying to do a good job. Alan said he was starting to look at the project a little differently, but the coded matrix was still causing him problems. Alan was not very excited about the last workshop. He did not understand how the national teaching standards related to the project. He was still having difficulty understanding the coding, especially that which dealt with questioning techniques.

Alan reacted negatively when informed that he would have to submit a videotaped segment of his teaching. He said he did not plan anything special for the taping. The only statement Alan made concerning videotaping was, "I don't think we are videotaping enough to get a sequence down. We have such long delays between taping and post-conferencing . . . ."

Alan said he was willing to meet with the consultant for the post-conference. Alan said the first conference went fine, once the consultant determined "whose sheet we were going over." During the second conference, the consultant explained, "what we were doing and then went over the data." The consultant did not give any suggestions for improvement. Alan was convinced the consultant did not want to hurt anyone's feelings or step on anyone's toes "and have someone come back mad and upset, saying this project is a bunch of hogwash." Alan did not get much out of the last post-conference. He said, "We didn't review the tape. We went into the coding a little bit, and then we got into talking about other things." No

suggestions were made for improvement.

Alan set three goals for improvement following the first post-conference. The first was to stop saying "OK." The second was to ask higher-level questions at the appropriate time. The third was to increase wait-time. He did not set goals for improvement following the second or third post-conferences.

Cynthia Kelly. Cynthia thought the information shared during the first workshop was right on target. She agreed teachers do not wait long enough after asking questions and as a whole repeat themselves a great deal. She thought the consultant tried too hard during the first workshop. Cynthia was not as impressed with the second workshop. She was disappointed when he did not have everyone's coded results. She felt let down. What was shared during the workshop meant little to Cynthia.

When asked about the third workshop conducted by the consultant, Cynthia said, "Oh no, here we go again." She felt that way because she thought the consultant would be unprepared again. She said, "This jerk, he's not going to be prepared, and I don't want to waste my time with this. I could be in my room rearranging or getting prepared for the school year." Once the consultant began, however, she changed her mind. She thought, "This person is good at what he does, and I realized that this project could help me. This isn't being done for him, but rather for me, and it's up to me to take advantage of it." She left the workshop "a lot less mad and grouchy."

Cynthia was encouraged by the fourth workshop. She was excited that the staff was given the option of taping or coding "live." She felt coding live and post-conferencing immediately afterward would be advantageous, because the information would be fresh in the minds of the teacher and consultant.

Cynthia was interested in videotaping a teaching segment. She stated, "When you actually watch yourself, you hear what you say, you see what you do." She felt that as a first-year teacher there was a lot to learn.

Cynthia questioned the accuracy of the first coded videotape. She said it showed she did not give examples during her lesson. She said, "When I teach, I go right from the book. The books says this is what you are going to do today: examples 1, 2, 3, 4. I know I followed the book, so I had to give examples."

Cynthia did not have a smooth experience for her second videotaping. It occurred during a busy time of the year, and she hurried to get it done. She planned something special for the tape and felt a little phony for doing so. After she finished taping, she realized the camera was not turned on. She reacted by saying, "Fine, I'm not going to do this." Eventually she did tape, "Because the administrators will be pissed, if I don't." This time she did not prepare anything special for the tape. She felt better about herself.

For the third videotaping, Cynthia chose to be coded "live." The live coding, however, did not occur. The consultant did not get back to her as to when it would happen, so she taped her segment

and sent it in. She said she was frustrated and commented, "the consultant is unorganized."

Cynthia said she was looking forward to post-conferencing with the consultant. She was anxious to find out what he thought of her and her class. Cynthia thought her first post-conference went well. During the conference, the consultant played Cynthia's tape. They found an inordinate amount of annoying verbal habits. She said "OK" a great deal. She thought the consultant was a little rushed for her conference and that he seemed tired from meeting with staff members all day.

For the second post-conference, Cynthia went in with a "chip on her shoulder." She had been called in on a day she was very busy. Once she was with the consultant, things improved. She said, "I don't know how this guy does it, but he does it every time." During the conference the consultant identified two concerns. He pointed out that her wait-time was insufficient and that she repeated student answers too quickly and too often. Cynthia left the conference feeling good, because she had learned something.

Cynthia was not enthused about post-conferencing a third time. She thought it would be a waste of her time. Once she was there, she had a good conference. She said, "The consultant knew who was coming in and knew what was going on." During the conference, the consultant pointed out that Cynthia had eliminated her habit of saying "OK." He also told her she was giving more examples. She was happy with the conference, but left wondering, "Was he being

honest, or was he just suckering me in?"

After the first videotaping and post-conference, Cynthia identified "giving more examples" as her goal for improvement. After the second cycle, she wanted to improve her wait-time and correct herself of repeating student answers. After the third cycle, Cynthia revealed her new goal was to ask higher-level questions. She added that most of her questions were knowledge level and by rephrasing them she could move to the next level.

Helen Kristiansen. Helen was confused after the first workshop. She thought the consultant was cold and unsure of what to do. She said, "If the consultant doesn't know what to do, how are we to know what we are supposed to do?" She left the workshop wondering if this should be pursued, since no real outcomes had been set.

Helen felt a little better after the second workshop. She thought the consultant had a better idea of what to do. She enjoyed the articles the consultant handed out, but was disappointed that all the tapes had not been coded. She said, "We were told to have them in by a certain date . . . ." She also expressed displeasure with the group activity. She said, "I was unsure what our group of three was to do. I need clearer guidelines."

When asked about the third workshop, Helen thought the consultant had finally figured out what the project was supposed to do. This was something she had not sensed before. She was still confused with the coding process and what it was supposed to represent.

Helen was not excited about attending the fourth workshop.

She said, "Here it is, another teacher workday; I have grades to do, and we have to go listen again." During the workshop she was glad the discussions identified the problem of turn-around time between taping and post-conferencing. She had hoped it could improve, but was not convinced it would.

Helen was not enthused about videotaping a teaching segment. She said, "My first reaction was, here we go again, we're back to our student teaching experiences." She did not like the idea of having the camera in her classroom, because she was unsure how her students would react to something foreign. She also thought the camera would make her nervous.

During the first taping, Helen said, "I felt uncomfortable taping, because usually I walk up and down the aisles, jingling my keys and things like that. I was probably more conscious not to do those things than I was of my teaching." She did not have much to say about the second taping, other than there was a long delay between the taping and the post-conference.

For the third taping, Helen chose not to have hers coded "live." She said she was not sure when the consultant would be able to do it, so there was a logistics problem. Helen still felt uncomfortable taping. Once the taping started, however, she was fine.

The idea of post-conferencing with the consultant interested Helen. She did feel the conference was an evaluation, regardless of what the administration said. The only difference would be meeting with the consultant and not an administrator. She thought this could

be good, because "maybe I am doing something wrong that the administrator and I have not noticed before."

Helen was very disappointed with the consultant during the first post-conference. She estimated the meeting lasted less than five minutes. She said the consultant was not prepared. She added, "He did not say anything that I couldn't have gotten myself from looking at the tape and the code." She thought he should have looked at the tape and offered suggestions.

Helen was no more impressed with the second post-conference. She had done her taping on September 25, and the post-conference took place on December 6. The consultant apologized for the long delay. He could not remember what was on Helen's tape, and since it occurred so long ago, neither could she. The consultant gave Helen the coded printout and had circled some areas, but she did not know why. The consultant told Helen she had good wait-time and that was the extent of the conference. Helen felt the post-conference was a waste of her time.

When asked about the third post-conference, Helen said, "Again we were told to have our tapes in by a certain date, and he again took forever to get them back." The consultant had the printout ready for the post-conference, and this pleased Helen. She still found the coding confusing, however. She said, "When you go in, the consultant puts all of these figures in front of you, like you actually understand them. We see these so seldom that we have to re-think them every time."

During the last post-conference, Helen and the consultant reviewed her tape, and he told her she was a master teacher. He had no suggestions for her. She was not sure if the consultant said the same thing to everybody, or if he were giving suggestions for improvement to others. Helen left the conference thinking that she was far from perfect and that there must be things she could improve on. The post-conference lasted about six minutes.

Helen set a few goals for improvement during the project. After the first videotaping and post-conference, she planned to stop repeating student answers. When she had time to think, however, she decided, "That's how kids learn in my class, by hearing information repeated over and over again." Therefore, Helen believed repeating was necessary. After further review, Helen decided to make asking higher-level questions her goal. Helen did not set a goal following the second or third post-conferences.

Patrick Rogers. Patrick did not get much out of the initial workshop conducted by the consultant. He said the consultant talked about too many things. Patrick kept turning to another teacher and asking, "What are we going to have to do?" His feelings did not change after the second workshop. Patrick was disappointed that the coded printouts were not returned. He wanted to see how he had done. The group activity was of no value to Patrick. He thought, "Do we really need to do this?"

When asked about the third workshop, Patrick had some strong feelings and recommendations for the consultant. He restated the



difficulty he was having with the coding, because he still did not know what any of it meant. When the consultant was going over the coding, Patrick thought, "I knew I would not have enough time to understand the code, so I, not unlike my students, acted like I was listening, when in fact, I was not."

Patrick felt he would get much more out of the project if the consultant would give him concrete examples of what he wanted. He recommended the consultant take segments of teacher tapes that demonstrated good questions, good follow-up, etc., and show them. This would give teachers an opportunity to compare, contrast, and have something to work toward.

Patrick thought the fourth workshop was a good use of his time. He was happy the consultant asked for input from the staff concerning the project. He was impressed that the consultant was so receptive and interested in improving the project.

Patrick was apprehensive about videotaping a segment of his teaching. He said he did not think he would act differently during the tape, but would always be aware of the camera. The first taping went fine. Patrick was not excited about taping a second time, but was interested in whether he had improved his questioning skills. To Patrick's dismay, the tape did not come out. The camera kept shutting off, and it captured nothing. Patrick did not do another tape. For the third taping, Patrick chose not to be coded "live," because he thought he would be uncomfortable with the consultant in the room.

The idea of post-conferencing with the consultant was fine with Patrick. He said, "I may get my ego shot down a little bit, but then again I may have done something right." He said, "I have a long way to go, and if this person can help me out, more power to him."

Patrick had mixed feelings about the first post-conference. He said the consultant was in a big hurry to get to a meeting and was on his way out the door. The consultant decided to go on with the conference. The consultant gave the coded data sheet to Patrick to look over. Patrick said, "To tell you the truth, I had no idea what any of it meant."

Although Patrick did not submit a tape, he and the consultant did have a second interview. They looked at last year's tape. The consultant asked Patrick his opinion of the project so far, and they discussed what other teachers were saying about it. Patrick said they had a good conference, and that it was almost like he had done a tape.

Patrick was not happy with the third post-conference. He said the consultant, "kept throwing these stats at me, the codes, and I just kept giving him stupid looks." He added, "I could look at those codes for three hundred years and not understand them." During the conference, the consultant told Patrick that he was doing a lot of 5-2-5's, and Patrick thought, "I don't know what a 5-2-5 is, and I don't want to find out. The consultant must think that I know the codes." The consultant, however, did show Patrick on tape where Patrick had successfully rephrased a question, and he appreciated that.

Patrick set a few goals for improvement during the project. Following the first videotaping and post-conference, Patrick decided to begin asking higher-level questions. On his first tape he had asked many lower-level questions, and he thought he needed to work on that. Patrick also wanted to work on his wait-time. He found himself quickly rephrasing questions instead of letting his students answer.

Patrick set goals for himself after the second cycle, although he had not taped. He said he wanted to get out of his book, ask higher-level questions, and challenge students to think on their own. Patrick did not set a goal for improvement following the third post-conference.

### Research Question Three

Are there any common themes that can be identified from the experiences and perceptions of the six teachers involved in the study?

As the case studies were reviewed, a number of major themes were detected. Ten themes were identified because they were important to the informants and, therefore, frequently mentioned in the case studies. The perspective of each informant and the amount of coverage given to each theme varied. The themes were as follows: (1) initial reactions, (2) the consultant, (3) ITIP, (4) the coding, (5) immediate feedback, (6) the goal setting--improvement of instruction, (7) student outcomes, (8) the journals, (9) final impressions, and (10) advice for the future.

Initial reactions. The responses were mixed when the informants were asked how they felt about starting the Instructional Awareness project. Margaret felt positive about it and said that every teacher should have an open mind to suggestions, especially from someone who was considered an expert in the field. Cynthia said she was all for the project because she liked the idea of video-taping. Patrick also liked the idea of the taping and thought it was the best indicator of how a teacher was doing.

The other three informants were not excited about the idea. Terrence had mixed feelings about starting the project because he was not sure of the benefit. Alan was initially negative, because he was not properly informed. Helen simply said, "Oh no, here we go again. Here is another project for us."

The consultant. Margaret never thought the consultant felt comfortable with his role as project coordinator. She thought he was unsure of himself at each of the workshops. She explained, "At the first workshop, he said numerous times that he didn't know where he was going with the program. Now if he doesn't know, how are we supposed to know?" Margaret found the consultant to be just as unsure at the third workshop, to the point where his anxiety was affecting her.

Margaret also expressed thoughts and feelings concerning the final workshop. She said her perception of the consultant was that he was very nervous and insecure. She said that was a side of the consultant that she had never seen before. She said, "In the past,

he was the one who had all the confidence in the world."

Terrence enjoyed the consultant. He said, "We have discussed many things that were not related to the project." He thought the consultant had done a good job, and he felt comfortable with him during post-conferences. He believed the consultant had developed good relationships between himself and his clients.

Alan was convinced that the consultant did not want to make anyone mad by offering suggestions for instructional improvements. He and the consultant spent most of their post-conference time talking about science. The consultant gave Alan some wood blocks for a density demonstration, and he used them in class.

Cynthia thought the consultant was unorganized and said this numerous times. The comments were usually in reference to the fact he had not returned the coded results in a prompt manner. Cynthia did say, however, that the consultant had an ability to always regenerate her interest in the project. She said, "I don't know how the guy does it, but he does it every time." Cynthia felt, overall, that the consultant's ideas were wonderful. She thought he was open and caring. She said, "He didn't treat us like peons."

Helen thought the consultant was cold and unsure of himself. She did not think the consultant knew what he was doing until well into the project. She was very disappointed with the consultant during her post-conferences because he spent so little time with her. She said, "He just wanted to scratch me off his list." Helen had little confidence in the consultant and thought the project could have been done

by the administrators.

In Patrick's opinion, the consultant had gotten off on the wrong foot right from the beginning, by "dumping all kinds of information on us and now knowing where to go with it." Patrick thought the objectives should have been spelled out from the beginning. Patrick also felt the consultant had gotten off on the wrong foot by being unorganized and rushed at the first post-conference. Patrick felt better at the second conference because the consultant "took his time and acted as though he was there just for me." Patrick was impressed that the consultant asked the staff for suggestions and was so receptive and interested in improving the project.

ITIP. Madline Hunter's Instructional Theory into Practice class was mentioned numerous times by the four experienced teachers. Each of the four had taken ITIP three years previously, and for these reasons it was included as one of the themes.

Margaret said she had liked the ITIP program because it had brought out things she had been taught, such as Bloom's taxonomy. Reviewing the taxonomy made her take a good look at her questioning skills.

Terrence thought from the beginning that the project would be another ITIP. He said later on in the project that although the Instructional Awareness project had increased his awareness of personal teaching techniques, ITIP had accomplished the same thing.

Alan also brought up the fact that ITIP had been a pleasant experience for him. He said, "It re-awakened me as far as teaching

methodology." Later on in the project, Alan said he had seen some improvement in his questioning skills and wait-time, but cautioned, "that goes back to ITIP. There's some carryover there."

Helen said most of the information shared at workshops concerning wait-time and the higher levels of questioning was nothing more than a repetition of ITIP. Later on in the project Helen said the Instructional Awareness approach had made her more aware of her questioning skills. ITIP had helped her understand the cognitive levels, but the project had forced her to think about each question she asked.

The coding. Each informant had an opinion of the coded data generated by the consultant and shared during the post-conferences.

Margaret complimented the TAS coding system by saying she was impressed with its ability to identify entire series of responses. She felt the coded results were an accurate description of her first teaching segment. She said the coding identified the level of questioning she intended and also showed that her students were thinking and responding at a higher level. Margaret referred to the code when qualifying her statement that she had improved her questioning skills. She said, "Look at the last coding, one-third of my questions are higher-level questions. I have also begun to probe more."

Terrence did not think the coded results were an accurate reflection of his first teaching segment. He said the sound was not clear on the tape, because the power pack on the camcorder was run down. Later on in the project, Terrence said the coding showed he made

progress with his questioning skills and wait-time techniques. He said during the final interview that the coding helped him identify how much time he had spent on various tasks.

During the first post-conference, Alan had trouble understanding the coding, but was able to determine that he needed to work on his wait-time. After the second post-conference, Alan again said he was having trouble understanding the "coded matrix," and thought it would be tough for anyone that had not had a class in it.

Cynthia questioned the accuracy of the coded data sheet following the first post-conference. She said it showed she did not give any examples during her lesson. She was sure she had. Later on she said the code showed she had totally eliminated her use of "OK."

Helen found the coded data confusing throughout the project. She said, "When you go in, the consultant puts all of these figures in front of you, like you actually understand them." Patrick felt the same way. He said, "I could look at my printout all day, and I wouldn't get anything out of it. It made me feel stupid."

Immediate feedback. A few of the informants had strong opinions concerning the amount of time that passed between the videotaping and the post-conference.

Helen wrote in her journal, "Let's face it! The video analysis is a thing of the past. We must have our taping done by February, so we can have immediate feedback. It's April 23, so far, nothing. Let us move on!"

Alan said that although the intentions of the project were



good, too much time went by between the taping and the post-conferencing. Cynthia expressed her dissatisfaction with the turn-around time at the fourth workshop when the consultant asked for ways to improve the project. Helen also expressed frustration. She said, "Again we were told to have our tapes back by a certain date, and he again took forever to get them back."

The goal setting--improvement of instruction. The goal Margaret set at her first post-conference was to stop repeating student answers. She thought she was training her students to only listen to her and not each other. At the next interview, when asked what goal she had set at the first post-conference, Margaret hesitated and said, "I wanted to stop saying OK and raise my questions to the higher levels." Later in the interview she said her major goal was to stop repeating student answers.

At the second post-conference, Margaret set a few goals. The first was to begin including all of her students in discussions, and the second was to improve the sequencing of her questions. At the third post-conference, Margaret said she did not set a goal. If she had, she said it would be to involve all of her students in discussion. At the final interview, when asked if the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on her teaching, Margaret said she was asking higher-level questions, had improved her wait-time techniques, stopped saying "OK," and no longer chomped on gum. She also felt she was dominating discussions less and involving her students more.

At the first post-conference, Terrence set a goal to improve his discussion techniques so he could get more student input. At the next interview, when asked what goal he had set at the first post-conference, Terrence said he had wanted to improve the clarity of his questions and his wait-time.

At the second post-conference, Terrence set a goal of "moving to the higher-level questions." Terrence did not set a goal at the third post-conference. When asked at the final interview if the Instructional Awareness project had affected his teaching, Terrence said it had required him to write down higher-level questions before he tried them in class. He thought his wait-time had improved.

At the first interview, Alan set three goals. One was to stop saying "OK." The second was to ask higher-level questions at the appropriate time, and the third was to increase his wait-time. When asked at the next interview what goal he had set at the first post-conference, Alan said, "I'm not sure, but I think it was to try to apply the higher-level stuff. The consultant's stuff."

Alan did not set a goal during the second or third post-conference. When asked at the final interview if the Instructional Awareness project had affected his teaching, Alan said he was more aware of his level of questioning and the taxonomy. He thought his wait-time had improved a little.

During the first post-conference, Cynthia set a goal to ask more examples. When asked at the next interview what goal she had set at the first post-conference, she said, "I'm not sure but I think

it was to work on my verbal habits, such as OK, OK, OK, and um, um, um."

At the second post-conference, Cynthia decided to improve her wait-time and also to stop repeating student answers. She wanted her students to listen to each other. At the third post-conference, Cynthia set a goal to ask high-level comprehension questions. At the final interview, when asked if the Instructional Awareness project had affected her teaching, Cynthia said she had eliminated her annoying verbal habits, was giving more examples, and was moving around the room more. She also thought she had improved her wait-time.

During the first post-conference, Helen set a goal of asking higher-level questions. When asked at the next interview what goal she had set at the first post-conference, Helen said she had not set one. Helen did not set a goal during her second or third post-conferences.

During the first post-conference, Patrick set two goals. The first was to begin asking higher-level questions. The second was to improve his wait-time. When asked at the next interview what goal he had set during the first post-conference, Patrick said, "I had to be asking higher-level questions."

At the second post-conference, Patrick said he wanted to get out of his book, ask higher-level questions, and challenge students to think on their own. Patrick did not set a goal during the third workshop. At the final interview, when asked if the Instructional

Awareness project had affected his teaching, Patrick said he had become a better questioner and his wait-time had improved.

Student outcomes. Improving student outcomes was a major topic of the Instructional Awareness project. During the third videotaping, post-conference, and goal-setting cycle, each teacher was asked to accompany the tape with a form that identified the teachers' objectives for the lesson, the teaching technique employed, and the manner in which student progress was assessed. They were also asked to submit an artifact to substantiate student progress. The artifact was defined as an example of student writing, a piece of artwork, an assignment completed during the class period, a journal entry, etc.

Margaret's artifact was a quiz. Terrence's artifact was a drawing, and Alan's was a lab report. Cynthia submitted a homework assignment and Helen's was a journal. Patrick's artifact was a list of student questions. There were no other references made regarding student outcomes.

The journals. Each informant was asked to keep a personal journal during the 1990-91 school year. A significant entry from five of the six informants is included below. Cynthia did not make entries in her journal.

Margaret. I think I am doing a great job. Students and parents tell me so. The administration and my colleagues make me question my teaching abilities. I do not feel right about this. What should I change? or should I? I feel good about my accomplishments. Conflict--is it good? If feelings could not be hurt, honesty is best. Conflict is still the result. Improvement should be for the student, not the teacher.

Terrence. During the in-service presentation I realized that change is a necessary part of education. When I try something different which leads to increased learning by students, it always makes the effort worthwhile.

Alan. Advanced chemistry students handling higher-level questions with little trouble. Ninth grade classes struggling to get beyond the knowledge level.

Helen. Where do students get their "don't care attitude?" Do students ever listen? Who should teach responsibility, parents, teachers, or both?

Patrick. Discussed the entire period today without using my book or notes. Each of the three classes took off on the subject a bit differently, which was neat. My questions were not exactly the same in each class. We still covered the material I wanted!

Final impressions. During the final interview, each informant was asked if the Instructional Awareness project should continue.

Margaret felt the project should not continue. She said it had accomplished what it set out to do: to make staff aware of their instructional practices. In her opinion, it had served its purpose, and the district should move on.

Terrence's opinion was the same as Margaret's. He believed he had gotten out of the project everything he needed to know and it was now up to him to make the improvements. He said, "An awareness project is just what it is, an awareness project, and it's done."

Alan did not think it should continue. He said that although the project's intentions were good, it was beyond its limits. He did not know what other areas could be explored. He added, "What research says and what's written in textbooks doesn't always work in the classroom."

Cynthia thought the project should continue for anyone who wanted to use it. She recommended the workshops be discontinued unless the consultant had something new to say.

Helen did not think the project should continue. She thought the entire project could have been done better with the building administrators. She said, "The administrators know us, because they are around all the time. Why should we do this for the consultant? The administrators are the bosses."

Patrick thought the project should continue. He believed the project could be improved by allowing him to tape, watch the tape with his administrator or another teacher, and "just talk teaching." He was not sure how this approach would be received by other teachers, but said "I want to get better."

Advice for the future. At the final interview each informant was asked how the administration should proceed if another long-term staff development project was planned.

Margaret was at a loss for an answer. She had been on a number of planning committees and found it very hard to get teachers to be honest about their needs. She said, "If you ask teachers what they want, most of them will not tell you what they really need, because they don't want to admit that they don't know how to do something. What you would get are things that the staff was already mediocre to good at."

Terrence recommended the administration include teachers in the planning process. As someone who had worked on the conference

in-service planning committee, he felt, for benefits to be realized, the entire process needed to be a joint effort. He cautioned, however, that it was very difficult to find something that teachers would be enthusiastic about.

Alan cautioned the administration to move very slowly in future staff development planning. He said, "The Instructional Awareness project was dumped on the staff without us ever knowing what was going on." He thought a committee should be formed so teachers had input.

Cynthia said staff input is very important, but cautioned the administration not to rely totally on teacher recommendation. She clarified this by saying, "It's not always easy to see what you need for yourself. You can think you're doing great, when actually you can improve." She recommended that administration make staff development decisions, with opportunities for teacher feedback.

Helen said, "I don't think we should be the guinea pigs, the first ones to do something. We should wait to see if it works somewhere else before we step into it. Or, just do it with a small portion of the staff, a pilot maybe."

Patrick said, "In terms of what to tell the administration, the idea is beyond me. I'm really not sure."

### Conclusions

As was stated in the review of literature, few studies have been conducted that attempt to describe the experiences and perceptions of classroom teachers while involved in a staff development project.

This study attempted to do that, without any predetermined boundaries, in order for the reader to see a staff development project through the eyes of classroom teachers.

The consultant developed the Instructional Awareness project using process-product research, research on staff development, and research on the change process. The process-product research has given educators some relatively clear information linking teacher behavior to student achievement. The consultant used this research as the instructional base for the first three workshops.

In regard to the research on staff development, the consultant followed Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981, 1982) recommendations for program design. In their research, they concluded there are five training components which need to be included in every staff development activity: presentation of material, demonstration of skills, practice, feedback, and coaching. At the workshops, the consultant presented the process-product research and demonstrated the respective teaching skills. The teachers were then given the opportunity to practice the skills and capture their progress on videotape. The consultant coded the videotapes and then conducted post-conferences with each teacher for feedback and coaching purposes.

The consultant also demonstrated an understanding of Hall, Wallace, and Dossett's (1973) research on the change process. In their Concerns-Based Adoption Model, Hall, Wallace, and Dossett contended that teachers can experience seven phases while going through the change process. The consultant referred to this research



numerous times during the project and gave the administrative team Hall and Hord's (1987) most recent work in this area.

The Instructional Awareness project was a research-based approach to improving the quality of instruction for the teachers involved. Each of the informants believed the project had an impact on his or her teaching, and each teacher could demonstrate new skills. Although the Instructional Awareness project appeared to have followed the research on program design and the change process, however, the informants still expressed frustration with the project.

Most of the frustration expressed by the informants focused on the long periods of time between the videotapings and the post-conferences. They felt the feedback was anything but immediate. Another source of frustration that was voiced originated with the post-conferences. When the teachers sensed the consultant was not interested in their post-conference, was not sure who he was talking to, or was in a hurry to complete the post-conference, they expressed dissatisfaction. They also expressed frustration if they sensed the consultant was not being totally candid with them concerning their teaching.

These findings are consistent with Red and Shainline's (1987) contention that change is very personal and complex. The frustration of the informants could have been avoided had the consultant tended to their personal needs. The consultant needed to show a genuine personal and professional interest in each of the informants and needed to be open and candid concerning their progress in respect to

the Instructional Awareness project.

Further research on the experiences and perceptions of those individuals involved in staff development projects is recommended. A qualitative study that includes the experiences and perceptions of the consultant who facilitates the project, the administrator responsible for staff development in the school district, and a group of teachers should be conducted to further increase the understanding educators have of staff development programs and projects.

In conclusion, this study can be used along with the research cited in Chapter II to increase the awareness and understanding of the staff development phenomenon. This awareness can then be used to improve the planning, organization, and implementation of future staff development efforts.

## REFERENCES

## REFERENCES

- Arredondo, D. E., & Block, J. H. (1990). Recognizing the connections between thinking skills and mastery learning. Educational Leadership, 47(5), 5-10.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklin, S. K. (1972). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Newton, Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brandt, R. W. (1990). Overview. Educational Leadership, 47(5), 3.
- Brophy, J., & Evertson, C. (1974). Process-product correlations in the Texas teacher effectiveness study: Final report. Austin, Texas: University of Texas.
- Burchett, E. W. (1989). Personnel perceptions of a collaborative school-based staff development approach: Case study of three suburban public intermediate schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University.
- Burgess, R. G. (1982). Field research: A source book and field manual. London: Allen & Urwin.
- Butt, K. L. (1989). Four middle school physical education teachers' experiences during a collaborative action research staff development project. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina-Greensboro.
- Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Crow, L. W., & Buckley, B. K. (1988). High tech teacher feedback. Tech Trends: For Leaders in Education and Training, 33(5), 37-40.
- Dillon-Peterson, B. (1981). Staff development/organization development. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Edgerton, R. B., & Langness, L. L. (1974). Methods and styles in the study of cultures. San Francisco: Chandler & Sharp.
- Frame, G. P. (1989). Teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of a school-based staff development program: A case study in change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(3), 207-226.

- Gabriel, J. (1957). An analysis of the emotional problems of the classroom teacher. Melbourne, Australia: F. W. Cheshire.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.
- Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). Looking into classrooms. New York: Harper & Row.
- Good, T., & Grouws, D. (1975). Process-product relationship in fourth grade mathematics classrooms: Final report. Columbia: University of Missouri.
- Griffin, G. W. (1983). Introduction: The work of staff development. Staff development: Eighty-second yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 30, 233-252.
- Guskey, T. R. (1985, April). Staff development and teacher change. Educational Leadership, 42, 57-60.
- Hall, G. E., George, A., & Rutherford, W. L. (1979). Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire. Austin: The University of Texas.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in schools. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. Austin: University of Texas.
- Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Hunter, M. (1990). Changing school culture through staff development. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Joyce, B. (1990). Changing school culture through staff development. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1980). Improving in-service training: The message of research. Educational Leadership, 37(5), 379-385.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1981). Teacher training research: Working hypotheses for program design and directions for further study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of ASCD, Los Angeles.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1982, October). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40, 4-10.
- Levine, S. L. (1985). Translating adult development research into staff development practices. The Journal of Staff Development, 6(1), 6-18.
- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). Teachers, their world, and their work. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury, California: Sage.
- Loucks, M. F., & Melle, M. (1982). Evaluation of staff development: How do you know it took? The Journal of Staff Development, 3, 102-117.
- McNeil, J. (1971). Toward accountable teachers: Their appraisals and improvement. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Medley, D., Coker, H., & Soar, R. (1984). Management-based evaluation of teacher performance. New York: Longman.
- Merriam, S. G. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mortensen, L., Bonnstetter, R., & Wandzilak, T. (1990). The teaching feedback model: Faculty colleagues providing feedback on the congruence between teaching objectives, classroom behavior, and student learning. Paper presented to the teaching faculty at the University of Maryland.
- Pambookian, H. (1976). Discrepancy between instructor and student evaluation of instruction: Effects on instruction. Instructional Science, 5, 63-75.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Newbury, California: Sage.

- Red, C., & Shainline, R. (1987). Teachers reflect on change. Educational Leadership, 44(3), 38-40.
- Riley, M. W. (1963). Sociological research volume I: A case approach. San Francisco: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Rosenshine, B. (1971). Teaching behaviors and student achievement. London: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. (1973). The use of direct observation to study teaching. Second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Showers, B. (1983). Transfer of training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.
- Showers, B., Joyce, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and state-of-the-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45, 77-87.
- Sparks, G. M. (1983). Inservice education: Training activities, teacher attitude, and behavioral change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Stallings, J., & Kaskowitz, D. (1974). Follow though classroom observation evaluation. Stanford, California: Stanford Research Institute.
- Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R., & Sabshin, M. (1981). Psychiatric ideologies and institutions. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1985). Introduction to qualitative research methods. New York: Wiley.
- Wade, R. K. (1984). What makes a difference in in-service teacher education? A meta-analysis of research. Educational Leadership, 42, 48-54.

APPENDIX A  
Interview Questions



### Demographic Interview

1. How long have you been teaching, and what is your field?
2. Why did you become a teacher?
3. What do you feel is your major strength as a classroom teacher?
4. What do you feel is your major weakness as a teacher?
5. What do you enjoy most about teaching?
6. What do you least enjoy about teaching?
7. Describe your classroom. What would I see if I walked in?  
What would you be doing? What would your students be doing?
8. What extra-curricular activities do you sponsor?
9. What are your hobbies?
10. What do you see yourself doing in five years?

### First Interview: April 1990

1. What is your opinion of staff development/in-service programs, in general? What have been your personal experiences concerning these programs in our school?
2. What were your feelings when informed that we were going to begin the Instructional Awareness project?
3. What were your feelings before, during, and after the consultant's first workshop?
4. What were your thoughts about doing a 15-minute videotaping of your teaching?
5. What were your thoughts before, during, and after the consultant's second workshop?
6. How do you feel about post-conferencing with the consultant regarding your coded teaching segment?
7. Do you have anything to add?

## Second Interview: May 1990

1. How did your post-conference with the consultant go?
2. Was the coded data an accurate reflection of your teaching segment?
3. What did you pick up on as areas for improvement?
4. What goals have you set?
5. Do you have anything to add?

## Third Interview: November 1990

1. What would you like to say about the Instructional Awareness project thus far?
2. What goal for instructional improvement did you set at your first post-conference?
3. What were your feelings before, during, and after the third workshop conducted by the consultant?
4. What were your thoughts about videotaping, post-conferencing, and goal-setting again?
5. What goal did you set at the second post-conference?
6. Has the Instructional Awareness project had any effect on your classroom teaching behaviors? Give examples.
7. Do you have anything to add?

## Final Interview: May 1991

1. What were your thoughts before, during, and after the consultant's fourth workshop?
2. You were given a choice as to whether you wanted to tape or be coded "live," and if you wanted to post-conference with the consultant or your assigned administrator. What choices did you make and why?
3. What were your thoughts about videotaping, post-conferencing, and goal-setting again?
4. How did the taping, post-conferencing and goal-setting go this semester?
5. What goal did you set at the third post-conference?

## Summary Questions

1. What type of school year did you have?
2. Has the Instructional Awareness project had an effect on your teaching? Give examples.
3. What qualities of the Instructional Awareness project influenced your either positively or negatively?
4. Since the beginning of the project have you become a better questioner? Has your wait-time improved? Are you monitoring progress better? Have you become self-evaluative? Give examples.
5. Overall, what are your feelings and perceptions of the Instructional Awareness project?
6. Should the project continue? If so, what improvements could be made? If not, why not?
7. If the school district ever plans another long-term staff development project, how would you advise the administration to proceed?

APPENDIX B  
TAS Statistical Code

## Categories Code File

Teacher	Student
Give Information	Answering Questions
1 Lecture	Y Student Answers Question
2 Examples	
3 Instructions	Other Activities
4 Review	
Questions	U Summarize
	I Offers Comments
	O Asking Questions
5 Knowledge	
6 Comprehension/Application	
7 Analysis/Synthesis/Evaluation	
Responses to Students	
8 Answer Question	
9 Repeat	
O Clarify/Interpret	
Q Probe	
Other Activities	
W Confirmation	
E Dignifying Student Response	
R Monitors Student Actions	
T Administrative	
TAB Wait-Time	
Point in Time Counters	*Teacher-centered    **Student-centered
Z Reject	C Visual Aids
X Affirmation	V Verbal Concerns
	B Humor
	N Caring
	M Managing

## TAS Statistics

## Sequence:

Name : High School  
 Subject : All Subjects--All Secondary Grades  
 Period :  
 Date : 8-19-1990  
 Lesson Plan and Comments:

This printout is a composite of all the high school code files compiled during the 1989-90 school year

Category	Total Time	Percent
Teacher	4:40:03.39	65.39%
Student	2:20:08.15	32.72%
Other codes	36.32	0.14%
Wait-time	7:30.12	1.75%
Total time	7:08:17.98	

## Counter Frequencies

Z = 36  
 X = 139  
 C = 58  
 V = 192  
 B = 82  
 N = 29  
 M = 23

## Code File Used: NUIUT

1 - (Information) Lecture	T - Administrative Actions
2 - (Information) Examples	Y - Student Answers Question
3 - (Information) Instruction	U - Student Summarizes
4 - (Information) Review	I - Student Offers Comments
5 - Question-Knowledge Level	O - Student Asks Question
6 - Question-Compre./Applicat.	P - Other - Open code
7 - Quest.-Anal/Synth/Evaluat.	Z - Reject
8 - Responses-Answer question	X - Affirmative
9 - Responses - Repeat	C - Visual Aid
0 - Clar./Interpret/Build on	V - Verbal habit
Q - Response - Probe for more	B - Humor
W - Teacher Confirms Response	N - Caring
E - Dignifying Student Response	M - Discipline
R - Monitors Student Actions	

## TIME MATRIX

Sequence:

Name : High School

Date : 8-10-1990

Code	Code Time				Wait Time		
	Total Time	Frequency	Avg. Time	(%)	Total Wait-Time	Avg. Wait-Time	(%)
1	1:35:55.08	293	19.64	22.40%	8.56	4.28	1.90%
2	12:16.05	43	17.12	2.86%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
3	33:41.28	230	8.79	7.87%	4.06	4.06	0.90%
4	4:51.20	25	11.65	1.13%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
5	35:48.00	780	2.65	8.36%	3:18.40	3.74	44.08%
6	11:38.53	170	4.11	2.72%	2:33.67	3.84	34.14%
7	3:12.07	50	3.84	0.75%	17.58	4.39	3.91%
8	6:11.20	67	5.54	1.44%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
9	20:37.98	462	2.68	4.82%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
0	31:53.52	283	6.76	7.45%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Q	13:28.97	307	2.64	3.15%	51.47	5.72	11.43%
W	5:54.44	148	2.39	1.38%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
E	45.42	15	3.03	0.18%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
R	45:57.60	189	14.59	10.73%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
T	3:49.65	15	15.31	0.89%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Y	1:16:05.40	1168	3.91	17.77%	9.62	9.62	2.14%
U	16.21	3	5.40	0.06%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
I	13:26.69	138	5.85	3.14%	6.76	6.76	1.50%
O	4:22.25	60	4.37	1.02%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
P	36.32	8	4.54	0.14%	0.00	0.00	0.00%
WAIT	7:30.12	111	4.06	1.75%			
	7:08:17.98	5097		100.00%	7:30.12		100.00%

## Dominant Patterns

Sequence: GRETHI

Name : High School

Date : 8-19-90

Pattern	Occurrences
3 R 3	88
5 Y 5	84
5 Y 9	197
R 3 R	79
Y 5 Y	108
Y 9 5	74
Y 9 0	77
Y Q Y	116

## PATTERN MATRIX

Sequence:

Name : High School

Date : 8-19-1990

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	Q	W	E	R	T	Y	U	I	O	P
1	10	5	22	8	165	38	8	.	.	.	1	1	.	3	1	11	.	12	6	.
2	3	.	5	.	17	5	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	8	3	.
3	13	5	9	.	25	4	2	.	.	.	1	2	1	136	2	11	.	11	7	.
4	4	2	1	.	12	4	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	1	.	.
5	35	1	6	2	110	6	.	2	.	.	3	.	.	3	3	548	.	3	5	.
6	6	.	.	.	14	14	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	92	.	.	1	1
7	1	.	.	.	3	4	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	37	.	.	.	.
8	11	1	5	1	6	2	.	.	1	.	1	1	.	12	.	5	.	11	9	.
9	61	2	7	1	111	21	5	.	.	96	79	21	1	1	1	45	.	7	1	1
0	36	12	10	3	82	26	6	.	.	1	31	4	1	4	1	34	3	23	3	2
Q	1	.	.	.	12	3	2	.	2	.	13	2	1	.	.	258	.	3	1	.
W	18	1	13	2	23	2	3	.	21	35	8	3	2	4	1	7	.	4	1	.
E	3	.	2	.	3	2	.	.	.	1	1	1	.	.	1	1	.	.	.	.
R	6	.	125	.	12	5	4	.	.	3	1	5	1	2	2	1	.	10	11	.
T	1	.	4	2	3	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3	.	.	.	1	1	3
Y	66	8	11	2	147	24	15	4	439	112	150	97	6	9	1	44	.	22	6	.
U	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
I	8	5	8	1	7	2	3	9	8	23	13	10	2	9	2	3	.	19	5	.
O	1	.	1	.	1	.	.	52	.	1	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.
P	.	.	1	.	.	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	5	.	.	.	.
/	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	Q	W	E	R	T	Y	U	I	O	P

Row followed by column