



# **RESEARCH BRIEF**

# WEIGHING FORMAT & EVIDENCE (PARTICIPANT POOL FALL 2017)

During the Fall 2017 term150 pre-service teachers participated in an experiment designed to measure how they value different types of professional development delivery and different types of evidence of effectiveness. In a 2 x 2 design, students read a vignette that described either a conventional program consisting of a two-day in person professional development session or an unconventional program consisting of a one-hour online professional development session. Each type of program was supported by either strong experimental evidence or weaker testimonial evidence. Participants also responded to questions about their mindsets about student motivation. Some preliminary results are presented here. Thank you for your time spent participating.

#### **Teacher's Mindsets**

Pre-service teachers in our sample had significantly more of a growth mindset than a fixed mindset.



## **Type of Program**

Fixed

Mindset

Those who read about a conventional program delivery method compared to an unconventional program delivery, were somewhat <u>more</u> likely to...

- ... think it was an appropriate method.
- ... believe it would improve their confidence
- ... to help students value learning.

#### Type of Evidence

Participants who reviewed a program with strong evidence were somewhat <u>less likely</u> to be concerned with the cost of the program, than those who were provided with weak evidence.

## What did the teachers think was the most appealing part of a Professional Development program?

- Being shown additional ways to engage and motivate their students to learn.
- The resources provided that they could refer to after the conclusion of the program.
- That it was supported with research showing the effectiveness of the program (when strong evidence was provided).
- The in-person format of learning (when given a conventional program).
- The price of the program (when given the low cost unconventional program)

Please check our website <u>here</u> as more information on this project becomes available. Report prepared by Devon Chazan and Lauren Goegan