Engaged Learning: Primary Teachers' Beliefs and Performance-Related self-Perceptions

Anita Pipere

Dr. psych, associated professor
Department of Pedagogical Psychology,
Faculty of Education and Management,
Institute of Sustainable Education,
Daugavpils University
Parades 1, Daugavpils, LV 5400, LATVIA
Phone numbers:
work +371 – 54 – 28636
Home +371 – 54 – 28679, mob. 9538049
E-mail address: pitons@dau.lv

The research extends the knowledge on relationships between the teachers' beliefs and performance for a sample of in-service primary teachers and engaged learning as a context relevant for the primary school setting.

The aim was to discover the relationships between the teachers' beliefs expressed as a rating of significance for indicators of engaged learning (EL) and performance-related self-perceptions regarding these indicators.

The survey was constructed and administered for 30 primary teachers of Latvia. The content of survey is based on variables of EL developed by Jones, Valdez, Nowakowski, and Rasmussen: vision of learning, tasks, assessment, instructional model, learning context, grouping, teacher roles, student roles.

Medium strength positive relationships were found between the beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions of teachers. The findings suggest that beliefs regarding variable student role and assessment were more strongly linked to performance than other variables; the weakest links were found for variable tasks.

Keywords: constructivism, engaged learning, primary teacher, beliefs, performance.

Introduction

Currently an urgent task for Latvian educators is to develop a sustainable educational paradigm complimentary with European and global contexts.

Political changes and unremitting educational reforms keep all the participants of educational affair always in a state of alertness and make the situation of teacher very unstable. Teachers in Latvia currently strive for cohe-

rence and ask for support to help them deal with huge amount of controversies both in the personal and professional field (Pipere, 2004). Though, the humanistic paradigm is claimed as a leading slogan in educational documents of Latvia, in its essence humanism relates more to the field of relationships and attitudes than to the praxis of teaching/learning process occurring in classroom on everyday basis.

Therefore, there is a need to define the background for primary teachers approach to the teaching/learning, to find out their attitude toward the different elements of engaged learning as the elaboration of constructivist paradigm, and to ascertain the agreement between the beliefs and performance in relation to engaged learning. These broad questions served as a frame for this study, which is conceived as a cross-disciplinary inquiry combining the theories and methodology from educational psychology, cognitive psychology, and educational studies.

Constructivist paradigm: Both to students and teachers

Constructivist learning is organized attempts to bring some kind of meaning to our lives. Education can be an enriching experience, as long as the meanings that emerge are personal and significant in some part of the person's life. Meanings should also be viable, that is, they should prove useful in mediating one's transactions – with stored knowledge and the world around (Thomas & harri-Augstein, 1995). Constructivist teaching emphasizes learning and not teaching, encourages and accepts learner autonomy and initiative, sees learners as creatures of will and purpose, thinks of learning as a process, encourages learner inquiry, acknowledges the critical role of experience in learning, nurtures learners natural curiosity, takes the learner's mental model into account, emphasizes performance and understanding when assessing learning, makes extensive use of cognitive terminology such as predict, create and analyse, considers how the student learns, encourages learners to engage in dialogue with other students and the teacher, supports cooperative learning, involves learners in real world situations, emphasizes the context in which learning takes place, considers the beliefs and attitudes of the learner, provides learners the opportunity to construct new knowledge and understanding from authentic experience (What is Constructivism? No date).

Brooks and Brooks (1999) defines a social-constructivist classroom as one in which students are viewed as partners in the learning process. Learning is a filter by which each student creates personal meaning through peer negotiation of the sensory experiences that are provided. The teacher's role in this type of classroom changes from someone who typically provides information on a certain topic to someone who orchestrates the environment and provides opportunities for students to create meaning through active and relevant experiences. In a constructivist classroom, student questions and input are highly valued and encouraged, as opposed to a more traditional classroom where the existing curriculum dictates student learning.

All above mentioned shows us that constructivist paradigm is equally important both for learners and teachers who can fulfil their mission only establishing and sustaining interrelated, synergistic and complementary relationships.

Engaged Learning in primary school

The Engaged Learning (EL) movement is an attempt to turn constructivist theory and what

we know about good teaching and learning into practice.

EL is a strategy which supports students in constructing knowledge in meaningful ways by allowing them to establish their own learning goals, explore appropriate resources and work together in groups to research real life issues which are meaningful to them, multidisciplinary in nature, and in which teachers serve as guides, coaches, facilitators and co-learners.

Recommendations for active, engaged learning experiences are coming from many directions. Jones, Valdez, Nowakowski, and Rasmussen (1994) summarized research and developed indicators of EL to use as a compass in planning and evaluating educational reform (see Appendix 1). They described the indicators of EL:

> "In engaged learning settings, students are *responsible for their own learning*; they take charge and are self-regulated. They define learning goals and problems that are meaningful to them; have a big picture of how specific activities relate to those goals; develop standards of excellence; and evaluate how well they have achieved their goals. They have alternative routes or strategies for attaining goals - and some strategies for correcting errors and redirecting themselves when their plans do not work. They know their own strengths and weaknesses and know how to deal with them productively and constructively. Engaged learners are also able to shape and manage change" (1995: 8).

The concise formulation and performance oriented form of these indicators permit to use them as a basis for the construction of research measures to explore the attitudes of teachers and learners toward the constructivist paradigm in education.

For primary school, EL was used first of all in respect to the IT as a tool for teaching/learning and as a background for the designing the projects for primary school environment. Though, there is a view that in primary school the integrated curriculum is more in Vogue than multidisciplinary curriculum and while agreeing that at times teachers should be *facilitators, guides, and co-learners*, there are also times when they are lecturers, disciplinarians, and managers of the teaching and learning environment (Romeo, 2000). The same thing is true for elementary students: before they can become the skilful and responsible learners as it is presented in the model of EL, they need to receive training and help in this mutual process of teaching/learning. There is also research evidence that primary teachers are more oriented toward teacher-directed activities, traditional teaching approaches, terms like "methods" and "lessons", than preschool teachers (File & Gullo, 2000). Still there is a need for further exploration of introduction of EL in primary classroom and issues connected with this non-traditional approach, because it could be too late to advance with constructivist teaching/learning in middle or secondary school.

Beliefs of teachers on constructivism

Since beliefs are thought to be action agendas (Ajzen, 1985; Pajares, 1992) and the teacher is a key figure of educational reforms (Bybee, 1993), identifying and understanding the beliefs of teachers regarding any educational reform idea becomes critical (Bybee, 1993; Cuban, 1990; Fullan & Miles, 1993).

Studies examining the constructivist beliefs of teachers are necessary to understand a teacher's journey as they attempt to implement constructivist teaching and learning practices (Haney & McArthur, 2002).

Nespor (1987) helped define the construct

of beliefs by asserting that beliefs are deeply personal, stable, lie beyond individual control or knowledge, and are usually unaffected by persuasion. They create an ideal or alternative situation that may differ from reality and are stronger affective and evaluative components than knowledge.

A hierarchy of beliefs envisages the existence of core and peripheral beliefs. Core beliefs are defined as those beliefs that are both stated and enacted. Peripheral beliefs are stated, but not enacted. The peripheral beliefs are filtered by core beliefs. The more a belief is connected with other beliefs within the belief system, the more central it is and the more impervious to change (Bem, 1970; Nisbett & Ross, 1980; Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 1968).

Researchers (Hampton, 1994; Golombek, 1998; Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2001) affirm the notion that changes in teachers' beliefs precede changes in their teaching practices. For example, Edwards (1996) posited that a teacher with a strong static view of mathematics would need to have her beliefs about the subject challenged before her teaching practice would be affected in spite of being involved in an innovative constructivist experience.

Though, the relationship between beliefs and practice is not a simple one-way relationship from belief to practice, but a dynamic two-way relationship in which beliefs are influenced by practical experience (Thompson, 1992). More recently, Raymond's (1997) study of an elementary school teacher's beliefs revealed that her beliefs about mathematics were influenced by her own experiences as a student, but her beliefs about mathematics teaching were primarily influenced by her teaching practice.

Beliefs of teachers may be quite general or very specific. For example, Harste, Woodward, and Burke (1984, cit. in Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2001) identified nineteen separate beliefs about teaching and learning that were built into a simple primary-one level activity. Teachers' beliefs strongly affect the materials and activities they choose for the classroom. Hampton (1994) suggests that some of these core beliefs are changeable, but others are "impermeable and difficult or impossible to change" (p. 129).

The results of study exploring the beliefs of language teachers (Richards, Gallo & Renandya, 2001) show that the most commonly reported core beliefs focus on tasks and instructional methods, second largest category of beliefs was about independent, self-directed and responsible learners, third most common key beliefs related to importance of language skills, and next beliefs were about the characteristics of a good teacher.

Fung (2004) indicates that a group of untrained primary school teachers held "mixed" beliefs about teaching. On the one hand, they agreed that teaching should aim at helping children to construct knowledge through a variety of experiences, with a particular emphasis on problem solving; but on the other hand, they admitted that exposition is an effective way of teaching.

Inconsistency between beliefs and performance

Over the past several years, the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their instructional behavior has become a focus of research endeavors, especially for pre-service or novice teachers in the field of mathematics education. Thompson (1992) points to a repeated finding that mathematics teachers' actions frequently bore no relation to their professed beliefs about mathematics and mathematics teaching.

Anderson & Piazza (1996) described prospective elementary teachers' beliefs about

mathematics and mathematics teaching and learning while enrolled in the mathematics content sequence of a teacher education program. In spite of almost one-half of the 48 pre-service teachers indicating lessened anxiety about mathematics and teaching mathematics, there were participants who remained antagonistic toward the constructivist approach of the project. In another case, Frykholm (1995) studied pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices, and found an overwhelming majority of the observed pre-service teachers' lessons bore little or no resemblance to the views they held.

The research by Foss and Kleinsasser (2001) using both quantitative and qualitative methodology also found the inconsistency between the pre-service elementary teachers' beliefs about mathematics and mathematics teaching: quantitative data obtained from surveys, grades, teaching evaluations, rating scales were inconsistent with their instructional behaviour explored qualitatively.

The current research extends the knowledge in the field focusing on a sample of in-service primary teachers and EL as the context relevant to the primary school setting. The **object** of the study is an attitude of primary teachers to the non-traditional approach to teaching/learning, the transformation of the teachers' beliefs in their classroom practice and consistency among these beliefs and practice. Therefore, the main **aim** was to discover the relationships between the teachers' beliefs expressed as a rating of significance for indicators of EL and performance-related self-perceptions regarding these indicators.

The research **questions** were stated:

- What is the comparative rating of beliefs and performance-related self-perception in relevance to variables of EL?
- What is the comparative rating of beliefs and performance-related self-perception in relevance to indicators of EL?
- Is there a consistency between the primary teachers' beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions regarding the variables and indicators of EL?

The **method** applied to find the answers on these questions is a correlation analysis of results obtained through the survey.

Sample

The participants were 30 primary teachers from different regions of Latvia with a wide range of work experience from one to 36 years (SD=9.63) (see Table 1) who volunteered to fulfil the survey during a one-day national conference on assessment in primary school. All participants were female.

Table 1. Years of teaching experience of the respondents (N=30)

Years of teaching experience	*Frequency*	*Percent*
1–5	5	16.7
6–11	7	23.3
12–17	9	30
18–23	4	13.3
24–29	2	6.7
30–36	3	10

The research shows (Handal, 2002), that teachers' beliefs, in general, are insensitive to traditional differential variables in education such as variables of gender, faculty position and teaching socio-economic area. Such variables as academic qualifications and teaching qualifications had little impact on teachers' espoused beliefs.

Instrument and procedures

The content of survey is based on 25 indicators of EL developed by Jones, Valdez, Nowakowski, and Rasmussen (see Appendix 1). The survey was divided into two sections. In section I, teachers rated the significance of indicators on a scale of 1=most important indicator to 4=least important indicator for this variable. The 5-point Likert scale was used in section II of the survey with 1= indicator is not relevant in my classroom practice, 5= indicator is highly relevant to my classroom practice.

Results

Analyzing the data one should be aware that self-report measures have to be treated with certain degree of discretion and caution. However, some researchers make the point regarding the responses of teachers that "teachers' perceptions constituted reality as far as their work lives were concerned" (Churchill et al., 1997: 142). Furthermore, in line with postmodernist attitude toward the truth in educational research if a teacher believes that their own particular knowledge, skill or personality characteristic is at a certain stage of development, and rates it accordingly, then that rating needs to be accepted as being 'true' for that teacher (Curtis & Cheng, 2001).

Comparative rating of beliefs and performance-related self-perception in relevance to variables of EL

Rating of significance of EL variables as beliefs shows that three most important variables of EL for in-service teachers were ***student roles, assessment*** and ***vision of learning***. Variable ***grouping*** received the fourth place in this rating. The fifth and sixth places were shared by ***learning context*** *and* ***tasks,*** but the last two places were assigned to ***teacher roles*** and ***instructional model.***

Rating of significance of EL variables as performance-related self-perceptions shows that three most important variables of EL for in-service teachers were ***tasks, learning context*** and ***grouping***, followed by ***teacher roles*** and ***instructional model***. The sixth and seventh places were shared by ***assessment*** and ***vision of learning***. Variable ***student roles*** appeared at the last place in this rating.

Comparative rating of beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions in relation to indicators of EL

Table 2 shows both the comparative ratings of EL indicators evaluated as beliefs and comparative ratings of EL indicators evaluated as performance-related self-perceptions.

Rating of significance of EL indicators as beliefs shows that three most important indicators were *responsible for learning* ***(vision of learning)***, *seamless and ongoing* ***(assessment)*** and *generative* ***(assessment)*** (see Table 2). The last three places were assigned to *producer* ***(student roles)***, *equitable* ***(assessment)*** and *facilitator* ***(teacher roles)***.

Rating of significance of EL indicators as performance-related self-perceptions shows that three most important indicators were *guide* ***(teacher roles)***, *tasks* ***(authentic)*** and *seamless and ongoing* ***(assessment)***. The last three places were assigned to *performance based* ***(assessment)***, *energized by learning* ***(vision of learning)*** and *equitable* ***(assessment)***.

Consistency between the beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions in relation to variables and indicators of EL

The correlation analysis helped to prove the consistency between the in-service primary te-

Table 2. ***Ratings of EL indicators as beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions***

N	*Variable*	*Indicator*	*Rank of indicator as belief*	*Rank of indicator as performance-related self-perception*
1	**Vision of Learning**	Responsible for learning	1	19
2	**Assessment**	Seamless and ongoing	2	3
3	**Assessment**	Generative	3	7
4	**Student Roles**	Explorer	4	17.5
5	**Grouping**	Flexible	5	6
6	**Teacher Roles**	Guide	6	1
7	**Student Roles**	Cognitive apprentice	7.5	11
8	**Student Roles**	Teacher	7.5	13
9	**Tasks**	Authentic	9	2
10	**Learning Context**	Knowledge – building	10	16
11	**Grouping**	Equitable	11	15
12	**Instructional Model**	Interactive	12	9.5
13	**Learning Context**	Empathetic	13	4.5
14	**Vision of Learning**	Strategic	14	17.5
15	**Tasks**	Challenging	15	8
16	**Vision of Learning**	Energized by learning	16	24
17	**Vision of Learning**	Collaborative	17.5	4.5
18	**Assessment**	Performance based	17.5	23
19	**Tasks**	Multidisciplinary	19	20
20	**Learning Context**	Collaborative	20	9.5
21	**Grouping**	Heterogeneous	21	13
22	**Instructional Models**	Generative	22	13
23	**Student roles**	Producer	23	21.5
24	**Assessment**	Equitable	24	25
25	**Teacher Roles**	Facilitator	25	21.5

achers' beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions regarding the variables and indicators of EL in the research sample.

The null hypothesis (Ho) was stated that there is no correlation between the rating of EL variables as beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions. It was found that r_S (6) = –.58, $p > .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted and there was not found statistical significant correlation between the rating of EL variables as beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions.

The null hypothesis (Ho) was stated that there is no correlation between the rating of EL indicators as beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions. It was found that r_S (23) = .48, $p < .025$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and there was found a statistical significant medium strength positive correlation between the rating of EL indicators as beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions.

Table 3 reflects the correlations between the ratings of beliefs and scores of performance for each of 25 indicators of EL.

Table 3. ***Correlations between beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions in relation to indicators of EL***

Variable	*Indicator*	*r*	*Mean r*
Vision of Learning	*Responsible for learning*	**.48***	
	Strategic	.01	.22
	Energized by learning	.19	
	Collaborative	.21	
Tasks	*Authentic*	–.01	
	Challenging	.13	.12
	Multidisciplinary	.23	
Instructional Model	*Interactive*	–.10	.18
	Generative	**.45***	
Learning Context	*Collaborative*	**.46***	
	Knowledge-building	.15	.23
	Empathetic	.09	
Grouping	*Heterogeneous*	.06	
	Equitable	.15	.20
	Flexible	**.40***	
Teacher Roles	*Facilitator*	.18	.25
	Guide	.32	
Student Roles	*Explorer*	.30	
	Cognitive apprentice	**.62***	.42
	Teacher	.07	
	Producer	**.67***	
Assessment	*Performance-based*	.39	
	Generative	.34	.36
	Seamless and ongoing	.32	
	Equitable	.37	

*p< .05

As the Table 3 shows, the highest statistically significant correlations were found for the indicators *producer and cognitive apprentice* ***(student role)***, *responsible for learning* ***(vision of learning)***, *collaborative* ***(learning context)***, *generative* ***(instructional model)***, *and flexible* ***(grouping)***.

The lowest, though statistically not significant correlations were found for the indicators *interactive* ***(instructional model)***, *authentic* ***(tasks)***, *strategic* ***(vision of learning)***.

Considering averages of correlations for variables, the highest average value was found for variable ***student roles,*** the lowest – for variable ***tasks.*** Table 3 reflects the significant differences between the coefficients obtained for each variable. The only variable, which shows the relatively compatible values of coefficients, are ***assessment.***

Discussion

Analysis of comparative rating of in-service primary teachers' beliefs about EL shows that in case of variables the most significant beliefs are connected with the characteristics of learner, but the least significant beliefs of EL reflect the characteristics and tasks of teacher.

Comparing these findings with comparative rating of in-service primary teachers' performance-related self-perceptions, we can see the almost opposite picture where the activities most relevant to classroom practice are those connected with characteristics and tasks

of teacher, while the least relevant activities referred to learner. In general, these findings coincide with the findings of Richards, Gallo and Renandya (2001) and Fung (2004).

Evaluation of indicators of EL shows that the most important beliefs were connected with a learner responsible for its learning, which is a very tempting goal for many teachers, as well as with assessment, which perhaps is answer biased by environment of survey administration (Conference on Assessment). The last two places could be explained with a rather homogeneous cultural context of Latvia (equitable assessment) and traditional view of primary teacher as a director and controller not the facilitator.

Analysis of indicators of EL as primary teachers' performance-related self-perceptions shows that the most relevant classroom practice is connected with the teacher as a guide, authentic tasks and seamless and ongoing assessment. The least relevant activities were assessment based on performance, learner energized by learning and equitable assessment.

As we can see, the beliefs of teachers can be very constructivist oriented, but, evidently, the reality of classroom does not allow implementation of these views in teaching/learning process. Perhaps, the causes for it can be found both in teachers and learners: teachers are not ready to give up the traditional model (Anderson & Piazza, 1996), they lack training how to support primary children to become active learners, or they are not sure that constructivist paradigm is developmentally appropriate for primary classroom (File & Gullo, 2000).

Learners, in their turn, are socialized in society oriented toward external rewards and their self-reflection skills and self-dependence and responsibility still need to be developed.

Interpreting correlation between the rating of beliefs and performance-related self-perceptions obtained in case of indicators of EL, we can see that this finding somehow differs from the general tendency demonstrated in research literature. Perhaps such correlation was obtained because of specific sample, which consisted mostly of the motivated and skillful in-service teachers. Perhaps the correlation between the beliefs and qualitative data about the real instructional behavior in this sample would be different.

The constructivist core beliefs about *student roles* have the highest correlation between beliefs and self-perceived performance. This variable also is the most important variable of EL as a belief and least important variable in classrooms. We can assume that if the teacher has implemented this highly valuable but challenging variable in the classroom than his/her beliefs regarding this variable is quite positive and vice versa (Thompson, 1992). The lowest correlation in regard to the peripheral beliefs about *tasks* could be caused by the specific understanding of the tasks for elementary pupils and their skills and knowledge at the primary stage. Even if the teacher has the positive constructivist beliefs towards the tasks, trying them out with elementary children could happen to be unsuccessful, which could let them evaluate the application of such tasks in their classroom as not relevant and important.

In general, primary teachers have different level of compatibility between the coefficients for several indicators of each variable, which perhaps is caused by the peculiarities of cultural and educational background of teachers, a various rate of acknowledgement of these indicators, as well as with the awareness of developmental peculiarities of primary children. The environment of study could be the biasing factor why the highest compatibility between the "consistency" coefficients was found for the variable *assessment.* Conference was oriented

toward the change of teachers' beliefs about assessment. We can assume that this factor levelled the values of correlation coefficients inside this variable.

The study raises many questions, for instance, what results could be obtained from "regular" teachers in "regular" classrooms, not in Conference situation? What are the reasons of such consistency between the beliefs and performance in relation to EL for primary school teachers? What would be the results obtained from middle school or secondary school teachers? What kind of teacher in-service training could provide the larger consistency between the beliefs and instructional behaviour?

There are some limitations of this study:

First, the respondents were all attending Conference on Assessment at the time of the study, which may have biased the responses. In general, for the studies like this situational context of sample could be an important variable of research.

Secondly, the data for this study came from a single source (i.e., a self-report survey), the data were not verified through other sources such as classroom observations, lesson plans, reports from students, colleagues or administrators. While the survey has proved to be an efficient and economic technique, it did not allow exploring the deeper meaning of the teachers' beliefs. This research should be followed up by in-depth interviews to explore the way in great depth how teachers interpret the items.

Though having some limitations, results could inspire further research with preservice primary teachers; indicate some reasons prohibiting the movement toward sustainable education at the primary school level, and help to make the informed decisions for pre-service and in-service primary teacher program designers, school leaders and policy makers.

REFERENCES:

1. Ajzen I. (1985) From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour, in J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.) *Action Control: From Cognition to Behaviour.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

2. Anderson D. S. & Piazza J. A. (1996) Changing beliefs: Teaching and learning mathematics in constructivist preservice classrooms. *Action in Teacher Education,* 18(2), 51–62.

3. Bem D. J. (1970) Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs. California: Brooks/Cole.

4. Brooks J. G. & Brooks M. G. (1999) In Search of Understanding: The Case for the Constructivist Classroom. Alexandria, VA: ASCD Publications.

5. Bybee R. W. (1993) Leadership, responsibility, and reform in science education. *Science Educator,* 2, 1–9.

6. Churchill R., Williamson J. & Grady N. (1997) Educational change and the new realities of teacher's work lives. *Asia – Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* 25 (2), 141–158.

7. Cuban L. (1990) Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19, 3–13.

8. Curtis A. & Cheng L. (2001) Teachers' self-evaluation of knowledge, skills and personality characteristics needed to manage change. *Asia – Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 29(2), 139–152.

9. Edwards T. G. (1996) Implications of a model for conceptualizing change in mathematics teachers' instructional practices. *Action in Teacher Education*, 18 (2), 19–30.

10. File N. & Gullo D. F. (2000) *Pre-service teachers' beliefs about primary classroom practice: Similarities and differences between Early Childhood and Elementary Prepared Students. Proceedings of the L.Katz Symposium November 5 – 7, 2000 ECAP Collaborative University of Illinois* "Issues in Early Childhood Education: Curriculum, Teacher Education, and Dissemination of Information".

11. Foss D. H. & Kleinsasser R. C. (2001) Contrasting research perspectives: What the evidence yields. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 7 (3), 271–295.

12. Frykholm J. A. (1995) *The Impact of the NCTM Standards on Pre-service Teachers' Beliefs and Practi-*

ces. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

13. Fullan M. G. & Miles M. B. (1993) Getting reforms right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 745–752.

14. Fung Y. (2004) Beliefs about teaching held by a group of primary school teachers at the start of an initial teacher education programme. Proceedings of 2nd Annual Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, January 3–6, 2004, 1162–1169.

15. Golombek P. R. (1998) A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 447–464.

16. Hampton S. (1994) Teacher change: Overthrowing the myth of one teacher, one classroom, in T. Shanahan (ed.) *Teachers Thinking, Teachers Knowing*. Illinois: NCRE, 122–140.

17. Handal B. P (2002) Teacher's Mathematical Beliefs and Gender, Faculty Position, Teaching Socio-Economic Area, Teaching Experience and Academic Qualifications. Programme and Abstracts of the Self-Concept Enhancement and Learning Facilitation (SELF) Research Centre International Conference, Sydney, Australia, 6–8 August, 2002.

18. Haney J. J. & McArthur J. (2002) Four case studies of prospective science teachers' beliefs concerning constructivist teaching practices. Science Education, 86, 783–802.

19. Harste J. C., Woodward V. A. & Burke C. L. (1984) *Language Stories and Literacy Lessons. Portsmouth*, N. H.: Heinemann.

20. Jones B. F., Valdez G., Nowakowski J. & Rasmussen, C. (1994) *Designing Learning and Technology for Educational Reform*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

21. Jones B. F., Valdez G., Nowakowski J. & Rasmussen, C. (1995) *Plugging in: Choosing and Using Educational Technology*. Washington, DC: Council for Educational Development and Research, and North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Available online: http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/edtalk/toc.htm

22. Nespor J. (1987) The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19, 317–328.

23. New Times Demand New Ways of Learning (No date) NCREL – North Central Regional Educational Laboratory Accessed at http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/edtalk/newtimes.htm on 01/28/04.

24. Nisbett R. & Ross L. (1980) *Human Inference: Strategies and Shortcomings of Social Judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

25. Pajares M. F. (1992) Teacher's beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 3, 307–332. Pipere A. (2004) Identity of Latvian Teacher: Examining Structural Variations and Interactive "Self". Proceedings of 2nd Annual Hawaii International Conference on Education, Honolulu, January 3–6, 2004, 3099–3113.

26. Raymond A. M. (1997) Inconsistency between a beginning elementary school teacher's mathematics beliefs and teaching practice. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 28(5), 550–576.

27. Richards J. C., Gallo P. B. & Renandya W.A. (2001) Exploring teachers' beliefs and the processes of change. *PAC Journal*, 1 (1), 41–62.

28. Rokeach M. (1968) Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change. San Francisco: Jossey – Bass Inc.

29. Smith R. (1994) Technologies for Enhanced Learning Directorate of School Education, Victoria Melbourne. What is Constructivism? (No date), Learning styles and CAE Accessed at http://hagar.up.ac.za/catts/learner/lindavr/lindapg1.htm on 01/28/04.

30. Thomas L. & S. harri-Augstein (1995) Self-organized Learning: Foundations of a Conversational Science of Psychology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

31. Thompson A. G. (1984) The relationship of teachers' conceptions of mathematics and mathematics teaching to instructional practice. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 15, 105–127.

32. Thompson A. G. (1992) Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: a synthesis of the research, in D. A. Grows (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning*, New York, Macmillan. 127–146.

Appendix 1

Indicators of Engaged Learning (Jones, Valdez, Nowakowski & Rasmussen, 1995)

Variable	*Indicator of Engaged Learning*	*Indicator Definition*
Vision of Learning	Responsible for learning	Learner involved in setting goals, choosing tasks, developing assessments and standards for the tasks; has big picture of learning and next steps in mind.
	Strategic	Learner actively develops repertoire of thinking/learning strategies.
	Energized by learning	Learner is not dependent on rewards from others; has a passion for learning.
	Collaborative	Learner develops new ideas and understanding in conversations and work with others
Tasks	Authentic	Pertains to real world, may be addressed to personal interest.
	Challenging	Difficult enough to be interesting but not totally frustrating, usually sustained.
	Multidisciplinary	Involves integrating disciplines to solve problems and address issues
Assess-ment	Performance-based	Involving a performance or demonstration, usually for a real audience and useful purpose.
	Generative	Assessments having meaning for learner; may be produce information, product, service.
	Seamless and ongoing	Assessment is part of instruction and vice versa; students learn during assessment.
	Equitable	Assessment is culture fair
Instructional Model	Interactive	Teacher or technology program responsive to student needs, requests (e.g., menu driven).
	Generative	Instruction oriented to constructing meaning; providing meaningful activities/experiences
Learning Context	Collaborative	Instruction conceptualizes students as part of learning community; activities are collaborative.
	Knowledge-building	Learning experiences set up to bring multiple perspectives to solve problems such that each perspective contributes to shared understanding for all; goes beyond brainstorming.
	Empathetic	Learning environment and experiences set up for valuing diversity, multiple perspectives, strengths
Grouping	Heterogeneous	Small groups with persons from different ability levels and backgrounds.
	Equitable	Small groups organized so that over time all students have challenging learning tasks/experiences.
	Flexible	Different groups organized for different instructional purposes so each person is a member of different groups; works with different people
Teacher Roles	Facilitator	Engages in negotiation, stimulates and monitors discussion and project work but does not control.
	Guide	Helps students to construct their own meaning by modeling, mediating, explaining when needed, redirecting focus, providing options
Student Roles	Explorer	Students have opportunity to explore new ideas/tools; push the envelope in ideas and research.
	Cognitive Apprentice	Learning is situated in relationship with mentor who coaches students to develop ideas and skills that stimulate the role of practicing professionals (i.e., engaged in real research).
	Teacher	Students encouraged to teach others in formal and informal contexts.
	Producer	Students develop products of real use to themselves and others

ĮTRAUKIAMASIS MOKYMASIS: PRADINIŲ KLASIŲ MOKYTOJŲ NUOSTATOS IR MOKOMOSIOS VEIKLOS SAVIVOKA

Anita Pipere

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aptariama konstruktyvistinė įtraukiamojo mokymosi (angl. *Engaged learning*) teorija ir pateikiama koreliacinio tyrimo ataskaita, kurios tikslas, remiantis konstruktyvizmo paradigmos nuostatomis bei Jones, Valdez, Nowakovski ir Rasmussen išskirtais indikatoriais / kintamaisiais (*mokymosi vizija, uždaviniai, įvertinimas, instrukcinis modelis, mokymosi kontekstas, grupavimas, mokytojo vaidmenys, moksleivio vaidmenys)*, nustatyti, ar egzistuoja statistiškai reikšmingas mokytojų mokomosios veiklos, besiremiančios įtraukiamojo mokymosi nuostatomis bei paties įtraukiamojo mokymosi konteksto ryšys.

Įsitraukimo į mokymąsi ugdymas, pasak konstruktyvistų, yra tinkamiausias mokant pradinių klasių moksleivius mokytis. Tyrime dalyvavo 30 pradinių klasių mokytojų iš įvairių Latvijos mokyklų.

Koreliacinis tyrimas parodė, kad yra vidutinio stiprumo teigiamas mokytojų nuostatų ir jų mokomosios veiklos savivokos ryšys. Tyrimo rezultatai parodė, kad mokytojų įsitikinimu kintamųjų *moksleivio vaidmenys ir įvertinimas* ryšys su jų mokomąja veikla yra stipresnis nei kitų; silpniausias nustatytas ryšys su kintamuoju *uždaviniai*.

Įteikta 2004 09 10
Priimta 2004 11 15